

# World Art Histories and the Cold War\*

Robert Born

Surveying the debates which have taken place over recent decades concerning the end of art or, respectively, the end of history, it is conspicuous that key contributions cluster around two points in time. In view of the eschatological import of these debates, it is of little surprise that the millennium marked one of these moments. The other, however, occurred more than a decade earlier and was shaped by the arguments of Arthur Danto and Hans Belting, both of whom took up Hegel's notion of the end of art and developed it in different ways. Danto perceived a radical caesura in the blurring of the boundaries between art and everyday objects. This had been the leitmotif of Andy Warhol's oeuvre, in the aftermath of which – Danto argued – the appreciation of art had increasingly become a matter of applied philosophy. This process inevitably restricts the cultural significance of art.<sup>1</sup>

Almost simultaneously, in 1983, Hans Belting posed his polemical question as to whether art history had come to its end. His text, based on the inaugural lecture he had delivered as professor in the history of art at Munich University, centred on the critique of art history as discipline which – according to him – had evaded the challenges of modern art and made little use of contemporary experiences. By placing more emphasis on these factors within the academic discourse, Belting hoped to gain new insights into the historical epochs of art.<sup>2</sup> His concept of an 'art history after the end of art history' took shape in a more defined way over the ensuing decade, a process highlighted by the omission of the question mark on the cover of the revised edition, which he published in 1995. Therein, Belting emphasised not only the role of contemporary media; he also analysed the legacy of Modernism. Still under the influence of the dramatic political changes from 1989 onwards, he addressed the relationship between Eastern and Western Europe and postulated the necessity of an 'art history in two voices'. A bivocal art

\* My special thanks for the English translation of the manuscript are addressed to Barbara Lück (Berlin), Jeanne-Marie Musto (New York), Stephen Clarkson (Toronto) and Andreas Puth (Leipzig). I would also like to thank Frank Treibmann (Berlin) for his help with the Russian titles.

<sup>1</sup> Berel Lang ed, *The Death of Art*, lead essay by Arthur Danto, New York, NY: Haven, 1984; Arthur Coleman Danto, *The Philosophical Disenfranchisement of Art*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1986. The impact of the debate initiated by Danto is surveyed in: David Carrier ed, *Danto and His Critics: Art History, Historiography and After the End of Art*, Middletown, Conn.: Wesleyan University Press, 1998 (*History and Theory* / Theme issue 37); Patricia Esquvel, 'Which Art? What are Hegel and Danto Talking About When They Talk About the "End of Art"?', *Konsthistorisk tidskrift/Journal of Art History*, 79: 4, 2010, 216–225, and most recently by Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert, 'Danto und Hegel zum Ende der Kunst - Ein Wettstreit um die Modernität der Kunst und Kunsttheorie', in: Annemarie Gethmann-Siefert, Herta Nagl-Docekal and Elisabeth Weisser-Lohmann eds, *Hegels Ästhetik als Theorie der Moderne*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2013, 17–37.

<sup>2</sup> Hans Belting, *Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte?*, Munich: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 1983. English edition: Hans Belting, *The End of the History of Art?*, translated by Christopher S. Wood, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987.

history would take account of the still divergent, twofold shaping of Europe.<sup>3</sup> With regard to the preceding era, 1945 to 1989, the impact of the twofold shaping Belting has diagnosed in specific relation to Europe is certainly in need of being applied more globally to the two blocs of power facing each other during the Cold War. This article aims to address that need by looking at the surveys of world art history written on both sides of the Iron Curtain during the first two decades after World War II.

The publications to be considered here include Mikail Alpatov's *Vseobshchaya istoriya iskusstva* ('The Universal History of Art', 1948–1949), Arnold Hauser's *The Social History of Art* (1951) and Ernst Gombrich's *The Story of Art* (1950). Each of these panoramic surveys went through several editions and was translated into at least one foreign language. Yet, in spite of the wide dissemination of these syntheses, James Elkins only addressed Alpatov's, and then only marginally, when assessing this specific genre of art-historical literature.<sup>4</sup> Whilst Elkins himself would certainly not claim his book to be exhaustive, his study does offer a highly nuanced reflection on the impact of the expansion of art-historical material on the concept and structure of textbooks in general. From the viewpoint of Belting's 'two voices', it is therefore all the more puzzling that Elkins, on the one hand, discusses a multi-volume universal history of art written by a Soviet authors' collective – published in the 1950s in both Russian and German – within a chapter entitled Non-European Stories whereas, on the other hand, Western Europe and the United States are treated as a single entity.<sup>5</sup>

The lasting impact of Cold War antagonism which evidently still informs Elkins's book also forms the background against which I shall consider the global art histories by Mikail V. Alpatov (1902–1986), Arnold Hauser (1892–1978) and E. H. Gombrich (1909–2001). Special attention will be paid to the narratives of artistic development elaborated by these authors, as well as to their *telos*. As has been argued repeatedly, it was above all the generation of scholars driven into exile by Nazi Germany and Austria in the 1930s which most fully absorbed Hegelian thought into art history and disseminated Hegelianism across the Anglophone world.<sup>6</sup> I shall, therefore, also examine the situation of exile and the ways in which it determined art-historical writing. My selection of case studies is informed by the

<sup>3</sup> Hans Belting, *Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte: eine Revision nach zehn Jahren*, Munich: Beck, 1995, 60. English edition: Hans Belting, *Art History After Modernism*, translated by Caroline Saltzweid and Mitch Cohen, Chicago: University of Chicago Press 2003, 61. For a discussion of the thesis of the 'two voices' with regard to East Central Europe, see: Piotr Piotrowski, 'On "two voices of art history"', in: Katja Bernhardt and Piotr Piotrowski eds, *Grenzen überwindend: Festschrift für Adam S. Labuda zum 60. Geburtstag*, Berlin: Lukas Verlag, 2006, 42–56; Mária Orišková, *Zweistimmige Kunstgeschichte*, Vienna: Praesens Verlag, 2008.

<sup>4</sup> James Elkins, *Stories of Art*, New York–London: Routledge, 2002, 164. A well-argued critique of Elkins's contextualization of Alpatov's *Universal History of Art* can be found in: Vardan Azatyan, 'Cold-war twins: Mikhail Alpatov's *A universal history of arts* and Ernst Gombrich's *The story of art*', in: *Relativism Versus Universalism & Ernst Hans Gombrich*. Bratislava 2009 (= *Human Affairs* 19: 3, 2009), 289–296, here 295.

<sup>5</sup> James Elkins, *Stories of Art*, 89.

<sup>6</sup> On the diffusion of Hegelian concepts by German-language émigré scholars, see: Eric Fernie, 'Introduction', *Art History and Its Methods: A Critical Anthology / Selection and Commentary* by Eric Fernie, London: Phaidon, 1995, 10–21, here 17; Jochen Wierich, 'Mutual seduction: German Art History and American Art', in: Barbara Groseclose and Jochen Wierich eds, *Internationalizing the History of American Art: Views*, University Park, Pa.: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2009, 41–60, here 44–45.

aim to trace the diverse ways in which the diffusion and reception of theories were operating – in particular in East Central Europe – and to examine continuities as well as breaks between the inter-war-period and the situation after 1945.<sup>7</sup>

Mikhail Vladimirovič Alpatov had completed his art-historical studies at the Moscow State University in 1924 and subsequently worked at several academic institutions in the Soviet capital. In parallel, he regularly travelled abroad and published the results of his research in leading international periodicals. Initially, his focus was on Early Christian and Byzantine art as well as the art of medieval Italy.<sup>8</sup> In mid-1920s Berlin, Alpatov collaborated with the Latvian born Oskar Wulff (1864–1946). Wulff had been a pupil of August Schmarsow (1853–1936) and shared the latter's interest in the psychology of art and a desire to extend art history into a systematic science of art (*Kunstwissenschaft*).<sup>9</sup> At the time, Wulff combined his work in the Berlin museums with teaching Eastern European art history and comparative science of art at the university. Together with Alpatov, he published a survey of the development of icon painting.<sup>10</sup> Alpatov also collaborated with a specialist on architecture, Nikolaj Ivanovič Brunov (1898–1971), who likewise travelled and published abroad in the 1920s and 30s. Together they wrote a survey of Russian art between 1000 and 1700 which appeared in 1932 in German.<sup>11</sup>

Both authors' exposure to German-language academe between 1925 and 1935 coincided with a crucial stage of the debate on methodology dividing *Kunstgeschichte* at the time. One issue at stake was to clarify the respective remit of art history and *Kunstwissenschaft*, the other was to define the relationship between the artwork's form and its contents. The latter issue incorporated the question of whether and how to reconstruct the original functional contexts of works of art.<sup>12</sup>

<sup>7</sup> For the transfer of theories, reference should not only be made to Edward Said, 'Traveling Theory', *The World The Text, and the Critic*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983, 226–247, and Mieke Bal, *Travelling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide*, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002, but with regard to East Central Europe also to Dietlind Hüchtker and Alfrun Kliems, 'Überbringen – Überformen – Überblenden. Theorietransfer im 20. Jahrhundert', in: Dietlind Hüchtker and Alfrun Kliems eds, *Travelling concepts'. Denkweisen und ihre (politischen) Übersetzungen im 20. Jahrhundert*, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2011, 9–23, here 9–13.

<sup>8</sup> Michail Vladimirovič Alpatov, 'Die Entstehung des Mosaiks von Jakobus Torriti in Santa Maria Maggiore in Rom. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Gotik in Italien', *Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 1924/25, 1–19; 'Die Fresken der Kachrije Djami in Konstantinopel', *Münchener Jahrbuch der bildenden Kunst*, N.S. 6, 1929, 345–364; 'A Byzantine Illuminated Manuscript of the Palaeologue Epoch in Moscow', *The Art Bulletin*, 12: 3 (September 1930), 207–218.

<sup>9</sup> For Schmarsow's and Wulff's positions in the debate on establishing a new *Kunstwissenschaft* (Study of Art) which was clearly defined against art history, see: Christian Fuhrmeister, 'Reine Wissenschaft: Art History in Germany and the Notion of 'Pure Science' and 'Objective Scholarship', 1920–1950', in: Mitchell B. Frank and Daniel Adler eds, *German Art History and Scientific Thought: Beyond Formalism*, Farnham-Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2012, 161–177, here 166. In view of the difficulties of rendering the term *Kunstwissenschaft* appropriately in English, it should be emphasised here that the German term *Wissenschaft* covers both the humanities and the natural sciences.

<sup>10</sup> Oskar Wulff and Michael Alpatov, *Denkmäler der Ikonenmalerei: in kunstgeschichtlicher Folge*, Hellerau bei Dresden: Avalun-Verlag, 1925. On Oskar Wulff: Barbara Schellewald, 'Der Blick auf den Osten - eine Kunstgeschichte à part: Oskar Wulff und Adolph Goldschmidt an der Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität und die Folgen nach 1945', in: Horst Bredekamp and Adam S. Labuda eds, *In der Mitte Berlins: 200 Jahre Kunstgeschichte an der Humboldt-Universität*, Berlin: Gebrüder Mann Verlag, 2010, 207–228, here 207–219.

<sup>11</sup> Mikhail Alpatov and Nikolaj Brunov, *Geschichte der altrussischen Kunst*, 2 vols. Augsburg: Filser, 1932.

<sup>12</sup> Lorenz Dittmann ed, *Kategorien und Methoden der deutschen Kunstgeschichte 1900-1930*, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1985; Marlite Halbertsma, *Wilhelm Pinder und die deutsche Kunstgeschichte*. Worms:

Important centres where these methodological debates on the future of art history took place were not only Berlin and Hamburg; the younger protagonists of the Vienna school of art history also played a significant role.<sup>13</sup> During his sojourn at Vienna in 1927, Alpatov established contacts with Hans Sedlmayr (1896–1984), then pursuing his aim to transform Alois Riegl's concept of *Kunstwollen* into a 'rigorous science of art' (*strenge Kunstwissenschaft*).<sup>14</sup> Alpatov's one-week stay in the Austrian capital marked the beginning of a productive exchange with Sedlmayr.<sup>15</sup> In his controversial book *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale* ('The origin of the cathedral'), which became a landmark of his neoconservative position after World War II, Sedlmayr notes how his concept of the Gothic cathedral as *Abbild* ('actual representation'/'reproduction') of the Heavenly Jerusalem had been decisively influenced by a profound remark Alpatov had made in 1934.<sup>16</sup>

Sedlmayr found in Alpatov a kindred spirit in establishing *Strukturforschung* ('structural analysis'), as evinced by Sedlmayr's correspondence with Meyer Schapiro (1901–1996).<sup>17</sup> The new approach of *Strukturforschung* was to centre upon the revelation of the structural principles underlying the formal organization of individual works of art. In his efforts to define Riegl's *Kunstwollen* more precisely, Sedlmayr introduced the category of the *objektiver Geist* ('objective spirit') which shows close affinities to Hegelian concepts. Here, Sedlmayr refers to Albert Vierkandt's (1867–1953) *Gesellschaftslehre* ('Treatise on society') of 1923.<sup>18</sup> The sociological characterization of this 'objective spirit' as 'supra-individual will' and as

Werner 1992, 83–104; Mitchell B. Frank and Daniel Adler, 'Introduction', *German Art History and Scientific Thought*, 1–12.

<sup>13</sup> Sergiusz Michalski, 'Zur methodologischen Stellung der Wiener Schule in den zwanziger und dreißiger Jahren', in: Stefan Krenn and Martina Pippal eds, *Wien und die Entwicklung der kunsthistorischen Methode. Akten des 25. Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte Wien 1983*, vol. 1, Vienna-Cologne-Graz: Böhlau Verlag, 1984, 83–90.

<sup>14</sup> Hans Sedlmayr, 'Zu einer strengen Kunstwissenschaft', *Kunstwissenschaftliche Forschungen* 1, 1931, 7–32. Translated by Mia Fineman as Hans Sedlmayr, 'Towards a Rigorous Study of Art', in: Christopher Wood ed, *The Vienna School Reader: Politics and Art Historical Method in the 1930s*, New York: Zone, 2000, 133–179. For a contextualization of the concept of rigorous science, taking into account Walter Benjamin's and Eberhard Hempel's criticisms of Sedlmayr's initiative, see: Fuhrmeister, 'Reine Wissenschaft', 166–168.

<sup>15</sup> Michail Alpatov, *Vospominaniya. Tvorcheskaya sud'ba. Semejnaya khronika. Gody ucheniya. Goroda i strany. Lyudi iskusstva* ('Memories. Career, Family History, Teaching Years, Cities and Countries'), Moscow: Iskusstvo 1994, 86, with personal memoirs of his 1927 stay in Vienna. For this, see also Otto Demus, 'Nachruf auf M. Alpatov', *Almanach der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften für das Jahr 1986*, Vienna: Verl. d. Österr. Akad. d. Wiss. 1987, 427–429.

<sup>16</sup> Hans Sedlmayr, *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale*, Zürich: Atlantis-Verlag, 1950, 10. The concept of the cathedral as an image of heaven can already be found in Alpatov and Brunov, *Geschichte der altrussischen Kunst*, vol. 1, 217–218. For a contextualisation of Sedlmayr's *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale* within the history of art history as a discipline and within the intellectual climate in Post War Germany see: Wilhelm Schlink, 'The Gothic Cathedral as Heavenly Jerusalem: A Fiction in German Art History', in: Bianca Kühnel ed, *The real and ideal Jerusalem in Jewish, Christian and Islamic Art: studies in honour of Bezalel Narkiss on the occasion of his seventieth birthday*, Jerusalem: Center for Jewish Art, 1998 (= *Jewish art*, 23/24.1997/98), 275–293.

<sup>17</sup> Evonne Levy, 'Sedlmayr and Schapiro correspond, 1930 – 1935', *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 59, 2010(2011), 235–263, here 239 (letter of 2 May 1931), 243 (29 December 1932), 245 (21 July 1934).

<sup>18</sup> On Sedlmayr's 'Strukturforschung', see most recently: Ian Verstegen, 'Materializing *Strukturforschung*', in: *German art history and scientific thought*, 141–160 as well as Ian Verstegen 'The "Second" Vienna School as social science', *Journal of Art Historiography* 7-IV/1 (December 2012), 8–10 (for the reception of Vierkandt's ideas).

a component part of 'larger entities' facilitated the dissociation of artworks from the historical context of their production, thereby allowing them to be linked to trans-historical categories such as people or race.<sup>19</sup>

The dangers inherent in this shift of emphasis were addressed by Meyer Schapiro as early as 1936 in his review of the second volume of the *Kunstwissenschaftliche Forschungen* ('Research in the Science of Art').<sup>20</sup> Alpatov contributed to this volume a study of Poussin's self-portrait in the Louvre which over-emphasizes the painter's national loyalties at the expense of the concrete social conditions in which the work was created – these are hardly mentioned.<sup>21</sup> As Vardan Azatyan has shown convincingly, Alpatov's close association with the methodological debates taking place in Vienna and Berlin – as well as his affinity with categories of people and nation – conferred something of a special status upon him within institutionalized Soviet art history. The discipline was undergoing reorganization in the late 1930s in compliance with new political directives concerning the sciences. These emphasised that formal observations must rest upon a scientific and methodologically nuanced basis. In this context, methods recently developed in German-language research were explicitly referred to as benchmarks.<sup>22</sup> The esteem in which Alpatov was held by the Soviet authorities is demonstrated by the fact that in 1939 he was given the opportunity to publish a collection of essays on the history of Western art.<sup>23</sup> To the painters Michelangelo, Titian, Rembrandt, Jacques-Louis David and Gustave Courbet discussed in this anthology the magazine *Iskusstvo* ('Art') – the main publication organ of Soviet art politics – had dedicated a series of essays in the late 1930s as well. These artists were regarded as reference figures within the increasingly ferocious debates on the establishment of Socialist Realism as the official art.<sup>24</sup> Alpatov's studies of 1939 were re-issued in Russian in 1963 and also underwent several German editions in both East and West Germany.<sup>25</sup> The essay collection of 1939 also contains a study on Pieter Brueghel the Elder's *The Blind Leading the Blind*; in writing on this subject, Alpatov harked back to a thematic focus of Max Dvořák's late writings which was also taken up by Sedlmayr. Before World War I important contributions to Brueghel scholarship were also made in Budapest by a group of art historians and philosophers connected with György Lukács (1885–1971) and later known as the 'Sunday Circle'. Among these scholars Leo Popper (1886–1911), an art critic who is not much known outside of Hungary, has to be mentioned. Until his early decease, he was Lukács's closest friend and had

<sup>19</sup> Hans Sedlmayr, 'Kunstgeschichte als Stilgeschichte (Die Quintessenz der Lehren Riegels)', in: *Kunst und Wahrheit. Zur Theorie und Methode der Kunstgeschichte*, Hamburg: Rohwolt, 1958, 14–34, here 20–22. See also: Jason Gaiger, 'Hegel's contested legacy: rethinking the relation between art history and philosophy', *The Art Bulletin*, 93: 2 (June 2011), 178–194, here 181.

<sup>20</sup> Meyer Schapiro, 'The New Viennese School', *Art Bulletin*, 18, 1936, 258–266.

<sup>21</sup> Mikhail Alpatov, 'Das Selbstbildnis Poussins im Louvre', *Kunstwissenschaftliche Forschungen*, 2, 1933, 113–130.

<sup>22</sup> Vardan Azatyan, 'Cold-war twins', 291–292.

<sup>23</sup> Mikhail Alpatov, *Étudy po istorii zapadnoevropeiskogo iskusstva* ('Studies in the History of Western European Art'), Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Iskusstva, 1939.

<sup>24</sup> Antoine Baudin, *Le réalisme socialiste soviétique de la période jdanovienne: (1947–1953)*, Vol. 1 'Les arts plastiques et leurs institutions', Berne: Lang, 1997, 32–33.

<sup>25</sup> Mikhail Alpatov, *Über westeuropäische und russische Kunst. Beiträge zu ihrer Geschichte*, Dresden: VEB Verlag der Kunst, 1982; *Studien zur Geschichte der westeuropäischen Kunst*, Cologne: DuMont Schauberg, 1974 and 1996, as part of a box set on 'Classics of Art History'. In his introduction to the 1974 edition, Werner Hofmann attempts a methodological contextualization of Alpatov's interpretations.

substantially influenced his academic career and attitude towards the visual arts.<sup>26</sup> He published about a dozen essays which dealt not only with Paul Cézanne, Vincent van Gogh and Aristide Maillol but also with the works of Pieter Brueghel. Popper laid emphasis on the gravity of their pictorial composition and on this basis postulated a parallel to the paintings by Cézanne.<sup>27</sup> In the interwar period Leo Popper's writings on Brueghel were received by other members of the group around György Lukács, like Charles de Tolnay (Karl von Tolnai 1899–1981) – who gravitated between the circle of Lukács and the Warburg Library associates in Hamburg – and Frederick (Frigyes) Antal (1887–1954), who both published on Netherlandish Mannerism.<sup>28</sup>

In 1938 – on the basis of his close textual and conceptual interconnections with coeval Western scholarship – Alpatov received the commission to write a universal history of art, which was intended as the first presentation of the development of arts from a Marxist perspective.<sup>29</sup> It seems quite plausible that this project was initiated as reaction to the *Geschichte der Kunst von der altchristlichen Zeit bis zur Gegenwart* ('History of Art from the Early Christian Time to the Present') of Richard Hamann (1879–1961), which had been published by the Berlin publishing house Th. Knaur in 1932 as an opulently illustrated work of almost 1000 pages and at a quite popular price. This initiative was part of the publisher's strategy to democratize education – a strategy supported by left-liberal authors such as Hamann. One remarkable feature of Hamann's survey was its enthusiastic presentation of expressionist art and of the architecture and design of the *Bauhaus* in the final chapter, which was retained in the second edition, which was published in 1935, hence after the seizure of power by the National Socialist Party in Germany.<sup>30</sup> A Polish translation of Hamann's survey was published in 1939, just before the outbreak of World War II.<sup>31</sup> The stated goal of Hamann's 'History of Art' was a departure from a purely formal analysis and interpretation of the development of art. Instead the author planned to present the development of art as a requirement of modern practicality. The impressive number of illustrations that complemented the text were intended as an independent statement about the artwork by the way of recording the objects. According to Hamann, one of the pioneers of the study of the

<sup>26</sup> Csilla Markója, 'Popper Leó (1886-1911)', in: István Bardoly and Csilla Markója eds, *'Emberék, és nem frakkok'. A magyar művészettörténet-írás nagy alakjai* ('People and no Tailcoats'. Significant Figures of Hungarian Art Historiography'), Budapest: Meridián, 2007, 263–284; Árpád Tímár, 'The Young Lukács and the Fine Arts', *Acta Historiae Artium* 34, 1989, 29–39, here 31–34.

<sup>27</sup> Leo Popper, 'Peter Bruegel der Ältere', *Kunst und Künstler* 8, 1910, 599–606.

<sup>28</sup> On the studies of Tolnay and Antal on Mannerism in the Netherlands, see: Robert Born, 'Budapest und die Entwicklung des Sozialgeschichtlichen Ansatzes in der Kunstgeschichte', in: *'Travelling concepts'. Denkweisen und ihre (politischen) Übersetzungen im 20. Jahrhundert*, 93–123, here 101–102 and 112–114.

<sup>29</sup> László Tímár, 'A Marxista esztétika néhány időszerű kérdéséhez' ('On Some Current Issues of Marxist Aesthetics'), *Építés-és közlekedéstudományi közlemények* 7, 1963, 471–500, here 472.

<sup>30</sup> Richard Hamann, *Geschichte der Kunst von der altchristlichen Zeit bis zur Gegenwart*, Berlin: Theodor Knaur-Verlag, 1932. On the fate of this publication also: Jost Hermand, *Der Kunsthistoriker Richard Hamann: eine politische Biographie (1879 - 1961)*, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna: Böhlau Verlag, 2009, 147–149.

<sup>31</sup> Richard Hamann, *Dzieje sztuki od epoki starochrześcijańskiej do czasów obecnych* (History of Art from Early Christian Times to the Present). Warsaw: M. Arct 1939.

medium of photography, the illustrations could fulfill a similar didactic function as the text itself.<sup>32</sup>

The manuscript of Alpatov's *Universal History of Art*, already completed by 1941, could not be published until 1948.<sup>33</sup> The work was initially conceived in four volumes. In the first two volumes, Alpatov analyses the development of art outside of Russia from pre-historic times onwards. In the first chapter he incorporates the art of native Africans and Australians as well as the pre-Columbian cultures of America, primarily as a concession to the Marxist model of history with its focus on the means of production.<sup>34</sup> This chapter dealing with the 'primitive art' is one of the few parts of the book in which Alpatov follows the methodical paradigms established by Lenin in his reflection-theory quite closely. Lenin had formulated the ideas of his theory of reflection in his 'Materialism and Empirio-criticism', published for the first time in 1909, in which he argued first that human perceptions correctly and accurately reflect the objective external world.<sup>35</sup> Lenin's theory of Reflection was given increasing consideration after the First Congress of Soviet Writers 1934. It was Andrei Alexandrovich Zhdanov (1896–1948), the prominent intellectual figure within the Political Bureau of the Communist Party, who established the reflection theory as one of the pillars of the artistic practice in the Soviet Union in the first years after the end of World War II, during the campaign to install Social Realism as the main artistic dogma. Zhdanov saw the process of the production of the works of art inserted into the social reality of the class struggles. Accordingly Alpatov emphasized for 'primitive art' a close connection between artistic creation and reality.<sup>36</sup> In his attempt to set out the general principles of artistic development in the 'Universal History of Art', Alpatov refers to this nexus at regular intervals. It is not too far-fetched to surmise a rhetorical concession to political conditions on his part, for there are other passages in which he evidently tries to run against Soviet Marxist ideology. For instance, he refers to the cultural flowering of Venice and Spain – which occurred during periods of economic decline and, what is more, he emphasizes the formal qualities of single, outstanding works of art. This counter-ideological undercurrent becomes especially obvious at the end of the second volume, where Alpatov makes great efforts to offer a historical contextualization of late 19th- and early 20th-century painting. The ordering of the works of Cézanne and Edvard Munch as the end points of the narrative on the development of art outside of Russia is certainly to be seen as a concession to the prevailing political situation. In the course of the debate on formalism, artistic phenomena which programmatically denied naturalist ways of representation – such as Expressionism, Surrealism and Impressionism were radically criticized by the officials of the Communist Party due to their programmatic shift away from reality. The influential

<sup>32</sup> On the role of photography in the work of Richard Hamann: Angela Matyssek, *Kunstgeschichte als fotografische Praxis: Richard Hamann und Foto Marburg*, Berlin: Mann, 2008, 281–284.

<sup>33</sup> Azatyan, 'Cold-war twins', 291–293.

<sup>34</sup> Alpatov, *Vseobshchaya istoriya iskusstva* ('Universal History of Art'), vol. 1, Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Iskusstvo, 1948.

<sup>35</sup> Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, *Materializm i empiriokrititsizm. Kriticheskie zametki ob odnoy reaktsionnoy filosofii*. Moskva: Izd. Zveno, 1909. First English edition: *Materialism and Empirio-criticism. Critical Comments on a Reactionary Philosophy*. New York: International Publishers, 1927 (Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, Collected Works Vol. 13).

<sup>36</sup> Edward M. Swiderski, *The Philosophical Foundations of Soviet Aesthetics; Theories and Controversies in the Post-War Years*. Dordrecht; Reidel, 1979, 58–59.

literary historian and philosopher György Lukács saw in the 1930s in Expressionism an irrational art form of the petty bourgeoisie, which helped pave the way for the rise of fascism.<sup>37</sup> This position was reiterated at the beginning of the 1950s. A similar strategy was adopted with regard to Impressionism. In view of the fact that from 1939 onward Cézanne was seen as a representative of a 'destructive avant-garde',<sup>38</sup> Alpatov's highlighting of Cézanne's efforts to develop a new formal language as an extraordinary achievement as well as his observations on the ways in which Edvard Munch visualized the fears of man in the modern age were a daring enterprise. At the same time, Alpatov's reference to the oeuvre of Mikhail Vrubel in this passage demonstrates his aim to include Russian art as integral component in his universal model.<sup>39</sup>

In spite of this patriotic perspective, the book met with harsh criticism, articulated both orally in public sessions and in print. Criticism of Alpatov's 'Universal History of Art' was part of the polemics against formalism, which were resumed against the background of intensifying confrontation between the two political blocs. The ideological positions in the debate on Socialist Realism were largely initiated by Andrei Aleksandrovich Zhdanov, secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and spokesman in matters of cultural policy. Accordingly the anti-formalist line later became known as 'zhdanovshchina' ('Zhdanovism' or 'The Zhdanov Doctrine').<sup>40</sup> One of the initial moments of the development of this position was Zhdanov's critique of Georgii Fedorovich Alexandrov's 'History of Western European philosophy' in June 1947.<sup>41</sup> Here, as later in the case of Alpatov the critique was directed against panoramic surveys, which were addressed to a wide readership. In both cases the objections were first published in Soviet media and shortly after across the Soviet satellite states in Eastern Europe.<sup>42</sup> In the case of the attack on Alpatov's 'Universal History of Art' the criticism was first presented at the meeting of the Academy of Fine Arts of the USSR in 1949 and subsequently in several articles in the most authoritative and influential Soviet journals like the *Literaturnaya Gazeta* and *Bolshevik*, the monthly newspaper of the Central Committee of the Communist Party in which mainly theoretical aspects of party work were discussed.<sup>43</sup> The strategic positioning of the reviews and their subsequent international dissemination via translations aimed at curbing liberal views, which had developed during the war years. The main points of critique were Alpatov's subjectivist aesthetic explanation of the works of art, borrowed from the bourgeois aesthetics. The development of art is not interpreted according to the dialectical matrix of Marxism but rather as history of the independent development of the mind, and the changing of artistic ideas handed

<sup>37</sup> György Lukács, 'Größe und Verfall des Expressionismus', *Internationale Literatur* 4, 1 (1934), 153–173

<sup>38</sup> Baudin, *Le réalisme socialiste soviétique*, 33.

<sup>39</sup> Alpatov, *Vseobščaja istorija iskusstvo* ('Universal History of Art'), vol. 2, Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdat. "Iskusstvo", 1948.

<sup>40</sup> Baudin, *Le réalisme socialiste soviétique*, 2–5.

<sup>41</sup> Sergej Donskoi, 'Die sowjetischen Kunsthistoriker und die abendländische Kunst', *Sowjetstudien*, 2, 1957, 182–199, here 187. See also: J. Miller and M. Miller, 'Andrei Zhdanov's Speech to the Philosophers: An Essay in Interpretation', *Soviet Studies*, 1: 1 June 1949), 40–51.

<sup>42</sup> 'Az „Alpatov-vita' ('The Alpatov Debate'), *Szovjet művészettörténet (Budapest)*, 3, 1952, 1–163.

<sup>43</sup> On the presentation and discussion at the meeting of the Academy of Fine Arts of the USSR see Baudin, *Le réalisme socialiste soviétique*, 65 and 84–85, as well as Vardan Azatyan, 'Cold-war twins', 293–294.

down from generation to generation. Nedoshivin sees Alpatov as an 'ally of the preachers of idealist neo-Kantian aesthetics'.<sup>44</sup> In addition Alpatov was accused of idealizing the work of mystical artists like Grünewald and El Greco, the latter seen by the allegedly reactionary American and English bourgeois art historiography as forerunner of Surrealism, while omitting to emphasize the role of Russian art within the development of the art of mankind.<sup>45</sup>

As a first reaction to the discussion and critique of Alpatov's 'Universal History of Art', it was decided to commission a multi-volume universal history of art strictly adhering to Marxist principles. Written by a collective of authors, the first volume of this work acted as substitute for the fourth volume of Alpatov's universal history, which was never published.<sup>46</sup> Also translated into other languages, the scope of this publication is clearly modelled on two German multi-volume editorial projects of the inter-war period, the *Handbuch der Kunstwissenschaft* and the *Propyläen Kunstgeschichte*.<sup>47</sup>

In this tightening political climate, Alpatov was certainly exposed to considerable danger – both personally and as a scholar. This may explain why he participated in a polemical attack against bourgeois art and *Kunstwissenschaft*, together with other prominent Soviet art historians such as Viktor N. Lasarew, Igor E. Grabar, or Boris R. Wipper.<sup>48</sup> In his contribution, Alpatov attacked especially the interpretations of Mannerism by German scholars, which had been partially advanced in close interdependence with the avant-garde of their time.<sup>49</sup> In his polemic, Alpatov particularly attacked Richard Hamann denying any scientific value to his 'World Art History', which in the 1950s experienced further editions in Western Germany.<sup>50</sup> Alpatov's criticism expressly referred to Hamann's system of artistic styles, as well as neologisms coined to describe the art of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, like *Andachtsstil* ('devotionstyle'), describing the works of Leonardo da Vinci and Gentile Bellini, or *volkstümlicher Vorbarock* ('popular pre-Baroque') as a characterization of the works of Andrea Mantegna. Hamann's survey was to remain the target of critique of art historical criticism within the Eastern Bloc

<sup>44</sup> German Nedoshivin, 'W pljenu estjetstwujuschtschjej obywatjel'schtschiny' ('In the Grip of Estheticizing Philistinism'), *Literaturnaya Gazeta* No. 4, January 11, 1950, 2 (English summary in *The Current Digest of Soviet Press*, 2: 3, 1950, 52–53).

<sup>45</sup> Pavel Trofimow, 'Serjosnyje nedostatki knigi po istorii iskusstw' ('Serious Faults of a Book on History of the Arts'), *Bolshevik* nr. 13, July, 1951, 71–80 (for a English summary see: 'A History of Art is denounced', *Current Digest of the Soviet Press*, 4: 5, May 1952, 15).

<sup>46</sup> Akademija Chudožestv SSSR, Institut Teorii i Istorii Izobrazitel'nych Iskusstv ed, *Vseobščaja istorija iskusstva* ('Universal History of Art'), 6 vols, Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe Izdatel'stvo Iskusstvo 1956–1966. See also: Elkins, *Stories of Art*, 89–97.

<sup>47</sup> The German edition, edited by Ullrich Kuhirt as *Allgemeine Geschichte der Kunst*, 8 Volumes, Leipzig: Seemann Verlag 1961–1970, deals with 20th-century art in two volumes separating East and West.

<sup>48</sup> Akademija Chudožestv SSSR, Institut Teorii i Istorii Izobrazitel'nych Iskusstv ed, *Protiv buržuaznogo iskusstva i iskusstvoznanija* ('Against Bourgeois Art and Science od Art'). Redacted by Igor E. Grabar and Wladimir S. Kemenow, Moscow: Izdat. Akad. Nauk SSSR, 1951. German Edition: *Gegen die bürgerliche Kunst und Kunstwissenschaft*. Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1954. See also: Uwe Hartmann, 'Die "Verteidigung" der Renaissance: zur Auseinandersetzung sowjetischer Kunsthistoriker mit der "bürgerlichen" Kunstwissenschaft zu Beginn des Kalten Krieges', in: Tatjana Bartsch and Jörg Meiner eds, *Kunst, Kontext, Geschichte: Festgabe für Hubert Faensen zum 75. Geburtstag*, Berlin: Lukas-Verlag, 2003, 294–309.

<sup>49</sup> Mikhail Alpatov, 'Zur Verteidigung der Renaissance (Gegen die Theorien der bürgerlichen Kunstwissenschaft)', in: *Gegen die bürgerliche Kunst und Kunstwissenschaft*, 161–193, here 165–167.

<sup>50</sup> Alpatov, 'Zur Verteidigung der Renaissance', 169–170.

especially because of its positive presentation of Expressionism, which repeatedly accused the author of propagating a reactionary position.<sup>51</sup>

The fate of Alpatov's art history survey illustrates why the author had felt compelled to offer a tribute to ideological coercion. The first two volumes were only banned for a short time, and between 1962 and 1964 lavishly designed translations made after the GDR-edition were published in several countries of the Eastern bloc. The typographic design of these volumes – closely following the GDR edition – and their almost simultaneous publication suggests a centrally planned initiative, provoked by popular art-historical surveys which had in the meantime appeared west of the Iron Curtain, such as Gombrich's *Story of Art* and Hamann's 'World Art History' and Horst W. Janson's *A History of Art: A Survey of the Major Visual Arts from the Dawn of History to the Present Day* of 1962.

At the same time, these translations of a work deeply influenced by a formalist approach reflect the short phase of relative openness in Soviet culture. This process of opening was initiated by Nikita Khrushchev's denunciation of Stalin in his 'Secret Speech' at the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1956 and was intensified after the 22nd Party Congress in 1962. The guidelines for art adopted at the 1962 meeting aimed at a strengthening of the role of art and literature as an educational component as well as the intensification of relations with foreign countries.<sup>52</sup> This new climate facilitated the publication of works like Aleksandr Solzhenitsyn's (1918–2008) *One Day in the Life of Ivan Denisovich* in 1962, as well as a series of exhibitions of Impressionist as well as international and national contemporary art. In February 1962 Alpatov was given the opportunity to publish an article in the newspaper *Izvestia* in which he advocated modern abstract directions in painting.<sup>53</sup> This short phase of opening towards western modernism ended with the polemically debated exhibition on contemporary Soviet art staged in the Moscow Manege that same year.<sup>54</sup>

Arnold Hauser's *The Social History of Art and Literature*, published in 1951, is equally a work whose conception had begun in the 1940s.<sup>55</sup> A highly ambitious comparative discussion of artistic and literary development distinguishes this book – which was repeatedly reissued and translated from 1960 onwards – from the other surveys. Nevertheless, its reception underwent remarkable vicissitudes.

Hauser had devised a model of artistic development from the Neolithic age to the inter-war period which was informed by categories such as social class, class

<sup>51</sup> Timár, 'A Marxista esztétika', 471.

<sup>52</sup> Karen Lass, *Vom Tauwetter zur Perestrojka: Kulturpolitik in der Sowjetunion 1953–1991*. Cologne-Weimar-Vienna: Böhlau, 2002, 65–74 and 110–116.

<sup>53</sup> See Priscilla Johnson: *Khrushchev and the Arts. The Politics of Soviet Culture, 1962–1964*. Cambridge, Mass. MIT Press 1965, 3. On the rehabilitation of modernism see also Susan E. Reid, 'Toward a new (socialist) realism: the re-engagement with western modernism in the Khrushchev thaw', in: Rosalind P. Blakesley and Susan E. Reid eds, *Russian art and the West: a century of dialogue in painting, architecture, and the decorative arts*, DeKalb, Ill.: Northern Illinois University Press, 2007, 217–239.

<sup>54</sup> Susan Reid, 'In the name of the people. The Manege Affair revisited', *Kritika: Explorations in Russian and Eurasian History*, 6: 4 (Fall 2005), 673–716.

<sup>55</sup> Arnold Hauser, *The Social History of Art and Literature*, 2 vols., London: Routledge & Keagan, 1951. The second edition has been published in four volumes 1962. In the following the 1999 reprint of the second edition will be used. First German edition: *Sozialgeschichte der Kunst und Literatur*, 2 vols., Munich: Beck, 1953. The study has been translated into 17 languages. See: David Wallace, 'Art, autonomy, and heteronomy: The provocation of Arnold Hauser's *The Social History of Art*', *Thesis Eleven*, 44, 1996, 28–46, here 28.

struggle, ideologies, and the relevance of economic production methods. His book met with waves of both commendation and criticism. These alternating currents reflect redefinitions of the tasks of art history advanced during the last half century. The most frequently articulated criticism of Hauser – according to which his arguments slavishly followed the tenets of dogmatic Marxism – is in urgent need of a differentiated reassessment, especially in view of the gestation period of his extensive panoramic survey.

Arnold Hauser's intellectual formation was decisively shaped before the First World War by his stay in Paris, where he came into contact with the ideas of Henri Bergson (1859–1941), and especially his association with the Budapest Sunday Circle. This informal debating group was established in 1915 by the philosopher György Lukács and the poet and future film theorist Béla Balász (1884–1949), following the models of the respective circles around Stefan George in Munich and Max Weber in Heidelberg. The Sunday Circle formed an important platform for theoretical reflections on the relationship between artistic production and worldview in the second capital city of the Dual Monarchy.<sup>56</sup> Meetings were held in Balász's flat and attended by writers, artists, philosophers, art historians, and musicians from Lukács's and Balász's milieu.<sup>57</sup> The latter had studied initially in Budapest, subsequently in Paris with Henri Bergson and in Berlin with Wilhelm Dilthey (1883–1911) and Georg Simmel (1858–1918).<sup>58</sup> The publications by Weber, Simmel and Dilthey formed further points of reference in the Sunday Circle.<sup>59</sup>

Lukács had come to know the Max Weber circle during his research stay in Heidelberg. There, between 1912 and 1914, he had written a treatise on the philosophy of art in which he reflected on the conditions under which great works of art were created. In this work, Lukács engaged with contemporary positions on aesthetics and the philosophy of art, such as those held by Konrad Fiedler, Wilhelm Worringer, and Heinrich Wölfflin. Immediately before his return to Budapest, and under the impact of *Lebensphilosophie* (the philosophy of living), Lukács wrote his study *The Theory of the Novel*, in which he emphasized historicity as a central

<sup>56</sup> Éva Karádi and Erzsébet Vezér eds, *Georg Lukács, Karl Mannheim und der Sonntagskreis*, Frankfurt am Main: Sandler, 1985; Arnold Hauser, 'Der Budapester "Sonntagskreis"', in: Arnold Hauser, *Im Gespräch mit Georg Lukács*, Munich: Beck, 1978, 48–81; Zoltán Novák, *A Vasárnap Társaság, Lukács Györgynek és csoportosulásának eszmei válsága, kiütkeresésük az első világháború időszakában* ('The Sunday Society. The Ideological Crisis during the First World War and the Search for a Solution by György Lukács and his Group'). Budapest: Kossuth Könyvkiadó, 1979, 30–48.

<sup>57</sup> For the joint impact of these two intellectuals, see: Ferenc Fehér 'Das Bündnis von Georg Lukács und Béla Balázs bis zur ungarischen Revolution 1918', in: Agnes Heller, Ferenc Fehér, György Márkus eds, *Die Seele und das Leben. Studien zum frühen Lukács*, Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1977, 131–176, here 137.

<sup>58</sup> Hanno Loewy, 'Medium und Initiation. Béla Balázs: Märchen, Ästhetik, Kino', Dissertation Universität Konstanz. URL: <http://deposit.ddb.de/cgi-bin/dokserv?idn=958461252> (accessed May 28, 2013), 8.

<sup>59</sup> Elisabeth Weisser-Lohmann, *Georg Lukács' Heidelberger Kunstphilosophie*, Bonn: Bouvier, 1992; Ute Luckhardt, „Aus dem Tempel der Sehnsucht.“ *Georg Simmel und Georg Lukács – Wege in und aus der Moderne*. Butzbach-Greidl: AFRA-Verlag, 1994; Eva Karádi, 'Georg Simmel und der Sonntagskreis', *Simmel-Newsletter* 1995, 45–53.

category of societal being.<sup>60</sup> Max Dvořák judged this analysis to be ‘the most important publication in the humanities’.<sup>61</sup>

Dvořák’s own considerations of the basis of artistic production in intellectual history were a further point of reference for the art historians of the Sunday Circle, who joined philosophers and aesthetes in their efforts to stress the *kompositionskonstituierende Kraft der Weltanschauung* (‘the composition-constituting force of the worldview’).<sup>62</sup> Apart from Arnold Hauser and the previously mentioned scholars Frederick Antal and Charles de Tolnay, the art historians Johannes Wilde (1888–1954), Lajos Fülep (1885–1970) and the sociologist Karl Mannheim (1893–1947) also belonged to the milieu of the Sunday Circle – all of them pivotal figures in terms of the history of the art-historical discipline. From this group, Frederick Antal and Johannes Wilde had been Dvořák’s pupils in Vienna even prior to World War I. After 1918, Tolnay also joined the circle of Dvořák’s disciples.

Hauser himself had begun as philosopher. As an art critic, he repeatedly raised objections to impressionist aesthetics – as did Lukács and Fülep –, a view frequently aired within the context of societal criticism.<sup>63</sup> A political radicalization of the group was set off in late 1918 when Lukács joined the Hungarian Communist Party and deepened with the declaration of the Hungarian Soviet Republic in March 1919. At this stage, the members of the Sunday Circle were setting their hopes on the new culture of a new society.<sup>64</sup> Following Lukács’s appointment as deputy people’s commissioner for education (with Balázs joining his staff) in Béla Kun’s government, several other Sunday Circle members actively participated in the cultural policies of the Soviet Republic. Frederick Antal and Johannes Wilde worked in the directory of art and museums.<sup>65</sup> Though neither of them were communists at the time, they took part in the nationalisation of art collections and, respectively, the

<sup>60</sup> György Lukács, ‘Die Theorie des Romans. Ein geschichtsphilosophischer Versuch über die Formen der großen Epik’, *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, 2, 1916, 225–271 and 390–431.

<sup>61</sup> György Lukács, ‘Introduction’, *Die Theorie des Romans*. Darmstadt-Neuwied: Luchterhand, 1963, 5–18, here 7. On the contacts between the Dvořák-School and the Sunday Circle see also Otto Benesch, ‘Max Dvořák. Ein Versuch zur Geschichte der historischen Geisteswissenschaften’, *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 44, 1924, 159–197, here 195–196; Ernő Marosi: ‘La storiografia ungherese dell’arte nei primi decenni del XX secolo e i suoi rapporti con la “Scuola di Vienna”’, in: Marco Pozzetto ed, *La scuola viennese di storia dell’arte*, Gorizia: Istituto per gli Incontri Culturali Mitteleuropei, 1996, 151–161; Born, ‘Budapest und die Entwicklung’, 94–96; Karoly Kokai, ‘Der Budapester Sonntagskreis und die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte’, in: Céline Trautmann-Waller ed. *L’école viennoise d’histoire de l’art*, Mont-Saint-Aignan: Publications de l’Université de Rouen et du Havre, 2011 (= *Austriaca* 72, June 2011), 77–98 and 104, as well as recently: Paul Stirton, ‘The Vienna School in Hungary: Antal, Wilde and Fülep’, *Journal of Art Historiography*, 8 PS/1 (June 2013).

<sup>62</sup> Anna Wessely, ‘Der Diskurs über die Kunst im Sonntagskreis’, in: Hubertus Gafner ed, *Wechselwirkungen. Ungarische Avantgarde in der Weimarer Republik*, exhibition catalogue Kassel and Bochum 1986–1987, Marburg: Jonas-Verlag, 1985, 541–553, here 542.

<sup>63</sup> Krisztina Passuth, ‘Moderne französische Kunst im Spiegel der ungarischen Kunstphilosophie der Jahrhundertwende’, in: Uwe Fleckner und Thomas W. Gaehtgens eds, *Prenez garde à la peinture! Kunstkritik in Frankreich 1900–1945*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1999, 303–323, here 308; Anna Wessely, ‘The reader’s progress. Remarks on Arnold Hauser’s philosophy of art history’, in: Kostas Gavroglu et al. eds, *Science, Mind and Art*, Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1995, 29–43, here 29–30; Árpád Tímár, ‘Hauser Arnold pályakezdése’, *Ars Hungarica*, 1, 1974, 191–204.

<sup>64</sup> Eva Karádi, ‘Macht und Ohnmacht des Geistes. Mitteleuropäische Intellektuelle im Budapester Sonntagskreis’, in: Gangolf Hübinger ed, *Intellektuelle im Deutschen Kaiserreich*, Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbücher, 1993, 124–140, here 133–138; David Kettler, *Marxismus und Kultur. Mannheim und Lukács in den ungarischen Revolutionen 1918/19*. Neuwied – Berlin: Luchterhand, 1967, 43–53.

<sup>65</sup> Hauser, ‘Der Budapester „Sonntagskreis“’, 58.

amalgamation of artworks in central museums. The objects assembled in Budapest in spring 1919 were catalogued and a selection of six hundred works became the subject of a special exhibition which made the artefacts accessible to a wide public. Dvořák's pupil Otto Benesch was called from Vienna to assist in the writing of the exhibition catalogue. The Budapest exhibition was frequently compared to the opening of the Louvre during the French Revolution and also met with Dvořák's approval.<sup>66</sup> At Lukács's instigation, Arnold Hauser and Karl Mannheim were also appointed to good positions in the education sector.<sup>67</sup>

The fall of the Soviet Republic entailed the end of an experiment in cultural politics decisively shaped by Lukács. The onset of the White Terror and the spread of anti-Semitic tendencies forced both the revolutionary leadership and the larger part of the Hungarian intellectuals into exile. For most of them, it only meant a first stage of exile, to be followed by a second one in 1933 and yet another in 1938.<sup>68</sup>

From an art-historical point of view, the caesura of 1919 marked the beginning of the pan-European impact exercised by the art historians from the Budapest Sunday Circle, all of whom – except for Fülep – left Hungary. As for most other Hungarian intellectuals, Vienna was their first point of call. The group reassembled there and attempted to reposition itself within the Hungarian émigré community. As not all Circle members were actively serving the communist cause, conflicts within the group increased, as demonstrated by Hauser's exclusion from the Circle and Mannheim's growing criticism of Lukács's positions.<sup>69</sup> The tensions eventually led to the disbandment of the Circle in 1921.

Following his exclusion, Hauser moved to Berlin, where until 1924 he studied history of art with Adolph Goldschmidt (1863–1944) and sociology with Ernst Troeltsch (1865–1923). Upon returning to Vienna, Hauser worked as head of advertising for a cinema company and lectured on the theory and technique of film at the Vienna adult education school. In parallel, he collected material for a study on the *Aesthetics and Sociology of Film*.<sup>70</sup> He was unable to complete this project as he had to leave Austria for England in 1938. The issues pertaining to film as a new medium that he had envisaged tackling are highly interesting, not least in the way in which he wanted to combine them. The relationship between theatre and cinema had been discussed since the 1910s. These issues were discussed at length within the Budapest Sunday Circle, whose members were influenced by the concepts put forward by Henri Bergson, who had already in 1907 started to discuss problems

<sup>66</sup> Julia Szabó, 'Kunstgeschichte während der Revolutionen und der Nachkriegszeit', in: Ernő Marosi ed, *Die ungarische Kunstgeschichte und die Wiener Schule 1846-1930*, exhibition catalogue Collegium Hungaricum Vienna 1983, Budapest: Statistischer Verlag, 1983, 77–80, here 79; on Dvořák's position with view to the nationalisation of art collections: 'Gelebtes Denken (G. Lukács im Gespräch über sein Leben) [1969-71] II, Krieg Revolution', in: György Lukács, *Autobiographische Texte und Gespräche*, Bielefeld: Aisthesis Verlag, 2005, 72–102, here 92.

<sup>67</sup> Lee Congdon, *Exile and Social Thought: Hungarian Intellectuals in Germany and Austria, 1919–1933*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1991, 36–38.

<sup>68</sup> Tibor Frank: *Double Exile. Migrations of Jewish-Hungarian Professionals Through Germany to the United States, 1919 – 1945*, Oxford: Lang, 2009.

<sup>69</sup> Mary Gluck, *Georg Lukács and his Generation 1900-1918*, Cambridge, Mass.-London: Harvard University Press, 1985, 211–222; Reinhard Laube, *Karl Mannheim und die Krise des Historismus. Historismus als wissenssoziologischer Perspektivismus*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 2004, 372–374.

<sup>70</sup> Hauser, 'Der Budapester "Sonntagskreis"', 63.

related to the possibilities of this new medium.<sup>71</sup> In 1913, Lukács had commented on relationship between theatre and cinema briefly, calling for a specialised aesthetics of cinema.<sup>72</sup> In the course of the intensifying debate – taking place primarily in the pages of the magazine *Neue Schaubühne* between 1919 and 1925 –, Béla Balázs, also formerly of the *Sunday Circle*, published in 1925 his study in film theory entitled *The Visible Man*,<sup>73</sup> which argued for an ‘artistic philosophy of film’.<sup>74</sup> At the same time the film as a new medium had also been in the focus of the journal *Ma* [‘Today’], which had been founded in 1916 by Lajos Kassák (1887-1967) in Budapest and was continued from 1920 to 1925 in Vienna. Therefore it appears likely that Arnold Hauser followed the debates in this avant-garde journal.<sup>75</sup> The second thread Hauser intended to discuss concerned the structures within which films were produced and received – issues with which he was intimately familiar thanks to his daily work.<sup>76</sup> The aesthetics and sociology of film had in fact also formed the focus of a doctoral dissertation by Emilie Altenloh. Submitted in 1913 to Alfred Weber in Heidelberg, Altenloh’s study was to remain the standard work of reference for the social interpretation of the new mass medium.<sup>77</sup> What is more, Hauser’s activities during his stay in Vienna also parallel the publications of Rudolf Arnheim’s *Film als Kunst* (‘Film as art’, 1932) and Erwin Panofsky’s ‘On movies’ (1936).<sup>78</sup> After World War II, Hauser addressed both sociological and formal concerns on the new medium of film in smaller articles, in which he postulated a connection between ‘the decline of the theatre and the rise of the film [which] can both be attributed to a new

<sup>71</sup> Henri Bergson, *L’Evolution créatrice*. Paris : Alcan, 1907.

<sup>72</sup> Georg v. Lukács: ‘Gedanken zu einer Ästhetik des "Kino"’. In: Pester Lloyd (Budapest), no. 90, 16.4.1911, 45–46. Extended version: ‘Gedanken zu einer Ästhetik des Kino’. In: *Frankfurter Zeitung*, no. 251, 10.9.1913, 1. Morgenblatt, 1–2. Reprints and a critical discussion of both versions can be found in: Jörg Schweinitz, ‘Georg Lukács frühe "Gedanken zu einer Ästhetik des Kino" (1911/13) und die zeitgenössische deutsche Debatte um das neue Medium’, *G: Zeitschrift für Germanistik, Leipzig*, 11: 6, 1990, 702–710. See further: Tom Levin, ‘From Dialectical to Normative Specificity. Reading Lukács on Film’, *New German Critique* 40 (Winter 1987), 35–61;

<sup>73</sup> Béla Balázs, *Der sichtbare Mensch oder Die Kultur des Films*, Vienna: Deutsch-Österreichischer Verlag, 1924. An extended version paying attention to the conceptual changes brought about by the sound film was published as *Der Geist des Films*, Halle: W. Knapp, 1930.

<sup>74</sup> See Hanno Loewy, *Medium und Initiation*. Béla Balázs: *Märchen, Ästhetik, Kino*. Dissertation Konstanz, <http://www.ub.uni-konstanz.de/kops/volltexte/2000/400> (accessed July 21, 2013), 376–378.

<sup>75</sup> On film as a medium in the journal *Ma* see: Karoly Kokai, ‘Film und Filmprojekte in der Wiener Avant-Garde Zeitschrift *Ma* (1920–25)’, in: Sasha Bru et al. eds, *Regarding the popular: modernism, the Avant-Garde and high and low culture*, Berlin–Boston, Mass.: De Gruyter, 2012, 379–393.

<sup>76</sup> Lee Congdon, ‘Arnold Hauser and the Retreat from Marxism’, in: Tamás Demeter ed, *Essays on Wittgenstein and Austrian Philosophy: In Honour of J.C. Nyiri*. Amsterdam–New York: Rodopi, 2004, 40–61, here 48.

<sup>77</sup> Emilie Altenloh, *Die Kinounternehmen und die sozialen Schichten ihrer Besucher*, Jena: Eugen Diederichs, 1914 (Reprint 1977). See further: Helmut H. Diederichs: *Frühgeschichte deutscher Filmtheorie. Ihre Entstehung und Entwicklung bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg*. Frankfurt am Main, Habilitation Thesis 1996, Frankfurt am Main 2001 [http://edocs.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/volltexte/2009/11980/pdf/Diederichs\\_habil.pdf](http://edocs.ub.uni-frankfurt.de/volltexte/2009/11980/pdf/Diederichs_habil.pdf) (accessed July 21, 2013), 217–239.

<sup>78</sup> Rudolf Arnheim, *Film als Kunst*. Berlin: Ernst Rowohlt, 1932; Erwin Panofsky, ‘On Movies’, *Bulletin of the Department of Art and Archaeology of Princeton University* (June 1936), 5–15. On the different stages of Panofsky’s Essay see also: Regine Prange, ‘Stil und Medium. Panofsky *On Movies*’, in: Bruno Reudenbach, ed, *Erwin Panofsky. Beiträge des Symposiums Hamburg 1992*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1994, 171–190; Thomas Y. Levin, ‘Iconology at the Movies: Panofsky’s Film Theory’, *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 9 (1996), 27–55.

sense of solidarity with the objective world'.<sup>79</sup> These contributions formed a preliminary stage for the final chapter of his *Social History of Art and Literature*. A crucial stimulus for this project was provided by none other than Karl Mannheim, who had fled from Germany to England in 1933. From 1940 onwards, Mannheim was series editor of the *International Library of Sociology and Social Reconstruction* at the publishing house Routledge and Kegan Paul, where Herbert Read (1893–1968) – an important supporter of Frederick Antal who had also emigrated to England – was adviser.<sup>80</sup> As series editor, Mannheim had asked his old friend Hauser to compile an anthology of writings on the sociology of art.<sup>81</sup> From this commission, Hauser – who had not found work in academia – was to develop over several years of weekend shifts his two-volume *Social History of Art and Literature*.<sup>82</sup> This first ever sociological analysis of art from the Stone Age to the end of the 19th century focused on Western European art and literature though he began, as per established precedent, with ancient Egypt and Greece. Hauser did not engage with individual artworks and frequently postulated the existence of collective styles. In his discussion of the development of the art, he deviates from the widespread model in which antiquity appears as normative for the modern era, a model that can be found in parts even in Alpatov's 'Universal History of Art'. In its investigation, Hauser focuses on the question of the institutions that have assumed a central role in the development of art and literature. An additional focus is the process of social emancipation of the artist. Accordingly the changes of form in literature and the visual arts are explained as results of social changes. The objective of this development is Modernity, which for Hauser starts already in the 18<sup>th</sup> century and which is presented almost exclusively with a Western European perspective.<sup>83</sup>

Not until the fourth section of his work does Hauser spell out the intention of his survey: to understand the present through analysing the developments of the past. In the last chapters Hauser boldly emphasised this desire to comprehend the present by concentrating on film. By employing the headline 'The Film Age', Hauser bestowed upon the comparatively new and hugely popular medium of film the status of an emblematic sign embodying the 20th century. Film appears as the first genuinely global medium, the language of which had been revolutionized through the invention of the close-up by the American director D. W. Griffith and the montage by Russian filmmakers.<sup>84</sup>

<sup>79</sup> Arnold Hauser, 'Can Movies Be Profound?', *The Partisan Review* 15/ 1 (January 1948), 69–73, here 69.

<sup>80</sup> Peter Burke, 'The Central European Moment in British Cultural Studies', Herbert Grabes ed, *Literary History - Cultural History: Force Fields and Tensions*, Tübingen: Narr, 2001, 279–288, here 282. On the support of Herbert Read and Kenneth Clark for Frederick Antal upon his arrival in England in 1933 see: Frank, *Double Exile*. 316–317.

<sup>81</sup> 'Ein langer Weg. Interview mit Arnold Hauser (1973)', in: *Im Gespräch mit Georg Lukács*, 28–47, here 37.

<sup>82</sup> For the completion of this study, see: Tom Steele, 'Arnold Hauser, Herbert Read and the Social History of Art in Britain', in: Gyula Ernyey ed, *Britain and Hungary: Contacts in Architecture and Design During the Nineteenth and Twentieth Century*, vol. 1. Budapest: Magyar Iparművészeti Főiskola 2005, 200–213, here 200–205.

<sup>83</sup> On the evolutionary model presented by Hauser from the perspective of literary studies see: Peter Uwe Hohendahl, 'Das Projekt 'Sozialgeschichte der Kunst und Literatur': Arnold Hauser', in: Klaus Garber ed, *Kulturwissenschaftler des 20. Jahrhunderts - Ihr Werk im Blick auf das Europa der Frühen Neuzeit*, München: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 2002, 245–262, here 247–253.

<sup>84</sup> Hauser, *Social History of Art*, vol. 4, 953.

Both in terms of its production and its presentation, film appears inextricably linked to technology. Accordingly, Hauser characterizes the Russians and the Americans as 'the two most technically minded peoples, who were partners and rivals in the development of this art'. Hauser's placement of film as the culmination of artistic development to date – as well as a potential starting point for new artistic developments – must be assessed against his background as sketched above: his twofold experience of exile and his intellectual formation in the midst of diverse cultural milieus of European Modernism.

It remains unclear whether Hauser had read Panofsky's essay 'On movies' and, without referencing it, integrated it in his line of argument. Certainly Hauser's comparison between movie production and medieval production is reminiscent of Panofsky's famous comparison between movie production and medieval cathedral architecture.<sup>85</sup> However it is indisputable that Panofsky and Hauser were the first art historians to have emphasized the unique possibilities of the new medium of film to dynamize space and spatialize time.<sup>86</sup> In doing so both related to the concepts first formulated by Henri Bergson. Hauser even described the spatialization of time in the literary works of Marcel Proust and James Joyce. In Joyce's *Ulysses*, he saw a work that is, not only with regard to the presentation of the narration but also with regard to its structure, comparable to the technical production of films, where usually different parts of the story are produced simultaneously.<sup>87</sup> The application of cinematographic categories to works of literature is one of the major points of distinction between Hauser's interpretation of the film as a medium and the Panofsky's views on this topic. Panofsky's enthusiasm for this most American of arts – to which he ascribed a significant potential for social communication and for society's self-definition – was certainly an expression of homage to his land of exile. At the same time Panofsky, who used primarily the photographic quality of the new medium to stress the importance of the content of the work of art as an alternative to the then ongoing process of abstraction, failed to address the sociological dimensions of this new medium.<sup>88</sup> Hauser's attitude was more sceptical on this point. He explicated his cautious placement of film at the beginning of a new stage of artistic development by criticizing the manipulative potential of this medium. This criticism was not only directed against the American film industry but implicitly also against Soviet film production which he otherwise highly appreciated.<sup>89</sup> The explosiveness of this critique – which had merely been articulated between the lines – is underlined by the fact that, among the editions of *The Social History* to appear in the eastern bloc in the late 1980s, the GDR edition omitted the passage on the age of film.<sup>90</sup> For readers behind the Iron Curtain, this act

<sup>85</sup> Hauser, *Social History of Art*, vol. 4, 959 and Erwin Panofsky, 'Style and Medium in the Motion Pictures', in: *Three Essays on Style*, ed. by Irving Lavin. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1995, 91–125, here 119.

<sup>86</sup> Erwin Panofsky, 'Style and Medium in the Motion Pictures', 96.

<sup>87</sup> Arnold Hauser, 'Im Zeichen des Films', *Merkur, Deutsche Zeitschrift für Europäisches Denken* 60 (July 1953), 146–164 and 'Der Begriff der Zeit in der neueren Kunst und Wissenschaft', *Merkur, Deutsche Zeitschrift für Europäisches Denken* 91 (September 1955), 801–815, here 810. The English version of this essay was published as 'Conceptions of Time in Modern Art and Science', *Partisan Review*, 23 (Summer 1956), 320–333.

<sup>88</sup> Thomas Y. Levin, 'Iconology at the Movies: Panofsky's Film Theory', 41–43.

<sup>89</sup> Hauser, *Social History of Art*, vol. 4, 958–959.

<sup>90</sup> Arnold Hauser, *Sozialgeschichte der Kunst und Literatur*, 2 vol., Dresden: VEB Verlag der Kunst, 1987.

of censorship turned the work into a torso which – just as in the case of Alpatov's art history survey – ended with Impressionism, foregoing any perspective on present or future developments in the arts. In spite of all the criticism directed against it, Hauser's synthesis still offered important stimuli to art historians on either side of the political divide. Its strong emphasis on a socio-historical approach was part of a movement against formalism which dominated both the historiography of art and the museum sector in Europe and America during the Cold War.<sup>91</sup>

In West Germany, the reception of Hauser's socio-historical method occurred within the context of efforts to reveal the ideological instrumentalisation of the discipline between 1933 and 1945.<sup>92</sup> Hauser's synthesis was also greeted with enthusiasm by the protagonists of the Frankfurt School, especially Theodor W. Adorno (1903–1969) and Max Horkheimer (1895–1973) as a seminal synthesis that combined an aesthetic with a social perspective in a period dominated by specialized case studies.<sup>93</sup> Together with Hauser, Adorno had organized a session on the problem of ideology at the sociologists' meeting in Heidelberg as early as 1954.<sup>94</sup> By the early 1970s, however, Hauser was lambasted as a 'typical representative of left-bourgeois philosophy and sociology'.<sup>95</sup> Even if this characterisation explicitly referenced the origins of Hauser's model in the sociology of knowledge and the sociology of culture, both of which had experienced their respective culminations as disciplines in Germany before 1933, the phrasing of this accusation is striking for the resemblance it bears to the criticism of Hauser's approach articulated within the GDR.<sup>96</sup>

Hauser concluded his study by expressing his hope that social revolutions would be followed by a radical change of thinking. This new thinking, based on scientific methods, would eventually allow the future to be mapped. Statements like this might have been a main reason for Ernst Gombrich's extremely polemical criticism of Hauser's *Social History of Art*.<sup>97</sup> Gombrich's criticism is of interest in several aspects. On the one hand, in 1950 Gombrich had also published a general survey of art history – one which became the most successful such survey ever. Its

<sup>91</sup> Enrico Castelnuovo, 'L'histoire sociale de l'art. Un bilan provisoire', *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales*, 2: 6 (December 1976), 63–75, here 69–75; Griselda Pollock, 'Thinking sociologically thinking aesthetically: Between convergence and difference with some historical reflections on sociology and art history', *History of the Human Sciences*, 20: 2, 2007, 141–175, here 155–157.

<sup>92</sup> Jutta Held, 'New Left Art History and Fascism in Germany': in Andrew Hemingway ed, *Marxism and the history of art: from William Morris to the New Left*, London- Ann Arbor, MI, Pluto Press, 2006, 196–212, here 196–207 and in the same volume Otto Karl Werckmeister, 'The turn from Marx to Warburg in West German art history, 1968-90', 213–220, here 213–215.

<sup>93</sup> Max Horkheimer/Theodor W. Adorno, *Soziologische Exkurse*, Frankfurt: Europäische Verlagsanstalt, 1956 (Frankfurter Beiträge zu Soziologie 4), 93–95.

<sup>94</sup> See Theodor W. Adorno, 'Beitrag zur Ideologienlehre', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 6: 3, 1953–54, 360–375 and Arnold Hauser, 'Der Begriff der Ideologie in der Kunstgeschichte', *Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie*, 6: 3, 1953–54, 376–390.

<sup>95</sup> Peter K. Klein, 'Arnold Hausers Theorie der Kunst', *Kritische Berichte*, 6: 3, 1978, 18–27. ('typischer Vertreter der linksbürgerlichen Philosophie und Soziologie').

<sup>96</sup> Hans-Ulrich Beyer, *Sozialgeschichte und Kunstgeschichte. Zur Kritik der theoretischen Konzeption der Kunstgeschichtsschreibung von Arnold Hauser*. Dissertation Leipzig 1986 (typescript).

<sup>97</sup> Ernst H. Gombrich, 'Review of Arnold Hauser, *The Social History of Art*', *Art Bulletin*, 35, 1951, 79–84. Reprinted in *Meditations on a Hobby Horse and Other Essays on the Theory of Art*, London- New York: Phaidon, 1963, 86–94.

genesis is closely linked with the circumstances of exile both with regard to the range of art it addresses and to the journalistic enterprise.

The publishing house Phaidon's project of a world history of art gave Gombrich an exceptional platform for presenting his concept of art's evolution through the ages, which also included the development of architecture. Phaidon, which had been founded by Béla Horowitz (1898–1955) and Ludwig Goldscheider (1896–1973) in Vienna, had specialized in art and art history from the mid-1930s.<sup>98</sup> It was especially thanks to the initiative of Goldscheider, who had studied art history, that Phaidon had already become an internationally renowned art publisher before 1938. Its academically authoritative books consistently demonstrated the highest editorial standards and were especially popular because of their very moderate prices. Due to its merger with British partners (Allen & Unwin) it was even possible for the press to distribute its products in the Reich up to 1939, even though the publisher had fled into English exile.<sup>99</sup>

Before his flight to England, Gombrich had already written, in German, a history of the world for young readers.<sup>101</sup> Later published in English as *A Little History of the World*, it has seldom been considered in discussions about the genesis of the *Story of Art*.<sup>102</sup> A juxtaposition of the first version with the later editions of *A Little History of the World* could be fruitful for documenting shifts within his approach through World War II and the subsequent Cold War. A comparison of his paradigms of historical development in *A Little History of the World* and *The Story of Art* cannot be made at this point, but it is clear that both publications, as well as Phaidon's programme, are closely related to the Central European ideal of *Bildung*, a culturally-specific concept which constituted an essential component of Gombrich's *The Story of Art*.<sup>103</sup>

On the other hand, Gombrich's criticism of Hauser represents a stage in his criticism of Hegelianism which he reformulated repeatedly over decades, most prominently in his *In Search of Cultural History* of 1969.<sup>104</sup> The evolution of this

<sup>98</sup> The close affiliation of Gombrich with Phaidon is evidenced by several references on monographs of Goldscheider from the series "Klassiker der Kunst" which are given by Gombrich in his appendix „A Note on Art Books“ in his *Story of Art*.

<sup>99</sup> See: Valerie Holman ed, 'The Early History of the Phaidon Press, 1923-1967', New York: Harwood Academic Publishers, 1999 (=Visual Resources 15: 3 Special Issue).

<sup>101</sup> Ernst H. Gombrich, *Weltgeschichte von der Urzeit bis zur Gegenwart*. Vienna: Steyrmühl-Verlag, 1936. Danish, Dutch, Norwegian, Polish and Swedish versions followed between 1937 and 1939. After World War Two a revised Version with new chapter was published in German as *Eine kurze Weltgeschichte für junge Leser: Von der Urzeit bis zur Gegenwart* in Cologne: Du Mont 1985; the English version *A Little History of the World* was only published in 2005 (New Haven-London: Yale University Press).

<sup>102</sup> Ernst H. Gombrich, *Die Kunst, Bilder zum Sprechen zu bringen: ein Gespräch mit Didier Eribon*. Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1993, 29 (on the first version of the Little History of the World) and 48–49 (on the contract with Phaidon for *The Story of Art*).

<sup>103</sup> Richard Woodfield, 'Gombrich's Story of Art', *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 36: 3 (July 1996), 313–316, here 315–316; James Elkins, 'Ten Reasons Why E. H. Gombrich is not Connected to Art History', in: *Relativism Versus Universalism*, 304–310, here 309.

<sup>104</sup> Carlo Ginzburg, 'Da Aby Warburg a Ernst Gombrich (Note su un problema di metodo)', *Studi medievali* seria 3, 7: 2 (1966), 1015–1065, here 1048–1053; Karl Clausberg, 'Zwischen Pathosformel und Ornament – Ernst Hans Gombrich', *Merkur, Deutsche Zeitschrift für Europäisches Denken* 545 (August 1994), 714–721; Dan Karlholm, 'Gombrich and Cultural History', *Nordisk Estetisk Tidskrift* 12 (1994), 27–37; David Summers, 'E.H. Gombrich and the tradition of Hegel', in: Paul Smith and Carolyn Wilde, eds, *A Companion to Art Theory*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2002, 139–149; Ján Bakoš, 'Introductory: Gombrich's struggle against metaphysics', in: *Relativism Versus Universalism*, 239–250; Andrew

criticism is certainly one of the most fascinating facets of Gombrich's multifarious field of activity.

In 1977, when he was awarded the Hegel prize of the city of Stuttgart, he characterized himself as a 'runaway Hegelian'.<sup>105</sup> Gombrich's criticism of the 'left Hegelianism' of Hauser and a short time later of the 'right Hegelianism' of André Malraux signified Gombrich's rejection of the concept of styles as expressing superordinate entities like social classes or *Zeitgeist* (spirit of the time); Gombrich saw this concept as encouraging totalitarian ideas.<sup>106</sup> This assessment merges Gombrich's personal experiences at the Vienna Institute with those of exile. Above all, it incorporates the fruitful intellectual exchange with the philosopher Karl Popper who had also had fled from Austria and, significantly, regarded Hegel as one of the spiritual fathers of modern totalitarianism.<sup>107</sup>

In addition to Popper, whose *Open Society and Its Enemies* has always been considered as a touchstone for Gombrich's *Story of Art*, a number of authors have recently pointed out with a different emphasis Gombrich's affinity to the concepts of Friedrich August von Hayek (1899–1992).<sup>108</sup> Hayek, a neo-liberal economist who also had emigrated from Austria, published in 1952 *The Counter-Revolution of Science. Studies in the Abuse of Reason*, a volume which was based on a series of articles published between 1942 and 1944 in the British journal *Economica*. In this series of articles Hayek analyzed the relationship between the method of natural science and social problems.<sup>109</sup> Hayek's articles formed important points of reference for Popper in his *Poverty of Historicism* and *The Open Society and Its Enemies*.<sup>110</sup> As Karl Clausberg has pointed out, Hayek's series of articles represent a continuation of the famous 'Methodenstreit' of the 1880s between Carl Menger (1840-1921), the representative of the Austrian School of Political Economics with Gustav von Schmoller (1883 - 1917), the main representative of the German Historical School of Political Economics, which was seen as connected to the Hegelian tradition.<sup>111</sup>

Hayek's critique of against 'all forms of state planning' also influenced the foundation of the Mont Pelerin Society in 1947 as a think tank was created, to fight and the 'misuse of history for the furtherance of creeds hostile to liberty'.<sup>112</sup> These

Hemingway, 'E. H. Gombrich in 1968: methodological individualism and the contradictions of conservatism', in: *Relativism versus universalism*, 297–303.

<sup>105</sup> Ernst H. Gombrich, 'Hegel und die Kunstgeschichte', *Neue Rundschau*, 88: 2. 1977, 202–219, here 212.

<sup>106</sup> Ernst H. Gombrich, 'André Malraux and the Crisis of Expressionism (a review of *The Voices of Silence*)', *Burlington Magazine*, 96: 621 (December 1954), 374–378.

<sup>107</sup> Gombrich, 'Hegel und die Kunstgeschichte'. See also: Bakoš, 'Introductory: Gombrich's struggle', in: *Relativism Versus Universalism*, 239–250; Hemingway, 'E. H. Gombrich in 1968, 298–299; Norbert Schneider, 'Form of thought and presentational gesture in Karl Popper and E. H. Gombrich', in: *Relativism Versus Universalism*, 251–258, here 254–256.

<sup>108</sup> Ian Verstegen, *A realist theory of art history*. London: Routledge, 2013, 87–89; Karl Clausberg, 'Wiener Schulen' im Rückblick. Eine kurze Bildergeschichte aus Kunst-, Natur- und Neurowissenschaften', in: Elize Bisanz ed., *Das Bild zwischen Kognition und Kreativität. Interdisziplinäre Zugänge zum bildhaften Denken*, Bielefeld: transcript, 2011 (Image 4), 21–73, here 58–60; Vardan Azatyan, 'Ernst Gombrich's politics of art history: exile, Cold War and "The Story of Art"', *Oxford Art Journal*, 33: 2, 2010, 127–141.

<sup>109</sup> F. A. Hayek, *The Counter-Revolution of Science. Studies in the Abuse of Reason*, Glencoe, IL: Free Press, 1952.

<sup>110</sup> Michael Schmid, *Rationalität und Theoriebildung: Studien zu Karl R. Poppers Methodologie der Sozialwissenschaften*, Amsterdam-Atlanta, GA: Rodopi 1996 (Schriftenreihe zur Philosophie Karl R. Poppers und des kritischen Rationalismus 8), 86–90.

<sup>111</sup> Karl Clausberg, 'Wiener Schulen' im Rückblick', 59.

<sup>112</sup> Azatyan, 'Ernst Gombrich's politics of art history', 130.

goals reflected the theories of the Austrian School of Political Economics, in which the individual person was the central subject of reference. The economy reacts situationally to the individual's needs. The reader encounters a similarly open frame of reference in Gombrich's *Story of Art*, which begins with the statement that 'Art' has had a different significance at different times and in different countries. Building upon the methodological approach of his teacher Julius von Schlosser, Gombrich opposed a monolithic concept of 'Art', which he regarded essentially as an ideological construction. The key role is played by the artists who create extraordinary works and thus generate new turns in the history of art. By constantly pointing to such departures from tradition Gombrich made an ideological rationalization of history impossible. Thus, the narrative cannot be structured in accordance with historical necessity and appears as an open network of incidents. This might indeed have disastrous consequences. Nevertheless, Gombrich comments confidently on the future development of art and outlines a much more optimistic prospect of the future than Arnold Hauser.

Despite the powerful influence of neoliberalism and his invectives against the analysis of art in terms of sociological categories, Gombrich's work was also adapted beyond the Iron Curtain. As Azatyan has demonstrated, in Russia this process began in 1989.<sup>113</sup> It had, however, already begun a decade earlier with the almost simultaneous publication of *The Story of Art* in Hungarian and Romanian.<sup>114</sup> At least two eastern bloc countries, therefore, had access to Gombrich's survey and not only to the Marxist survey by Hauser.

Returning to the initial question concerning the role that exiled scholars played in the transfer of Hegel's concepts to Anglophone countries, the consideration of the art history surveys by Hauser and Gombrich shows that such a transfer may be assumed, but deserves differentiated reflection. Theories about the productive potential unlocked by circumstances of exile appear to be helpful here. In addition to Edward Said and Villem Flusser, both of whom claimed that disengagement from accustomed cultural roots would stimulate creativity, the models of 'Travelling Concepts' provide important reference points.<sup>115</sup> Each of the three case studies presented here may be regarded as a remoulding of theoretical and methodological concepts which had originated in Central Europe and had to be adapted after the end of World War II on both sides of the Iron Curtain to the particular political circumstances. Referring back to the 'two voices of art history' after 1945 that Belting postulated in his revised edition of *Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte / Art History After Modernism*, these observations also apply to Alpatov's survey. The analysis of his work reveals that, despite the division of the scientific community into two ideologically distinct factions, Western idioms were discussed and sometimes even accepted in the community of Eastern scholars. This example, as well as the distribution of Gombrich's *Story of Art* in the former eastern bloc, illustrate that the still prevalent image of the eastern bloc as monolithic urgently needs to be revised. Future case studies on the circulation of publications

<sup>113</sup> Azatyan, 'Cold-war twins', 257–258.

<sup>114</sup> Ernst H. Gombrich, *Istoria artei*, București: Meridiane, 1975; *A művészet története*, Budapest: Gondolat, 1978.

<sup>115</sup> Edward Said, 'Reflections on exile', *Granta*, 13, 1984, 159–172; Vilém Flusser, 'Exil und Kreativität', in: Vilém Flusser, *Von der Freiheit des Migranten. Einsprüche gegen den Nationalismus*, Düsseldorf: Bollmann 1994, 103–109.

or on the role of international conferences in connection with the transfer of concepts between 1945 and 1989 would generate various new perspectives on this period in the history of the discipline. As it stands, the complexity of the Cold War's impact on the discipline of art history remains poorly understood.

**Robert Born** is Research Fellow and Director of the Project 'Ottoman Orient and East Central Europe' at the GWZO in Leipzig. He studied History of Art at Basel University and the Freie Universität Berlin and received his Ph.D at the Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin. He has published on Late Antique Urbanism in South Eastern Europe, Historiography of Art and Nationalism in East Central and South Eastern Europe.

rborn@uni-leipzig.de