CIHA as the Subject of Art Theory

The Methodological Discourse in the International Congresses of Art History from Post-War Years to the 2000s

Jennifer Cooke

Abstract

The title of this article recalls a session of the 2012 CIHA congress in Nuremberg – 'CIHA as the Object of Art History' – that analysed the role the Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art in the development of art history as a discipline. Only a few years earlier, Heinrich Dilly had drawn an overview of the International Congresses of Art History, together with specialists of other fields. Dilly explained the lack of interest of art historiography for the import of such conferences with the fact that they were 'too big a matter', as the papers had rapidly multiplied, and also 'very large a matter', in the sense that the debate was difficult to frame and, more often than not, the choice of participants depended on a political agenda rather than scientific reasons. This article thus endeavours to tackle this very large matter as a vantage point on the methodological reflection, in the attempt to trace the continuities and discontinuities of the theoretical discourse insofar as discussed in CIHA meetings, from the Lisbon conference in 1949 to that held in Nuremberg in 2012.

Contents

Lieux de légitimation, lieux de pouvoir aussi où la prise de parole et le jeu de présence/absence ont tout un sens, les Congrès sont aussi des lieux où s'établissent parfois de vrai débats.[1]

[1] The title of this article recalls a session of the 2012 CIHA congress in Nuremberg – 'CIHA as the Object of Art History' – that analysed the role the Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art in the development of art history as a

[1] Christophe Prochasson, "Les Congrès: lieux de l'échange intellectuel. Introduction", in: *Mil neuf cent* 7 (1989), 5-8: 7.

discipline.[2] Only a few years earlier, Heinrich Dilly had drawn an overview of the International Congresses of Art History, together with specialists of other fields. Dilly explained the lack of interest of art historiography for the import of such conferences with the fact that they were 'too big a matter', as the papers had rapidly multiplied, and also 'very large a matter', in the sense that the debate was difficult to frame and, more often than not, the choice of participants depended on a political agenda rather than scientific reasons.[3] This article thus endeavours to tackle this very large matter as a vantage point on the methodological reflection, in the attempt to trace the continuities and discontinuities of the theoretical discourse insofar as discussed in CIHA meetings, from the Lisbon conference in 1949 to that held in Nuremberg in 2012.[4]

[2] Since the first one held in Vienna in 1873, these international meetings promoted the dialogue between scholars and museum professionals as art history was establishing its status of academic discipline, although it was not until the Rome conference of 1912 that they became truly international in participation.[5] During the congress held in Brussels in 1930 CIHA was officially formed, and its statutes clearly stated that the goals of the Committee were to focus the attention on problems of method, raise awareness of art appreciation among scholars specialised in other 'moral and historical' sciences, and share practices in the field of art conservation, museography and publishing.[6]

[3] The post-war years were marked by an increase in number of CIHA members, with a wider representation beyond Western countries, as well as of national and

[2] Jaynie Anderson, "CIHA as the Object of Art History", in: *The Challenge of the Object. 33rd Congress of the International Committee of the History of Art*, eds. G. Ulrich Großmann and Petra Krutisch, 4 vols., Nuremberg 2013, IV, 1474-1476.

[3] Heinrich Dilly, "Trouvailles. Images latentes du congrès international d'histoire de l'art", in: *Revue Germanique Internationale* 12 (2010), 105-122.

[4] For an overview of CIHA's history and organisation see Thierry Dufrêne, "A Short History of CIHA", 2007, http://www.esteticas.unam.mx/CIHA/documents/Short_History_of_CIHA.pdf and http://www.ciha.org/statutes (accessed 16 August 2018).

[5] CIHA's by-laws state that the role of these congresses is "stimuler les rencontres internationales d'historiens d'art, afin de leur permettre de confronter leurs résultats et leurs méthodes, comme de créer entre eux des liens d'amitié personnels: cela, afin d'éviter tout cloisonnement et toute intolerance dans une discipline par excellence internationale"; Unesco Archives, Paris, CIPSH 102, Règlement du CIHA (1971), Article 5, Section 1.

[6] "Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art", in: *Actes du 12. Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art, Bruxelles 20-29 septembre 1930*, 2 vols., Bruxelles 1930, I, 251: "1° En ce qui concerne l'interprétation historique des œuvres d'art et leur appréciation esthétique, il faut retenir l'attention des historiens d'art sur les questions de méthode. 2° Il faut intéresser également à l'histoire de l'art des savants spécialisés dans les autres sciences morales et historiques. 3° Dans le domaine de la conservation des œuvres d'art, et en particulier de la muséographie, des publications et de la bibliographie, on étudiera en commun les solutions les plus recommandables."

intercontinental meetings.[7] In order to befit this growing participation of countries (as well as an expanding notion of art objects) the statutes were progressively amended between 1961 and 1979. Another significant change was placing CIHA under the aegis of the CIPSH (Conseil International de la Philosophie et des Sciences Humaines) in 1961, thus forging a connection with UNESCO that would further prompt internationalism in the coming years.

[4] The new by-laws listed as the Committee's principal goals to develop the study of artistic phenomena, promote a permanent connection among art scholars, and disseminate information about ongoing research.[8] Fostering communication in the scientific community was evidently perceived as a main purpose, and to that end two colloquia were organised in the interval between the main international congresses (whose periodicity shifted between three and five, and was finally brought to four years)[9], and a house journal was created, the *Bulletin du CIHA*, reporting on the activities and symposia promoted by CIHA and its national committees.[10] The Comité's efforts also went into the extensive and systematic cataloguing of art works and monuments, launching ambitious corpora such as the *Corpus Vitrearum*, the *Corpus des Peintures Murales du Moyen-Âge*, and the *Répertoire et guide photographique*.[11]

[5] As CIHA's organisation became more structured in post-war years, so did its congresses. As already prescribed in Brussels in 1930,[12] they revolved around a general theme which had a specific connection to the hosting city or country, following a practice that was first introduced in the 1912 conference in Rome.[13]

---

[7] Unlike other organisations such as ICOM that welcome individual members, CIHA's membership is only through National Committees whose representatives constitute the General Assembly, whereas the Bureau is the main executive body.

[8] "Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art. Statuts", in: *Bulletin du CIHA* 1 (1965), no. 1-2, 3.

[9] Between 1930 and 1964 congresses were held every three years, then every five until 1983, every three until 1992, and finally every four up to today.

[10] Cf. "Editorial", in: *Bulletin du CIHA* 2 (1967), no. 1, 1-2. In the minds of its creators, Millard Meiss and André Chastel, the bulletin was to disseminate the news on art history, such as chair appointments, academic events, research institutes – incidentally a list of specifics that made no mention of the methodological debate. However, the *Bulletin* appeared intermittently only between 1965 and 1969 ceasing its publication for financial reasons.

[11] The *Corpus Vitrearum*, coordinated by Hans Hahnloser, was probably the most successful of these enterprises also organising regular colloquia.

[12] "Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art", 252: "Fournir aux congrès des themes très précis d'intérêt international, de manière à ce que les congressistes puissant se preparer à intervenir utilement dans la discussion."

[13] "L'Italia e l'arte straniera" (Italy and Foreign Art) was the theme of the 10th conference organised by Adolfo Venturi in Rome. This formula of national art and its international connections would be repeated by his son, Lionello, for the 18th congress held in Venice in 1955 and again in the following Paris meeting of 1958. In the coming decades, only the

The by-laws drafted in 1971 clearly prescribed that each conference be devoted to a main topic, although this prescription appeared to have been tempered in the final version.[14] However, the General Assembly held in Copenhagen in 1975 proposed to abolish a general theme altogether and replace it with six subjects dealing with the principal trends in art research, a solution that was applied to the following congresses in Bologna (1979) and Vienna (1983).[15] With regard to the conference programmes, they often featured a panel dedicated to the anniversaries or centenaries of celebrated Western artists – or art historians in the heyday of art history's self-reflexivity – while other sessions were generally articulated according to the traditional art historical periodisation. Per contra, since the 1980s the sessions increasingly reflected a less traditional – i.e. chronological and geographical – approach, and the choice of main topics, too, progressively took on the cross-cultural turn of art history in the last three decades.

[6] How questions of method were addressed in these congresses must be considered within this 'institutional' framework. Prompting an exchange amongst scholars on such matters was significantly stated as the first objective of the Comité in the statutes approved at the Brussels congress, and the next meetings followed suit.[16] Under the stimulus of Lionello Venturi, the 1933 Stockholm conference featured a session on principles of art criticism, where he discussed current methodological problems and focused on the Crocean approach and the concept of taste.[17] And the next Swiss meeting in 1936 included the panel "Théorie et histoire de la critique d'art", again chaired by the same Venturi.[18]

[7] In the London gathering of 1939, only weeks before the war broke out, the title of the session was quite tellingly "Sciences accessory to the history of art: The history of criticism".[19] One could stress 'accessory' as the operative word, since methodological problems were marginalised when CIHA conferences resumed after the war, at least until the meeting in Bonn in 1964 which again

Granada conference of 1973 re-proposed a regionalist perspective (albeit in its international relations), possibly because of the emergence first of a Euro-American bloc, and then of the global turn.

[14] The two versions of Article VII, Section 1 read: "Chaque Congrès possède un theme défini", which was then changed into "Chaque Congrès possède un thème principal, sans toutefois être limité à ce thème" (Unesco Archives, Paris, CIPSH 102, Règlement du CIHA).

[15] Unesco Archives, Paris, CIPSH 102, Note relative à la réorganisation du CIHA. The goal was the "retour du Comité International à son vrai rôle, qui est de prendre la tête de l’actualité scientifique".

[16] See note 6.

[17] Lionello Venturi, "Sur quelques problèmes actuels de la critique d'art", in: *XIIIe Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art. Stockholm 1933. Résumés des communications présentées au congrès*, Stockholm 1933, 294-300.

[18] *14. Congrès international d'histoire de l'art: Suisse, 31 août au 9 septembre 1936*, Basel 1938.

featured a panel specifically devoted to the main approaches to artworks.[20] This formula would be replicated in the following congresses of Budapest (1969), Granada (1973), Bologna (1979) and Vienna (1983), mainly discussing the formalist, iconological and contextual approaches while considering structuralism as a viable alternative to the form vs. content dichotomy. At the Strasbourg (1989) and Berlin (1992) conferences the critical reappraisal of art history's founding fathers (such as Warburg) went hand in hand with the discussion on canonicity in the postmodern age and reflected the crisis in the discipline. The shift from a Western to a global perspective that brought on the collapse of art historical canons was prefigured in the Washington congress (1986) and would dominate CIHA's meetings in the new millennium, in which an oblique and comparative perspective replaced the more markedly historiographical analysis of methods.

From Lisbon to Paris: the Congresses in the 1950s

[8] The first post-war conference was organised by Reynaldo dos Santos in Lisbon in 1949 (instead of 1942) where a reduced number of delegations – with the obvious absence of Germany – gathered around the main theme of Portuguese art and architecture.[21] Under the promising title of 'Problèmes concernant l'histoire de l'art' no significant theoretical contributions were made, as the more pressing issues of heritage conservation were understandably given prominence.[22]

[9] The following meeting took place in Amsterdam under the chairmanship of Jan van Gelder in 1952, and once more matters of a strictly methodological nature were not addressed.[23] However, the iconological school was the most represented one with papers by Erwin Panofsky, Millard Meiss and Henry van de Waal. Panofsky, in particular, spoke of the 'Renaissance-Dämmerung' ensuing

[19] Because of the impending war the proceedings were not published, hence only the general programme survives.

[20] This point was also remarked in Gerhard Schmidt, "Die Internationalen Kongresse für Kunstgeschichte", in: *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 36 (1983), 7-15: 14-15.

[21] Manueline Renaissance and the Baroque were the main focus of the conference, also encompassing its Brazilian derivations which partially broadened the scope to extra-European countries, see Germain Bazin, "L'architecture religieuse du Portugal et du Brésil à l'époque baroque", and Robert C. Smith, "The Development of Baroque Art in Portugal and Brazil", in: *XVI Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art. Rapports et communications*, ed. R. dos Santos, 2 vols., Lisbon and Porto 1949, I, 69-93.

[22] Adolfo Faria de Castro gave a very short paper with the promising title of "Des méthodes dans l'histoire de l'art" which merely repeated trite assumptions based on the premium of aesthetic values coupled with the need to apply modern scientific techniques to the analysis of paintings; see Adolfo Faria de Castro, "Des méthodes dans l'histoire de l'art", in: *XVI Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art*, vol. 2, 33-35.

[23] *Actes du 17. Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art: Amsterdam 23-31 juillet 1952*, Den Haag 1955.

from the contention posited by science historians that there had been no real Renaissance in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, a position which the German art historian attempted at reconciling with the views of art scholars.[24] Ernst H. Gombrich, who on that occasion outlined the idea of artistic progress in fifteenth-century Italy, later recalled that people in Amsterdam were beginning to grow sceptical of the idea of Renaissance embodied by Jacob Burckhardt. Panofsky, especially, was very displeased about it and emphasised the remarkable thaw the Renaissance had brought.[25]

[10] The relations between Venice and Europe were the topic of the conference Lionello Venturi organised in the Serenissima in 1955. Once again, the procedures and aims of the discipline were not foregrounded, in spite of Venturi's sensibility for the matter. An interest that was evidenced in his inaugural speech, where he delineated the development of art criticism since the 10th International Congress, which his father, Adolfo, had chaired in 1912. While the philological-documentary approach had not substantially changed, he remarked that the contextual study of the work of art against its religious, political and philosophical background had conversely made significant progress and even more so the study of the evolution of artistic form.[26]

[11] The 19th conference in Paris chaired by Marcel Aubert re-proposed the topic of artistic connections between national and European art and, like in the Venetian precedent, methodological discourse was not a subject of debate. Noteworthy is the attention devoted to Mannerism – foreshadowing the next New York congress – and to the relations with Eastern Europe, an aspect which would have resurfaced a decade later.[27]

[12] In the 1950s, the methodological debate was developed in a separate forum from CIHA. Lionello Venturi, along with André Chastel and Giulio C. Argan, were amongst the key-promoters of the International Association of Art Critics (AICA), whose first two meetings were held in Paris in 1948 and 1949.[28] And after Venturi organised the third conference in Venice in 1950, AICA was officially established

[24] Panofsky had presented the same paper at a symposium in New York earlier that year and for this reason it did not appear in the Amsterdam proceedings, see Erwin Panofsky, "Artist, Scientist, Genius: Notes on the 'Renaissance Dämmerung'", in: *The Renaissance*, symposium proceedings, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 8-10 February 1952, New York 1953, 77-93.

[25] Ernst H. Gombrich, *A Lifelong Interest. Conversations on Art and Science with Didier Eribon*, London 1991, 137. Also see Ernst H. Gombrich, "The Renaissance Concept of Artistic Progress and Its Consequences", in: *Actes du 17. Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art*, 291-307.

[26] Lionello Venturi, "Discorso del nuovo presidente del comitato internazionale di storia dell'arte", in: *Venezia e l'Europa. Atti del XVIII Congresso Internazionale di Storia dell'Arte*, ed. Lionello Venturi, Venice 1956, 20-21: 21.

[27] *Relations artistiques entre la France et les autres pays depuis le Haut Moyen Âge jusqu'à la fin du XIXe siècle. Actes du XIXe Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art. Paris 8-13 septembre 1958*, Paris 1959.

and placed under the aegis of UNESCO.[29] Indeed, the vocation for contemporary art lent itself to a more forward-thinking stance of AICA meetings when compared to the germane CIHA conferences. Matters such as contemporary aesthetics, the debate between realism and abstraction in the 1950s, the relations between art and new media in the 1960s-80s, and more importantly the decentralisation of culture and the developing countries since the 1970s, testify to an awareness that resonated with the Comité only years later.

New York – Bonn and the Consecration of Iconology in the Western Bloc

[13] The first one convened outside of Europe, the conference in New York in September 1961 organised by Millard Meiss marked in some ways a new course for CIHA.[30] The first participation of American art historians in the international congresses dated back to 1921, attesting to the increasingly central role the United States were to play in art scholarship, as well as in the global political arena, in the following decades.[31] When Hitler shook the tree of art history, America picked the apples in the 1930s and 1940s, as Walter W. S. Cook's well-known motto recited, fostering that 'golden age' of art historical studies across the Atlantic that Erwin Panofsky – the ripest apple of them all – described in 1953.[32] And indeed, this congress celebrated the uprooted school of iconology whose foremost American disciple was Meiss himself, who was to succeed Panofsky at Princeton in 1963.[33] Upon recalling Panofsky's notorious scepticism towards theoretical speculation – a tendency he had disavowed when he came

[28] Denys Sutton, "The First International Congress of Art Critics", in: *College Art Journal* 8 (1948-1949), no. 2, 129-135. On the history of AICA see Ramon Tio Bellido, ed., *Histoires de 50 ans de l'Association Internationale des Critiques d'Art/AICA*, Paris 2002; Henry Meyeric-Hughes, "L'AICA à l'ère de la globalisation: du club de gentlemen à la collégialité universelle", in: *Memoires croisées, dérives archivistiques*, ed. Jean-Marc Poinsot, Paris 2015, 29-35; Antje Kramer-Mallordy, "The Archives of the International Association of Art Critics, a Forward-Looking History of Globalization?", in: *Critique d'Art* 45 (2015), 138-155: 142.

[29] http://aicainternational.org/en/background-objectives-of-aica/ (accessed 16 August 2018).

[30] The congress should have been held in Copenhagen, as announced in the previous Paris meeting, see "International Congress", in: *College Art Journal* 18 (1959), no. 3, 249. Meiss, however, had gone to great lengths to bring the Congress to New York, receiving generous grants from the American Council of Learned Societies and from "other sources" in an effort to convince CIHA to meet in the United States, see Millard Meiss, "International Congress", in: *Art Journal* 21 (1961), no. 1, pp. 1 and 18.

[31] In spite of a participation in CIHA conferences since the 1920s, the American national committee (NCHA) was established only in 1950, appointing Walter Cook, Sumner Crosby, Frederick Deknatel, Rensselaer Lee and Henry Hope.

[32] Erwin Panofsky, "Three Decades of Art History in the United States: Impressions of a Transplanted European" (1954), in: Erwin Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts. Papers in and on Art History*, Garden City NY 1955, 321-346.

into contact with Anglo-Saxon pragmatism – one could possibly relate the absence of a session devoted to methodology to the long shadow cast by the German art historian.[34]

[14] A few remarks can however be surmised from the nature of the sessions topics and the papers presented. While connoisseurship was pushed to the margins – even Richard Offner discussed problems of restoration rather than attribution – the iconological approach was dominant by large and far. The 'Nachleben', or rather its 'survival'/'revival' Anglo-Saxon historicisation, was the main interpretative framework under the weight of Panofsky's recently published *Renaissance and Renascences*.[35]

[15] As is known, the founding myth of iconology was closely linked to CIHA congresses insofar as Warburg famously spoke of "critical iconology" at the tenth conference in Rome, but the name of the Hamburg art historian was overshadowed by "il duca signor e maestro", Panofsky.[36] The latter delivered a lecture on Correggio's Camera di San Paolo, anticipating the forthcoming book on the fresco cycle written in response to Roberto Longhi's formalistic interpretation.[37] Whereas Kenneth Clark took a more methodological standpoint in his lectio magistralis that discussed motives – a conjunction of form and

[33] On Millard Meiss refer to Jennifer Cooke, *Millard Meiss: tra Connoisseurship, Iconologia e Kulturgeschichte*, Milan 2015, esp. 92-103.

[34] Panofsky's adagio notably was 'the discussion of methods spoils their application', see William S. Heckscher, "The Genesis of Iconology", in: *Stil und Überlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes. Akten des 21. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte in Bonn 1964*, ed. Herbert von Einem, 3 vols., Berlin 1967, III, 239-262: 262.

[35] Erwin Panofsky, *Renaissance and Renascences in Western Art*, Stockholm 1960. Georges Didi-Huberman claimed the Warburgian 'Nachleben' was impoverished when it was turned into 'survival' by the hand of Gombrich and Panofsky especially, see Georges Didi-Huberman, *The Surviving Image: Phantoms of Time and Time of Phantoms. Aby Warburg's History of Art*, University Park PA 2017 (ed. or. Paris 2002), and Georges Didi-Huberman, "Artistic Survival: Panofsky vs. Warburg and the Exorcism of Impure Time", in: *Common Knowledge* 9 (2003), no. 2, 273-285. This view was, however, criticised by Matthew Rampley arguing that Didi-Huberman was assuming Warburg as the counterpoint to traditional art history which Panofsky epitomised, see Matthew Rampley, "The Poetics of the Image: Art History and the Rhetoric of Interpretation", in: *Marburger Jahrbuch für Kunstwissenschaft* 35 (2008), 7-30: 23. Rampley, on the other hand, posited that the difference between Warburg and Panofsky lies in the former's interest in the synchrony of phenomena in the same historical cultural time, see Matthew Rampley, "Iconology of the Interval: Aby Warburg's Legacy", in: *Word & Image* 17 (2001), no. 4, 303-324.

[36] André Chastel, "Introduction", in: *Studies in Western Art. Acts of the Twentieth International Congress of the History of Art*, 4 vols., Princeton 1963, II, 3. Cf. Alfred Neumeyer, "Acts of the Twentieth International Congress of the History of Art", in: *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 23 (1965), no. 4, 513-514: "While Erwin Panofsky is today's master in the field, we should not forget that it was the never-mentioned Aby Warburg who conceived first of this problem and its multi-layered applications."

content similar to Panofsky's Typus – as a possible alternative to resolve the dichotomy between formalism and iconology.[38]

[16] In spite of the climate of détente advocated by Khrushchev's principle of Peaceful Coexistence, events had escalated in 1961 – the Bay of Pigs Invasion had taken place in April and the Berlin Wall would have been completed in November – which ultimately led to exclude participants from beyond the Iron Curtain, with the sole exception of Poland, Czechoslovakia and non-aligned Yugoslavia.[39] All the more significantly, the topic chosen, 'Studies in Western Art', was a clear declaration of intent. And the new statutes of CIHA presented on this occasion, and later ratified in Madrid, clearly emphasised that the goal of the Comité was to develop the systematic study of artistic phenomena "with regard to the post-classical West and its connections with world art".[40] The relations of the West to world art (yet still in the Western hemisphere) were explored in the session on pre-Colombian and colonial art in Central and South America chaired by George Kubler, who only a year later would have published *The Shape of Time*, a cornerstone of the following debate on the geography of art.[41] In his introduction to the session, Kubler offered an explanation of Latin American metropolitan schools in terms of "fast and slow happening" in the centre/periphery, a paradigm which would be further expounded in the next CIHA conference held in the New World.[42]

[17] The New York congress is also remembered for the section on Mannerism chaired by Ernst H. Gombrich, which notably led to a critical reconsideration of that period. Although perhaps a far-fetched hypothesis, this interest in Mannerism could be tinged with Cold War tensions since Mikhail Alpatov had strongly criticised the Western 'bourgeois' art historians who studied this period

---

[37] Erwin Panofsky, *The Iconography of Correggio's Camera di San Paolo*, London 1961. Cf. Roberto Longhi, *Il Correggio e la Camera di San Paolo a Parma*, Genoa 1956.

[38] Kenneth Clark, "Motives", in: *Studies in Western Art*, IV, 189-205.

[39] A similar tension animated the 1960 International Congress of Historical Sciences in Stockholm wherein however scholars from both sides participated, see Karl D. Erdmann, *Toward a Global Community of Historians: The International Historical Congresses and the International Committee of Historical Sciences, 1898-2000*, New York and Oxford 2005, 245-248.

[40] The statutes were approved in the CIHA general assembly in Madrid on 3 June 1963, see "Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art. Statuts", in: *Bulletin du CIHA* 1 (1965), no. 1-2, 3.

[41] George Kubler, *The Shape of Time: Remarks on the History of Things*, New Haven CT 1962.

[42] George Kubler, "Introduction", in: *Studies in Western Art*, III, 145-147. Cf. John R. Martin's unfavourable review lamenting a lack of unity of approach: John R. Martin, "Latin American Art, and the Baroque Period in Europe. Studies in Western Art: Acts of the Twentieth International Congress of the History of Art by Millard Meiss", in: *Renaissance News* 18 (1965), no. 4, 320-322.

of decline undermining Renaissance culture.[43] Along this line, the fact that, in his opening introduction, Gombrich attacked Dvořák's "Hegelian dogma" – a not so veiled remark against Geistesgeschichte – may take on a different relevance if linked to the scholar's open criticism of the materialist/Marxist notion of history.[44] Finally, the sessions on the reactions to Impressionism chaired by Meyer Schapiro, on Frank Lloyd Wright organised by Henry-Russell Hitchcock, and Van Regteren Altena's on drawings, represented the strands of research that art history in the United States had been pursuing in the past decades.[45]

[18] In 1964 the CIHA congress significantly took place in Bonn under the presidency of Herbert von Einem, and the theme chosen was "Style and Tradition in the Art of the West". It was the first meeting on German soil after the war, and for many émigré art historians the first chance to return to their motherland and meet the new generation of compatriot scholars.[46] A heretofore missing self-reflexivity of the discipline finally entered a CIHA conference as two of its founding fathers were celebrated, Heinrich Wölfflin and Aby Warburg.[47]

[19] Although most papers focussed on specific case studies rather than broaching broader frameworks, special attention must be accorded to the session on style and iconography chaired by Jan Białostocki.[48] The Polish art

[43] The reference to the article Alpatov wrote in 1951 (*Protiv buržuaznogo iskusstva i iskusstovznanija*, ed. Igor E. Grabar and Vladimir S. Kemenov, Moscow 1951, 129-130) is mentioned in Nicos Hadjinicolau, "Introduzione", in: Frederick Antal, *La pittura italiana tra classicismo e manierismo*, ed. Nicos Hadjinicolau, Rome 1977, 9 note 2.

[44] Ernst H. Gombrich, "Introduction", in: *Studies in Western Art*, II, 168-169. Gombrich's anti-totalitarian *Story of Art* (1950) promoted a methodological individualism that was fraught with political liberalism, see Vardan Azatyan, "Cold-War Twins: Mikhail Alpatov's *A Universal History of Arts* and Ernst Gombrich's *The Story of Art*", in: *Human Affairs* 19 (2009), 289-296. As is known, Gombrich's anti-Hegelian views were influenced by Karl Popper's critique of historicism formulated in *The Poverty of Historicism* published only a few years earlier (London 1957).

[45] Those were the fields that were prominently featured in *The Art Bulletin* since Meiss's editorship in the 1940s, see Millard Meiss, "The Art Bulletin at Fifty", in: *The Art Bulletin* 46 (1964), no. 1, 1-5.

[46] While Germany had been marginalised in the historical sciences – whose international congresses saw the predominance of French scholars until the next decade; the first post-war congress in Germany would have taken place only in 1985 – this had not been the case for art history. And as Herbert von Einem (1905-1983) had no direct ties to the Nazi regime, in the post-war years he was the main representative of German art historians. See *Metzler Kunsthistoriker-Lexikon: zweihundert Porträts deutschsprachiger Autoren aus vier Jahrhunderten*, eds. Peter Betthausen, Peter H. Feist and Christiane Fork, Stuttgart 1999, 70-73.

[47] Joseph Gantner, "Gedenkrede für Heinrich Wölfflin (1864-1964)", in: *Stil und Überlieferung*, I, 58-68. On Warburg see *infra*.

[48] The history of style and iconography were actually the two main trends James S. Ackerman had recently described in his account of (a still only) Western history of art: James S. Ackerman, "Western Art History", in: *Art and Archaeology*, ed. James S.

historian championed an iconologically-oriented approach as a means to contrast both the history of style and the Marxist perspective on art, as well as a way to remain in the orbit of Western culture.[49] Moreover, Białostocki was an advocate for a return to the original formulation as opposed to the recent contemporary applications that had been dubbed as 'trigger-happy' iconology.[50] This view was clearly reflected in the Bonn session whose opening paper harked back to the genesis of the iconological method as formulated by Aby Warburg – a name that had been not mentioned in the New York conference.[51] William S. Heckscher closely analysed how Warburg developed his Kulturgeschichte approach between 1907 and 1912, and how his famous Schifanoia lecture was received by his colleagues patrolling the disciplinary boundaries of art history.[52] Warburg's oeuvre and theories would be fully expounded at the Strasbourg congress in 1989, but Heckscher's paper of 1964 marked a turning point in his critical fortune.[53]

Ackerman and Rhys Carpenter, Englewood Cliffs NJ 1963, 164-186.

[49] Wojciech Bałus, "A Marginalized Tradition? Polish Art History", in: *Art History and Visual Studies in Europe: Transnational Discourses and National Frameworks*, eds. Matthew Rampley, Thierry Lenain, Hubert Locher et al., Leiden and Boston 2012, 439-449. On Jan Białostocki (1921-1988) see Gianni C. Sciolla, *Jan Białostocki: un metodo iconologico*, Genoa 2017.

[50] Jan Białostocki, "Iconography and Iconology" *ad vocem*, in: *Encyclopaedia of World Art*, vol. 7, New York 1963, cols. 769-785. The expression is owed to Julius S. Held, "Erwin Panofsky, *Early Netherlandish Painting, Its Origin and Character*", in: *The Art Bulletin* 37 (1955), no. 3, 205-234: 212.

[51] Cf. Neumeyer, "Acts of the Twentieth International Congress of the History of Art", 514.

[52] Aby Warburg, "Italienische Kunst und internationale Astrologie im Palazzo Schifanoia zu Ferrara", in: *Arte italiana e arte straniera: Atti del 10. Congresso Internazionale di Storia dell'Arte in Roma*, Rome 1922, 179-193 (Engl. transl. "Italian Art and International Astrology in the Palazzo Schifanoia", in: Aby Warburg, *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity: Contribution to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance*, ed. Kurt W. Forster, Los Angeles 1999, 563-592); Heckscher, "The Genesis of Iconology", 239-262. Significantly, "The Genesis of Iconology" was also the title of a recent article written by Jaś Elsner and Katharina Lorenz, who identify the roots of the method in Panofsky alone (in: *Critical Inquiry* 38 (2012), no. 3, 483-512). Heckscher later admitted to Panofsky he was dissatisfied with the Bonn meeting, especially for how his paper had been commented on in the German press (Erwin Panofsky, *Korrespondenz 1910 bis 1968,* 5 vols., ed. Dieter Wuttke, vol. 5, Wiesbaden 2011, 555 note 2).

[53] Like Heckscher himself remarked in a letter to Panofsky, the Hamburg-born art historian had suddenly become of interest in the 1960s – in 1966, Carlo Ginzburg's and Erik Forssmann's pioneering articles on the Warburgian method appeared, followed by Gombrich's intellectual biography in 1970: "It is strange how Warburg seems to be suddenly again at the center of attention, possibly because he was born in 1866. But I think a revival of the late Edwardian phase taste: My Fair Lady, is in the air"; William S. Heckscher to Erwin Panofsky, 18 January 1965, in: Panofsky, *Korrespondenz 1910 bis 1968*, V, 607. Carlo Ginzburg, "Da A. Warburg a E. H. Gombrich. Note su un problema di metodo", in: *Studi medievali*, s. III, 7 (1966), 1015-1065; Erik Forssmann, "Ikonologie und

[20] The other contributions on style and iconography were pieces of textbook iconology, namely those by Otto Pächt and Millard Meiss.[54] The latter, in particular, explored the effects of form on iconography, i.e. how a certain subject thrived in connection to a specific style, providing a different angle on the clear demarcation of the two outlined by Panofsky – who incidentally welcomed this paper in "real admiration".[55] Panofsky did not attend the conference (he would set foot in Germany only in 1967) and in those years was growing sceptical of the popularity of his method[56] – so much that in a letter to Herbert von Einem dated 1962, he preferred to define his approach as 'eclectic', owing much to Vöge, Riegl, Goldschmidt, Warburg and even a little to Wölfflin.[57]

[21] The many-sidedness of his formulations was further underscored when Panofsky replied to Michael Podro's popularised piece of criticism of 1965 that presented him as the father of iconology by pointing out that Warburg and Giehlow ought to be credited with that role, instead.[58] And only two years later, mindful of the recent applications, he was even reluctant to use the term iconology favouring the less 'esoteric' iconography, as remarked in the preface to *Essais d'iconologie*.[59] Furthermore, whilst the Bonn conference was celebrating the iconological method also a debate on the notion of style, sparked by 1962 Ackerman's *A Theory of Style* and Kubler's *The Shape of Time*, was underway.[60]

---

allgemeine Kunstgeschichte", in: *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 11 (1966), 132-169; Ernst H. Gombrich, *Aby Warburg. An Intellectual Biography*, London 1970. A thorough account of Warburg's fortune can be found in Claudia Cieri Via, *Introduzione a Aby Warburg*, Rome and Bari 2011, 145-167.

[54] Otto Pächt, "Künstlerische Originalität und ikonographische Erneuerung", in: *Stil und Überlieferung*, III, 262-271, and Millard Meiss, "Sleep in Venice", in: *Stil und Überlieferung*, III, 271-279.

[55] Archives of American Art, Washington DC, Millard Meiss Papers. Erwin Panofsky to Millard Meiss, 10 November 1966.

[56] Jan Białostocki, "Erwin Panofsky (1892-1968): Thinker, Historian, Human Being", in: *Simiolus* 4 (1970), no. 2, 68-89: 70. Panofsky’s comment on Heckscher's paper was the famous dictum "The discussion of methods spoils their application", which the latter used as an epigraph for his paper.

[57] Panofsky, *Korrespondenz 1910 bis 1968*, V, 192-193. Erwin Panofsky to Herbert von Einem, 1 April 1962.

[58] Michael Podro, "Clues and Images. On Erwin Panofsky's Approach to the History of Art", in: *The Listener* 73 (4 March 1965), 338-339. Cf. also Panofsky, *Korrespondenz 1910 bis 1968*, V, 632.

[59] Erwin Panofsky, "Préface à l’édition française", in: Erwin Panofsky, *Essais d’iconologie. Thèmes humanistes dans l’art de la Renaissance,* Paris 1967, 3-5: 5.

[60] James S. Ackerman, "A Theory of Style", in: *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 20 (1962), no. 3, 227-237. Cf. Andrea Pinotti, "Formalism and the History of Style", in: *Art History and Visual Studies in Europe: Transnational Discourses and National Frameworks*, eds. Matthew Rampley, Thierry Lenain, Hubert Locher et al., Leiden and Boston 2012, 77-78.

[22] Within this framework, one must also consider that iconology was beginning to be targeted as a 'maximalist' method.[61] And in the same 1964, Susan Sontag was arguing against the interpretation "based on the highly dubious theory that a work of art is composed of items of content", which ultimately violates art in that form and content are separated. Although she did not take overt issue with Panofsky (mentioned only for his essay on films), the "shadow world of 'meanings'" that interpretation sets up seems to constitute quite explicit a critique.[62]

The Heyday of the Discussion on Methods from Budapest to Vienna

[23] The formula of a methodological session became of age with the 1969 congress in Budapest about the interplay of general evolution and regional development in Central Europe[63] – a significant attempt at challenging the commonplace centre vs. periphery assumption, in the words of its organiser Lajos Vayer, and at restoring relations with the Eastern Bloc, even though the Cold War had admittedly passed its acute phase.[64] Actually, CIHA had at first envisaged the possibility to organise the next congress in Moscow during the Bonn meeting (in which two Russian scholars, Aleksey Aleksandrovich Fyodorov-Davydov and Mikhail Jakovlevich Libman, took part), and had made several appeals to the Soviet Union to form a national committee but to no avail.[65]

---

[61] On this point see the very penetrating article by Franco Bernabei, "Jan Białostocki, Formalism, and Iconology", in: *Artibus et Historiae* 11 (1990), no. 22, 9-21, esp. 15-16.

[62] Susan Sontag, "Against Interpretation" (1964), in: Susan Sontag, *Against Interpretation and Other Essays*, London 1967, 3-14: 10 and 7; also see "On Style" (1965), in: Sontag, *Against Interpretation and Other Essays*, 15-36.

[63] In a report on the Bonn conference Chastel had indeed mentioned that CIHA's plan for the following years was to open up to Central and Eastern Europe, see André Chastel, "Historiens de l'art à Bonn", in: *Le Monde,* 25 September 1964.

[64] Lajos Vayer, "Allgemeine Entwicklung und regionale Entwicklungen in der Kunstgeschichte – Situation des Problems in Mitteleuropa", in: *Evolution générale et développements régionaux en histoire de l'art. Actes du XXIIe Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art, Budapest 1969*, 3 vols., Budapest 1972, I, 19-29. Cf. also Thomas W. Gaehtgens, "Introduction", in: *The Challenge of the Object. 33rd Congress of the International Committee of the History of Art*, 4 vols., Nuremberg 2013, IV, 1472-1473: 1472.

[65] "Procès-Verbal des séances tenues par le Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art et par son bureau à Bonn", in: *Bulletin du CIHA* 1 (1965), no. 1-2, 16-17; "Procès-verbal de la réunion plénière du Comité International tenue lors du colloque de Split", in: *Bulletin du CIHA* 4 (1969), no. 1, 4. Per contra, Moscow would have hosted the International Congress of Historical Sciences in 1970, though not without a heated confrontation due to the recent events in Czechoslovakia, see Agnes Blänsdorf, "Une collaboration scientifique dans un esprit œcuménique et international: Les congrès internationaux d'historiens et le Comité International des Sciences Historiques dans l'Entre-deux-guerres", in: *Revue Germanique Internationale* 12 (2010), 209-228.

[24] Russian participants were however welcome, and the appointment of Mikhail Alpatov as chairman of the session 'Art History and the Other Human Sciences' could be seen as another sign of reconcilement.[66] The reference to interdisciplinarity implicit in the very title indicates the addressed methodological bone of contention, i.e. the social history of art, which at the previous congress had been glossed over and basically subsumed under the umbrella of iconology avoiding all reference to Marxist theories.[67]

[25] The (now) tripartite methodological framework offered by the Bulgarian art historian Atanas Stojkov included formal and iconological analyses alongside the sociological one as represented by Wölfflin, Panofsky and Hauser.[68] Stojkov underscored the limitation inherent in all three approaches, which failed to adopt a universal perspective encompassing non-European art. And specifically, while Wölfflin's formalism did not account for any link between spiritual life and style, Panofsky's iconology undermined aesthetic appreciation. Emphasising the connection with Dvořák's Geistesgeschichte, Hauser's sociological interpretation was highly praised, even though Stojkov also warned against the perils of simplistic economic relations. Finally, the speaker stressed the importance of the Soviet contribution to Marxist art history, namely citing the work of Boris Vipper, Mikhail Alpatov, Viktor Lazarev and Aleksey Aleksandrovich Fyodorov-Davydov.[69] Stojkov's enthusiasm for the social history of art was tempered by Roberto Salvini's following appraisal of its limits. Assessing the theories of Budapest-born Antal and Hauser, Salvini remarked that the strict determinism of the artwork mirroring the socio-economic conditions could not account for the artist's individuality, nor for artistic traditions. Hence he proposed a social history of figurative language wherein formalism is intended in a linguistic sense in that it is shaped by both an expressive individual aspect and a social communicative one.[70]

[26] José-Augusto França took an even more overt structuralist turn in his paper by introducing a dynamic and multi-layered social history of art that intersects a "conscience gestaltique" and an "intégration socio-culturelle axée sur un

[66] On Mikhail Alpatov (1902-1986) refer to Azatyan, "Cold-War Twins".

[67] Gregor Paulsson, "Kunst, Gesellschaft, Symbolmilieu", in: *Stil und Überlieferung*, III, 53-54.

[68] Atanas Stojkov, "Aperçu sur trois conceptions de l'art: Wölfflin, Panofsky, Hauser", in: *Evolution générale et développements régionaux*, II, 485-490.

[69] Stojkov, "Aperçu sur trois conceptions de l'art", 490.

[70] Roberto Salvini, "Significato e limiti di una storia sociale dell'arte", in: *Evolution générale et développements régionaux*, II, 491-503. When Salvini had reviewed Antal's *Remarks on the Method of Art History*, he criticised his deterministic connection between art and socio-economic conditions detrimental to artistic personality and the quality of the art work, see Roberto Salvini, "F. Antal, *Remarks on the Method of Art History*", in: *Commentari* 1 (1950), no. 2, 132-133. On Roberto Salvini (1912-1985) refer to Stefano Bulgarelli, "Roberto Salvini, l'impegno nella storia dell'arte", in: *Paragone* s. III, 74 (2007), 15-40.

processus structuralisant".[71] Similarly, Lajos Németh verified the applicability of a structuralist interpretation to modern art, building his argument on Erwin Panofsky's Dokumentsinn and Hans Sedlmayr's Strukturanalyse.[72] Moreover, another plea for a contextual modus operandi came from André Chastel, who in the session on museums offered a historical outline of attributionism and admonished that only if combined with an attention to the cultural milieu would this approach rise above mere classification.[73] This critical assessment of the social history of art was, on the one hand, a tribute to the hosting city, Budapest, home to the famous Sunday Circle and to the two members that were its principal proponents, viz. Antal and Hauser. At the same time, this interest may also reflect the revival of Marxist-oriented theories encouraged by the social movements in reaction to Cold War formalism, which – as Donald Preziosi noted – led to pursue a socially-minded discipline, coupled with a widespread nostalgia for the theoretical perspectives of the 1930s.[74]

[27] All the same, apart from Stojkov's, the assessments presented in Budapest did not wholeheartedly embrace a sociological art history but rather set forth a version tempered by stylistic analysis, also considering a semiotic approach as a viable reconciling course. Even Alpatov's closing remarks were quite ecumenical as he appealed to a far-reaching approach that went beyond the sole stylistic analysis, although sociology, iconology or psychology ought to be considered in the light of the pre-eminence of artistic values.[75]

---

[71] José-Augusto França, "Une méthode historiographique", in: *Evolution générale et développements régionaux*, II, 505-509: 509. In 1976 França would develop such a semiotic corrective to the sociology of art drawing on Pierre Francastel's concept of *pensée plastique* and thus achieving a 'visual thinking', aligned with Nicos Hadjinicolau's *idéologie imagée*, see José-Augusto França, "Le fait artistique dans la sociologie de l'art", in: *La sociologie de l'art et sa vocation interdisciplinaire. L'œuvre et l'influence de Pierre Francastel*, ed. Jean-Louis Ferrier, Paris 1976, 127-136. Cf. also Nicos Hadjinicolau, "L'objet de la discipline de l'histoire de l'art et le temps de l'histoire des arts", in: *La sociologie de l'art et sa vocation interdisciplinaire*, 41-53.

[72] Lajos Németh, "Problème de l'interprétation et de l'appréciation de la peinture moderne", in: *Evolution générale et développements régionaux*, II, 557-562.

[73] André Chastel, "Attribution et méthode: le problème de l'artiste devant l'historien", in: *Evolution générale et développements régionaux*, II, 719-723.

[74] Donald Preziosi, *Rethinking Art History. Meditations on a Coy Science*, New Haven CT and London 1989, 161. This was the direction taken in Germany by the Ulmer Verein constituted in 1968, a group of radical art historians who propounded a neo-Marxist art history, see Otto K. Werckmeister, "Radical Art History", in: *Art Journal* 42 (1982), no. 4, 284-291, and Otto K. Werckmeister, "The Turn from Marx to Warburg in West German Art History, 1968-90", in: *Marxism and the History of Art. From William Morris to the New Left*, ed. Andrew Hemingway, London and Ann Arbor MI 2006, 213-220, esp. 214-215. Also refer to Horst Bredekamp's recollection of those years: Christopher S. Wood, "Iconoclasts and Iconophiles: Horst Bredekamp in Conversation with Christopher S. Wood", in: *The Art Bulletin* 94 (2012), no. 4, 515-527.

[28] Significantly, Alpatov's 'Cold War twin', Ernst H. Gombrich, whose absence at the conference is quite telling, was in those years taking overt issue with the Hegelian paradigm underlying that physiognomic fallacy whereby art mirrors the Zeitgeist.[76] According to Gombrich, historical determinism had fostered that idea of collective identity which had ultimately led to National Socialist and Soviet ideologies, and therefore he strongly attacked the a priori character of the strict interdependence between art and society.[77] In this sense, the reference Salvini made to artistic tradition may thus be taken as a possible indication of Gombrich's influence, for it closely recalled the idea of artistic creation based on the convergence of tradition and illusionistic devices the Austrian-born scholar had posited in *The Story of Art* (1950), and further expounded in *Art and Illusion: A Study in the Psychology of Pictorial Representation* (1960).[78]

[29] The 1973 congress was held in Granada and organised by Xavier de Salas.[79] One hundred years after the first conference took place in Vienna, de Salas traced a brief outline of CIHA meetings in his introduction and focused on the critical misfortune of Spanish art whose identity was the conference's main theme.[80] Jan Białostocki once more chaired a session on the problems of interpretation and historical classification. In his introductory overview, the Polish art historian concentrated on the impact on other disciplines of the epistemological models formulated in art history, from the aesthetic element adopted by Huizinga's historical thinking to the Warburgian study of symbolism developed in cultural anthropology, linguistics and ethnology.[81] Białostocki

---

[75] Mikhail Alpatov, "Conclusion", in: *Evolution générale et développements régionaux*, II, 617-618.

[76] Azatyan, "Cold-War Twins".

[77] Ernst H. Gombrich, "In Search of Cultural History" (1967), in: idem, *Ideals and Idols. Essays on Values in History and in Art*, Oxford 1979, 24-59, and Ernst H. Gombrich, "Style" (1968), in: *Art History and Its Methods: A Critical Anthology*, ed. Eric Fernie, London 1995, 129-140.

[78] Cf. Andrew Hemingway, "E. H. Gombrich in 1968: Methodological Individualism and the Contradictions of Conservatism", in: *Human Affairs* 19 (2009), 297-303.

[79] Originally, the Andalusian congress ought to have been held in 1974, but it would have coincided with ICOM’s meeting in Spain. So, at the London CIHA meeting of 1971 the Comité decided to postpone the conference to 1975, but at the next General Assembly in Lisbon in 1972 the congress was scheduled in the following year.

[80] Xavier de Salas, "Discurso Inaugural", in: *España entre el Mediterraneo y el Atlantico. Actas del XXIII Congreso Internacional de Historia del Arte*, 3 vols., Granada 1978, I, 25-41. Cf. also Gonzalo M. Borrás Gualis, "Art History in Spain: A Generational History", in: *Art History and Visual Studies in Europe: Transnational Discourses and National Frameworks*, eds. Matthew Rampley, Thierry Lenain, Hubert Locher et al., Leiden and Boston 2012, 473-483.

[81] The former reference was made in connection to the 1972 commemorative conference of Johan Huizinga and namely in response to the criticism of the physiognomic fallacy Gombrich made on that occasion, cf. Ernst H. Gombrich, "Huizinga's *Homo Ludens*", in:

concluded by observing the return to the analysis of the single work of art dominant in current art history and the reliance upon function and meaning rather than form.[82] Lajos Németh then examined the notion of epoch explained in terms of style or as the spirit of an age, and formulated a complex definition of society borrowing Bourdieu's idea of the 'cultural field', in which style is only one of the many variables.[83]

[30] Piotr Skubiszewski, on the other hand, described the methodological foundations of art history as articulated in two possible approaches, one explaining the single work of art in itself and the other one as a part of a historical process. The epistemological model he was proposing relied on the notions of structure and seriation, as postulated in the theories of Erwin Panofsky, Hans Sedlmayr, and George Kubler, especially.[84] This meant a structuralist framework that was to encompass all genetic and functional interpretations of artistic phenomena. Skubiszewski believed such a paradigm could offer a viable definition of the discipline and its relations to other human sciences and overcome the conflicting multiplicity of current methodologies.[85]

[31] While the other speakers examined only specific problems of historical interpretation or periodisation, these two papers attempted at finding new epistemological variants for a discipline that was beginning to face an identity crisis. The winds that had been shaking the objectivity of historical account since the 1960s, and namely with the oeuvre of Michel Foucault, were now endangering the positivist Hegelian foundations of art history, too.[86] A crisis that was barely detectable in the CIHA conference but that in those years was widely echoed in less conservative venues such as journals of neighbouring disciplines, like *New Literary History*.[87] A certain concern for CIHA's critical myopia in this

---

Johan Huizinga 1872-1972, conference proceedings, Groeningen 11-15 December 1972, ed. Willem R. H. Koops, Ernst H. Kossman and Gees Van der Plaat, Den Haag 1973, 275-296.

[82] Jan Bialostocki, "Reflections on Facts and Generalizations in the History of Art", in: *España entre el Mediterraneo y el Atlantico,* III, 481-486.

[83] Lajos Nemeth, "Contribution à l'interpretation de la notion d'époque dans l'histoire de l'art", in: *España entre el Mediterraneo y el Atlantico*, III, 563-568.

[84] In the French translation of *The Shape of Time*, which appeared in the same 1973, Andrei Boris Nakov hailed Kubler's theories as a new methodological perspective for a lethargic history of art, see Andrei B. Nakov, "Pour une nouvelle méthodologie", in: George Kubler, *Formes du Temps: remarques sur l'histoire des choses,* Paris 1973, 9-19.

[85] Piotr Skubiszewski, "Les deux approches principales en histoire de l'art", in: *España entre el Mediterraneo y el Atlantico*, III, 607-621.

[86] Cf. John Elkins, "Art History Without Theory", in: *Critical Inquiry* 14 (1988), 354-378, and Stephen Melville, "The Temptation of New Perspectives", in: *October* 52 (1990), 3-15.

[87] The 1972 spring issue of *New Literary History* compared artistic and literary studies addressing the separation between history and criticism that was typical of the former. While Paul and Svetlana Alpers found the reason in the disjunction between form and

sense was beginning to grow amongst its foremost members, like André Chastel and Millard Meiss.[88] For this reason, Chastel had proposed at the General Assembly convened in Lisbon in 1972 that methodology be accorded more prominence in the following Granada international conference.[89]

[32] The congress Cesare Gnudi chaired in Bologna in 1979 marked a significant turning point in broadening the scope to non-Western countries, coincidentally in the same year when Edward Said published *Orientalism*, unanimously acclaimed as the beginning of the awareness of non-European art.[90] Unlike the previous meetings, there was no main topic in this conference and a range of subjects was considered.[91] The first plenary session was chaired by Shuji Takashina, who spoke of the reception of European art in Japan from the sixteenth to the early twentieth century.[92]

---

content, Kurt W. Forster remarked that art scholarship had severed its ties with history and progressively bonded with philosophy leading to a mystification of the work of art. Forster also decried that in the past decades the history of art had obsessively turned to its founding fathers thus limiting new suggestions, which had mainly come from outsiders. Cf. Svetlana Alpers and Paul Alpers, "Ut Pictura Noesis? Criticism in Literary Studies and Art History", in: *New Literary History* 3 (1972), no. 3, 437-458, and Kurt W. Forster, "Critical History of Art, or Transfiguration of Values?", in: *New Literary History* 3 (1972), no. 3, 459-470.

[88] Upon reporting on the congress in Budapest, Chastel wrote to Meiss that the session chairmen merely announced the following numbers, and dubbed it "Kunstgeschichte ohne Probleme" (Archives of American Art [AAA], Washington DC, Millard Meiss Papers. Letter from André Chastel to Millard Meiss dated 28 November 1969). Again, in 1971 Chastel bemoaned a slumbering CIHA in need of new figures (AAA, Millard Meiss Papers. Letter from André Chastel to Millard Meiss dated 5 October 1971).

[89] Unesco Archives, Paris, CIPSH 102. Compte rendu provisoire des séances de l'Assemblée générale et du Bureau tenues lors du colloque de Lisbonne (5-6 juin 1972).

[90] Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, New York 1979.

[91] As agreed at the General Assembly held in Copenhagen in 1975, the main theme was replaced by six subjects deemed timely in the current art historical research. This point had already been raised by Millard Meiss in a letter he wrote to Jacques Thuillier in 1971: "[…] I should think that not more than half the sessions of a congress should be devoted to one theme, which would of course be relevant in one way or another to the place in which the meeting is held. Even if the theme is only loosely developed it will inevitably exclude the discussion of problems that are attracting special attention in the field, and it is very likely to fail to catch scholars who have something fresh and unusual to say. […] I had the impression that the Comité was collectively attempting to prepare the outline of a book. Might we not prefer one theme for four or five sessions, and several themes for the rest?" (INHA, Paris, Fonds Chastel, Correspondence. Correspondence M, Meiss, Millard. Letter to Jacques Thuillier dated 23 August 1971).

[92] Shuji Takashina, "Quatre siècles de reception des phénomènes artistiques européens au Japon", in: *Atti del XXIV Congresso Internazionale di Storia dell'Arte organizzato in Bologna dal 10 al 18 settembre 1979*, vol. 11: *Conferenze plenarie e indici*, Bologna 1984, 11-23. In 1991, Takashina would organise the first CIHA colloquium outside of the Euro-America area; see: *Japan and Europe in Art History. C.I.H.A. Tokyo Colloquium 1991*,

[33] Equally noteworthy were the session on the influence of salons, museums and galleries on nineteenth- and twentieth-century art and that on the role of prints as stylistic vehicle, chaired by Francis Haskell and Henri Zerner respectively.[93] The importance of studying the "collective taste" that França had stressed in Budapest had come to fruition in Bologna, where problems such as collecting, the critical appreciation of primitives, the role of museums and art exhibitions were addressed in resonance with Haskell's studies.[94] The session on prints dissemination allowed for a research on a wide spectrum, including peripheral areas like Dalmatia and South America, and also featured a paper by David Freedberg that focused on the function (one could say 'power') of images in shaping taste and the beholder's share – an anticipation of later avenues.[95]

[34] Lajos Vayer organised a meaty methodological panel (in the light of the Bonn, Budapest and Granada precedents) on style problems, iconology, interdisciplinarity and internationality as 'conditions of existence of a history of art'.[96] Vayer decried the schizophrenic syndrome affecting contemporary art history, where custodians and art scholars were primarily concerned with minute studies on heritage and overlooked the methodological discourse. The stagnating theoretical debate, Vayer claimed, was dominated by the opposition of style and iconology preventing any synthetic and more effective perspective.[97] To the Hungarian's mind, the foundations laid by modern time fathers, like Panofsky, Argan and Sedlmayr, were to provide a bedrock in establishing the forms of a

---

ed. Shuji Takashina, Tokyo 1995.

[93] An otherwise quite polemic Nicholas Penny in his review of the Congress praised these two sessions as the most interesting ones that dealt with some key topics of contemporary debate, see Nicholas Penny, "The 24th International Congress of Art History in Bologna", in: *The Burlington Magazine* 121 (1979), 746-749: 746.

[94] Francis Haskell, "Introduction", in: *Saloni, gallerie, musei e loro influenza sullo sviluppo dell'arte dei secoli XIX e XX*, ed. Francis Haskell, Bologna 1981 (= *Atti del XXIV Congresso Internazionale di Storia dell'Arte*, VII), 1-7. Cf. Francis Haskell, *Rediscoveries in Art: Some Aspects of Taste, Fashion and Collecting in England and in France*, Ithaca NY 1976.

[95] David Freedberg, "Prints and the Status of Images in Flanders", in: *Le stampe e la diffusione delle immagini e degli stili*, ed. Henri Zerner, Bologna 1983 (= *Atti del XXIV Congresso Internazionale di Storia dell'Arte*, VIII), 39-54. Cf. David Freedberg, *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*, Chicago 1989.

[96] Philipp Fehl ironically commented, "There is something plaintiff about the title of our session, as if we were parents who ask themselves *where have we failed?*"; Philipp Fehl, "Beauty and the Historian of Art: Reflections on Titian's *Venus and Adonis*", in: *Problemi di metodo: condizioni di esistenza di una storia dell'arte*, ed. Lajos Vayer, Bologna 1982 (= *Atti del XXIV Congresso Internazionale di Storia dell'Arte*, X), 185.

[97] Five years earlier, James S. Ackerman had similarly decried a "stagnation of art theory", and he attributed the confinement of art criticism from the academic field to the two conflicting notions of transcendental aesthetic value and of positivist historical objectivity, see James S. Ackerman, "Toward a New Social Theory of Art", in: *New Literary History* 4 (1973), no. 2, 315-330.

universal art history encompassing the world at large.[98] Although a certain disinterest of the congress participants in the methodological panel was reported,[99] Vayer's alarming tone echoed that plea for a re-foundation of art history as the discipline had plunged into a "state of genteel dissolution".[100]

[35] The loss of identity ensuing from an interdisciplinary horizon was the underlying peril of sociological and cultural theories, according to Roberto Salvini. The Italian art historian proposed to consider the ideological content from the point of view of the impact it has on the artist who transposes it into poetry. This overarching Kulturgeschichte approach, combined with his Crocean background, was the same methodological perspective he had expounded in Budapest in 1969.[101] Similarly, Peter H. Feist argued in favour of a history of art as history of culture, in spite of the general fear that the former would hence lose its own subject.[102] Grgo Gramulin conversely believed that the answer to a vacillating discipline was a thorough re-examination of style categories and their application to art along both a horizontal and a vertical axis.[103]

[36] Hans Sedlmayr, one of the beacons frequently invoked, discussed the concept of critical forms as basic structures that determine recurring types, generating principles of forms that define an epoch thus allowing for a Strukturgeschichte.[104] In the same panel no less, Sergiusz Michalski put Strukturanalyse and Gestalt theory under scrutiny linking them to the framework

---

[98] Lajos Vayer, "Prefazione", in: *Problemi di metodo: condizioni di esistenza di una storia dell'arte*, 1-14.

[99] Penny mentioned truant attendees who visited San Domenico "instead of listening to talks on methodology", see Penny, "The 24th International Congress of Art History in Bologna", 746.

[100] This was how Timothy J. Clark had described the situation calling for a new course that would overcome the Hegelian legacy and re-think art history in materialist terms, hence paving the way for what would be named the *New Art History*, see Timothy J. Clark, "The Conditions of Artistic Creation" (1974), in: *Art History and Its Methods: A Critical Anthology*, ed. Eric Fernie, London 1995, 248-253. Cf. also Timothy J. Clark, "On the Social History of Art", in: *Image of the People. Gustave Courbet and the 1848 Revolution*, London 1973, 9-20. In 1976 the progressive journal *October* was launched, which would become a forum of debate on the identity crisis for the following two decades, with the clear intent to address contemporary art practice and the theoretical discourse from a Marxist point of view, see "About October", in: *October* 1 (1976), 3-5: 4.

[101] Roberto Salvini, "Le nuove tendenze della critica e l'interpretazione della personalità artistica, ovvero autonomia ed eteronomia della storia dell'arte", in: *Problemi di metodo: condizioni di esistenza di una storia dell'arte*, ed. Lajos Vayer, Bologna 1982 (= *Atti del XXIV Congresso Internazionale di Storia dell'Arte*, X), 15-25.

[102] Peter H. Feist, "History of Art and History of Culture", in: *Problemi di metodo*, 63-67.

[103] Grgo Gramulin, "Categorie stilistiche quali strumenti della storia dell'arte", in: *Problemi di metodo*, 39-44.

[104] Hans Sedlmayr, "Prinzip und Methode der kritischen Formen", in: *Problemi di metodo*, 31-38.

Kubler postulated.[105] França re-proposed a combination of a sociological history of art and a semiological perspective taking the art object as a system of signs and relations, thus venturing into a viewpoint he defined as anthropological.[106] Georg Kauffmann, too, opted for an approach that largely drew from linguistic models.[107] And along this line, the Saussurian distinction of langue and language as a viable paradigm to achieve a universal perspective on art was discussed in André Chastel's paper on the relationship between verbal and visual communication.[108]

[37] Atanas Stojkov, in his turn, explored the limits of a strictly sociological approach and argued for a more complex interpretation of the work of art and stylistic developments against a complex socio-cultural background à la Baxandall, but also in the light of artistic value.[109] Iconology was no longer acclaimed as the methodological forefront of art history but scrutinised from a critical point of view. Feist, for instance, remarked how it had failed to account for artistic creation as a whole, focusing on particulars instead.[110] According to França, Panofsky had remained prisoner of a conservative understanding of symbolic values.[111] Chastel, in turn, emphasised how iconology presupposed stylistic stability, and cautioned that this had to be constantly reviewed.[112] On the other hand, Białostocki, echoing what Argan had remarked, saw in iconology the potential to transcend the Eurocentric limits of the history of art and offer a modern historiographic perspective.[113]

[38] Jan Białostocki's proposition of a comparative international history of art was the paper with the most far-reaching critical relevance. The role CIHA ought to play in promoting a history of art beyond European (or Western) borders was a point that Białostocki and Chastel had both raised in those years.[114] And to that

---

[105] Sergiusz Michalski, "Strukturanalyse, Gestaltismus und die Kublersche Theorie. Einige Bemerkungen zu ihrer Geschichte und Abgrenzung", in: *Problemi di metodo*, 69-77.

[106] José-Augusto França, "Sur l'histoire sociologique de l'art", in: *Problemi di metodo*, 89-98.

[107] Georg Kauffmann, "Kunstgeschichte und Linguistik", in: *Problemi di metodo*, 105-115.

[108] André Chastel, "Sur la communication non verbale", in: *Problemi di metodo*, 225-235.

[109] Atanas Stojkov, "Possibilités et limites de l'approche sociologique en matière d'histoire de l'art, in: *Problemi di metodo*, 99-104.

[110] Feist, "History of Art and History of Culture", 67.

[111] França, "Sur l'histoire sociologique de l'art", 93.

[112] Chastel, "Sur la communication non verbale", 259.

[113] Jan Białostocki, "A Comparative History of World Art, Is it Possible?", in: *Problemi di metodo*, 207-216: 211. Cf. Giulio C. Argan, "Ideology and Iconology", in: *Critical Inquiry* 2 (1975), no. 2, 297-305.

[114] André Chastel, "Organisations internationales et histoire de l'art", in: *Revue de l'art* 37 (1977), 5-8; Jan Bialostocki, "A Plea for Internationality", in: *Art History* 1 (1978), no. 4, i-iv; André Chastel, "Die Internationalität der Kunstgeschichte und das Comité International

effect, the Comité had indeed changed its statutes in 1977 and eliminated the prior reference to post-classical Western art, upon several solicitations both on UNESCO's part and of the CIHA secretary, Jacques Thuillier.[115] In Bologna, Białostocki proposed to adopt a comparative approach to artistic production, drawing from the model formulated in literary history, and trace an overarching world art history of the influences, evolutions, revivals. Far from fathoming a homogeneous development, this universal art history would have to account for the specific functions, meanings and aesthetic appeal works of art hold in the different cultures. And for this reason, Białostocki resorted to George Kubler's notion of prime object and series alongside Gombrich's comparative approach to decoration.[116] Then Teddy Brunius addressed the applicability of a vocabulary shaped on European artistic phenomena to non-Western art, from the very notion of art to the stylistic terms based on psychological reactions, anticipating an ongoing debate that started in the 1990s.[117] On the other hand, Zdenka Volavka reminded that non-European art had had a place in the discipline from its very inception, and namely in the studies of the Vienna School, a point Arthur Rosenauer also made in his analysis of Riegl's studies.[118]

[39] The Vienna School of Art History was paid tribute in the next congress of 1983 convened by Hermann Fillitz and Martina Pippal in Vienna – the hosting city of the first international conference of art history in 1873.[119] There a session chaired by Leopold D. Ettlinger dealt with such key figures as Alois Riegl, Max Dvořák, Heinrich Wölfflin and Julius von Schlosser, and a representative of the younger generation of Vienna-trained scholars, Ernst H. Gombrich, gave a vivid memory of his formative years.[120] At the time the scholars gathered in Vienna

d'Histoire de l'Art", in: *Acta Historiae Artium* 25 (1979), 175-178.

[115] Cf. Dufrêne, "A Short History of CIHA", and Thierry Dufrêne and Peter J. Schneemann, "The CIHA as an Object. Object of Desire – Object in the Making", in: *The Challenge of the Object. 33rd Congress of the International Committee of the History of Art*, eds. G. Ulrich Großmann and Petra Krutisch, 4 vols., Nuremberg 2013, IV, 1496-1500: 1496.

[116] Białostocki, "A Comparative History of World Art". Cf. also Kubler, *The Shape of Time*; Ernst H. Gombrich, *The Sense of Order. A Study in the Psychology of Decorative Art*, Oxford 1979.

[117] Teddy Brunius, "On the Vocabulary of Art History", in: *Problemi di metodo*, 217-224.

[118] Zdenka Volavka, "The Study of African Art as an Art Historical Discipline", in: *Problemi di metodo*, 225-235; Arthur Rosenauer, "Zur Wechselbeziehung von Methode und Forschungsgegenstand am Beispiel einiger Schriften Alois Riegls", in: *Problemi di metodo*, 55-62.

[119] Like in Bologna, there was no general theme in the Vienna conference, too. Moreover, in the spirit of commemoration of the first congress the *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* featured an outline of the history of these meetings with their programmes and lists of participants, see Gerhard Schmidt, "Die Internationalen Kongresse für Kunstgeschichte", in: *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 36 (1983), 7-15.

[120] Ernst H. Gombrich, "Kunstwissenschaft und Psychologie vor fünfzig Jahren", in: *Wien und die Entwicklung der kunsthistorischen Methode,* eds. Hermann Fillitz und Martina

were commemorating their founding fathers in a moment of self-reflexivity with respect to the discipline, art history had been shaken from what some perceived as a state of lethargy and was seriously questioning its role and future direction.[121]

[40] In 1981 Hervé Fischer published a book that effectively proclaimed the end of art history as it were, vouching for a turn to anthropology and sociology in search of new methodological possibilities.[122] In 1982 the expression "New Art History?" was used for the first time at a colloquium organised by the editors of *Block,* a radical journal published at Middlesex Polytechnic.[123] And in the same year, Henri Zerner launched a survey on the *Art Journal* about how the discipline could rethink its object outside of the artwork/artefact dichotomy and reconsider its historical character, thus leading to a new art history concerned with the material conditions of production as traditional approaches like connoisseurship and philological study would coalesce with anthropological theories.[124] In his reply to Zerner's survey, Donald Preziosi remarked that, faced with the collapse of old paradigms, art critics and theorists did not turn away from history but rather critically re-examined it in search for new perspectives.[125]

[41] The Vienna congress was indeed a case in point as reflected in the session on the historical methods of the Wiener Schule in which the historiographical analysis was more or less overtly directed at finding new epistemological possibilities. Margaret Olin, for instance, compared the strive to new theoretical constructs in fin de siècle Vienna to the contemporary predicament.[126] And Joan

---

Pippal, Wien, Köln and Graz 1984 (= *Akten des XXV. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte. Wien, 4.-10. September 1983*, I), 99-104 (repr. as Ernst H. Gombrich, "Art History and Psychology in Vienna Fifty Years Ago", in: *Art Journal* 44 (1984), no. 2, 162-164). Also see the other essays contained in the volume.

[121] Norman Bryson, *Vision and Painting: The Logic of the Gaze*, New Haven CT 1983, xi.

[122] Hervé Fischer, *L'histoire de l'art est terminée*, Paris 1981.

[123] Cf. Kristina Jõekalda's review of the conference "After the 'New Art History'" organised by the *Journal of Art Historiography* (Barber Art Gallery, University of Birmingham, 26-27 March 2012): Kristina Jõekalda, "What has Become of the New Art History?", in: *Journal of Art Historiography* 9 (2013), https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2013/12/jc3b5ekalda.pdf (accessed 16 August 2018).

[124] Henri Zerner, "Editor's Statement: The Crisis in the Discipline", in: *Art Journal* 42 (1982), no. 4, 279. Among the contributors were Oleg Grabar, Joan Hart, David Summers and Donald Preziosi.

[125] Donald Preziosi, "Constru(ct)ing the Origins of Art", in: *Art Journal* 42 (1982), no. 4, 320-325. Later Preziosi would however remark that the *Art Journal* survey had failed to openly deal with the debate on the methodological prospects of the future of the discipline, see Donald Preziosi, *Rethinking Art History. Meditations on a Coy Science*, New Haven CT and London 1989, 1-2.

[126] Margaret Olin, "*Spätrömische Kunstindustrie*: The Crisis of Knowledge in Fin de Siècle Vienna", in: *Wien und die Entwicklung der kunsthistorischen Methode*, 33-34.

Hart, in both the *Art Journal* issue and the congress, turned to Heinrich Wölfflin for an epistemological model.[127] Also Jan Bakoš's penetrating analysis of the theoretical constructs of Riegl, Dvořák and Schlosser disclosed a critical reflection on art history's preconceptions and prejudices resonating with the challenges posed in the modern day.[128] A more optimistic view was that of John Shearman, who thought the "unnecessary panic" of a methodological crisis was altogether unfounded.[129]

[42] Another contributor to the aforementioned *Art Journal* issue, Oleg Grabar, also chaired a session on European art and Islam between the fifteenth and eighteenth century, and in his introduction touched on the issue of formulating an interpretative scheme for world art that would not be a form of cultural imperialism. Reiterating what he had fully expounded in the American journal, Grabar claimed a universal history of art was a past vestige which had now to be replaced with a centrifugal model, insofar as each art history developed its own method.[130] The Vienna session on "Problems and Methods of Classification" chaired by John White, in turn, mostly featured single case studies rather than general theoretical issues. However, the interplay between geography of style and regionalism and the meaning of stylistic categories and schools were the most debated topics, targeting the pitfalls of oversimplifications based on ideological or hierarchal grounds.[131] After all, even Hans Belting tentatively added a question mark to his *Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte?* published in the same 1983, contributing – as he later admitted – to a long list of apocalyptic proclaims on the dissolution of the universal significance of Western art and historiography as in the meantime Arthur C. Danto would also theorise.[132]

---

[127] Joan Hart, "Some Reflections on Wölfflin and the Vienna School", in: *Wien und die Entwicklung der kunsthistorischen Methode*, 53-64; Joan Hart, "Reinterpreting Wölfflin: Neo-Kantianism and Hermeneutics", in: *Art Journal* 42 (1982), no. 4, 292-300.

[128] Jan Bakoš, "The Vienna School's Views of the Structure of the Art Historical Process", in: *Wien und die Entwicklung der kunsthistorischen Methode*, 117-122.

[129] John Shearman, "Johannes Wilde (1891-1970)", in: *Wien und die Entwicklung der kunsthistorischen Methode*, 91-98: 91-92.

[130] Oleg Grabar, "Introduction and Afterthoughts", in: *Europa und die Kunst des Islam 15. bis 18. Jahrhundert*, eds. Hermann Fillitz and Martina Pippal, Vienna, Cologne and Graz 1985 (= *Akten des XXV. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte. Wien, 4.-10. September 1983*, V), 7-8; Oleg Grabar, "On the Universality of the History of Art", in: *Art Journal* 42 (1982), no. 4, 281-283.

[131] *Probleme und Methoden der Klassifizierung*, eds. Hermann Fillitz and Martina Pippal, Vienna, Cologne and Graz (= *Akten des XXV. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte. Wien, 4.-10. September 1983*, III).

[132] Hans Belting, *Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte?*, Munich 1983. He would later reconsider some of his views in Hans Belting, *Art History After Modernism*, Chicago 2003, 7-16. Arthur C. Danto, "Narratives of the End of Art", in: Arthur C. Danto, *Encounters and Reflections. Art in the Historical Present*, Berkeley 1990, 331-345. Cf. David Carrier, *Danto and His Critics: Art History, Historiography and* After the End of Art, Middletown CT

The Two W's from Washington 1986 to Amsterdam 1996: Warburg and World Art

[43] *Because of its excessively materialistic or excessively mystical tenor, our young discipline denies itself the panoramic view of world history.*[133]

In the 1980s and 90s, the reconsideration of Warburg's methodological legacy as a source of renewal for modern art history went hand in hand with the attempt to expand the horizons of the discipline to non-Western cultures. And these two instances were perfectly matched in the twenty-sixth congress of 1986 in Washington on "World Art. Themes of Unity in Diversity" (a significant shift since the 1961 "Studies in Western Art").[134] That this conference was a watershed charting a new course of CIHA's "ecumenical mandate" was clear in the inaugural speech of its organiser, Irving Lavin, who had already proposed that a congress be held in the United States in 1979 after changes were made in the Comité's by-laws to include all art instead of Western art from Constantine to Modern.[135] The opening lectures were delivered by André Chastel and George Kubler who touched on some aspects of this new inclusive perspective, however failing to address the issue of world art per se – as Thomas W. Gaehtgens would later note.[136]

[44] In the name of the interdisciplinary outlook, Lavin had intended to introduce dual sessions chaired by a scholar from another field, but in the end the second chair was filled by another art historian of a different specialty. And in the sake of diversity, each panel had to include papers on art of at least three continents and epochs, thus doing away with the more traditional chronological order. No specific session dealt with methods, although Lavin recalled that the matter had not been entirely ruled out.[137] After all, the impasse of theoretical formulations was still a cogent matter, as in the same 1986 Donald Preziosi published his famous *Rethinking Art History*, Victor Burgin was proclaiming the end of art theory as an independent form of art history, aesthetics and criticism, and A. L.

1998.

[133] Aby Warburg, *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity. Contributions to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance*, Los Angeles CA 1999, 585.

[134] In preparation of the conference in Washington, the American National Committee for the History of Art (NCHA) was created in 1980, see http://wp.nchart.org/about/ (accessed 16 August 2018).

[135] Irving Lavin, "Preface", in: *World Art: Themes of Unity in Diversity. Acts of the XXVIth International Congress of the History of Art*, 3 vols., University Park PA 1989, I, xiii.

[136] André Chastel, "L'art du monde: le problème des universaux", in: *World Art: Themes of Unity in Diversity*, I, 11-24; George Kubler, "The Aesthetic Recognition of Ancient American Art (1492-1842) ", in: *World Art: Themes of Unity in Diversity*, I, 27-40. Cf. Thomas W. Gaehtgens, "Introduction", in: *The Challenge of the Object. 33rd Congress of the International Committee of the History of Art*, eds. G. Ulrich Großmann and Petra Krutisch, 4 vols., Nuremberg 2013, IV, 1472-1473: 1473.

[137] Irving Lavin, in email exchange with the author, 28 May 2017.

Rees and Frances Borzello were furthering *The New Art History*.[138] The first panel in Washington on centre vs. periphery chaired by Enrico Castelnuovo was de facto a methodological session in that this schema was proposed as a possible paradigm for the transmission of style. Challenging the notion of a one-way propagation of the dominating style from the centre to a passive periphery (as championed for instance in Kenneth Clark's outline of European art), Castelnuovo introduced the difference between delay and resistance.[139] Jan Białostocki, an early promoter of world art, explored the concept of provinciality in Eastern European art and architecture resorting to Kubler's notions of prime object and slow and fast happening.[140] Kubler had reappraised *The Shape of Time* in 1982, returning on its key concepts in connection with the problems criticism had raised[141] as well as on the reasons of the critical fortune of his book – namely the critique of positivist Western art history "from a point of view shaped in part by anthropological methods" that had made it the gospel for both the crisis of paradigms and the wider spectrum of world art.[142]

[45] The discussion on possible universals from a cross-cultural perspective was the topic of the two following sessions of the congress on diagrams and geometric patterns and on art and language, while the history of the artist was for the first time considered in a CIHA congress. Moreover, the Warburgian theme of 'art and ritual' was dealt with in the all-encompassing section chaired by John Onians with examples spanning different civilisations and periods.[143] The

[138] Donald Preziosi, *Rethinking Art History. Meditations on a Coy Science*, New Haven CT and London 1989; Victor Burgin, *The End of Art Theory. Criticism and Postmodernity*, Basingstoke and New York 1986; *The New Art History*, ed. A. L. Rees and Frances Borzello, London 1986.

[139] Enrico Castelnuovo, "Introduction", in: *World Art: Themes of Unity in Diversity*, I, 43-48. Castelnuovo had applied the centre and periphery schema to explain the development of Italian art, see Enrico Castelnuovo and Carlo Ginzburg, "Centro e periferia", in: *Storia dell'arte italiana. Questioni e metodi*, ed. Giovanni Previtali, Turin 1979, 285-352. Cf. also Kenneth Clark, *Provincialism*, London 1962, 3.

[140] Jan Białostocki, "Some Values of Artistic Periphery", in: *World Art: Themes of Unity in Diversity*, I, 49-54.

[141] Białostocki, in particular, had expressed scepticism of the applicability to historical situations in the Mediterranean world and criticised Kubler's oversight of creativity and individuality, cf. Jan Białostocki, "*The Shape of Time. Remarks on the History of Things* by George Kubler", in: *The Art Bulletin* 47 (1965), 135-139.

[142] George Kubler, "The Shape of Time. Reconsidered", in: *Perspecta* 19 (1982), 112-121: 118.

[143] John Onians, "Introduction", in: *World Art: Themes of Unity in Diversity*, III, 539-545. Credited with fathering the studies on world art, Onians had launched in 1978 *Art History*, a journal whose purpose was to extend the boundaries of the discipline to anthropology, archaeology, psychology and neurology, see John Onians, "Editorial", in: *Art History* 1 (1978), no. 1, unpaged. His opening article, indeed, investigated the origins of representational art in the Palaeolithic Age to find visual patterns that would be common to all civilisations, see Desmond Collins and John Onians, "The Origins of Art", in: *Art*

conference in Washington was the stepping stone of a critical debate on world art that would continue in the following decades. So much that while William Rubin's 1984 controversial exhibition on primitivism at the Museum of Modern Art in New York was still guided by an ethnocentric colonialist point of view, in 1988 Susan Vogel's show in the New York Center for African Art disputed this antiquated notion, followed a year later by Jean-Hubert Martin's famous "Magiciens de la Terre" in Paris. And the 1989 *Art in America* July issue ominously titled 'The Global Issue' containing statements on the new globalised art scene clearly indicated that the matters discussed at Washingston had now become centre-stage.[144]

[46] Only two months prior to the fall of the Berlin wall, art historians convened in Strasbourg for CIHA's international congress on "Art and Revolutions" organised by Albert Châtelet – evidently commemorating the Storming of the Bastille. However, another centenary had also determined the choice of Strasbourg since Aby Warburg studied at the local Art Institute from 1889 to 1891.[145] Whereas the debate on world art was not addressed, a methodological section was resumed under the chairmanship of Harald Olbrich, with the intent to critically assess the developments of art history from Warburg to the present day. Not only had the 1980s and early 1990s brought an epistemological quandary but also a wealth of studies on the history of the history of art – from Michael Podro's *The Critical Historians of Art* (1982) to Germain Bazin's *Histoire de l'histoire de l'art* (1986), Heinrich Dilly's *Altmeister der modernen Kunstgeschichte* (1990), Eduard Hüttinger's *Porträts und Profile. Zur Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte* (1992), Vernon H. Minor *Art History's History* (1994) and Gianni C. Sciolla's *La critica d'arte del Novecento* (1995).

[47] Although the international symposium that took place in Hamburg in 1990 would mark the definitive consecration of Warburg's critical fortune, the Strasbourg conference was an important milestone of his critical reassessment in the 1980s and 1990s.[146] In his paper, Konrad Hoffmann outlined Warburg's thought in the light of Ginzburg's and Gombrich's accounts, which had drawn attention to the multi-faceted nature of the methodology (and – according to

History 1 (1978), no. 1, 1-25.

[144] *Primitivism in 20th Century Art. Affinity of the Tribal and the Modern*, ed. William S. Rubin, New York 1984; *Art/Artifact: African Art in Anthropology Collections*, ed. Susan Vogel, New York 1988; *Magiciens de la Terre*, ed. Jean-Hubert Martin, exh. cat. Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris 1989. On this matter refer to Hans Belting, "From World Art to Global Art. View on a New Panorama", in: *The Challenge of the Object. 33rd Congress of the International Committee of the History of Art*, eds. G. Ulrich Großmann and Petra Krutisch, 4 vols., Nuremberg 2013, IV, 1511-1515. *Magiciens de la terre* was taken as a turning point in the post-colonial debate on art in *Art Since 1900: Modernism, Antimodernism, Postmodernism*, eds. Hal Foster, Rosalind E. Krauss and Yves-Alain Bois, New York 2004, 617-621.

[145] Albert Châtelet, "Révolution et art et révolution dans l'art. L'exemple du XVe siècle", in: *L'art et les révolutions. XVIIe Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art, Strasbourg 1-7 septembre 1989*, 9 vols., Strasbourg 1990-1992, IX (1990), 147-166: 147-149.

Martin Warnke – foregrounded those psychological aspects that had partially outshone the scholar).[147] Warburg's theories, whilst lending themselves to an irrationalist interpretation current in the relativist approach, were regarded as a possible reference point for cultural studies, namely as concerns their anthropological outlook on cultural phenomena.[148] To no one's surprise, the same Gombrich, prefacing the second edition of his *Intellectual Biography* of Aby Warburg in 1986, had warned against any misguided interpretation of Warburg that would justify an oppositional art, a peril that was lurking behind this surge of interest in the father of iconology.[149] The actualisation of Warburg's theories as the pre-figuration of the postmodern was the main argument of Eveline Pinto's paper. Namely, she linked the concept of revival to the transhistoricity of the aesthetic postmodern, along with Warburg's notion of desacralised art, his rejection of a teleological development of artistic expression, and his willingness to go beyond the limits of the discipline.[150] Likewise, Michael Ann Holly

---

[146] *Aby Warburg. Akten des internationalen Symposions*, eds. Horst Bredekamp, Michael Diers and Charlotte Schoell-Glass, Weinheim 1991.

[147] Konrad Hoffmann, "'Angst und Methode' nach Warburg. Erinnerung als Veränderung", in: *L'art et les révolutions. XVIIe Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art, Strasbourg 1-7 septembre 1989*, V (1992), 7-14. ; see Ernst H. Gombrich, *Aby Warburg. An Intellectual Biography*, London 1970, and Carlo Ginzburg, "Da A. Warburg a E. H. Gombrich. Note su un problema di metodo", in: *Studi medievali*, s. III, 7 (1966), 1015-1065; Cf. Martin Warnke, "Aby Warburg (1866-1929)", in: *Revue germanique internationale* 2 (1994), 123-135: 126.

[148] Cf. Silvina P. Vidal, "Rethinking the Warburgian Tradition in the 21st Century", in: *Journal of Art Historiography* 1 (2009), https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2011/02/media_139151_en.pdf (accessed 16 August 2018).

[149] Ernst H. Gombrich, "Preface to the Second Edition", in: Ernst H. Gombrich, *Aby Warburg: An Intellectual Biography*, Oxford ²1986, vii-ix: viii. Gombrich clarified that Warburg was a man rooted in the nineteenth century and hence had a high valuation of High Renaissance art as opposed to the "barbarism of the bigoted Middle Ages" and the "deplorable excesses of Baroque rhetoric". Cf. also Wind's unfavourable critique of Gombrich's biography in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 25 June 1971, 735-736, now published in Edgar Wind, *The Eloquence of Symbols. Studies in Humanist Art*, ed. Jaynie Anderson, Oxford 1983, 106-113.

[150] Eveline Pinto, "Warburg, postmoderne?", in: *L'art et les révolutions. XVIIe Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art, Strasbourg 1-7 septembre 1989*, V (1992), 27-42. In 1987 Pinto had published an essay on Warburg and the 'iconologie critique', and in 1990 she would edit a collection of the Florentine essays of the Hamburg-born historian. Cf. Eveline Pinto, "Mécénat familial et histoire de l'art. Aby Warburg et l'iconologie critique", in: *Revue de synthèse* IV s., 1 (1987), 91-107; Aby Warburg, *Essais florentins*, ed. Eveline Pinto, Paris 1990. The 1990s saw indeed a growing interest for Warburg in France, as evidenced by the studies of Roland Recht, Philippe-Alain Michaud and Georges Didi-Huberman.

emphasised the interdisciplinarity of Warburg's studies and rebuked so-called 'new' art historians for forgetting the innovative aspects of his approach.[151]

[48] Almost a decade after the crisis had been proclaimed, Holly proceeded to chart the different theoretical trends that had appeared in the meantime: the revision of iconology of Gombrich, Alpers and Baxandall, the semiotic framework of literary critics like Norman Bryson, the reception studies of T. J. Clark, Thomas Crow, Keith Moxey and Janet Wolff, and lastly the feminist turn spearheaded by Linda Nochlin, Griselda Pollock and Lisa Tickner.[152] A year later, Holly would take her argument further at a symposium on iconography in Princeton where she discussed Warburg's broader notion of iconology (as opposed to Panofsky's narrower humanistic application) and hailed him as the forefather of the investigation of visual culture, bolstering the so-called iconic turn.[153] Along these lines, other papers in Strasbourg traced the methodological turning points in art historiography, stressing the epistemological changes from the positivist paradigm – from Dvořák's interests in modern art and his principle of discontinuity as opposed to Riegl's evolutionism, to Sedlmayr's Verlust der Mitte, to Max Raphael's approach combining Strukturanalyse and Marxism, to the Baroque studies in 1930s Germany as proof of the inadequacy of historicism.[154] Moreover, in defence of connoisseurship spoke Jaynie Anderson, who outlined Giovanni Morelli's technique of attribution in the light of the influence of Cuvier's comparative anatomy. She claimed that in the recent debate connoisseurship

[151] Michael A. Holly, "Warburg, Iconology, and the *New* Art History", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 15-25. New Art History's oversight of the Warburgian legacy would also be criticised by Margaret Iversen at the 1990 Hamburg symposium, questioning the innovative import of Rees's and Borzello's theories, see Margaret Iversen, "Aby Warburg and the New Art History", in: *Aby Warburg. Akten des internationalen Symposions*, eds. Horst Bredekamp, Michael Diers and Charlotte Schoell-Glass, Weinheim 1991, 281-287.

[152] Holly, "Warburg, Iconology, and the *New* Art History", 18-19. These were the strands represented in a colloquium held at the University of Rochester earlier that year, cf. *Visual Culture: Images and Interpretations*, eds. Norman Bryson, Michael A. Holly and Keith Moxey, Hanover and London 1994.

[153] Michael A. Holly, "Unwriting Iconology", in: *Iconography at the Crossroads. Papers from the Colloquium Sponsored by the Index of Christian Art*, Princeton University, 23-24 March 1990, ed. Brendan Cassidy, Princeton 1993, 17-25.

[154] Edwin Lachnit, "Ansätze methodischer Evolution in der Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 43-52; Jan Bakoš, "Die epistemologische Wende eines Kunsthistorikers", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 53-72; Arthur Rosenauer, "Zur neuen Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 73-83; Norbert Schneider, "Revolutionskritik und Kritik der Moderne bei Hans Sedlmayr", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 85-91; Heinrich Dilly, "Internationale und nationale kunstgeschichtliche Praxis", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 93-101; Peter Betthausen, "Erklärung oder Deutung: deutsche Kunstwissenschaft um 1930", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 103-109; Tanja Frank, "Methodenästhetik: Max Raphaels Beitrag zur Marxistischen Kunsttheorie", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 111-120; Fernando C. Cremades, "El valor de las imagines en la crisis del historicismo", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 121-133.

had actually fared better than cultural history for it directly studied the work of art itself.[155]

[49] Elzbieta Giersztor-Milobedza, on the other hand, proposed a definition of crisis in Kuhnian terms, that is an interregnum when the old epistemology is deemed obsolete and the new one is yet to be formulated. Namely, she sketched the present predicament as a discipline torn between contextualism (viz. New Art History) and formalism (viz. visual studies) and called for a complementary approach befitting the fragmentary pluralism. Once more, New Art History was ruled out as the new paradigm insomuch as it reproduced the orthodox ontology. Rather than a methodological revolution, to Giersztor-Milobedza's mind, a more natural shift embracing continuity intertwined with discontinuity would have proved more effective.[156] Keith Moxey, who together with Holly and Bryson was a key proponent in the American front of visual studies, expounded a semiotic approach to ideology that would overcome the dichotomy of sociological vs. formalist art history. The Russian derivation of Saussurean linguistics could provide the basis for a history of visual representation where the sign could draw its meaning from the context that produced it. Within this framework, the interpreting process is considered an ideological one, hence merely a preference for one interpretation over the other. In this sense, Moxey found in Panofsky's iconology and Baxandall's period eye viable heuristic devices.[157] This point would have been explored also in the afore-mentioned Princeton symposium, where Moxey argued for an iconography from a semiotic perspective as "the study of the conventions used by a particular culture to encode the values that structure its identity".[158] And in a later article, Moxey explained that a semiotic iconology would have to forego its idealist epistemology inherent in the notion of intrinsic meaning and decentre the role of the art historian to that of merely another sign in the interpretative process.[159] Moreover, Moxey's critique of the contextual approach tout court echoed an ongoing debate (on what had now become an orthodox method), which in 1985 had led Svetlana Alpers to pose the provocative question "Art or Society: Must We Choose?".[160]

---

[155] Jaynie Anderson, "Giovanni Morelli's Scientific Method of Attribution – Origins and Interpretations", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 135-141.

[156] Elzbieta Gieysztor-Milobedzka, "Art History and the New Paradigm. Some Reflections", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 161-176.

[157] Keith Moxey, "Semiotics and the Social History of Arts. Toward a History of Visual Representation", in: *L'art et les révolutions*, V (1992), 209-218. Interestingly, Moxey suggested Baxandall's approach in *Patterns of Intention* failed to account for the historical perspective of the modern-day interpreter, anticipating the latter's following formulations on inferential criticism. Moxey later published an extended version of the paper in *New Literary History* 22 (1991), 985-999.

[158] Keith Moxey, "The Politics of Iconology", in: *Iconography at the Crossroads,* 27-31: 30.

[159] Keith Moxey, "Semiotics and the Social History of Art", in: *New Literary History* 22 (1991), no. 4, 985-999.

[50] This session on the revolutions in art history thus perfectly exemplified that centrifugal tendency in the discipline. This was how Stephen Bann would describe in that same 1989 the condition of an art history that had "identified with history, repudiated connoisseurship, and ignored criticism".[161] Furthermore, compared to Warburg's rising star, in Strasbourg that of Panofsky seemed to shine not as brightly, a reflection of the revision his iconology was undergoing in the 1980s. Svetlana Alpers as early as 1977 decried the inertia of art historians as mere providers of falsely objective frameworks in the likes of iconology.[162] In 1983 with *The Art of Describing*, Alpers delivered her final blow to Panofsky, disproving his theories as laden with a humanistic bias.[163] And according to Donald Preziosi, William J. T. Mitchell's *Iconology* brought the arc of the interest in Panofsky to earth for good in 1986.[164] The fact that Mitchell mentioned Panofsky only in passing whilst focusing on Nelson Goodman, Ernst Gombrich and Marxist theories, instead, spoke volumes.[165] In this picture, Michael Ann Holly's book on Panofsky (1984) did little to restore the critical fortune of the German scholar.[166] To Preziosi's mind, in fact, Holly failed to account for the semiological correlation and forced the hand of interpretation in aligning him with contemporary criticism.[167]

---

[160] This topic was discussed at a CAA symposium in Los Angeles and the proceedings printed in the journal *Representations* (1985), no. 12. On that occasion both Thomas Crow and Michael Baxandall argued for a more flexible notion of 'culture' encompassing both society and art. See Thomas Crow, "Codes of Silence: Historical Interpretation and the Art of Watteau", in: *Representations* (1985), no. 12, 2-14; Michael Baxandall, "Art, Society, and the Bouguer Principle", in: *Representations* (1985), no. 12, 32-43.

[161] Stephen Bann, "Art History in Perspective", in: *History of the Human Sciences* 2 (1989), no. 1, 1-18: 2. Cf. also David Carrier, "Winckelmann and Pater, Morelli and Freud: The Tropics of Art Historical Discourse", in: *History of the Human Sciences* 2 (1989), no. 1, 19-38.

[162] Svetlana Alpers, "Is Art History?", in: *Daedalus* 106 (1977), no. 3, 1-13.

[163] Svetlana Alpers, *The Art of Describing*: *Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century*, Chicago 1983, see esp. xvii-xxvii. Cf. Mariët Westermann, "Svetlana Alpers, *The Art of Describing: Dutch Art in the Seventeenth Century*, 1983", in: *The Books that Shaped Art History. From Gombrich and Greenberg to Alpers and Krauss*, eds. Richard Shone and John-Paul Stonard, London 2013, 177-189.

[164] Preziosi, *Rethinking Art History*, 112. Joan Hart was also particularly critical: Joan Hart, "*Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* by Michael Ann Holly", in: *RACAR: Revue d'art canadienne* 13 (1986), no. 1, 70-72.

[165] William J. T. Mitchell, *Iconology. Image, Text, Ideology*, Chicago and London 1986.

[166] Michael A. Holly, *Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History*, Ithaca NY 1984. Stephen Bann framed the connection between Holly's book and the contemporary debate on the discipline's identity: Stephen Bann, "*Panofsky and the Foundations of Art History* by Michael Ann Holly", in: *History and Theory* 25 (1986), no. 2, 109-205.

[167] Preziosi, *Rethinking Art History*, 112-114. David Carrier responded to the arguments against Holly, see David Carrier, "*Rethinking Art History. Meditations on a Coy Science* by Donald Preziosi", in: *The Burlington Magazine* 132 (1990), 586.

[51] An atmosphere "laden with great expectations" surrounded the 1992 congress in Berlin on artistic exchange.[168] As chairman Thomas W. Gaehtgens remarked, it was a different Germany since the last conference in 1964 and the opening of East-West borders understandably resonated throughout the congress. The presence of many scholars from the former Eastern Bloc was parallelled by the special focus on Central and Eastern European art as well as by a session on Constructivism and political propaganda.[169] Moreover, after the matter had been partially overlooked in Strasbourg, world art was once more addressed in terms of ethnicity and national identity with regard to Asia especially.

[52] A newly reunited Germany was re-entering the international forum after twenty years of marginalisation. In 1970 at the famous Cologne conference "Das Kunstwerk zwischen Wissenschaft und Weltanschauung", German art historians convened to discuss the relationship between scholarly objectivity and ideology, raising some issues on the continuity of German art history through the Nazi period.[170] After the 1970s, radical art history had waned and Werckmeister claimed that the rediscovery of Warburg led way to new possibilities for a discipline that had lost its direction. Martin Warnke and Horst Bredekamp in the following two decades redefined their Marxist leanings to a more depoliticised social history of art that had found in the works of Aby Warburg its "new, compelling paradigm". The Hamburg conference commemorating Warburg, as Werckmeister wrote, had celebrated him as the forefather of a "supra-historical science of images and an anthropology of artistic culture".[171] It was a betrayal of Marx for Warburg, according to Werckmeister, a view that Horst Bredekamp strongly contested.[172] At the CIHA conference the name of Warburg was evoked in connection to the speculation on primitive art from an anthropological

[168] Adriaan W. Reinink, "Opening Address", in: *Memory & Oblivion. Proceedings of the XXIXth International Congress of the History of Art held in Amsterdam, 1-7 September 1996*, eds. Adriaan W. Reinink and Jeroen Stumpel, 2 vols., Amsterdam 1999, I, 5-10: 6.

[169] Thomas W. Gaehtgens, "Vorwort des Herausgebers", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch. Akten des XXVIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte. Berlin, 15.-20. Juli 1992*, 3 vols., ed. Thomas W. Gaehtgens, Berlin 1993, I, XXI-XXIII.

[170] *Das Kunstwerk zwischen Wissenschaft und Weltanschauung*, ed. Martin Warnke, Gütersloh 1970. Cf. also Willibald Sauerländer, "Martin Warnke, *Das Kunstwerk zwischen Wissenschaft und Weltanschauung*", in: *Kunstchronik* 23 (1970), 320-330; Hanna Deinhard, "*Das Kunstwerk zwischen Wissenschaft und Weltanschauung* by Martin Warnke", in: *The Art Bulletin* 54 (1972), 113-115.

[171] Werckmeister, "The Turn from Marx to Warburg", 216-217.

[172] Christopher S. Wood, "Iconoclasts and Iconophiles: Horst Bredekamp in Conversation with Christopher S. Wood", in: *The Art Bulletin* 94 (2012), no. 4, 515-527: 519: "What is hard to take in Werckmeister's article is a false alternative between Warburg and critical art history."

perspective by Carlo Severi and Salvatore Settis, both referencing to his most interdisciplinary studies on Hopi and Pueblo rituals.[173]

[53] At the same time, 1992 can be assumed as the year of the pictorial turn as proclaimed by William J. T. Mitchell in his well-known postmodern critique of visual culture defined as "a postlinguistic, postsemiotic rediscovery of the picture as a complex interplay between visuality, apparatus, institutions, discourse, bodies, and figurality".[174] Echoes of the pictorial turn can be found in the Berlin conference, too, especially in Victor I. Stoichita's and Fred Licht's panels on mimesis and iconicity, featuring papers of David Freedberg, Georges Didi-Huberman, and Daniel Arasse.[175] Alongside Freedberg's *The Power of Images* (1989), Hans Belting's most influential *Bild und Kult* (1990) – a cornerstone for the development of Bildwissenschaft – and its far-reaching methodological implications prompting an anthropology of the image, indeed casts a shadow on the congress, as can be inferred from the session on the body in Mediaeval secular art.[176] In 1994 Gottfried Boehm would publish *Was ist ein Bild?*, an anthology that set a touchstone for German Bildwissenschaft.[177]

[54] However, as recently observed, the German iconic turn – represented by the three B's, Belting, Bredekamp, Boehm – was rather fluid and lacked a specific and, more importantly, unified methodological approach, when compared to its Anglo-American Visual Studies counterpart.[178] Albeit the differences in the two

---

[173] Carlo Severi, "Protés, ou la propagation d'une forme: art primitif et mémoire", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch. Akten des XXVIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte. Berlin, 15.-20. Juli 1992*, 3 vols., ed. Thomas W. Gaehtgens, Berlin 1993, I, 121-138; Salvatore Settis, "Kunstgeschichte als vergleichende Kulturwissenschaft: Aby Warburg, die Pueblo-Indianer und das Nachleben der Antike", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, I, 139-158. On Warburg's reception in Germany between the 1970s and 1990s see Michael Diers, "Warburg and the Warburgian Tradition of Cultural History", in: *New German Critique* 65 (1995), 59-73.

[174] William J. T. Mitchell, *Picture Theory. Essays on Verbal and Visual Representation*, Chicago and London 1994, 16.

[175] Victor I. Stoichita, "Introduction", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 409-411; Fred Licht, "Introduction", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 527-528; David Freedberg, "Imitation and Its Discontents", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 483-491; Georges Didi-Huberman, "L'imitation comme mythe à la Renaissance", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 493-502; Daniel Arrasse, "Giovanni Bellini et les limites de la mimésis: la *Pietà* de la Brera", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 503-510.

[176] Michael Camille, "Introduction", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 341-343. Cf. Freedberg, *The Power of Images*; Hans Belting, *Bild und Kult: eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst*, Munich 1990.

[177] Gottfried Boehm, *Was ist ein Bild?*, Munich 1994. On Bildwissenschaft see the essays contained in "*Iconic Turn* et réflexion sociétale", in: *Trivium* 1 (2008).

[178] Matthew Rampley, "Bildwissenschaft: Theories of the Image in German-Language Scholarship", in: *Art History and Visual Studies in Europe: Transnational Discourses and National Frameworks*, eds. Matthew Rampley, Thierry Lenain, Hubert Locher et al., Leiden

strands are blurred – Visual Studies more often than not focused on pictures and referred to Panofsky, whereas Bildwissenschaft set priority on the body as a medium harking back to Warburg –, one was rooted in sociology whilst the other in anthropology.[179] Not only did the papers presented in Berlin give evidence to the contrast between these two camps, but the session on theory in art history saw the predominance of the American group.[180]

[55] It was indeed chaired by Michael Ann Holly and Keith Moxey, the key proponents in those years of Visual Studies. In 1987 and 1989, Holly and Moxey, along with Norman Bryson, had organised two important symposia in the United States about the theory and interpretation in the Visual Arts.[181] They were positing that the history of art be replaced by the history of images, moving away from the Western canon of masterpieces towards a broader understanding of the cultural significance of artworks.[182] Moreover, they were proposing a semiotic notion of representation that overcame the pitfalls of the Marxist structure/superstructure paradigm, not only accounting for class but also gender issues.[183] This theoretical framework informed the panel in Berlin, too. As stated in their introduction, Holly and Moxey argued for an interpretation shaped by the socio-political conditions of the present, which did away with the "dream of transparency" and embraced the otherness of the past.[184] And a significant number of scholars from the American symposium were invited to Berlin, the majority of which in this methodological session, such as Wolfgang Kemp, Whitney Davis and Lisa Tickner, and others, like Thomas Crow, in other panels.[185]

[56] The prime representative of Rezeptionsästhetik, Wolfgang Kemp, delivered a paper on the text/context model introduced by structuralists and semioticians.

---

and Boston 2012, 119-134.

[179] Jeffrey Hamburger, "Hans Belting, *Bild und Kult: Eine Geschichte des Bildes vor dem Zeitalter der Kunst*, 1990", in: *The Books that Shaped Art History*, 203-215: 212-213. Horst Bredekamp, in his turn, would deem this camp separation as detrimental to both, see Horst Bredekamp, "A Neglected Tradition? Art History as *Bildwissenschaft*", in: *Critical Inquiry* 29 (2003), no. 3, 418-428.

[180] Of the three B's, only Bredekamp was present in Berlin with a paper on *Kunstkammern*, Horst Bredekamp, "Die Kunstkammer als Ort spielerischen Austauschs", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, I, 65-78.

[181] Cf. *Visual Theory: Painting and Interpretation*, eds. Norman Bryson, Michael A. Holly and Keith Moxey, New York 1991; *Visual Culture: Images and Interpretations*, eds. Norman Bryson, Michael A. Holly and Keith Moxey, Middletown CT 1994.

[182] "Introduction", in: *Visual Culture: Images and Interpretations*, xv-xxix: xvi.

[183] "Introduction", in: *Visual Culture: Images and Interpretations*, xviii-xix.

[184] Michael A. Holly and Keith Moxey, "Introduction", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 651-652.

[185] Thomas Crow, "Fashioning the New York School", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 319-328; Rosalind Krauss, "Jackson Pollock's Agency", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 329-338.

Kemp raised two objections to the "catchall term" 'context': first, against the idea that there is an Urkontext which can be isolated, for the freedom of choice is almost infinite; second, against the assumption that a context can be referred to a text, while he rather preferred Foucault's notion of circulation of discourse.[186] Norman Bryson and Mieke Bal, too, were in those years challenging the semiotic notion of context as a predetermined set of factors giving meaning to the sign, and opted for that of a result of interpretative choices attempting at 'framing' the sign.[187] Kemp had lain the foundations of his reception aesthetics in his seminal *Der Betrachter ist im Bild* (1985), whose second edition was published in the same year as the Berlin conference. In the book Kemp postulated the notion of an implicit beholder, referring to the function of the beholder prescribed in the work of art which establishes an intra-painting communication that must be interpreted in connection with socio-historical and aesthetic statements.[188]

[57] The paper Stephen Melville delivered in Berlin attempted at a structuralist revision of the aesthetic judgement in order to overcome the positivist Panofskian construct of meaning.[189] The American historian was then working on a deconstructionist perspective on theory, postmodernity and historiography, also retrieving the link between art history and modern art as well as between vision and textuality.[190] A similar view of the loss of the history of art was that offered by Whitney Davis, who studied Winckelmann's *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* and his bringing-to-life of a lost beauty as the bias coexistent with art history.[191] Keith Moxey, in his turn, revisited the centrality of the iconological approach analysing the humanist prejudice in Panofsky's theories, whose assumption of a universal aesthetic value matched a Eurocentric epistemology in

[186] Wolfgang Kemp, "Text/Kontext – Grenze/Austausch. Zugleich ein Versuch über Nancy zur Zeit Stanislas Leszczynskis", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 653-664.

[187] Norman Bryson and Mieke Bal, "Semiotics and Art History", in: *The Art Bulletin* 73 (1991), no. 2, 174-208. Cf. also Norman Bryson, "Art in Context", in: *Studies in Historical Change*, ed. Ralph Cohen, Charlottesville VA 1992, 34-35.

[188] Wolfgang Kemp, *Der Betrachter ist im Bild: Kunstwissenschaft und Rezeptionsästhetik*, Cologne 1985. See also Wolfgang Kemp, "The Work of Art and Its Beholder. The Methodology of the Aesthetic of Reception", in: *The Subjects of Art History: Historical Objects in Contemporary Perspectives*, eds. Mark A. Cheetham, Michael A. Holly and Keith Moxey, Cambridge UK 1998, 180-196.

[189] Stephen Melville, "Judgement and History in Recent Art History", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 665-672.

[190] Stephen Melville, "The Temptations of New Perspectives", in: *October* 52 (1990), 3-15; Stephen Melville, *Vision and Textuality*, Basingstoke 1995.

[191] Whitney Davis, "Winckelmann Divided", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 673-680. In those years many studies appeared on Winckelmann in connection with the problem of historicity, see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "Antiquarianism, the History of Objects, and the History of Art", in: *Journal of the History of Ideas* 62 (2001), no. 3, 523-541: 524. Cf. Alex Potts, *Flesh and the Ideal: Winckelmann and the Origins of Art History*, New Haven CT 1994.

an age of colonisation and imperialism.[192] The validation of historical narratives and the problematic of meaning in modern art were also the focus of the two following papers.[193] Finally, Holly investigated the optimistic historical perspective of the iconologist, based on the transparency of the work of art, and juxtaposed it to the opacity of the post-structuralist's view. Proposing a fusion of horizons in a Gadamerian sense, Holly championed an interpretative process where the viewer is challenged by the work of art to engage in a game with it – thus echoing Kemp's implicit beholder.[194] This reinterpretation of Panofsky's iconology from the standpoint of visual studies came to the fore in the commemorative symposium on the German art historian held in Princeton in 1993, where his approach was intersected with anthropology, history, literature, science, music and film. Specifically, the investigation of the relation between words and images made Panofsky the forerunner of Visual Studies, according to Mitchell.[195]

[58] On that occasion, Horst Bredekamp linked the recent revival of Wölfflin, Panofsky (the Hamburg years) and Warburg's *Mnemosyne* to a return to the beginnings of the linguistic paradigm.[196] In the moment when Visual Studies were coming of age – Mitchell in Princeton had enthusiastically outlined a manifesto of visual culture based on multiculturalism and cultural democratisation –, this approach was however already showing its problematics. The fragmented picture that the famous questionnaire on Visual Studies in the 1996 summer issue of *October* gave, was indeed telling in this respect. Its proponents had drawn attention to the theoretical tenets of Visual Studies, i.e. the ahistorical model of anthropology adopted and the concept of disembodied image underlying the interdisciplinary paradigm.[197]

---

[192] Keith Moxey, "Panofsky's Melancholia", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 681-692. Cf. also Keith Moxey, "Panofsky's Concept of *Iconology* and the Problem of Interpretation in the History of Art", in: *New Literary History* 17 (1986), no. 2, 265-274.

[193] Lisa Tickner, "Now and Then: *The Hieratic Head of Ezra Pound*", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 693-702; Fred Orton, "Figuring Jasper's Flag (First Draft): A Different Kind of Beginning", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 703-711.

[194] Michael A. Holly, "Witnessing an Annunciation", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 713-725.

[195] William J. T. Mitchell, "Introduction", in: *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Views from the Outside. A Centennial Commemoration of Erwin Panofsky (1892-1968)*, ed. Irving Lavin, Princeton NJ 1995, 165-167; William J. T. Mitchell, "What is Visual Culture?", in: *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Views from the Outside*, 207-217. Cf. Carl E. Schorske, "A Window on Academic Culture in the Humanities", in: *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Views from the Outside*, 373-383: 379-380.

[196] Horst Bredekamp, "Words, Images, Ellipses", in: *Meaning in the Visual Arts: Views from the Outside,* 363-371.

[197] Rosalind Krauss and Hal Foster, "Introduction", in: *October* 77 (1996), 3-4. While Kurt Forster, Svetlana Alpers and Michael Ann Holly saw in visual studies a possible solution to the collapse of traditional paradigms, Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann questioned the

[59] The lingering scepticism of the *October* group[198] would be remarked by James Elkins, who described the impression given of visual culture as "a disorganized, possibly ineffectual, illegitimate, and even misguided extension of art history and other disciplines".[199] In the English-speaking world, Visual Studies were taking on an overarching definition which progressively marginalised art history for its failure to confront modern media.[200] The widespread call for disciplinary trespassing prompted the reflection on canonicity and, in the same 1996, the June issue of *The Art Bulletin* featured the survey "Rethinking the Canon".[201] But this survey is most famously remembered for the first definition of World Art Studies that John Onians posited.[202] Ten years after the Washington conference, Onians expounded a comparative, anthropological approach to a "natural history of artistic activity" that would expose "the underlying disunities and incompatibilities" within the Western canon itself, thus bringing forth the need to create a "larger disciplinary frame".[203]

[60] A global perspective along with multidisciplinarity were at the base of World Art Studies, focusing on aspects like the origins of art, the intercultural comparison of art in the context and interculturisation in the arts, and drawing

innovative character of this approach and Christopher S. Wood believed their pretence to interdisciplinarity was merely imaginative rather than factual, see Kurt W. Forster and David Britt, "Aby Warburg: His Study of Ritual and Art on Two Continents", in: *October* 77 (1996), 5-24; Svetlana Alpers, in: *October* 77 (1996), 26; Michael A. Holly, in: *October* 77 (1996), 39-41; Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, in: *October* 77 (1996), 45-48; Christopher S. Wood, in: *October* 77 (1996), 68-70.

[198] The editor, Rosalind Krauss, would a year later declare "I hate visual culture", see Scott Rothkopf, "Krauss and the Art of Cultural Controversy: Interview with Rosalind Krauss", in *The Harvard Crimson*, May 1997, http://www.thecrimson.com/article/1997/5/16/krauss-and-the-art-of-cultural/ (accessed 16 August 2018).

[199] John Elkins, *Visual Studies: A Skeptical Introduction*, New York and London 2003, 18.

[200] William J. T. Mitchell, "Showing Seeing: A Critique of Visual Culture", in: *Art History, Aesthetics, Visual Studies*, eds. Michael A. Holly and Keith Moxey, New Haven CT 2002, 231-250.

[201] The contributions presented showed that the canon was far from overthrown but had rather expanded to include every theory, hence highlighting the new perspectives of corporeality or gay/gender studies or non-Western cultures: Michael Camille, "Prophets, Canons, and Promising Monsters", in: *The Art Bulletin* 78 (1996), no. 2, 198-201; Zeynep Çelik, "Colonialism, Orientalism and the Canon", in: *The Art Bulletin* 78 (1996), no. 2, 202-205; Adrian Rifkin, "Theory as a Place", in: *The Art Bulletin* 78 (1996), no. 2, 209-212; Christopher B. Steiner, "Can the Canon Burst?", in: *The Art Bulletin* 78 (1996), no. 2, 213-217.

[202] In 1992 Onians had renamed the Department of Art History at the University of East Anglia 'Department of World Art Studies', leading the way in the field, and Wilfried van Damme launched a similar programme at the University of Leiden.

[203] John Onians, "World Art Studies and the Need for a New Natural History of Art", in: *The Art Bulletin* 78 (1996), no. 2, 206-209.

from philosophy, anthropology and neuroscience.[204] And indeed, again in 1996, Hal Foster was speaking of an ethnographic turn in art theory brought on by the awareness of other cultures, and of the relativity of art historical paradigms.[205] In those same years, a similar debate on the need to broaden disciplinary horizons to non-Western areas animated history studies, too, which increasingly referred to 'global history'.[206]

[61] The next CIHA congress of 1996 was held in Amsterdam under the rubric of a very Warburgian title, "Memory & Oblivion". In the words of its organiser, Wessel Reinink, this vertical topic sought to retake the course opened by the Washington 1986 meeting.[207] At the Amsterdam conference the strictly speculative debate on art theory was not developed, but Gerhard Wolf's session on "The Memory of the Art Historian" was significant from a methodological standpoint. The discourse on world art (history) returned to the fore as Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann analysed the Eurocentrism in art history, and two papers concerned the development of art history in Mexico and South Africa.[208] Dealing with memory obviously conjured Warburg, whose approach to cultural problems was read in an oblique perspective and linked to anti-Semitism by Charlotte Schoell-Glass.[209] And for the first time since Bologna 1979, Antal's social history of art was re-addressed and considered in the light of the impact Cold War ideology had on its reception.[210] Postmodernity and the culture of images were the subject of the three concluding papers of the session.[211]

---

[204] Wilfried Van Damme and Kitty Zijlmans, "Art History in a Global Frame", in: *Art History and Visual Studies in Europe*, 220-222. The authors stressed the similarities of World Art Studies and *Bildwissenschaft*.

[205] Hal Foster, "The Artist as Ethnographer", in: Hal Foster, *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century*, Cambridge MA 1996, 171-203. Cf. also Matthew Rampley, "Anthropology at the Origins of Art History", in: *Site Specificity. The Ethnographic Turn*, ed. Alex Coles, London 2000, 138-165.

[206] Global history was the subject of the 1990 International Congress of Historical Sciences in Madrid, a line furthered in Montreal 1995 and that culminated in the Oslo 2000 conference with the session "Perspectives on Global History". Also, in 1990 the *Journal of World History* was launched. Cf. Karl D. Erdmann, *Toward a Global Community of Historians: The International Historical Congresses and the International Committee of Historical Sciences, 1898-2000*, New York and Oxford 2005, 311-361.

[207] Adriaan W. Reinink and Jeroen Stumpel, "Preface", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, I, xiii-xiv.

[208] Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "Eurocentrism and Art History? Universal History and the Historiography of the Arts before Winckelmann", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, I, 35-42; Rita Eder, "The Private World of Malinche: New Issues in Mexican Art History", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, I, 101-109; Alexander E. Duffey, "Art History in South Africa: Past and Present", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, I, 111-121.

[209] Charlotte Schoell-Glass, "The Archive's Silent Record: Anti-Semitism and the Formation of Aby Warburg's *Cultural Science*", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, I, 89-94.

[210] Deborah L. Krohn, "Antal and His Critics: A Forgotten Chapter in the Historiography of the Italian Renaissance in the Twentieth Century", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, I, 95-99.

[62] Jean-Hubert Martin's "Closed Circuits?" was another methodologically-laden panel for it dealt with contemporary art and non-Western cultures. Martin had chosen the title in open polemic against the "Aperto" section of the 1993 Venice Biennale, which to his mind had failed to overcome Western stereotyped views.[212] The notion of outsider was referred not only to non-Euroamerican artists, but also to queer and gender perspectives in Western art.[213] This meant that after being adumbrated in the papers delivered by Thomas Crow, Rosalind Krauss, Lisa Tickner and Whitney Davis in Berlin, gender and queer studies were now making their way into a CIHA congress.[214]

[63] Finally, probably an indication of the tensions evidenced in the *October* questionnaire, the Amsterdam CIHA congress remained silent on the ongoing debate on Visual Studies. Also noteworthy is the fact that the two art historians universally acclaimed for fathering visual culture, Svetlana Alpers and Michael Baxandall, never took part in a CIHA conference – though their names were often evoked. Actually, Alpers' *The Art of Describing* had been received by rather critical reviews in the 1980s, and even the more positive ones stressed that it was not a book on art history but on cultural tradition à la Baxandall, which could be indicative of a certain marginalisation.[215] In 1990 a German translation of Baxandall's *Patterns of Intention* had appeared, but although the "unacknowledged poststructuralist foundation of subjectivity" of Baxandall's inferential criticism was in keeping with the debate on art theory as formulated in the Berlin conference, reviews at the time were rather tepid.[216]

---

[211] Anca Oroveanu, "The History of Art Shaping Art?", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, I, 123-130; Gerhard Pfennig, "Technische und rechtliche Aspekte der Verwaltung von Text- und Bildrechten", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, I, 131-136; Karl Clausberg, "Video, ergo sum? Die Kunstgeschichte der virtuellen Bilder zwischen Erinnerungs- und Projektionstechnik", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, I, 137-148.

[212] Jean-Hubert Martin, "Qui a peur des peaux rouges, du péril jaune et de la négritude?", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, II, 961-964.

[213] Allen F. Roberts, "Recycling Memory in Urban Senegal", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, II, 965-974; Biruta Flood, "The Case of Latvian Art Between 1940-1990 and After", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, II, 975-980; Joe A. Thomas, "Pop Art and the Forgotten Codes of Camp", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, II, 989-995; Jeanette Hoorn, "History and Memory in the Art of Gordon Bennett", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, II, 1013-1018; Amelia Jones, "Strategic Oblivion: 1970s Feminist Art in 1980s Art History", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, II, 1043-1048.

[214] Cf. Thomas Crow, "Fashioning the New York School", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 319-328; Rosalind Krauss, "Jackson Pollock's Agency", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 329-338; Lisa Tickner, "Now and Then: *The Hieratic Head of Ezra Pound*", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 693-702; Whitney Davis, "Winckelmann Divided", in: *Künstlerischer Austausch*, II, 673-680.

[215] Anthony Grafton and Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "Holland without Huizinga: Dutch Visual Culture in the Seventeenth Century", in: *Journal of Interdisciplinary History* 26 (1985), no. 2, 255-265.

[216] Michael A. Holly, "Patterns in the Shadows: Attention in/to the Writings of Michael Baxandall", in: *About Michael Baxandall*, ed. Adrian Rifkin, Oxford 1999, 5-16: 14. Cf.

The Congresses of the New Millennium

[64] The new millennium opened with a CIHA conference in London chaired by Nigel Llewellyn around the momentous theme of time.[217] On the one hand, echoing the reflections on revivals in art of the previous congress, the topic was an overt reference to Kubler's theories, on the other.[218] One may in fact think of Didi-Huberman's contemporaneous studies on the latencies and resurgences in art and the image conceived in anachronistic terms.[219] The organisers set out to develop the topic along three main lines, how and which time is represented, time and place as a topos for art historical writing, and the connection between theory and creativity.[220]

[65] The symbolic representation of time in art history was the subject of a section whose approach was both iconographic and contextual, revolving mainly around Western tradition but also with forays into African, Asian and Arabic art.[221] The discussion on time and spectatorship, both in terms of immediate response and of long-term reception, continued the examination of Visual Studies and Rezeptionsästhetik, involving John Shearman, Wolfgang Kemp and Oskar Bätschmann, amongst others.[222] The impact of digital media on art history, already partially explored in the previous conference, was further expounded in the session "Digital Art History Time", which constituted a benchmark for the relevance of new technologies.[223] The first session chaired by Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann revolved around the geohistory of art, and its proceedings were later

Adrian D. Rifkin, "Brief Encounters of the Cultural Kind", in: *Art History* 11 (1986), no. 2, 275-278.

[217] Nigel Llewellyn, "Art History for the Millennium: The Theme of *Time* and the London Conference in the Year 2000", in: *Memory & Oblivion*, I, 25-32. Also see "CIHA 2000. Claire Donovan talks to the Congress Director, Nigel Llewellyn", in: *The Art Book* 7 (2000), no. 4, 28-31.

[218] The organisers of the conference were not able to publish the proceedings but left the possibility of publication open to those who wanted it. The sections published include: *Symbols of Time in the History of Art*, eds. Christian Heck and Kristen Lippincott, Turnhout 2002; *The Enduring Instant. Time and the Spectator in the Visual Arts*, eds. Antoinette Roesler-Friedenthal and Johannes Nathan, Berlin 2003; *Time and Place. The Geohistory of Art*, eds. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann and Elizabeth Pilliod, Aldershot 2005.

[219] In the same 2000, the French critic published *Devant le temps* in which he argued for the anachronism of the artwork: Georges Didi-Huberman, *Devant le temps. Histoire de l'art et anachronisme des images*, Paris 2000. Cf. Georges Didi-Huberman, "History and Image: Has the *Epistemological Transformation* Taken Place", in: *The Art Historian: National Traditions and Institutional Practices*, ed. Michael F. Zimmermann, New Haven CT and London 2003, 128-143.

[220] "CIHA 2000. Claire Donovan talks to the Congress Director, Nigel Llewellyn", in: *The Art Book* 7 (2000), no. 4, 28-31: 28.

[221] *Symbols of Time in the History of Art*, eds. Christian Heck and Kristen Lippincott, Turnhout 2002.

[222] *The Enduring Instant. Time and the Spectator in the Visual Arts*, eds. Antoinette Roesler-Friedenthal and Johannes Nathan, Berlin 2003.

published separately.[224] This return to the geography of art was connected to a reconsideration of the role of the national, which since the 1990s had once again become a safe topic of investigation, according to Kaufmann. A case in point, the Amsterdam CIHA congress (1996) was initially supposed to be about national styles.[225] The reflection on cultural and artistic landscapes and borders was prompted in those years by World Art Studies, as John Onians was undertaking his project *Atlas of World Art*.[226]

[66] The peripheral regions in Europe were in themselves a perfect case-study for the negotiation of identity in terms of "multi-trajectivity" rather than a one-directional culture radiating from the centre of the Continent, as shown by Piotr Piotrowski in his critical geography of Central Europe before and after the Cold War.[227] Dario Gamboni framed the alternating polarities of the insularity of art works and the opposite contextualisation within a national spirit from the eigtheenth century to the present.[228]

[67] David Summers, in turn, analysed the arbitrariness of the concept of chronology and reversed the causality between national/local identity and style. According to Summers, style is in fact the institutionalisation and continuation of a set of characteristics that a group gives authority to, insofar as they suit local purposes. As a consequence, the notion that culture affects the visual character of the art of a group must be refuted based on the scheme of arbitrariness and authority.[229] Summers had begun his studies on the transformative use of the theoretical constructs of Western art history in 1987 with *The Judgment of Sense*.[230] Under the influence of his professor George Kubler he worked around

[223] Antonella Sbrilli, "Computerization, Digitization and the Internet", in: *Art History and Visual Studies in Europe*, 135-150: 137-138.

[224] Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "Introduction", in: *Time and Place. The Geohistory of Art*, eds. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann and Elizabeth Pilliod, Aldershot 2005, 1-19. Kaufmann was then completing his study on *Kunsttopographie*, see Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art*, Chicago and London 2004. The definition of 'geohistory' is owed to Fernand Braudel, *Les ambitions de l'histoire*, ed. Sylvie Aymard, Paris 1997, 103.

[225] DaCosta Kaufmann, "Introduction", 6.

[226] *Borders in Art. Revisiting* Kunstgeographie, *Proceedings of the Fourth Joint Conference of Polish and English Art Historians, University of East Anglia, Norwich 1998*, ed. Katarzyna Murawska-Muthesius, Warsaw 2000; *Compression vs. Expression: Containing and Explaining the World's Art*, ed. John Onians, Williamstown MA 2006.

[227] Piotr Piotrowski, "Between Place and Time: a Critical Geography of *New* Central Europe", in: *Time and Place. The Geohistory of Art*, 153-171.

[228] Dario Gamboni, "'Independent of Time and Place': On the Rise and Decline of a Modernist Ideal", in: *Time and Place. The Geohistory of Art*, 173-201.

[229] David Summers, "Arbitrariness and Authority: How Art Makes Cultures", in: *Time and Place. The Geohistory of Art*, 203-216.

[230] David Summers, *The Judgment of Sense: Renaissance Naturalism and the Rise of Aesthetics*, Cambridge UK 1987. Also see David Summers, "Form, Nineteenth-Century Metaphysics, and the Problem of Art Historical Description", in: *Critical Inquiry* 15 (1989),

the concept of defect of distance, in that art's purpose is to make present what is absent and thus become a locus of loss and remembrance experienced in the viewer's body.[231] This was the theoretical cornerstone of his later controversial book *Real Spaces*, which became the bone of contention addressed in the following CIHA congresses on world art.[232]

[68] Indeed, the impact of the study of non-Western artistic phenomena on the formulations of new methodological postmodernist frameworks was touched on by Belting in the contemporaneous *Art History After Modernism*.[233] Along with Kubler and Baxandall, Belting was in fact taken as an example by Summers for a post-formalist art history that discloses intercultural possibilities. Summers overtly took issue with the linguistic turn insofar as it relied on an ethnocentric notion of representationalism, and he proposed a semiotic model hinged on indexicality and facture, i.e. that every artefact is a record of its having been made, congruent with Baxandall's inferential criticism. Rather than vision, corporeality and spatial existence were assumed as the universals underlying artistic creation instead; hence spatial arts, and not visual arts were deemed a more appropriate category. From this followed the concept of real space, the space people share with objects and other people, and virtual space, the representation of such space.[234]

[69] In 2002, James Elkins forcefully argued the opposite point of view, i.e. that a universal multicultural art history was a mere utopian dream stemming from a postcolonial form of guilt.[235] He believed that the Hegelian thought art historiography rested upon was unavoidable and that art history was essentially a Western enterprise.[236] Elkins addressed the debate sparked by World Art Studies in his lengthy review of Summers' *Real Spaces*, credited with being the only attempt to encapsulate the matter in one book.[237] More in general, the reviewer pointed to the conceptual disarray in referring either to world art or

372-406.

[231] On Kubler's influence see David Summers, "Regarding Art and Art History", in: *The Art Bulletin* 95 (2013), no. 3, 355-356.

[232] David Summers, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism*, London 2003. On the critical debate raised by Summers' book see C. Oliver O'Donnell, "Revisiting David Summers' *Real Spaces*: a Neo-Pragmatist Interpretation", in: *World Art* 8 (2017), no. 1, 1-18.

[233] Belting, *Art History After Modernism*.

[234] Summers, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism*, 15-59.

[235] Keith Moxey was also very critical of Summers accusing him of ethnocentrism and a Western bias, see O'Donnell, "Revisiting David Summers' Real Spaces: a Neo-Pragmatist Interpretation", 9.

[236] John Elkins, *Stories of Art*, London 2002, 146.

[237] John Elkins, "David Summers, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism*", in: *The Art Bulletin* 86 (2004), no. 2, 373-381, repr. as John Elkins, "On David Summers's *Real Spaces*", in: *Is Art History Global?*, ed. John Elkins, New York and London 2007, 41-71.

global art or multiculturalism or visual culture – a similar problem also Belting, amongst others, would have remarked.[238] Elkins argued that the notion of space was rooted in Renaissance Western thought and therefore held little validity when applied to pre-Renaissance or non-Western art.[239]

[70] Finally, Elkins attempted at subsuming the multifarious debate on world art into five options which effectively provided a viable framework for the different positions reflected in the following CIHA congresses that are hence worth enumerating. First, art history may simply extend its area of research whilst remaining substantially unchanged. Second, art history could adjust its working concepts to fit non-Western art. Third, art history ought to find indigenous critical concepts to discuss other cultures. Fourth, art history should also avoid Western interpretative strategies. Fifth, interdisciplinarity, transdisciplinarity and subdisciplinarity may dissolve art history as a discipline and turn it into a multidisciplinary approach to visual studies.[240]

[71] The mapping of a world art history was given full prominence in the following two CIHA conferences in Montreal and Melbourne, held in 2004 and 2008 respectively. The growing interest in geohistory is reflected in the very title of the former, "Site and Territories of Art History", organised by Ruth Philipps.[241] Significantly, in 2004 John Onians was publishing his worldwide survey text, *Atlas of World Art*, and a year before he had chaired a session on this topic at the Annual Meeting of the College Art Association.[242] In consideration of Summers' book, space was assumed as a cross-cultural topic for the conference in

---

[238] Hans Belting, "From World Art to Global Art. View on a New Panorama", in: *The Challenge of the Object. 33rd Congress of the International Committee of the History of Art*, eds. G. Ulrich Großmann and Petra Krutisch, 4 vols., Nuremberg 2013, IV, 1511-1515: 1511. According to Belting, *world art* refers to the modernist idea of the art from the areas outside the Western hemisphere, whereas *global art* is a post-modern and post-colonialist notion intended to overthrow the centre-periphery scheme.

[239] Elkins, "David Summers, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism*", 376. Elkins referred to the ten principles of Westerness Peter Burke outlined in 1994, including that of space. Incidentally, this example testifies to a similar debate in the historical studies of the time, see Peter Burke, "Western Historical Thinking in a Global Perspective – 10 Theses", in: *Western Historical Thinking: An Intercultural Debate*, ed. Jörn Rüsen, New York and Oxford 2002, 15-30.

[240] Elkins, "David Summers, *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism*", 377-378.

[241] The proceedings of the conference were not published hence the observations rely on the programme alone which can be found at http://ciha2004.uqam.ca/ciha_htlm/v_anglaise/pges_syn/syna_int.html (accessed 16 August 2018).

[242] *Atlas of World Art*, ed. John Onians, Oxford and New York 2004. The CAA meeting in New York (February 2003) included the session "Mapping the World's Art", in which both Onians and Kaufmann participated.

Montreal.[243] Urban, utopian, shared, virtual, invaded, genderised spaces were discussed along with national narratives and the North as art historical constituting ideologies. A panel dealing with interdisciplinarity as the new disciplinary paradigm, and another one with the body as space, were an indication of the currency of these two subjects pointed out by Elkins.[244] In 2007 he published a volume titled *Is Art History Global?* – with a Belting-like question mark – once more stressing the topicality of the debate on whether art history could be globalised while not losing its current recognisable shape.[245] Elkins essentially re-stated his views that art history relied on a stable narrative and depended on Western schemata, and hence that there was no non-Western tradition of art history as such.[246] 2007 was a momentous year for the discussion on world art, as a CIHA colloquium on the relations between art history and anthropology was held, followed by the symposium "Challenges of World Art History" at the Clark Institute and by the conference "How to Write Art History – National, Regional or Global?" in Budapest.[247] The following year was graced with another survey book on the global turn in art history, *World Art Studies*, under the aegis of the eponymous department at Leiden University chaired by Wilfried van Damme, which would feature some of the key speakers of the CIHA conference in Melbourne, and also David Carrier published *A World Art History and Its Objects*.[248]

[72] The Australian conference was perceived as a "boomerang-answer" to the question posed in the Budapest symposium.[249] In fact, there Jaynie Anderson had illustrated the antipodean perspective on art history that would be explored in Melbourne.[250] And like in Budapest, the global observation extended its

[243] However, David Summers was not present amongst the speakers.

[244] These observations were again surmised only from the conference programme.

[245] *Is Art History Global?,* ed. John Elkins, New York and London 2007; the book stemmed from the Art Seminar roundtable held in 2005.

[246] John Elkins, "Art History as a Global Discipline", in: *Is Art History Global?*, 3-23: 19. Also see John Elkins, "Can We Invent a World Art Studies?", in: *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches*, ed. Kitty Zijlmans and Wilfried van Damme, Amsterdam 2008, 107-118.

[247] *Cannibalismes disciplinaires. Quand l'histoire de l'art et l'anthropologie se rencontrent*, ed. Thierry Dufrêne and Anne-Christine Taylor, Paris 2010; *How to Write Art History – National, Regional or Global? Conference of the CIHA*, ed. László Beke, Budapest 2008 (*Acta historiae Academiae Artium Scientiarum Hungaricae* XLIX).

[248] *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches*, ed. Kitty Zijlmans and Wilfried van Damme, Amsterdam 2008; David Carrier, *A World Art History and Its Objects*, University Park PA 2008.

[249] László Beke, "Preface – Which Might Be An Epilogue, As Well", in: *How to Write Art History*, 11-13: 13.

[250] Jaynie Anderson, "How to Write Art History from an Antipodean Perspective", in: *How to Write Art History*, 24-36.

boundaries towards the East rather than Africa, which was only considered in relation to Europe. In this clime of contestation over the West-centrism of art history, the thirty-second congress of art historians convened in Melbourne around the theme "Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence". For the first time outside of the Western world, this CIHA conference received an unprecedented global response, with participants from as many as fifty countries.[251] As its organiser Jaynie Anderson clarified, crossing cultures was preferred to multiculturalism, which rather implied a Eurocentric vision, and she optimistically proclaimed the Melbourne conference the gateway to the achievements of a world art history, wherein Australia could play a prominent role.[252]

[73] The session chaired by Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann "The Idea of World Art" provided the methodological foundation of such discourse. The current debate sparked by David Summers and James Elkins, as well as the history of Kunsttopographie present since the inception of art history, were taken as the gauge of the coming of age of a global art history. Kaufmann also referred to the terminological distinction between global and world art and warned against the danger inherent in the old centre-periphery paradigm.[253] A similar concern was voiced by Peter J. Schneemann, who rather drew attention on cultural hybridisation and migration as the heart of a new approach.[254] John Onians ventured into neuro-art history to explain previously unknown areas of human activity and study the art of all places and times with an unbiased look.[255] Piotr Piotrowski deconstructed the universalist myth of modernism as opposed to the

[251] In the 1960s Japan had been proposed as venue for the 1974 CIHA conference (Canada being an alternative), see "Procès-verbal des séances tenues par le Comité International d'Histoire de l'Art et par son bureau à Bonn", in: *Bulletin du CIHA* 1 (1965), no. 1-2, 18.

[252] Jaynie Anderson, "The World at Stake", in: *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence. The Proceedings of the 32nd International Congress in the History of Art*, ed. Jaynie Anderson, Melbourne 2009, 63-64. There had been a growing awareness of the institutional history of art history in Australia in the previous years, see Jacqueline Strecker, "Colonizing Culture. The Origins of Art History in Australia", in: *Art History and Its Institutions. Foundations of a Discipline*, ed. Elizabeth C. Mansfield, London 2002, 100-111.

[253] Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "Introduction 1", in: *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, 72-74.

[254] Peter J. Schneemann, "Introduction 2", in: *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence,* 75-76.

[255] John Onians, "Neuroarthistory as World Art History", in: *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, 78-81. Only a year earlier Onians had expounded such theories, tracing their origin back to Gombrich and Baxandall: John Onians, *Neuroarthistory: From Aristotle and Pliny to Baxandall and Zeki,* New Haven CT and London 2007. Also see John Onians, "Neuroarthistory: Making More Sense of Art", in: *World Art Studies: Exploring Concepts and Approaches*, ed. Kitty Zijlmans and Wilfried van Damme, Amsterdam 2008, 265-286.

local identity enforced by post-modernism, and argued for a horizontal art history hinged on transnationality rather than internationality. Within this framework, the oblique perspective of the periphery would effectively also lead to the relativisation of the Western canon itself.[256]

[74] Jan von Bonsdorff considered the macro-stylistic area of 'artedominium' theorised by the Swedish art historian Johnny Roosval in the 1920s and 1930s as a viable tool to describe global artistic phenomena, provided its static connotations were overcome.[257] Paul D. Mukherji, in turn, criticised the relativist tendency to underscore the otherness of non-Western art. Most world art survey books, he claimed, overlooked the convergence with occidental paradigms, and he thus proposed a comparative aesthetics for multiculturalism, instead.[258] As can be expected, the other sessions of the conference were urging a revision of pre-established canons. This was particularly evident in the provocative exploration of the concept of Renaissance from a hybrid point of view that called into question the classic history-minded Renaissance formulated by Panofsky.[259] Claire Farago, indeed, proceeded to an open attack against Panofsky's "erudition and cosmopolitanism" that served Americans' new cultural identity after WWII. The very concept of intrinsic meaning had proved completely obsolete in a broad analysis of art objects that were the result of hybridisation.[260] A similar standpoint was that of Keith Moxey, who questioned the very need of the concept of Renaissance rooted in Hegelian (and Panofskian) teleological development, whereas a Foucaultian paradigm based on discontinuity would have been more effective.[261] Even if Panofsky's theories had already been reconsidered in CIHA congresses – albeit always acknowledging his legacy –, criticism against the German scholar had never been so overt. Panofsky's anecdote of the Australian bushman equated to the primitive man who cannot understand art was often evoked as the epitome of an antiquated and colonialist view no longer applicable to an overarching artistic investigation.[262]

---

[256] Piotr Piotrowski, "Towards Horizontal Art History", in: *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, 82-85.

[257] Jan von Bonsdorff, "Global Aspects on Johnny Roosval's Concept of the *Artedominium*", in: *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, 86-90. Cf. Johnny Roosval, *Den Baltiska nordens kyrkor*, Uppsala 1924, and Johnny Roosval, *Le Nord Baltique comme domaine artistique homogène et sa situation dans le bloc Saxon-Baltique*, in *Actes du XIIIe Congrès International d'Histoire de l'Art*, ed. Johnny Roosval, Stockholm 1933, 147-152.

[258] Paul D. Mukherji, "Putting the World in a Book. How Global Can Art History Be Today?", in: *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, 91-96.

[259] Luke Morgan, "Introduction", in: *Crossing Cultures*, 180-181.

[260] Claire Farago, "Reframing the Renaissance Problem Today", in: *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, 227-232: 228.

[261] Keith Moxey, "Do We Still Need a Renaissance?", in: *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, 233-238.

[75] A comparative view on cross-cultural phenomena characterised the rest of the panels in the conference, such as colonialism and cultural exchange, the representation(s) of nature, the sacred, materiality and techniques, the creation of identity, migration, art and war. A revision of the canon of Western modernism was proposed in dealing with Global Modern Art from a peripheral standpoint. Also, the emergence of new contemporary art centres in a globalised market was analysed in connection with the role of post-modern museums in negotiating identity. Overall, the congress in Melbourne was casting a positive light on the prospect of a world art, although criticalities in formulating an all-encompassing approach still lingered. And Hans Belting, only a year later, was stating the impossibility of a global art history, for universalist explanations would always be at odds with local phenomena. To his mind, more often than not, the Western art discourse went beyond its borders only insofar as other visual cultures reflected an influence of Euro-American art.[263]

[76] Furthermore, some remarks must be made about the fact that while the debate on Visual Studies dominated the CIHA conferences in the 1990s, it appears to be marginalised in the new millennium. The 1996 *October's* infamous questionnaire, in this sense, had unveiled a general discord on Visual Studies. The lack of consensus on what the nature and scope of Visual Studies (and the pictorial turn in general) were, dominated amongst their promulgators and opponents alike. This situation is evidenced in the pages of the newly-founded *Journal of Visual Culture*, which since its very inception in 2002 voiced the divisions within its field.[264] After all, in 2003 James Elkins called his introduction to *Visual Studies* 'skeptical' inasmuch as it touched on the criticalities in defining the object and scope of this interdiscipline.[265]

[77] The 2012 CIHA congress chaired by G. Ulrich Grossmann was held in Nuremberg under the title of "The Challenge of the Object", which intended to continue the cross-cultural perspective in the formulation of the art object set forth in Melbourne.[266] The 21 sections were for the first time conceived so as

---

[262] Jaynie Anderson, "Playing between the Lines", in: *Crossing Cultures: Conflict, Migration and Convergence*, 4-9.

[263] Hans Belting, "Art in the TV Age", in: *Transmission Image: Visual Translation and Cultural Agency*, ed. Birgit Mersmann and Alexandra Schneider, Newcastle 2009, 169-183: 177.

[264] Cf. William J. T. Mitchell, "Showing Seeing: A Critique of Visual Culture", in: *Journal of Visual Culture* 1 (2002), no. 2, 165-181; Mieke Bal, "Visual Essentialism and the Object of Visual Culture", in: *Journal of Visual Culture* 2 (2003), no. 1, 5-32; "Responses to Mieke Bal's 'Visual Essentialism and the Object of Visual Culture' (2003)", in: *Journal of Visual Culture* 2 (2003), no. 2, 229-268.

[265] John Elkins, *Visual Studies: A Skeptical Introduction*, New York and London 2003. There was an advance publication of the book's preface on the first issue of the *Journal of Visual Culture* 1 (2002), no. 1, 93-99.

[266] G. Ulrich Großmann, "The Challenge of the Object", in: *The Challenge of the Object. 33rd Congress of the International Committee of the History of Art*, eds. G. Ulrich

each would not concern one single genre, style or continent, thus attempting at overcoming narrow categorical limitations and prompt a cross-cultural approach.[267] And almost echoing the afore-mentioned debate on the nature of Visual Studies, the first section chaired by Horst Bredekamp is methodologically relevant for it questioned the object of art history.[268] Audrey Rieber showed that there never was a univocal notion of said object, since even the founding fathers were divided between a formalist and an iconological camp.[269] Assimina Kaniari, on the other hand, challenged the recent acclamation of Kubler as a theorist of a proto-world art history (mostly propounded by Summers), placing *The Shape of Time* within the context of American art history in the 1940s-1960s.[270] Significantly, Michael Yonan critically reconsidered the primacy of vision championed by Visual Studies as a typically Anglo-American phenomenon linked to the strong underlying Neo-Platonic tendencies. He claimed materiality had been too readily overseen, even when accounted for in art historians' theories – like in Baxandall's for instance.[271] Along the same lines, the issue of reconciling modern anachronicity with an art historical narrative based on chronology was addressed in a session on the anthropological turn by Keith Moxey.[272]

[78] Coming full circle, the final session examined the topic of CIHA congresses as an index of the discipline's development.[273] Thomas W. Gaehtgens identified the transition from a Western to an international to a global perspective as the key characteristic of the Comité's history.[274] And Hans Belting's concluding remarks on the terminological and historical difference between global and world

---

Großmann and Petra Krutisch, 4 vols., Nuremberg 2013, I, 27-31.

[267] G. Ulrich Großmann, "'The Challenge of the Object' – the CIHA Congress 2012 in Nuremberg", in: *Diogenes* 58 (2012), no. 3, 154-166: 156.

[268] Horst Bredekamp, "Introduction", in: *The Challenge of the Object*, I, 34-36.

[269] Audrey Rieber, "What is Art History the History of? On the Epistemological Problem of the Object of Art History", in: *The Challenge of the Object*, I, 42-45.

[270] Assimina Kaniari, "Material Objects as Impossible Things. Kubler, Panofsky and Abstraction", in: *The Challenge of the Object*, I, 46-49.

[271] Michael Yonan, "The Suppression of Materiality in Anglo-American Art-Historical Writing", in: *The Challenge of the Object*, I, 63-66. In a 2012 interview, Linda Nochlin had also stressed a return to the object, see Linda Nochlin and Dan Karlholm, "Misery, Beauty, and Other Issues: Linda Nochlin in Conversation with Dan Karlholm", in: *The Art Bulletin* 94 (2012), no. 2, 187-198: 197.

[272] Keith Moxey, "The Time of the Object", in: *The Challenge of the Object*, I, 328-330. Also see the session introduction: Ruth B. Phillips, "Were We Never Western? An Introduction to The Object as Subject", in: *The Challenge of the Object*, I, 264-267.

[273] Just before the Nuremberg conference, Jaynie Anderson analysed the role CIHA played in developing the new global perspective of art historiography, see Jaynie Anderson, "CIHA's Roles in the Making of Art History Around the Globe", in: *World Art* 2 (2012), no. 2, 173-196.

[274] Thomas W. Gaehtgens, "Introduction", in: *The Challenge of the Object,* IV, 1472-1473.

art evidenced a confusion which the previous Melbourne congress had failed to clarify. Specifically, he claimed the need to formulate new narratives with a local perspective free of the colonial gaze, and conversely to recover self-referential narratives of Western art with an outside perspective.[275] Such relevance of the cross-cultural definition of terms and paradigms was indeed becoming a much-debated issue and was actually made the topic of the 2016 meeting held in Beijing chaired by Qingsheng Zhu.[276] The concluding remarks he made at the end of the conference are extremely telling of the role played by CIHA as a locus of the cross-cultural redefinition of the art historical canon:

Shall we still apply the methodology of linguistics and the study of styles, or that of iconography, or other traditional approaches of art history to study the new situation and new phenomena? Are the approaches of the Humanities and the logical deduction of causality themselves susceptible to doubt? Perhaps now is the time to use images/pictures to explain images/pictures.[277]

A Possible Trajectory

[79] If methodological themes dominated the cognate international congresses of historians discussing since their inception alternative theoretical approaches, the story of the CIHA conferences was a different one. However, one can safely say that until the late 1960s the international congresses of art history gave little prominence to art theory. Following this (sometimes subterranean or laconic) debate in the post-war years, a trajectory of the directions taken by the discipline may be traced. The framework that thus emerges befits, how Gisela Koch and Heike-Barbara Weber described these international meetings at the conjunction of scholarly discipline and public ("Fachwissenschaft" and "Öffentlichkeit"), a Janus-faced creature both conservative and progressive.[278]

[80] As an expression of the art historical establishment and a representation of the discipline's state of the art, CIHA's contribution to shaping the methodological debate in post-war years could be described as a Kublerian 'slow and fast happening'. The rise and fall of Panofsky's iconology is the first phenomenon that can be surmised. Celebrated in Bonn as a possible unifying paradigm in the Euro-American bloc of art history, evoked in Budapest as one of the principal methodologies, re-interpreted with a structuralist corrective in Granada and Bologna, iconology did not stand the test of the questioning of the

[275] Hans Belting, "From World Art to Global Art. View on a New Panorama", in: *The Challenge of the Object,* IV, 1511-1515: 1514-1515.

[276] The conference main theme was "Terms", see http://www.ciha2016.org/en/ (accessed 16 August 2018).

[277] http://www.ciha2016.org/en/news/index/467 (accessed 16 August 2018).

[278] Gisela Koch and Heike-Barbara Weber, "Der internationale kunsthistorische Kongreß und die Disziplin Kunstgeschichte", in: *Révolution et évolution de l'histoire de l'art de Warburg à nos jours*, ed. Harald Olbrich, Strasbourg 1992 (= *L'art et les révolutions*, V), 219-222: 220.

discipline's epistemological models in the 1980s and 90s. Moreover, as art history moved on to a world and later global perspective, Panofsky's intrinsic meaning, based on the reference to a textual culture and a representational art, had become the symbol of Westcentrism. Conversely, CIHA's congresses greatly contributed to build Aby Warburg's critical fortune. Leading the way to his rediscovery in the 1960s, Warburg progressively became the beacon of the new orientations in the 1980s and 1990s. The collapse of the Hegelian teleological narratives that opened up a crisis in the discipline in the 1980s was mirrored by a re-investigation of its methodological tenets in Vienna 1983. And in the following two meetings of Strasbourg and Berlin, Warburg's defiance of disciplinary boundaries made him the tutelary deity of the modern commitment to interdisciplinarity. His Bilderatlas and essays on American natives were taken as anticipations of post-modern visual and anthropological turns. The reflection on methods between Budapest and Bologna conferences was under the spell of structuralism and semioticism exploring the methodological possibilities when applied to iconology and the social history of art. As a matter of fact, George Kubler's duration and seriation and Hans Sedlmayr's Strukturanalyse were considered as possible solutions to what was perceived as a stagnating theoretical discourse.

[81] The early social history of art was significantly addressed mainly in those years foregrounding the limitations of Antal's and Hauser's deterministic theories. The more radical strands of the 1970s as exemplified by German radical art historians were, conversely, mostly left out of the debate. As was the case with British leftist proponents of the New Art History, whose anti-establishment proclaims earned them strong criticism in the sessions on art theory chaired by Michael Ann Holly and Keith Moxey in Strasbourg and Berlin. And while visual culturists led the way in those two instances, their stronghold faltered in the next conferences. As the 1996 *October* questionnaire marked the crisis of Visual Studies, in the pages of *The Art Bulletin* John Onians was theorising world art history. Finally, World Art Studies constitute the last (or rather the latest) leg of this trajectory. In fact, the definition of national and regional stylistic identities is the very heart of the history of CIHA meetings, especially if one follows Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann's geohistorical perspective. While the process of decolonisation was underway, CIHA fulfilled the pleas to internationality resounding within its members by changing its statutes to encompass a broader notion of art history no longer limited to the West.

[82] In this sense, the Washington conference on world art set the tone of the conferences in the new millennium. The CIHA congresses of London, Montreal and Melbourne were crucial in the debate on world/global art. Yet the more watchful views on the broadening of horizons that were morphing art history were voiced outside of CIHA's meetings. On the whole, the more recent developments show that CIHA congresses have come a long way in keeping up with the current problems of the discipline, perhaps as their key players have

somehow answered the wishes one of its most active members, Millard Meiss, proffered in the early post-war years:

We must all attempt to change it from a simulated diplomatic corps to a gathering of scholars more or less impecunious but possessing a sense of humor and living – at least some of them – in the 20th century.[279]

Local Editor
Andrea Lermer, Zentralinstitut für Kunstgeschichte, Munich

Reviewers
Veerle Thielemans, Terra Foundation for American Art, Paris
Michael F. Zimmermann, Katholische Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt

[279] INHA, Paris, Archives, Fonds André Chastel, Correspondence générale, Correspondence LOTZ-MUR, letter from Millard Meiss to André Chastel dated 8 November 1952.