

MAPPING THE ART HISTORICAL LANDSCAPE:  
GENRES OF ART HISTORY APPEARING IN  
ART HISTORY LITERATURE AND THE JOURNAL, *ART EDUCATION*  
DISSERTATION

Presented in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for  
the Degree Doctor of Philosophy in the  
Graduate School of The Ohio State University

By

Cheryl Lynn Williams, B.A., M.A.

\* \* \* \* \*

The Ohio State University

1997

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Kenneth A. Marantz, Advisor

Dr. E. Louis Lankford

Dr. Nancy P. MacGregor

Approved by

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Kenneth A. Marantz". The signature is written in a cursive style and is positioned above a horizontal line.

Advisor  
Department of Art Education

Copyright by  
Cheryl Lynn Williams  
1997

## ABSTRACT

The primary purpose of this dissertation is to identify, explicate, and clarify a range of genres, or subject-matter focuses, of art history to assist art educators in considering and planning art history components of art curricula. It is aimed at adding to the theoretical knowledge base of art history education -- upon which curricular decisions are made, teachers are trained, educational practice is guided, and further research is conducted. In this study, literature in the fields of art history and art education is analyzed to correspondingly accomplish the following: to create portraits of art history based on art historians' monologues and dialogues, and to review art educators' depictions of art history in art education literature, specifically as published from 1980 through 1996 in *Art Education*, the journal of the National Art Education Association. Philosophical inquiry is the principal research methodology used to identify alternative perspectives, clarify ideas, and stimulate reflective thinking regarding art history and art history education.

In this doctoral study, a Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History is drawn to identify a diverse range of art historical scholarship. The reader is taken on an investigation of five broad areas of this scholarship through an analytical exploration of art history literature. The areas or zones of scholarship identified and explored in this odyssey alternatively focus on *art maker, art object, context of creation, art audience, or have multiple focuses.*

Within these five zones of scholarship, nine specific regions of art historical studies, or genres of art history, are identified, investigated, and placed within the conceptual map: *biographical art history* and *psych-based art history* within the area that focuses on art maker; *formalist art history* and *content-based art history* within the area that focuses on art object; *socio-cultural art history* within the area that focuses on context of creation; *response-based art history* within the area that focuses on art audience; and *artistic processes-based art history*, *feminist art history*, and *semiotics-based art history* within the area that contains scholarship that has multiple focuses. "Other" is identified as yet an additional category of genres of art history existing within the art history domain. The placement of "other" on the Conceptual Map of Art History serves as an indicator that the map is not a closed theoretical construct. This conceptual map is then used to guide an investigation of the journal, *Art Education*.

This study adds to the literature that makes the case that "art history" is not a monolithic concept. This helps art educators to talk more than in generalities about art history education. Also, this assists art educators with increasing their awarenesses of and abilities to recognize the multiple perspectives that art history encompasses and in understanding that art historical scholarship is not a static phenomenon. The conceptual map provides art educators with a tool for the critical analysis of art curriculum, teaching practices, and instructional resources regarding art history. It also provides more precise terminology for dialogues. The study clarifies a range of genres of art history, identifies art educators' considerations of these, as published in *Art Education* from 1980 through 1996, and empowers teachers in their curriculum development efforts regarding art history education.

Dedicated to my father,  
Dorwin L. Williams, Ph.D.  
(1928 - 1996)

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply grateful to Dr. Kenneth Marantz for his guidance and support throughout my doctoral study. He has taught me to enjoy the richness of language and all the added nuances of meaning that the use of metaphors can bring; to think critically, particularly regarding commonly held assumptions; to question profusely and perceptively; and to *embrace* the many challenges incumbent in the process of seeking answers. I am also most grateful to both Ken and Sylvia Marantz for serving as professional role models and mentors in life for me.

My sincere appreciation also goes to the other members of my dissertation committee. Dr. E. Louis Lankford and Dr. Nancy MacGregor have provided me with wise counsel, much encouragement, and great inspiration through their examples as leaders in the field of art education. The graduate courses I took with each of my committee members made invaluable contributions to my academic growth. Among the many other outstanding faculty members in the Department of Art Education, I wish to thank Dr. Arthur Efland, in particular, for the many insights into the field of art education that his courses in curriculum and the history of art education afforded me. I am also indebted to Patricia Trumps for providing me with the opportunity to implement the *ArtVentures* educational outreach program at the Wexner Center for the Arts and for her continued support professionally. Indeed, I have met *many* wonderful and supportive people throughout my

graduate studies at The Ohio State University. In particular, I would like to thank the following individuals for their kindness: Beth Ament, Anke Beining, Bob Dalton, Mary Finke, Bill Harris, Motepele Malebana, Jill Markey, Rob McCallum, Sandra Mims, Camille Miranda, Lois Petrovich-Mwaniki, Mary Neno, Nadine Scott, Leslie Simon, Carol Stavropoulos, and Susan Witten. I am also indebted to my art education and art history professors at Purdue University: Drs. George Geahigan, Sally McRorie, and David Parrish. They provided me with a solid academic preparation for my doctoral studies, and their support and encouragement led me to The Ohio State University.

Additionally, I wish to thank dear family friends, Carmen and Glenn Himes, for providing me with a warm welcome to Columbus and for continuing to offer their generous hospitality and care in sharing with me professionally and personally memorable events. Also, during my stay in Columbus, I was so very fortunate to find good roommates who became good friends, and I wish to thank each for contributing so much to my graduate-school experience through their friendship: Geneva Buckholz, Cathy Clark, Maril Flanagan, Erin Smith Springhorn -- and, in particular, Nisi Beese Watson. A special thank you also goes to Helen Rabichow and Sally Rice.

At every step in the process of obtaining my Ph.D., the love and support of my family has sustained and encouraged me. My heartfelt, deep thanks go to my dear father, Dorwin Williams; mother, Charlotte Williams; brother, Tom Williams; and sister, Lora Williams. And to my extraordinary husband, Paul Sproll -- who I met through the art education program at Ohio State -- my love and gratitude for all the love, encouragement, and help that he has given me during this long "journey." I also wish to acknowledge my many students who have taught me so much. And, finally, *thanks be to God.*

## VITA

- April 2, 1960 . . . . . Born - Columbia, Missouri
- 1982 . . . . . B.A. Visual Arts Teaching K-12  
Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN
- 1989 . . . . . M.A. Creative Arts  
Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN
- 1982 - 1985 . . . . . Art Teacher  
Hamilton Southeastern Schools  
Noblesville, IN
- 1985 - 1986 . . . . . Administrative Assistant  
The Art Institute of Chicago, IL
- 1986 - 1987 . . . . . Art Teacher  
Lafayette School Corp., Lafayette, IN
- 1987 - 1988 . . . . . Graduate Teaching Assistant  
Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN
- 1988 - 1989 . . . . . University Fellow  
The Ohio State University, Columbus
- 1989 - 1992 . . . . . Graduate Teaching Associate  
The Ohio State University, Columbus
- 1990 - 1991 . . . . . Graduate Administrative Associate  
The Ohio Partnership for the Visual  
Arts, Columbus, OH
- 1992 - 1993 . . . . . Graduate Administrative Associate,  
*ArtVentures* Program Coordinator  
Wexner Center for the Arts  
Columbus, OH



- 1995 - 1996 . . . . . Art Instructor  
 Burnell Campus Laboratory School  
 Bridgewater State College  
 Bridgewater, MA
- 1995 - 1997 . . . . . Instructor, Art Education  
 Bridgewater State College  
 Bridgewater, MA
- 1997 - present . . . . . Assistant Professor, Art Education  
 Rhode Island College, Providence, RI

## PUBLICATIONS

Genres of art history and rationales for and against the inclusion of art history in elementary school curricula: A philosophical study addressing clarification and justification questions regarding art history education. (1993). In S. Thunder-McGuire (Ed.), *Working papers in art education*, 1993, (pp. 33-42). Iowa City: University of Iowa.

## FIELDS OF STUDY

Major Field: Art Education

Studies in Aesthetics and Philosophy of Art Education.  
 Professor E. Louis Lankford.

Studies in Art Curriculum Design. Professors Arthur Efland  
 and Nancy MacGregor.

Studies in Art History. Professors Barbara Groseclose and  
 Christine Verzar.

Studies in the Art of the Picturebook. Professor Kenneth  
 Marantz.

Museum Studies. Professors James Hutchens and Kenneth  
 Marantz.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract . . . . .	ii
Dedication . . . . .	iv
Acknowledgments . . . . .	v
Vita . . . . .	vii
List of Figures . . . . .	xi
Chapters:	
1. INTRODUCTION: A ROAD MAP FOR THE STUDY . . . . .	1
Current Contexts and Need for the Study . . . . .	3
Specific Focus of the Study . . . . .	12
The Inquiry Process . . . . .	14
Significance of the Study . . . . .	26
2. GUIDEBOOKS FOR ART HISTORY: AN INVESTIGATION OF HANDBOOKS FOR TRAVELERS IN THE DOMAIN OF ART HISTORY . . . . .	28
Defining "Guidebooks for Art History" . . . . .	29
An Overview of Selected Guidebooks for Art History . . . . .	30
Usefulness of Guidebooks for Art History . . . . .	47
3. SURVEYING ART HISTORICAL TERRAINS: AN EXPLORATION OF GENRES OF ART HISTORY PRESENTED IN ART HISTORY LITERATURE . . . . .	50
A Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History. . . . .	52
Explication of a Range of Genres of Art History . . . . .	56
Mementos to Keep Hold Of . . . . .	149

4.	ART HISTORICAL EXCURSIONS IN <i>ART EDUCATION</i> : AN ANALYSIS OF GENRES OF ART HISTORY APPEARING IN <i>ART EDUCATION</i> , THE JOURNAL OF THE NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION . . . . .	152
	Sightings (Citings) of Genres of Art History Appearing in the Journal, <i>Art Education</i> from 1980 through 1996 . . . . .	154
	Ruminations . . . . .	222
5.	REFLECTIONS ON THESE ART HISTORICAL JOURNEYS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER TRAVEL: IMPLICATIONS FOR ART EDUCATION . . . . .	223
	Research Findings and Value to the Field of Art Education . . . . .	224
	Recommendations to Art Educators Regarding Art History Education . . . . .	225
	Suggestions for Further Research . . . . .	226
	Closing Remarks . . . . .	227
	List of References . . . . .	228

## LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>	<u>Page</u>
3.1 A Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History . . . . .	57

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION: A ROAD MAP FOR THE STUDY

Deep understanding of a complex landscape will not be obtained in a single traversal. Similarly for a conceptual landscape. Rather, *the landscape must be crisscrossed in many directions* to master its complexity and to avoid having the fullness of the domain attenuated. The same sites in a landscape (the same cases or concepts in a knowledge domain) should be revisited from different directions, thought about from different perspectives, and so on.

– Spiro, Coulson, Feltovich, and Anderson (1988, p. 6;  
cited in Efland, Freedman, & Stuhr, 1996, p. 116)

In the 1980s, three major art education forces in the United States laid the groundwork for the current resurgence of interest in incorporating art history into school curricula. Harkening back to ideas propounded in the 1960s by Manual Barkan (1966), advocacy statements for the teaching of art history in America's schools were issued by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (1985), the National Art Education Association (1986), and the National Endowment for the Arts (1988). In *Beyond Creating: The Place for Art in America's Schools*, art history was one of four "disciplines" (along with art production, art criticism, and aesthetics) advocated for art education content in the newly developed "discipline-based art education" approach to art education espoused by the Getty Center for Education in the Arts (1985), an operating entity of the J. Paul Getty Trust. In *Quality Art Education: Goals for*

*Schools, An Interpretation*, the National Art Education Association (1986) promoted to its membership this same view – of art history as one of four needed components of art education content (with the other components also identified as art production, art criticism, and aesthetics) – although not identifying it as discipline-based art education or Getty-inspired. Similarly, in *Toward Civilization: A Report on Arts Education*, a report on the state of arts education in the United States mandated by Congress, the National Endowment for the Arts (1988) asserted that arts instruction “must include the history, critical theory, and ideas of the arts as well as creation, production, and performance” (p. 13).

Since the appearance of these seminal publications propelling art history into the spotlight of educational consideration in the 1980s, increasing attention has been directed toward consideration of the content and manner of art history education. Further conceptual clarifications and critical analyses of art history and educational approaches to this field of inquiry, however, are needed to add to the theoretical knowledge base upon which curricular decisions are made, teachers are trained, educational practice is guided, and further research is conducted. This is the focus and central aim of this study.

In this dissertation I am using the term “art history” in a broader sense than is perhaps usual in either the field of art history or art education. For the purposes of this study, I have preferred to conceive of art history as a domain defined by a more expansive and penetrable set of boundaries. I use the term “art history” to refer to studies of any aspect of art’s past, including a range of both intrinsic and contextual factors. The overlapping of art history and many other disciplines is recognized and applauded in this study. In my view, the use of the term art history in this way more readily permits the

active involvement of other modes of inquiry surrounding investigations of art's historical states, contexts, and significance. Working with a more inclusive definition of art history invites, for instance, aesthetics, anthropology, art criticism, psychology, sociology, and women's studies to become additional tools which one can use to unearth art historical information and meaning. I believe that this more comprehensive use of the term "art history" is called for here, as this study seeks to identify and explore a *range* of conceptualizations of art history. To place tight restrictions on to what it might refer would hinder this investigation from the outset.

A number of current contexts make this doctoral research both warranted and timely. Five are identified next to locate the study in the present-day environment.

### Current Contexts and Need for the Study

#### A Mainstream Issue Today

One contemporary circumstance that summons this study is that art history is at present widely considered to be an essential component of art education curricula. The National Art Education Association, the Getty Education Institute for the Arts (formerly the Getty Center for Education in the Arts), and the National Endowment for the Arts continue to recommend art history as one of the basic components of visual arts curricula today, and since the 1980s when these national organizations published advocacy statements for such, this position has become commonly accepted in the field

of art education. This is evidenced by, for example: the prevalence in which current state art curriculum frameworks and local art curricula specify the inclusion of art history for K-12 art instruction; the frequency in which art history now appears as a presentation topic at national and state art education conferences; and the contemporary swell of attention to art history in art education publications and educational products offered as teaching resources.

The idea of art history as a component of visual arts education is, thus, it seems, today overwhelmingly embraced as a theoretical construct by the field of art education. Further research regarding art history as educational subject matter, both for continued theory-building and improved practical application, is needed. Day and DiBlasio (1983) emphasize that art education researchers should address "mainstream issues relevant to practicing art education" (p.170). I contend that clarification of various conceptions of art history is indeed a mainstream issue currently relevant for art education practice. It is relevant at both elementary and secondary school levels, and consequently, at the higher education level, as well, for the preparation of teachers – and is, therefore, presently a particularly appropriate topic of research. The focus of this study is further substantiated as a subject of investigation pertinent to art education today as it directly connects to recent calls for research in the field. Namely, "conceptual issues" was one of eight content areas prescribed for "an art education research agenda toward the 21st century" in 1993 by the National Art Education Association Research Commission. And in 1996, Marschalek, the Task Force Chair of Conceptual Issues for the NAEA Commission on Research in Art Education, underscored the appropriateness and need for conceptual research in art education



(National Art Education Association Commission on Research in Art Education, 1996).

### Major National Educational Reform Movement Now Underway

Another current context that provides grounds for conducting this study is the historic legislation *Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994* and the corresponding development of the National Education Goals and the impetus for comprehensive educational reform. This amounts to a present-day situation in which federal attention is directed to creating a national educational mission; instigating the establishment of clear, quality standards in school subject areas; and encouraging the implementation of strategies for setting and meeting high levels of educational achievement by America's children. This is a time in our nation's history when there is a momentum for reconsideration of educational policies and curriculum theories and content, across multiple levels of schooling, and in a diverse range of subject areas, including the arts.

It is significant that the arts are identified -- alongside English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, history and geography -- as a core subject in the National Education Goals. The arts are now formally identified in U.S. Federal policy as a basic component of quality education programs recommended to state and local boards of education. This recognition brings arts education associations and professionals both opportunities to seize and challenges to meet; arts education is now on our nation's educational agenda and is called to share in the responsibility of improving the education of America's children. Arts

education associations and professionals are asked to identify and advocate what specific forms and emphases arts education should take in our schools and what types of contributions arts education should be utilized to make to our children's education and to the formation of the American citizenry and society of the future.

This national provocation for educational reform has indeed provided an effective call to action for arts education reform initiatives. In 1991, in anticipation of the passage of the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act of 1994*, a consortium of national dance, music, theater, and visual arts education associations, began to develop national voluntary standards for content and student achievement in each arts area. The National Art Education Association has responded by creating the National Visual Arts Standards and issuing calls to its membership to review and revise existing policies and practice to address these newly created content standards and to assist students in meeting the performance standards, published in 1994 (Consortium of National Arts Education Associations, 1994; National Art Education Association, 1994). Guidelines are offered in the National Visual Arts Standards for art program development; however, more questions are posed in the process than answers provided. For these standards do not provide a curriculum; instead, they suggest a framework for curriculum development. The development of art curricula, selection of specific content and instructional strategies, and determination of how to meet these standards or others is left up to individuals to determine in response to their own state and local contexts and personal philosophies of education – as is the approach taken to education in the United States. Most importantly, these standards instigate thinking and rethinking about art education goals and practices.

What role(s) could and should art history education play amidst all this momentum for educational reform? Surely in this time of reconsidering educational goals, standards, and, at the local level, specific content and instruction, further clarification of possibilities regarding art history education would be useful and appropriate.

### Impending Move into the 21st Century

Another pervasive contemporary context that seems to me to be catalytic in initiating widespread reexaminations of current educational theory and practice is the impending dawn of the new millennium. "The 21st Century" -- what has always been conceptualized by the citizens of today as "the future" -- is about to become "the present." I believe that a collective psychological pressure has been building across the country in recent years and is continuing to escalate in response to this imminent occurrence and that this is largely responsible for instigating the present-day Zeitgeist of educational reform. Similar to a New Year's Eve impulse to take stock of one's life and make resolutions for improvements in the next year, there appears to be at present a compelling instinct for professional introspection and reappraisal of educational goals and actions on the eve of a new century and a new millennium.

Certainly the art education community is actively addressing and preparing for both new opportunities and challenges that the 21st century will bring. The time is ripe for envisioning what could be concerning visual arts education and for beginning the work to turn those "fields of dreams" into reality. I believe it is relevant to now ask: What role(s) could art history play in K-12 curricula in the 21st century? What should be the goals for the

inclusion of art history in state and local school curricula? And, specifically what art historical content should be taught in America's schools in the 21st century? This study encourages art educators to reconsider their positions regarding these questions and to develop responses which are appropriate for their own particular circumstances and educational philosophies. The study seeks to assist individuals attempting to answer such questions by explicating a range of views of art history – and in so doing, to open educators' minds to a wider spectrum of possibilities.

#### Feminist, Multicultural, Populist, and Postmodern Ongoing Challenges

The existence of justifiable critical challenges of the status quo in academic scholarship, educational practice at all levels of schooling, and society at large is yet another present-day condition that offers just cause for reexamining art history as subject matter for art education. A number of such challenges have been issued in the recent past and are continuing to be raised by postmodern theories, feminist inquiry, populist questioning, and multicultural perspectives. Each voices concerns and questions relevant to art making, art history, art criticism, aesthetics, general education, and indeed to the breadth of fields of inquiry and institutions existing in society – and, thereby (and directly as well), each voices concerns and questions relevant to art education. Certainly challenges that are feminist, multicultural, populist, and postmodern in nature call for reconsiderations and revisions of theory, policy, practice, and research in art education and hold profound implications for rethinking and reestablishing viewpoints, dialogues, content, activities, and goals. Some art educators are aware of these issues and are considering and identifying ways in which art education should respond; however, more

individuals need to become engaged in ongoing explorations regarding such complex matters of importance.

Art history education is one component of art education that needs to address these challenges. In what ways should art history education be revised to address feminist, multicultural, populist, and postmodern perspectives and theories? And in what ways might art history education serve as an aid to art education and general education in responding to such challenges? Bias, prejudice, discrimination, exclusion, elitism, power inequities, and narrowness of thinking are today recognized as pervasive problems in American society and in the world that are important issues to consider in every endeavor and situation and should be addressed by everyone. How might these political, social, and moral issues be considered and addressed through art history education? In my view, art educators should address such questions. By illuminating a variety of art historical pathways of investigation, this study attempts to assist art educators in finding ways to develop art history instruction in light of several pressing revisionist stances and social concerns.

#### Need for Further Art History Education Research

A select number of art educators in recent years have committed their research efforts to the topic of art history and educational implications for K-12 settings. Mary Erickson has made numerous significant contributions to the field in this area. Building on her dissertation (Erickson, 1974), which focused upon identifying processes of art historical investigation, Erickson (1983) promotes teaching "art history as a process of inquiry" (p. 5) rather than

as information to be learned. She has continued to research varying aspects of art history education, including further investigations concerning methods of teaching art history (e.g., Addiss & Erickson, 1993; Erickson, 1992, 1994b) and developmental issues regarding children's art historical understandings (e.g., Erickson, 1994a, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c). She is now extending her research to place the conversation about art history education within the context of newer technologies, specifically over the Internet through ArtsEdNet, an electronic online service from the Getty Education Institute for the Arts (Erickson, Rogers, & Short, 1997).

Others who have recently contributed to art history education research include Ann Elizabeth Calvert (1985), Maida S. Johnston Kostakis (1985), Mark Brian Moilanen (1989), and Jennifer Paziienza (1989). Each has conducted doctoral research on an aspect of art history education. Calvert promotes a cultural contextual approach to art history education by explicating both a rationale and model for such, while Kostakis provides descriptive analysis of a biographical approach to art history and focuses on justifying its place in elementary school curricula. Calvert has further researched applications of a cultural contextual approach to art history curricula and continues to promote it to the field of art education (e.g., Calvert, 1988a, 1988b, 1992). Moilanen explains that his dissertation "examines the nature of secondary art teachers' concepts of art history and subsequent implications for art history instruction in secondary schools" (p. 14). Paziienza advocates incorporating art history in school curricula using a constructivist historical inquiry approach. She provides information regarding both the theory and use of this approach at the elementary school

level and has presented her research to practitioners in the anthology *Art Education: Elementary*, edited by Johnson (1992) (Pazienza, 1992).

Jacqueline Chanda (1992, 1993a, 1993b, 1994, 1996) and Virginia L. Fitzpatrick (1992) have also recently focused research efforts on art history education. Chanda focuses her research on developing curriculum theory and resources for the study of non-Western works of art, particularly African art. For example, she advocates a thematic or topical approach to art history education in *African Arts & Cultures* (Chanda, 1993a) and the use of cross-cultural comparisons as a teaching strategy (Chanda, 1994). Fitzpatrick provides a brief overview of selected art historical methods of inquiry and research on art history teaching in her contribution of *Art History: A Contextual Inquiry Course* to the National Art Education Association's *Point of View Series*. Fitzpatrick explains that her monograph "is intended as a practical guide to teaching art history as an inquiry course" (p. v). She promotes teaching that "encourage[s] active participation by students in discovering the contextual history of art" (p. v). Others' art history education research efforts that have been published in the journal *Art Education* from 1980 through 1996 are identified and discussed later as part of my dissertation.

The art history education research endeavors highlighted above and others not mentioned here have made valuable contributions to the field of art education. However, other questions need to be asked and researched to better assist educators with planning art history components of curricula. In particular, further clarification of a variety of approaches to art history and explication of a range of possibilities needs to be further investigated and presented to art educators to assist them in making well-informed curricular decisions. Also, a review of what types of art history have been widely

presented to art educators in their literature in recent years is needed. For additional research and publications needs may be identified by clarifying what perspectives regarding art history – and emphases, omissions, or lack of attention to various approaches to art history – have been disseminated of late to the field. The need for further art history education research represents another impetus for the doctoral research I have undertaken.

### Specific Focus of the Study

#### Purpose of the Study

This dissertation presents a variety of conceptions of art history and varying educational uses of, reactions to, and considerations of these. It should be noted that "conceptions of art history" could indicate alternative definitions of art history; however, that is not the focus of this study. Instead, the central issue of this investigation is the clarification and educational consideration of different types of art history. The specific purposes of this dissertation are as follows: (1) to identify, explicate, and clarify a range of genres of art history for art educators to consider for inclusion in art curricula; (2) to provide art educators with a tool for the critical analysis of art curriculum, teaching practices, and instructional resources regarding art history; (3) to identify, explicate, and clarify recent attention given to a range of genres of art history in art education literature, specifically in the journal *Art Education* and (4) through these processes, to assist art educators in critically analyzing a range of genres of art history and to provide more



precise terminology for deliberations of educational uses of these as varieties of approaches to art history education. I use "genres of art history" to refer to the types of subject-matter focuses of written histories of art. I base this usage on both the general definition of "genre" as "a particular sort, kind, or category; esp., a category of art or literature" (*Funk & Wagnalls Standard Dictionary*, 1983, p. 325) and the artworld definition of "genre" as "a type of painting, judged by its content or subject-matter, e.g. still-life, landscape, portraiture, history painting" (Lucie-Smith, 1984, p.88). There is a precedence for the use of the term "genre" in art history literature as well (e.g. Kleinbauer, 1971/1989).

Literature in the fields of (a) art history and (b) art education is analyzed to correspondingly accomplish the following: (a) to create portraits of art history based on art historians' monologues and dialogues and (b) to review art educators' depictions of art history in art education literature, specifically the journal *Art Education*. These varieties of portrayals of art history are gathered and framed in this study for consideration by art educators, curriculum developers, policy makers, and researchers. The ultimate goal of this study is to increase awarenesses, understandings, and questioning of multifarious types of art history, a range of lenses through which histories of art are created, and alternative possibilities regarding content approaches to art history education. This is meant to assist in the deliberation of the inclusion of varieties of genres of art history in school curricula, to assist educators in making more-informed decisions regarding art history instruction for America's children, and to contribute to art education dialogue and research in this area.

### Specific Research Questions for the Study

This dissertation addresses the following questions:

1. What genres of art history exist in art history literature; how are these varying conceptions of art history similar, dissimilar, and conceptually related; and how may they be articulated in a conceptual framework?
2. What attention and responses to genres of art history identified in art history literature have been published in art education literature, specifically in *Art Education*, the journal of the National Art Education Association, from 1980 to 1996?

### The Inquiry Process

#### Research Methodology

Throughout my graduate studies, I have been concerned with how one clarifies ideas, critically examines alternatives, thinks reflectively, develops well-founded recommendations, and raises questions in the process of examining different people's ideas. I have found that analyzing, categorizing, thinking critically, reflecting, reasoning, justifying, and questioning are all essential to this study and are recognized functions of philosophical research (Fitzgibbons, 1981; Lankford, 1992; May, 1992; Pratte, 1992; Scriven, 1988; Soltis, 1978). Thus, philosophical inquiry was the methodology of choice for addressing the specific research questions identified above.

Should one wonder how philosophical research is useful to the field of art education, Lankford (1992) clarifies the relevance of and need for philosophical inquiry for all aspects of art education – research, theory, and

practice. It was in 1992 that an entire issue of *Studies in Art Education*, the research journal of the National Art Education Association, was devoted to the theme *The Philosophical Future of Research, Theory, and Practice in Art Education*, and Lankford served as Guest Editor of that issue. He succinctly explains both a major drawback and the significance of engaging in philosophical inquiry when he writes "Although philosophy can be an esoteric business, it can also shape what and how we understand the world, and the ways we choose to live" (p. 196) . . . and, I would add, the ways we choose to teach.

Lankford (1992) presents "five aims of philosophy of art education" that articulate a rationale for conducting philosophical research and identify varying topics that philosophical inquiry may address: (1) "to justify our reason for being [or, I would insert, teaching as we do]," (2) "to clarify ideas," (3) "to synthesize ideas," (4) "to recommend," and (5) "to raise questions" (pp. 197-199). This study addresses these aims in varying degrees. The focus of my dissertation presents my research designed to clarify ideas regarding art history and synthesizes those ideas in a meaningful way for art educators.

The field of educational philosophy also offers guidance for taking a philosophical approach to the research topic. Peters and White (1973) describe this hybrid discipline as follows:

Philosophy of education, like any other branch of philosophy, is concerned with problems about the meaning and interrelationships of concepts and with the justification of assumptions -- relevant, in this case, to the area of human endeavor, which we call "education" (p. 93).

As Peters and White point out, there are both clarificatory and justificatory strands of philosophical inquiry related to education; it is the clarificatory strand that is the focus of in this study. Drawing from the tradition of analytic

philosophy of education, which focuses on clarificatory objectives of philosophical research, I utilize conceptual analysis (Pratte, 1992; Scriven, 1988; Soltis, 1978; Wilson, 1976) to clarify possibilities residing under the heading of art history. However, in response to criticisms raised against analytic philosophy (e.g., Cherryholmes, 1988; Derrida, 1981, 1982; Foucault, 1972, 1977, 1980; Nozick, 1981; Putnam, 1985; Rorty, 1979, 1989), I do not presume to present either unbiased, value-neutral description or universal, unchanging "truths" applicable for widespread application. Assuming postpositivism (Lather, 1991), what I present is, instead, my offering of another interpretation and presentation of materials and an invitation for others to reexamine their ideas about this subject area.

May (1992) demonstrates the contributions that philosophical inquiry offers art education by very creatively presenting four different views of philosophy in a polyvocal text and inviting art educators to join in the conversation. What I believe is most significant and valuable in May's article is her incitement of the reader to fully engage in thinking critically about ideas presented by others, her provocation of the reader to contemplate his or her own perspectives on a multitude of issues and questions, and May's encouragement of the reader to question, question, question. The four approaches to philosophical inquiry that May presents are diverse. However, inherent in each approach is the overriding similarity of questioning and thinking deeply about issues, possible answers, and other questions -- and activating such behavior in others. It is in this spirit of philosophical inquiry that I have approached this study. Geahigan (1992) further substantiates the relevance and importance of philosophical inquiry for art education and the need for the analysis of art education concepts as is the focus of this study.

## Design of the Study

In this study, published literature in the fields of art history and art education is targeted for examination and critical analysis. The purposes are to identify, explicate, and consider various conceptions of, or more precisely types of, art history that exist in these fields and are available for educational use. The study is philosophical in nature as indicated above; the specific philosophical research methods utilized are identified later within this introductory chapter.

The study is conceived as a series of art historical journeys, one in which the terrain in two fields of study is investigated to develop a topography of each region explored that indicates similarities and differences among the multifarious forms of art history sighted in each. The two journeys are interconnected and together comprise a sequential expedition investigating the topic of art history education. The expedition culminates in reflective travel -- looking back over the ground covered and looking ahead, making recommendations for future art historical adventures. A more detailed itinerary for this expedition is presented below.

In the first art historical journey, covered in Chapters 2 and 3, publications in the field of art history, particularly art history methodology, theory, and historiography are surveyed to identify a range of types of subject matter focused upon by art historians and to explicate ways in which published histories of art vary categorically by subject matter. Similarities and differences in approach are clarified through the presentation of concrete examples of specific published histories of art. A typology of art history is developed and offered for consideration.

Art education literature is explored in the second art historical journey, taken in Chapter 4, to investigate the appearances of these varieties of art history within the field of art education. Here, the focus is upon identifying which genres of art history, and views regarding them, the national professional organization for visual arts educators (the National Art Education Association) has promoted and disseminated to its membership -- specifically as published in *Art Education*, the journal of the National Art Education Association, from 1980 to 1996.

The final phase of the dissertation expedition, Chapter 5, profiles findings from the study for the field of art education. Recommendations are also included which provide suggestions for art educators and identify further needed research.

### Limitations of the Study

That this study is based on philosophical research immediately places certain parameters on the study: it does not report experimental research findings, survey results, historical perspectives, ethnographic descriptions, or case study analyses. Further restrictions within the bounds of philosophical research, however, were needed and placed upon this study. For example, in seeking to place necessary limitations on the study, I decided to concentrate on analytic questions regarding the *matter* of education but not questions regarding the *manner* of education, with the former referring to "what is or could be taught" and the latter referring to "the way in which some matter is or could be taught" (Fitzgibbons, 1981, p. 14). I chose to focus on investigating categories of the *what* of teaching art history, not the how of teaching such.

Specifically, I have limited the study to an investigation of possible content focuses for art history education by focusing my research on identifying and explicating a range of types of art history and art educators' consideration of these as published in *Art Education*. I took this approach because as Fitzgibbons (1981) says "it is important to understand that decisions concerning matter [of education] are logically prior to decisions concerning manner" (p. 195). This dissertation, while certainly not negating the importance of addressing what the manner of teaching art history could and should be, seeks instead to answer a prior question, "What are possibilities regarding the matter of art history education?"

In "The Work of Art and The Object of Appreciation," Kenneth Marantz (1966) identified several issues relevant to this study and its limitations. He pointed out the need for investigations and considerations of rationales for art history education and the basis upon which they are made, a philosophical endeavor, when he provided contrasting views regarding whether or not art history helps to develop an appreciation of art. He has called to our attention that if art history is included in school curricula on the basis that it will help to facilitate art appreciation, that not all hold this assumption to be true. What are the justifications for including art history in school curricula? Upon what bases may decisions for introducing various types of art history to children and taking them on art history learning trips be made? As worthwhile as analyzing rationales and addressing these questions would seem to be toward improving art history education theory and practice, this needed research is beyond the parameters of this study. This is another limitation of this dissertation: I do not debate rationales for or against art history education or bases for the adoption of one approach to art history

education over another. However, I do report various art educators' stances, to some degree, within my analysis of the journal *Art Education*, and overall, my dissertation provides a substantial amount of information and insights that are very relevant for art educators seeking to weigh alternatives. Also, I believe that my doctoral research may be useful for other, future studies that do focus on investigating rationales for art history education.

Marantz also pointed out that "in a real sense our understanding of art history is limited to the available photographed monuments" (p. 16). This is a definite limitation for art history education, and one that teachers must indeed deal with -- but one that this study does not address. This issue is more closely related to instructional delivery and manner of teaching art history rather than the matter of art history education, as is the focus of this dissertation. Marantz (1966) additionally presented categories for art appreciation "which may be educationally useful" (p. 9). He identified three analytic categories (identification, description, and context) that "constitute methods of finding out what qualities went into a work of art and what were some of the events which affected its creation" (p. 7), and three synthetic categories (association, critical, and friendship) that "are an attempt to point out ways in which the observer may become critically and emotionally aware of the values in a work -- [and] may come to comprehend it more fully" (p. 7). In so doing, he raised the question of such categories for art history. This is the focus of my dissertation. But this brings up another limitation: the study does not attempt to define how art history and art appreciation -- or aesthetics and art criticism -- overlap. This is another limitation placed upon the study to make it more feasible. Art history's overlapping in these and other fields of study is recognized in the study; however, I have focused on identifying



regions of art historical scholarship, rather than drawing boundary lines between this field of inquiry and others.

The study is further confined in that, although the primary aim is to present a range of conceptions of art history for educational consideration, certain restrictions were placed on where the conceptions were drawn from for analysis in the study. For example, the conceptions of art history reported on were not sought from art teachers. Instead of researching views held by school-based practitioners, conceptions of art history were collected via extensive reviews of published literature in the fields of art history and art education. The ideas presented generally represent views of art history held by higher education faculty and others who have added to the body of theoretical readings or resources made available to such practitioners.

The reviews of literature had to have bounds placed on them, as well, to make the study feasible. As indicated in the bibliography, the review of art history literature presents an examination of numerous books regarding art history methodology, theory, and historiography, as well as a multitude of published histories of art exhausting a particular theme to exemplify the variety of conceptions of art history discussed. As comprehensive as I attempted to make it, however, I certainly do not claim that this study represents all of the varieties of conceptions of art history existing in the field of art history's literature. One particular limitation in this regard is that I have circumscribed my examination of art history literature to Western scholarship in the field of art history and have primarily examined writings published in the United States. Some of these publications include attention to Non-Western art, although not as many as is desirable in my view. My intent was to identify and examine a diversity of views currently circulating

in the U.S., not to provide a definitive metanarrative of all views and sub-permutations of art history views in print in this field.

The examination of art education literature for an analysis of conceptions of art history identifiable in the field of art education was circumscribed tightly to an inspection of *Art Education*, the journal of the National Art Education Association, specifically issues published from 1980 through 1996. This restriction in the scope of art education literature examined diverts the study from an attempt or pretense of examining the world of art education literature and what is circulating 'round that globe and, instead, converges the study to an identification of what views of art history the national professional organization for visual arts educators has disseminated to its entire membership through its official journal during a specific sixteen-year period.

### Methods of Investigation

In the previous discussion of research methodology, I presented a description of the type of methodology selected for this study. In this section I present the specific methods of investigation that I use for clarifying conceptions of art history.

A careful analysis of concepts regarding art history is essential for making decisions regarding art history education. The focus of this philosophical study is upon the identification and analysis of multifarious forms of art history to facilitate improved awareness and understanding of such for educational consideration. As Lankford (1989) asserts: "commitment to clarity and meaning" are of utmost importance to

philosophical inquiry. I agree with Lankford and concur with the assertion made by Pratte (1992):

the activity of clarification must be seen as inherently "radical" and even "passionate." It is radical insofar as it does not "answer questions" but "questions answers," but not in a personally threatening way. . . . It is passionate insofar as it is a compulsion to know, understand, witness, or have the perspective of another. (p.31)

I use the following four methods of analysis in pursuit of the clarification of a range of conceptions of art history:

- describing and making distinctions (Floden & Buchmann, 1990; Pratte, 1992; Scriven, 1988; Soltis, 1978)
- categorizing information (Pratte, 1992; Soltis, 1978)
- providing examples and counterexamples (Scriven, 1988; Soltis, 1978; Wilson, 1963)
- employing metaphors and making analogies (Pratte, 1992; Scriven, 1988)

These methods are derived from analytic philosophy and are among the inquiry methods used by educational philosophers today. Below, I explain how I use these various methods in the study.

Describing and making distinctions. Simply describing various aspects of concepts and statements and making distinctions among them is a basic analytic method (Pratte, 1992; Scriven, 1988; Soltis, 1978). I use this approach to identify a variety of genres of art history and to clarify similarities and differences among them. The following are two questions I address in making distinctions among the range of conceptions of art history I present:

- What are varying focuses of attention or emphases of an assortment of approaches to art history?

- . What beliefs, biases, opinions, and values are either subtly or overtly asserted by assorted presentations of art history?

The first question is the primary focus of my dissertation research, however, I broadly note how differing answers to both these questions shape and color conceptions of art history and indeed make distinctions among them.

Categorizing information. Intuitively categorizing ideas and information is helpful to the analysis of materials. Both Pratte (1992) and Soltis (1978) recommend such as a clarificatory procedure for educational philosophizing. For by classifying materials and organizing it into categories, a better understanding of the similarities and differences of those materials is likely to result.

Soltis (1978) offers the "differentiation-type analytic strategy" as a procedure for explicating the variety of forms taken by a concept. He asserts, "A differentiation-type analysis aims at identifying and separating basic senses or meanings of something and thereby illuminates more fully the topography of some conceptual domain" (p. 97). I use Soltis's differentiation-type strategy to analyze "art history" and to develop a typology for art history based on reviewing literature in the field of art history. I also use categorizing information as a method to identify and analyze genres of art history existing in art education literature, specifically the journal *Art Education*.

Providing examples and counterexamples. Scriven (1988), Soltis (1978), and Wilson (1963) recommend the method of providing examples and counterexamples (or contrasts) when seeking to clarify abstract ideas. I extensively utilize this method in the study. I believe it provides a useful and appropriate means of communicating the information I uncover regarding

varying genres of art history. I define a variety of genres or types of art history by providing specific concrete examples of histories of art. The quotations that I include from these histories of art make these examples all the more "concrete." I believe presenting and discussing these examples of types of art history is a most effective way of clearly defining a selection of types of art history. By providing a range of alternative views of art history, in essence, I also provide counterexamples to further clarify concepts and ideas.

Employing metaphors and making analogies. Employing metaphors and making analogies is another useful method for philosophically analyzing material and communicating ideas (Pratte, 1992; Scriven, 1988). Scriven (1988) suggests that when searching for "methodologies for doing conceptual analysis, we find that the general use of analogies and of evocative language, rather than proofs, axiomatization, and quantification, is our main concern" (p. 145). He claims that "much of educational research is dominated by analogies and metaphors, relatively simple conceptions or pictures that drive the direction of thought and experimentation" (p. 146). Pratte (1992) reiterates the benefit of employing metaphors and making analogies as an analytic method by asserting that "the metaphor . . . can be useful, heuristically illuminating, if it is seen for what it is, a [clarificatory] 'tool' " (p. 19). In a recent edition of *Studies in Art Education*, Johnson (1992) discusses the power that metaphors wield in the fight for clarity in the communication and comprehension of ideas. She writes:

Recent inquiries into the nature of metaphor suggest it is a central feature of thought and that we should not regard it as merely a poetic device (Brown, 1977; Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; MacCormac, 1985). Metaphors structure human thinking in every form of knowledge (Brown, 1977; Schon, 1979). They are indispensable forms of understanding by which we figuratively

comprehend our experiences in the world (Johnson, 1987). The metaphors that inform our thought and structure our knowledge range from those which might be regarded as functioning on a surface level in language to those which seem to work on a more deeply embedded cognitive level. (p. 144)

Throughout this study, I use metaphors and analogies as a philosophical inquiry method for clarifying ideas.

To summarize, I utilize four philosophical methods of investigation -- describing and making distinctions; categorizing information; providing examples and counterexamples; and employing metaphors and making analogies -- for clarifying a range of genres of art history incorporated in two fields of literature, art history and art education.

### Significance of the Study

The significance of this study resides in its potential to increase educators' awarenesses, understandings, and considerations of multifarious genres of art history and of issues related to and possibilities regarding art history education; to encourage more questioning and dialogue on these issues; and to assist in strengthening theory, research, and practice regarding art history education. The aim of this study is to stimulate and assist others -- teachers, teacher educators, curriculum theorists, educational policy makers, and educational researchers -- with engaging in philosophical inquiry regarding art history and art history education.

I believe that the importance of philosophical research for the field of art education is its capability both to provoke art educators and others to engage in philosophical inquiry regarding the educational decisions they

make in their own particular circumstances and to assist them with this process – and in so doing, to instigate more thoughtful considerations and reconsiderations of educational issues that then result in actually impacting and improving art education practice.

## CHAPTER 2

### GUIDEBOOKS FOR ART HISTORY: AN INVESTIGATION OF HANDBOOKS FOR TRAVELERS IN THE DOMAIN OF ART HISTORY

The real voyage of discovery consists not in seeing  
new landscapes, but in having new eyes.

– Marcel Proust (1871-1922)  
French Writer

As art created today instantaneously becomes "art of the past" and can be viewed "historically," and as there continues to be an endless proliferation of art making, the potential subject matter for art historical investigations is practically infinite. This expanding supply of artifacts challenges contemporary art historians to work diligently to provide analyses regarding recently created art and the accompanying questions and issues it raises. Simultaneously art historical scholarship must deal with the task of reviewing and re-reviewing art's many histories and the plethora of existing written histories of art which provide divergent points.

As histories of art are written situated in art historians' current intellectual and social milieus, they are circumscribed by art historians' particular world views and are perhaps more often telling of those worlds



than of the art examined. Histories of art, therefore, continue to be rewritten over time, either corroborating what has been previously written, adding more information to existing art historical accounts, or revising them in light of other perspectives previously not favored or even incomprehensible in prior times. Certainly, the world of art is an immense, complex, amorphous sphere, and as art historians continue to report on this world, they continue to discover by looking anew.

### Defining "Guidebooks for Art History"

Literature in the domain of art history may be placed into three very broad topical categories: (a) histories of art that are written about some aspect of art's many histories; (b) theoretical writings espousing or analyzing a particular view, approach, or methodology toward writing histories of art; and (c) what I term "guidebooks for art history," meaning those writings that attempt to provide an overview perspective on (a) and/or (b). In this chapter, I present and discuss literature from the third of these topical categories. The focus of this chapter is on presenting an overview of several guidebooks for art history, paying particular attention to how each approaches the task of mapping art history's vast terrains. In the next chapter I refer to and analyze all three of the above topical categories of art history literature in the process of offering my own guidebook for art history, which both overlaps and diverges from the views and approaches of those in the reviewed guidebooks.

## An Overview of Selected Guidebooks for Art History

In responding to the profusion of written discourse about art's many histories, occasionally, an art historian has attempted to provide an explanatory text describing or reviewing multiple approaches, views, theories, methodologies, etc. of the field of art history. As I have indicated, I consider these to be guidebooks for the discipline of art history and its often complex discourse. In the pages that follow, I review a selection of these. I first present two such books published in the 1970s that provide an overview of traditional methods still utilized in art historical scholarship. Then I skip to the late 1980s and the early to mid 1990s to describe four guidebooks that chart more recent movements in the field.

In offering a "lay of the land," authors of some of these guidebooks attempt to provide a neutral reporting and to this end submerge their own views and opinions, not openly advocating one art historical approach over another. Others, however, openly acknowledge their subjectivity or own bias, and some even explain how it has affected their writing. Whether disclosed or not, certainly, all guidebooks are written subjectively: by making decisions to select or omit certain views and art for review; through the selection of language used to describe various positions; and, at times, by forthrightly lobbying for the adoption of certain views over others. The point here is that each art historian providing a guidebook for art history is anchored to a particular world view and is responding to multiple factors at work in the field of art history, scholarship, and society at large at the time of the writing of the publication. Sometimes these factors are more discernible than at other times. I attempt to note such factors as well as the more general approach and

scope of these publications. Unless noted otherwise, the monographs examined present and discuss art history within the framework of exclusively Western art historical scholarship and exclusively focus on Western art. Confining this investigation to Western art historical scholarship is one of the limitations I have placed on this study for reasons identified in Chapter 1. The second limitation is one that Western scholarship predominantly places on itself but one that has recently been recognized in the field of art history as a narrowness that should be rectified. I support a more inclusive study of the world's art, yet here my aim is to report on what is included – rather than what could or should be included – in Western art historical scholarship.

#### Guidebooks for Traditional Approaches to Art History

*Modern Perspectives in Western Art History: An Anthology of 20th-century Writings on the Visual Arts* was published in 1971. It was written by W. Eugene Kleinbauer clearly for the purpose of providing a guidebook for art history, explicitly stated by the author as "to introduce students of the humanities to the variety of methods that scholars, mainly of this century, have adopted and developed for conveying what may be called their 'perspectives' on the unfolding of the visual arts in the Western world" (p. vii). In the introduction to his book, the author first attempts to distinguish art history from antiquarianism, aesthetics, art theory, and art criticism and explores how varying conceptions of history affect art historical investigation.

In the remaining two-thirds of his 105-page introduction, Kleinbauer (1971/1989) then presents an assortment of approaches to art history, labeling them collectively as "genres of modern scholarship" (p. 37). Kleinbauer

classifies each approach or genre of art history as having either an *intrinsic* or *extrinsic* perspective -- that is, respectively, focusing on aspects *of* works of art themselves, or conversely, factors *outside* works of art. The author identifies the following as alternative emphases of approaches taking an intrinsic perspective: materials and techniques, connoisseurship (which focuses on authorship and authenticity of artworks), formal qualities, and iconography (subject matter or meaning). He presents the following as the various concerns of those approaches taking an extrinsic perspective: artist biography, psychoanalysis of artists, psychology of perception, a range of social factors, cultural history, and the history of ideas.

Kleinbauer's presentation of these varying perspectives is encyclopedic: his overview is densely packed with references to numerous names of art historians, their ideas, and their publications dating from the late 1800s through the late 1960s. It is a consolidated historiography of the field of art history covering this time period in Western scholarship. In the succeeding chapters, Kleinbauer presents an anthology of 17 writings by art historians, writings that he believes represent the major intrinsic and extrinsic modes of 20th-century Western art historical scholarship. Each writing is preceded by a concise introductory essay presenting a brief biography of the author/art historian, identification of other noteworthy papers or books he (all 17 essays selected were written by men) has written, and a synopsis of major ideas and contributions the author has made to the field of art history.

Kleinbauer's selection of writings that focus on varying aspects of Western fine arts were originally published in America and Europe in the 1930s, 1940s, 1950s, and, primarily, the 1960s. Kleinbauer's *Modern Perspectives in Western Art History: An Anthology of 20th-century Writings*

*on the Visual Arts*, more correctly stated then, represents a range of *mid-twentieth century*, established – and now recognized as *traditional* – approaches to the discipline of art history in Western scholarship. However, Kleinbauer aptly titled the main heading for his book, for at the time of its publication, "*modern perspectives in Western art history*" denoted that the book addressed the current or recent views circulating in the field of art history. Now, over 25 years later, that same title is still indicative of the contents of the book; however, the term *modern* now identifies the views espoused as *passee*, belonging to the historical time period preceding the postmodern era.

In 1976, Mark Roskill's monograph *What is Art History?* was published, also offering an introduction to the discipline of art history. It was aimed at clarifying what an art historian does and further, it seems, at generating more respect for the art historian's work. For Roskill states his aim of this book is "to show, in terms which can be understood without any background knowledge, that art history is a science, with definite principles and techniques, rather than a matter of intuition or guesswork" (p.9). By linking art history to science rather than the humanities and in the tone of this writing, he implies a positivist stance toward art history scholarship which has since been refuted (Moxey, 1994; Reese & Borzello, 1986). Toward his stated aim, Roskill does not present a history or comprehensive overview of the discipline of art history, as does Kleinbauer; instead he provides an engaging account of a variety of case studies of problems that art historians have tackled in the early- to mid-20th century.

Roskill's selection of examples is narrowed to those regarding virtually only paintings and exclusively artworks created by European artists from the

14th through the 17th century, particularly the Italian Renaissance, plus one chapter devoted to a 20th-century Spanish artist. The author states that his particular familiarity and interest in the Renaissance provides the basis for this selection of artists and artworks, and he explains the basis for his decision to focus exclusively on paintings as follows: "I have chosen to use paintings throughout because, amongst works of art in general, these tend to have the most immediate appeal, and also because painting represents (in proportionate terms) the dominant area of art history" (p. 7). In more recent years, the emphasis on fine art "masterpieces" has been challenged by some art historians as too limited (e.g. Bryson, Holly, & Moxey, 1994; Freedberg, 1989).

In comparison to Kleinbauer's (1971) chronicle of art historical scholarship explicating numerous varieties of approaches taken to art history, Roskill presents limited references to the methodological history of art history. He restricts his account of what art historians do to an examination of a range of questions art historians have addressed within only three of the assortment of approaches to art history existing in his day. Specifically, six of the nine chapters of *What is Art History?* focus on connoisseurship (which focuses on authorship and authenticity of artworks), two chapters describe problems within the realm of iconography (subject matter or meaning), and one chapter addresses the historical display of works of art. In Roskill's book, the art historian is characterized as an art detective who searches for clues to accurately identify either (a) the artist who created particular works of art or components of collaboratively-created artworks, (b) the meaning of specific works of art, or (c) how particular artworks were displayed and viewed at the time of their creation. The reader is given purview as to how several such

cases have been "solved," including the "thriller" of how a prolific forger of Dutch 17th-century paintings was detected and his works exposed as frauds in the mid-20th century.

Because of the content and emphasis of this guidebook for art history, *What is Art History?*, could appropriately be retitled as *What Do Art Historians Do?* or even more accurately, *What Do Art Historians Concerned with Connoisseurship and Iconography of Renaissance through Modern Paintings Do?* Certainly, Roskill answers the latter question most completely and engagingly. A little over a decade later, in his introduction to the second edition of this book, the author himself utilizes the benefits of hindsight and knowledge of more recent developments in the discipline of art history to identify what would be a more fitting title for his book: *Art History as a Discipline: Some Classic Cases* (Roskill, 1976/1989). If it were indeed renamed as such, the title would more clearly identify the content of this book and place it in an historical perspective of the time in which it was produced.

Both Kleinbauer's *Modern Perspectives in Western Art History* (1971) and Roskill's *What is Art History?* (1976) exemplify guidebooks for art history that provide accounts of traditional genres of art history. At the time in which they were written, each provided a likely accurate survey of prominent scholarly landmarks within the art historical landscape as observable from their time-specific vantage points. These publications now serve as monuments commemorating art historical roads well traveled -- and still taken today. However, new routes of exploration covering the same ground have since opened up and, additionally, new vistas have since begun to be explored and mapped. Alternative study trips have been organized that re-examine old answers, demand new ways of thinking, and ask new questions.

### Guidebooks for Art History that Chart Beyond Traditional Approaches

The 1970s and 1980s brought dramatic challenges and radical shifts in thinking about the positions articulated by Kleinbauer (1971) and Roskill (1976) to the discipline of art history. In contrast to Kleinbauer's and Roskill's depictions of a serene pastoral scene for the field of art history, reports on the impact of revisionist art history illustrated art history as a chaotic scene. Variations of established methodological approaches to art history and new varieties of approaches, along with critical analyses of traditional practices and questioning of the status quo, were agitating what was a rather tranquil discipline. And a cloud of confusion arose over the art historical landscape in reaction to the profusion of new ideas bombarding the intellectual airways and the resulting skirmishes. In the late 1980s and throughout the 1990s, utilizing perspective gained from the passage of a bit of time, guidebooks for art history were and are being published that attempt to clarify some of the new ideas propounded and questions asked within the field of art history. The following is a review of four such books that illustrate aerial views of the expanding and metamorphosing domain of art history as seen from assorted vantage points in the late 1980s through the mid 1990s.

*Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science*, written by Donald Preziosi and published in 1989, is indicative of the challenges that have arisen to traditional approaches to the study of art history. It is a guidebook of a different sort than those discussed previously, because instead of focusing upon uncovering and verifying the structures and procedures of past and present discourse, the author aims at exposing the conflicts within



and among such. Rather than attempting to clarify the discipline of art history, Preziosi seeks to point out its complexity and disarray. He writes:

Surveying the development of any modern academic discipline is not unlike trying to read a heavily palimpsested manuscript full of emendations, erasures, and marginalia, with innumerable graffiti added by different hands over time. Rereading the history of art history is, in particular, not an easy task. Its development is not simple, unilinear, progressive, or cumulative. The ramifications of its practices are often startlingly contradictory. Despite the accumulation of confident manifestoes, pronouncements, methodological protocols, and intricate supportive technologies, art history seems to go off in different directions at the same time or tends to dissolve and to blur as one tries to fix it in clear and steady focus. (p. xi)

Here, Preziosi presents an analogy for art history which he then utilizes as a basis for a metaphorical conception of his book and others' books that analyze the discipline of art history and/or seek to present a history of it. Specifically, his characterization of art history as a "heavily palimpsested manuscript" leads into his description of his book as "several probes into the archaeology of art history" (p.xiii). By viewing art history as a *multilayered* textual surface and theoretical discussions of it as archaeological excavation, Preziosi points out the complexity of "mapping the art historical landscape," a focus of this dissertation. The metaphors he selects indicate the complexity of that task as surface configurations are but one element for topographical reports -- with much else to be learned from probing the depths of strata that contribute to the formations of various theoretical stances within this domain.

In contrast to Kleinbauer and Roskill who present and discuss a variety of art historical writings as a means of explicating and analyzing particular methodological approaches to art history, Preziosi, in the six chapters of his book, identifies and explores how various factors have impacted an assortment of approaches taken to art history. Specifically, Preziosi addresses

how such topics as the following have variously influenced, impacted, and molded the study of art history and continue to do so:

- the language of the discipline of art history, particularly metaphors for conceptualizing both it and various factors it addresses;
- the subjectivity of art history – the invested, value-laden nature of its discourse – and acts of power exerted within, by, and upon art history;
- (a) technological instruments that project visuals for art historical presentations and consumption and (b) the organization of libraries, archives, other art history repositories and reference access centers, and art history college survey textbooks;
- "the historical role of various theories of meaning and signification in determining the matrix of disciplinary strategies constituting modern art history" (Preziosi, 1989, p.xiv); and
- various notions of the origins of art, particularly art historical considerations of Paleolithic art, and how the discipline of art history, for the most part, has not dealt with such topics and the problematic inconsistencies that exist in what discourse has occurred. (To me, this suggests an examination of various art theories that undergird and guide art historical scholarship.)

I believe the issues and questions Preziosi raises are worthy of consideration and indeed need to be addressed both to generate better understandings of the domain of art history and to make wise educational decisions regarding its inclusion in school curricula. It is particularly timely to consider Preziosi's view of visual apparatuses and data storage/retrieval houses as not unobtrusive handmaidens to art historians but rather as authoritarian instructors that demand attention be given to art history in certain, prescribed ways. For with computer and internet technologies providing new access to visual representations of art and art historical information in ways incomprehensible just a few years ago and continuing to configure new possibilities, a critical eye must be cast on both the *content* of

overt and hidden messages being transmitted and the *manner* of these presentations of art and art history. Such will profoundly affect future generations' views of art history, art, and the world as depicted through lenses of art and art history.

In summary, *Rethinking Art History* is not a guidebook that provides highlights of what to see on journeys through the art history landscape, but rather it is a guide for what types of questions one might ask when touring such. It is a handbook of questions to ask both when examining various art historical methodological monuments and of those who purport to be guides for such. In my view, what is most valuable about Preziosi's book, is his incitement of the reader to reconsider how art historical information and ideas have been and continue to be presented, the underlying assumptions and biases of such discourse, and his prodding of the reader to undertake "archaeological excavations" of art history that deeply probe its complex, contradictory, "palimpsested" form.

Preziosi contends that art history's "future survival as a discipline will be read in its ability to understand its own complex and contradictory history" (p.52). The following is a review of three monographs published between 1991 and 1996 that undertake this challenging feat. They are among a new generation of guidebooks for art history that chart freshly staked out art historical territories and provide an account of how recent art historical studies alternatively resettle art historical lands already occupied by traditional views; conjoin previously demarcated regions; and "boldly go where no art historian has gone before."

*Visual Theory: Painting and Interpretation*, edited by Norman Bryson, Michael Ann Holly, and Keith Moxey (1991) is amongst the recent generation

of books that challenge traditional approaches to the study of art history by presenting a variety of alternative perspectives, approaches, and issues. The format of this book makes the reader privy to contemporary, prominent art historians' conversations regarding a variety of divergent viewpoints addressing theory and method of art history, specifically regarding the interpretation of art, primarily paintings. The book is an anthology of seven essays which were first presented as lectures by scholars who participated in a 1987 Institute on "Theory and Interpretation in the Visual Arts" funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities. These essays present a spectrum of opinions regarding the act of interpreting art; however, the topic is further explored by the inclusion of one or two formal critiques of each essay, responses written by other scholars. The topics of the essays presented and responded to in this volume are as follows:

- the representation and interpretation of women as depicted in paintings and the inequitable power relationship between men and women which is both reflected in and perpetuated by such imagery (Nochlin, 1991);
- a semiotic approach to the study of art in which art is viewed as "sign" or "discourse" and as a social transmission which *interacts with* economic and political factors and powers (Bryson, 1991);
- interpretations of Saussure's structural linguistics for theoretical discourse regarding art (Krauss, 1991);
- how the psychology of perception is intertwined with the act of the creation of art and an exploration of the role of the spectator of art, a role which the artist plays in the creation of art as well as a role the viewer of art who is not the artist plays (Wollheim, 1991);
- the act of the perception of art as a simultaneous recognition of both subject and the material procedure of creation (Podro, 1991);
- the interaction of perception and thought or knowledge in the recognition of art (Danto, 1991); and

- . universal human attributes that are active in the perception of art and the limitations of mimetic and linguistic theories of art, particularly for accounting for conceptual art (Summers, 1991).

The inclusion of this range of interpretive strategies and considerations, and also reactions to the ideas presented, strengthens understanding and consideration of possible approaches to the interpretation of art. Such discussions permit one to place one's own views in the context of a present-day continuum of thoughts on the subject of the interpretation of art. This volume helps us understand that views on this continuum range from perspectives that consider artistic representation and interpretation to be historically determined and, therefore, to be subject to change over time -- to those views that assert artistic representation and interpretation is based on perceptual acuities and/or phenomenological factors that are trans-historical. By presenting conflicting, overlapping, and divergent views regarding the interpretation of art, this volume assists readers in becoming more fully aware of a multiplicity of perspectives regarding the study of art; in gaining better understandings of the ideas and rationales behind divergent views; and in developing more informed personal viewpoints on methodological approaches to art history. The following two publications also lay out a range of methodological strategies for approaching art history, with both a variety of traditional and a number of contemporary genres of art history spotlighted for consideration.

In *Art History's History*, Vernon Hyde Minor (1994) sets up an ambitious task for his guidebook for art history: "to attempt to describe in this book what art history is, where it came from, what ideas, institutions and practices form its background, how it achieved its present shape, and what critical methods it uses" (p.4). It was written as a primer for those just

beginning to explore the domain of art history. This contrasts with *Visual Theory: Painting and Interpretation* (Bryson, Holly, & Moxey, 1991) and *Rethinking Art History: Meditations on a Coy Science* (Preziosi, 1989) which I presented earlier as guidebooks for art history, for they were aimed at an audience of scholars already acquainted with and indeed immersed in art historical scholarship. So Minor's monograph, while it further expands on the professional dialogue in the field of art history and related disciplines, it aims at providing an introduction to such and bringing a new generation of scholars into art historical discussions.

*Art History's History* is divided into three parts. In the first, Minor presents a history of pre-academic art institutions, art academies, and the discipline of art history within the university setting -- discussing how artistic training and the study of art has changed over time and questioning how such has impacted conceptions and the creation of art and notions of art history. In the second part, the author presents an overview of a variety of Western theories of art from antiquity through the 18th century. He emphasizes that such theories impact the current scholarship and teaching of art history.

In "Part Three: The Emergence of Method and Modernism in Art History," Minor continues his history of thought regarding art and art history by introducing those he believes are the key figures and ideas in this realm from the 19th and 20th centuries. He first presents brief chapters on Winckelmann, Kant, Hegel, Riegl, and Wolfflin and discusses their ideas as influential to the development of the field of art history. Minor then proceeds to present seven approaches to art history, devoting a short but informative chapter to each: (1) connoisseurship, style, and formalism; (2)

sociological and Marxist perspectives; (3) feminism; (4) deconstruction; (5) semiotics; (6) psychoanalysis; and (7) culture. This section of Minor's book functions as a pocket map indicating some of the art historical fields currently being tilled. In the last chapter, Minor acknowledges a limitation of his book: that its focus, "which is Western, is too narrow and exclusive" (p. 204). He points out how the discipline of art history is now more aware of this restriction, writing: "Global perspectives are replacing the more parochial outlook of Western art history. The accepted structure of Western art, as it derives from Greek and Roman origins, is being challenged" (p.204). Minor advocates taking a multicultural perspective toward art history while he simultaneously indicates such an approach is yet to be fully developed and embraced by the field.

Intended as a beginner's guide to art historical scholarship, Minor's text provides a succinct history of prominent ideas in Western art historical scholarship. It concisely describes salient points of these ideas and offers a short bibliography for each topic and varying approach to art history to next lead the reader to other, more specialized and detailed, guidebooks for further explorations of the viewpoints introduced. *Art History's History* provides a narrated tour of highlights of historical factors impacting the field of art history and a collection of diverse views of art history methodology. This handbook is a particularly useful aid for a first trek through the maze of art historical scholarship and brings up many points worth contemplating along the way.

Similarly, *The Methodologies of Art: An Introduction* by Laurie Schneider Adams (1996) attempts to assist the reader in navigating through the proliferation of Western art historical discourse which is often

complicated and difficult to comprehend. Adams functions as a translator and, in facilitating communication, not only conveys summations of what is said by various authorities in the field but clarifies through narrated explanations and discussions of numerous examples how various theories of methodological approaches to art history translate in the practice of applying them to the study of selected works of art.

In the first chapter of her book, Adams presents her explorations of answers to the question "What is art?." In this essay, she discusses the view of art as a combination of imitation and skill as first proffered by Plato, as a natural human impulse to create, as differentiated from nature's forms, and as visual metaphor. She does not seek to resolve the dilemma of identifying *the* definitive definition of art but rather prefaces her explications of various approaches to art history with this stimulus for the reader to question with her various notions of art that impact considerations of art history.

Adams next identifies and explores an assortment of methodologies for studying art, presenting a chapter on each entitled as follows:

- . "Formalism and Style"
- . "Iconography"
- . "Contextual Approaches I: Marxism"
- . "Contextual Approaches II: Feminism"
- . "Biography and Autobiography"
- . "Semiotics I: Structuralism and Post-Structuralism"
- . "Semiotics II: Deconstruction"
- . "Psychoanalysis I: Freud"
- . "Psychoanalysis II: Winnicott and Lacan"
- . "Aesthetics and Psychoanalysis: Roger Fry and Roland Barthes"



She indeed functions as a well-seasoned, skillful tour guide for the discipline of art history, for she leads the reader on a whistle-stop tour that enables the reader to both witness much of the art historical landscape in a short span of time and learn much through her informative commentary. This commentary focuses upon background information regarding the formation of selected methodologies for the study of art and includes pointing out and discussing numerous applications of these methodologies to specific works of art. The author's selection of methodologies is a mixture of traditional and contemporary approaches to art history -- with a particular emphasis on psychoanalytic varieties. Adams previously wrote *Art and Psychoanalysis* and her particular interest in approaches to the study of art that utilize and addressing psychoanalytic theories is evidenced here.

In the preface to *The Methodologies of Art: An Introduction*, Adams concisely states her approach in writing this book: "In this book I survey some of the methodologies used in reading pictures, sculptures, and architecture, with a view to enriching the viewer's response to works of art" (p. xvi). She does indeed present and discuss a multitude of specific works of art; however, her selection of artworks is virtually exclusively limited to Western fine art exemplars in these categories. I believe it is also important to note that even in this most recently published (1996) guidebook for art history, that purports to comprehensively address the study of works of art, the author (in this case female) works within the tradition of male-biased Western art scholarship. Despite years of feminist calls to art history to fully incorporate attention to women artists (as well as to address the stereotypes of imagery of women and other feminist concerns) which the author acknowledges with a chapter in her book, Adams gives minimal attention to

artworks created by women: of the 77 works of art illustrated, only five were created by women – and these were all presented exclusively within the chapter on the feminist contextual approach to art history.

The title for Adams's book, in my view, would more accurately reflect its contents if entitled *Methodologies for Reading Western Fine Art Objects: An Introduction to Interpreting Western Traditional Exemplars of Pictures, Sculptures, and Architecture*. This title also indicates Adams conception of all methodologies of art history as being ultimately intent upon finding out more about art objects. I acknowledge the validity of this view; however, I posit a different view. I believe that many, perhaps most, *but not all* art historians are focused upon works of art. This includes both seeking directly from artworks themselves meanings and/or formal and/or expressive qualities of those artworks – or utilizing the investigation of factors external to works of art to learn more about particular artworks. However, as I see it, many other art historians are focused on those external factors *as their focal point of investigation*, not merely as a means to an end (of a better understanding of particular artworks).

The difference between Adams's point of view and mine is clarified by comparing Adams' view of biographical and autobiographical approaches to art history to mine. While Adams views this genre of art history as a means for "*reading of works* [italics added] in relation to the lives of artists," I consider it to be concerned with learning about the lives of artists. When biographical art history is seen in this view, rather than utilizing knowledge of the artist's life to learn more about a work of art, artworks and much other information outside artworks is studied to learn more about the artist and his or her life. So while Adams and I agree that a variety of factors are studied

both within and outside works of art, we differ on the root question of what is the desired ultimate focus of interest for those investigations that explore factors external to artworks. In my opinion, differences of viewpoints such as this simply enrich art historical discussions. It is not necessary or desirable to attempt to "resolve" this debate by arguing which is *the* "correct" stance. I believe a repertoire of viewpoints should be presented and applauded in academic recitals.

To summarize my response to Adams's book: *The Methodologies of Art: An Introduction* is a very informative guidebook for art history that delivers an expansive educational tour of the art historical landscape, yet like all guidebooks and guided tours, it is restricted by the author's particular viewpoints, interests, and conscious or unconscious bias. In the next chapter, I will add my own voice to the chorus of art history guidebooks. The tour of art history I provide will be limited by a variety of factors, too, but like all of the guidebooks I have reviewed, I believe it is also informative and useful for thoughtfully considering art history and art history education.

### Usefulness of Guidebooks for Art History

Investigating art history literature, particularly the varying theoretical positions within the field, can be an arduous endeavor. Preziosi (1989) offers a description of such in keeping with the overall theme of this dissertation:

Journeying through the actual forest of art historical writing can be an unsettling experience and an unattractive task for any accustomed to viewing historical landscapes from the air or from angles (however anamorphic) that collapse the great complexity of the art historical terrain into an orderly and

pedagogically neat booklet of road maps. . . . And yet, this unsettling, tedious, and disconcerting journey . . . must be undertaken if we are at all concerned with the fate of the discipline in this period of confusing transition and transformation. (p. xi)

And such a journey, I would add, "must be undertaken if we are at all concerned with" strengthening art history education as well. I believe that it is numerous excursions of this type that must be made, however. To articulate why multiple trips must be taken, I refer to part of the quotation placed at the beginning of Chapter 1:

Deep understanding of a complex landscape will not be obtained in a single traversal. . . . The same sights in a landscape (the same cases or concepts in a knowledge domain) should be revisited from different directions, thought about from different perspectives, and so on. (Spiro, Coulson, Feltovich, & Anderson, 1988, p. 6 as cited in Efland, Freedman, & Stuhr, 1996, p. 116)

Guidebooks for art history can be very useful for these travels. Each is potentially informative through its own way of pointing out various places of possible interest for explorations and providing a commentary of sights from varying viewpoints. Guidebooks for art history can also assist in translating art historical discourse, which may seem to some every bit a foreign language, or simply assist in interpreting nuances of regional dialects spoken in particular locales of the art history domain. For those taking inaugural excursions, a guidebook can serve as an invaluable aid in leading the way for informative and thought-provoking travel. Gaining one's footing with experienced guides can build the confidence needed to instigate other adventures on one's own, develop needed investigatory skills to do so, and stir further curiosity to prompt the undertaking of such.

For those more seasoned wayfarers, a guidebook for art history can disclose other less-traveled pathways to new understandings, alternate routes of investigation, and spots of scholarship sometimes missed. And for art history travelers of all experience levels, guidebooks for art history can serve as companions offering other outlooks on the monuments or scenery toured and other perspectives of the journey, with some guidebooks admittedly more comprehensible, enlightening, and useful than others. Further, such travel companions, even more significantly, can stimulate new questions to ask, contemplate, and investigate. Also, most guidebooks identify suggestions for other destinations for prospective visits and other resources for making future travel plans. In summary, with each traversal of the art historical landscape, or exploration of a certain region within its amorphous borders, new insights can be gained; with each guidebook for art history read, new perspectives for viewing that landscape may be created.

## CHAPTER 3

### SURVEYING ART HISTORICAL TERRAINS: AN EXPLORATION OF GENRES OF ART HISTORY PRESENTED IN ART HISTORY LITERATURE

. . . once you have traveled, the voyage never ends but is played out over and over again in the quietest chambers . . . the mind can never break off from the journey.

– Pat Conroy (b. 1945)  
American Writer

In this chapter I present my own version of a "guidebook for art history." Unlike the other guidebooks reviewed in the previous chapter, it is not written for the purposes of either inducting undergraduate or graduate art history students into art history scholarship or contributing to the discourse among art historians – although it could serve such purposes. Instead, it is specifically dedicated to educators. My guidebook for art history is aimed at contributing to art education research, specifically at providing educators with an overview and analysis of a broad scope of ideas reverberating in art history, provoking and encouraging educators to question and further investigate art history, and assisting them in making curricular decisions regarding art history education for America's children.

It is important to note the context for this guidebook for art history: it is one chapter of a dissertation addressing art history as an aspect of art education that needs further clarification and attention in the field of art education. Unlike the other guidebooks, the genres of art history introduced and explicated in this chapter, as represented in art history literature, are then used to analyze how forms of art history appear in art education literature and are offered for consideration as a range of possible approaches to art history education in our nation's elementary and secondary schools.

My guidebook for art history begins with a brief orientation session for the reader about to embark with me on an extensive tour of art history literature. In this orientation session, I present a conceptual map I have created to identify different regions of art historical scholarship. This map indicates both (a) differing broad categorical focuses of histories of art and (b) a diverse range of genres of art history that address these various focuses. I have labeled this diagram of scholarship "A Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History." It serves both as a classification design for subject-matter focuses of art history and as an itinerary for this study trip, for it simultaneously indicates categories of varying approaches to art history and the route of investigation for this chapter.

Our cross-country conceptual tour of the art history landscape then begins. I guide the reader through each region demarcated in my Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History. I identify, explicate, and analyze a range of types of approaches to art history along the way by referring to and responding to both theoretical writings on art history and particular examples of written histories of art which illustrate differing conceptual viewpoints in Western art historical scholarship. Much conceptual ground is covered in this

guidebook. I distill, restate, interpret, analyze, and quote ideas and information from numerous resources within art history literature in order to clarify multifarious viewpoints in this domain of inquiry. I have simplified many theoretical ideas to accommodate an extensive itinerary. Also, I present many of my own ideas and opinions along the way as a commentary regarding the sights explored.

I believe that this component of this dissertation provides an informative journey through the vast art historical landscape. However, to reiterate a key premise of this study: many treks through art history literature must be undertaken for an in-depth understanding of any aspect of it. My aim in this chapter is not to provide a history of art history but rather to assist in increasing awarenesses, comprehensions, and questioning of a range of genres of art history. What I offer is a sightseeing expedition that is meant to inform and provoke reflection – and to stimulate a thirst in readers for further travel.

I close the chapter by providing mementos of the art historical journey taken in this chapter. These are reminders of key concepts on which the next chapter's analysis of attention given to art history in art education literature is based.

### A Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History

A broad array of types of art history certainly exists as may be noted by examining even a small selection of the abundant histories of art that have been written. I have presented an overview of several publications which



identify and discuss a variety of approaches to art history. However, in my research of art history literature I found a lack of resources that place these genres of art history within any categorization scheme. *Modern Perspectives in Western Art History* (Kleinbauer, 1971/1989) is a notable exception. This resource, as reviewed earlier, provides a comprehensive examination of various forms of traditional, Western art historical scholarship and many of the approaches described have also been used for the study of non-Western art. But further, this publication, unlike the others reviewed, proposes a very basic system of classification for methodological approaches to art history. The author's categorization of types of art history is based simply on whether emphasis is placed on a work of art itself or, conversely, factors related to but outside a work of art. Kleinbauer (1971/1989) uses this approach to classify modes of Western art history, respectively labeling the two categories as *intrinsic* and *extrinsic* perspectives. This dichotomous scheme for categorizing types of art history facilitates understanding how types of art history may vary on a basic level. However, I believe that a more fully-developed organizational structure for considering genres of art history could provide significantly further insights. This belief has prodded me to create a classification design for genres of art history.

### Categories of Genres of Art History

How do various approaches to art history fundamentally differ? How can an assortment of genres of art history be conceptually clustered? I have attempted to answer these questions by developing what I label as "A Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History." I present this representational

framework verbally and then offer a visual illustration of it (Figure 3.1). I believe that this categorization scheme can be of great assistance in navigating art historical discourse, for in essence it is a topographical map identifying the most basic features of different regions of thought within the art history landscape. It is necessarily an oversimplified schematic representation of the complexity of ideas and publications existing in the field of art history. Certainly a tremendous amount of overlapping and intertwining of ideas exists that is not captured in this diagram. Yet I believe that for those interested in surveying art history it can be of great service for getting one's bearings and setting off through the profusion of relevant literature in pursuit of more in-depth understandings of art history. It serves as an orientation to the tour of art history I lead. As when visiting numerous sights on a whirlwind, around-the-world tour, each region identified in this conceptual framework is but briefly visited in the pages that follow. Hopefully, each stopover is long enough, however, to obtain an understanding of basic customs characteristic of each area of scholarship. Kleinbauer's (1971/1989) scheme for categorizing perspectives of Western art history, as either intrinsic or extrinsic, both inspired and guided me in my development of this classification design for types of art history. To provide further insights into art history, I have elected to group and present types of art history under the following five categories:

- . Genres of Art History that Focus on ART MAKER
- . Genres of Art History that Focus on ART OBJECT
- . Genres of Art History that Focus on CONTEXT OF CREATION
- . Genres of Art History that Focus on ART AUDIENCE
- . Genres of Art History that have MULTIPLE FOCUSES

Those types of art history that focus on art object take an intrinsic perspective; those that focus on art maker, context of creation, or art audience take an extrinsic perspective; and those that have multiple focuses take either an extrinsic perspective or a combination of extrinsic and intrinsic perspectives.

I believe this categorization is preferable to Kleinbauer's (1971/1989), as it sub-divides those types of art history that take an extrinsic perspective into three categories. This clarifies what may be focused upon outside of an artwork itself. Also, this categorization scheme provides a fifth category for those types of art history that overlap classifications. This also accommodates more recent developments in the field. To further develop my composition of A Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History, I next identify and place specific genres of art history under the various headings within this framework.

#### Identification and Classification of an Assortment of Genres of Art History

Genres of art history that are allied with art maker include *biographical art history* and what I label as *psych-based art history*. Two genres that may be identified under the category of art object are *formalist art history* and what I refer to as *content-based art history*. One type of art history that focuses on context of creation is *socio-cultural art history*.and one kind that emphasizes art audience is what I term as *response-based art history*. Examples of genres of art history that have multiple focuses are *artistic processes-based art history*, *feminist art history*, and *semiotics-based art history*.

Certainly types and sub-types of art history exist other than those I have identified here. As Kleinbauer (1971/1989) states "A multiplicity of genres

flourishes in modern art history [and, I would add, especially in postmodern art history!]; indeed, this may be regarded as its salient characteristic" (p. 37). There is no doubt that new types and variations will continue to appear as well. Thus, my Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History is and inevitably will be incomplete. However, I contend it provides a useful framework for examining and considering views of art history espoused by both art historians and, as evidenced in later chapters, art educators as well. I have included "other" throughout the conceptual map to emphasize that alternative perspectives exist and that more are certainly likely forthcoming.

On the next page, I present my ideas for categorizing approaches to art history in diagram form (Figure 3.1). A key point to keep in mind when attempting to classify any art history publication within this framework is that while often one genre of art history may be identified as a dominant force in the construction of the contents of that publication, perhaps more often a combination of two or more approaches to art history are utilized and intertwined in both formulating questions regarding some aspect of art's histories and attempting to answer such.

### Explication of a Range of Genres of Art History

In this dissertation, I identify, describe, and analyze a selection of types of art history that investigate each of the broad topical categories in my Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History: art maker, art object, context of creation, art audience and those that have multiple focuses. The specific types of art history are the ten genres I identified within my Conceptual Map of

Genres of Art History that  
Focus on ART MAKER

- . Biographical Art History
- . Psych-based Art History
- . Other

Genres of Art History that  
Focus on CONTEXT OF CREATION

- . Socio-Cultural Art History
- . Other

Genres of Art History that  
have MULTIPLE FOCUSES

- . Artistic Process-based Art History
- . Feminist Art History
- . Semiotics-based Art History
- . Other

Genres of Art History that  
Focus on ART OBJECT

- . Formalist Art History
- . Content-based Art History
- . Other

Genres of Art History that  
Focus on ART AUDIENCE

- . Response-based Art History
- . Other

Other

Figure 3.1: A Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History

Genres of Art History: biographical art history, psych-based art history, formalist art history, content-based art history, socio-cultural art history, response-based art history, artistic processes-based art history, feminist art history, semiotics-based art history, and "other." These represent a range of the types of art history that exist in art history literature. These also represent a spectrum of approaches to art history for educators to consider in making decisions regarding its inclusion in elementary and secondary school curricula.

One means by which I explicate genres of art history appearing in art history literature is by referring to the ideas presented in a number of theoretical writings espousing or analyzing a particular view, approach, or methodology toward writing histories of art. Primarily, however, I have approached this challenge by pinpointing and exploring *manifestations* of differing concepts of art history expounded by art historians: that is, I identify, explain, and analyze specific published histories of art. In other words, the primary means I use to explicate a variety of genres of art history is to provide concrete examples of a selection of these types of art history, and I explain how each is representative of a certain type of art history. I analyze various aspects of each genre and pose questions as well as provide information regarding each.

This discussion of specific art historical writings is the manner in which I have chosen to most clearly define a selection of types of art history. I include bountiful quotations from these writings, for I consider such documentation essential for elucidating kinds of histories of art. The quotations serve as verbal illustrations for the material I cover.

To provide further clarity, I chose a theme upon which to center my response. Leonardo da Vinci and his art serves as that connecting thread. Intense interest in Leonardo and his art has led many notable art historians to study and write about him and/or his art. By presenting a variety of art historical writings that in some way relate to Leonardo or his art, the similarities and differences between various types of art history are more evident. Parrish (1987) introduced me to this idea and suggested several of the examples I discuss. Specifically, three of the approximately twenty examples I identify within this theme were proposed by Parrish: Vasari (1568/1946), Wittkower and Wittkower (1963), and Freud (1910/1916). While researching material for this chapter, I learned that this idea is not without precedence in the field of art history. For example, Wölfflin (1915/1950) and Panofsky (1955/1982) also refer to Leonardo and his work to clarify their proposals for art history methodologies. I must emphasize that Leonardo da Vinci and his art is *not* the focus of this investigation; it is the vehicle used to explore a range of genres of art history.

### Genres of Art History that Focus on ART MAKER

Who are the creators of works of art? What are their life stories? What are their personal traits? What is known or can be theorized about artists from prehistoric times through today? When the focus of art historical investigations is upon *artists* rather than works of art or other factors, then I propose the studies be classified within the category "Genres of Art History that Focus on Art Maker." Variations exist under this heading. Specific

recorded histories of art within this category may investigate distinct groups of artists or more generic categories of artists; however, the majority of histories of art within this classification are written about specific *individual* artists. The two genres of art history within this category that I present both focus on particular art makers as the focal point of their research.

### Biographical Art History

One type of art history that focuses on art maker is biographical art history. The life of the individual artist is the topic of investigation. This type of art history seemingly reflects the view that "There really is no such thing as Art. There are only artists" (Gombrich, 1978, p. 4). Biographical art history may be the oldest type of art history, but it is still a prevalent approach used today (Adams, 1996; Kleinbauer, 1971/1989).

Giorgio Vasari's 1550 publication, *Lives of the Artists: Biographies of the Most Eminent Architects, Painters, and Sculptors of Italy* (2 vols., 1550; expanded ed. in 3 vols., 1568/1946) is a classic example of this type of art history. It exemplifies biographical art history by the manner in which artists are discussed and because it is the lives of artists that are focused upon. Vasari's account of art presents men of achievement, with the emphasis clearly on men rather than art (or women, as is predominantly the case in biographical art history and throughout the discipline of art history's history). The entries in its table of contents read simply as a list of Who's Who of artists down through the ages -- from Cimabue to Michelangelo. Over 150 artists are presented. Vasari's entry on Leonardo da Vinci provides my first



example of a type of art history tied to the theme of Leonardo and his art. His introduction of this artist reads as follows:

The most heavenly gifts seem to be showered on certain human beings. Sometimes supernaturally, marvelously, they all congregate in one individual. Beauty, grace, and talent are combined in such bounty that in whatever that man undertakes, he outdistances all other men and proves himself to be specially endowed by the hand of God. He owes his pre-eminence not to human teaching or human power. This was seen and acknowledged by all men in the case of Leonardo da Vinci, who had, besides the beauty of his person . . . an indescribable grace in every effortless act and deed. His talent was so rare that he mastered any subject to which he turned his attention. (Vasari, 1568/1946, p. 187)

This passage illustrates the way in which Vasari discusses Leonardo. It also exemplifies the manner in which many biographical histories of art discuss artists, for biographical art history frequently equates artists with heroes (sometimes, but traditionally rarely, with heroines) and not uncommonly presents them as a virtual special super-species of the human race. Vasari's entry regarding Leonardo is a prime example of this aspect of biographical art history.

The fact that Vasari focuses his history of art on the life of the art maker, however, is the predominant reason why *Lives of the Artists* exemplifies biographical art history. Vasari writes of Leonardo's life, achievements, and personality. He begins with Leonardo's lineage and training, and he then proceeds to give many specific examples attesting to the brilliance of Leonardo – not only as a painter but also as a sculptor, musician, inventor, architect, engineer, and scientist. Vasari recounts stories of Leonardo's life and gives the reader a sense of Leonardo's personality: presenting him as gregarious, gracious, and humorous, as well as a perfectionist often unable to finish projects. These personal attributes of

Leonardo are presented within the scope of an historical account of the whole life of this artist. As a man of Leonardo's own country and approximate time period, Vasari based much of his writing on stories told by those in contact with Leonardo during his lifetime. Thus, Vasari's *Lives of the Artists* provides a uniquely insightful, personal narrative of Leonardo and his life -- though one not without bias, as Vasari's book favors the reputation of the author's country and its artists (Minor, 1994). Certainly the personal agenda and bias of the author of any biography colors the portrait of the individual portrayed. This is another aspect of biographical art history that *Lives of the Artists* illustrates.

Below is an excerpt from Vasari's entry on Leonardo, specifically his passage on Leonardo's *Last Supper*. Although a lengthy quote, it is the most appropriate manner in which to document Vasari's writing on Leonardo and his art to later contrast with other art historians' writings. Vasari states that just after Leonardo was invited to Milan in 1493 by the Duke of Milan to play his lyre and then painted "an altar-picture of the Nativity":

Lionardo [sic] then did a Last Supper for the Dominicans at S. Maria delle Grazie in Milan, endowing the heads of the Apostles with such majesty and beauty that he left that of Christ unfinished, feeling that he could not give it that celestial divinity which it demanded. This work left in such a condition has always been held in the greatest veneration by the Milanese and by other foreigners, as Lionardo has seized the moment when the Apostles are anxious to discover who would betray their Master. All their faces are expressive of love, fear, wrath or grief at not being able to grasp the meaning of Christ, in contrast to the obstinacy, hatred and treason of Judas, while the whole work, down to the smallest details, displays incredible diligence, even the texture of the tablecloth being clearly visible so that actual cambric would not look more real. It is said that the prior incessantly importuned Lionardo to finish the work, thinking it strange that the artist should pass half a day at a time lost in thought. He would have desired him never to lay down the

brush, as if he were digging a garden. Seeing that his importunity produced no effect, he had recourse to the duke, who felt compelled to send for Lionardo to inquire about the work, showing tactfully that he was driven to act by the importunity of the prior. Lionardo, aware of the acuteness and discretion of the duke, talked with him fully about the picture, a thing which he had never done with the prior. He spoke freely of his art, and explained how men of genius really are doing most when they work least, as they are thinking out ideas and perfecting the conceptions, which they subsequently carry out with their hands. He added that there were still two heads to be done, that of Christ, which he would not look for on the earth, and felt unable to conceive the beauty of the celestial grace that must have been incarnate in the divinity. The other head was that of Judas, which also caused him thought, as he did not think he could express the face of a man who could resolve to betray his Master, the Creator of the world, after having received so many benefits. But he was willing in this case to seek no farther, and for lack of a better he would do the head of the importunate and tactless prior. The duke was wonderfully amused, and laughingly declared that he was quite right. Then the poor prior, covered with confusion, went back to his garden and left Lionardo in peace, while the artist indeed finished his Judas, making him a veritable likeness of treason and cruelty. The head of Christ was left unfinished, as I have said. The nobility of this painting, in its composition and the care in which it was finished, induced the King of France to wish to take it home with him. Accordingly he employed architects to frame it in wood and iron, so that it might be transported in safety, without any regard for the cost, so great was his desire. But the king was thwarted by its being done on the wall, and it remained with the Milanese. (Vasari, 1568/1927/1963, pp. 161-162)

Although Vasari discusses the subject matter of this painting and even notes the response of those who viewed the work, he primarily presents the art object in terms of an event in Leonardo's life. It is an anecdotal account of the creation of this painting, one of many notable occurrences in a chronology of the life of Leonardo.

Biographical art history equates the "history of art" to "the history of artists" and is sometimes accused of presenting "art as a testimonial to

individual male genius" (Wallach, 1984, p. 31). Thus, it seems most fitting to represent it with a verbal portrait of Leonardo – of the sort that can be read in Vasari's *Lives of the Artists*.

### Psych-based Art History

A type of art history related to biographical art history is that which I have labeled as "psych-based art history." Like biographical art history, psych-based art history focuses on *art maker*. The basic difference between the two is that while biographical art history addresses the artist's life history, psych-based art history more specifically explores the artist's inner world, the mind or mental processes of the art maker.

I find basically two variants of psych-based art history: psychological art history and psychoanalytical art history. Although Kleinbauer (1971/1989) acknowledges art historians' concern for both "psychological and psychoanalytic aspects of artistic creation" (p. 70), he uses one term, "the psychoanalytic approach" for art histories concerned with either. I believe classifying these separately as sub-types of the broader term "psych-based art history" is preferable. I have found examples of both.

I propose that "psychological art history" be used to refer to those histories of art that deal primarily with the emotional and behavioral characteristics of individual artists or groups of artists (e.g., their personalities, dispositions, character, feelings, appearance, and/or conduct). "Psychoanalytic art history" may then be reserved to refer to those histories of art that delve deeper into the psyche of individual artists or groups of artists and that consider artworks as representations of the subconscious and unconscious of

the creators of art. I define each of these variations of psych-based art history in detail below by presenting an example related to Leonardo da Vinci and his art.

Psychological art history. Rudolf and Margot Wittkower's (1963) *Born Under Saturn; The Character and Conduct of Artists: A Documented History from Antiquity to the French Revolution* is a good example of art historical writing that is psychological in approach. In the preface of their book, the Wittkowers assert the following: "More often than not psychologists, sociologists and, to a certain extent, art critics agree that certain marked characteristics distinguish the artist from 'normal' people. The 'otherness' of artists is also widely accepted by the general public" (p. xix). The Wittkowers proceed to explain that in writing this book their "main concern was to investigate when, where, and why an image of the typical artist arose in people's minds, and what its distinguishing traits and varying fortunes have been" (p. xix). Specifically, they focus their attention on "the alienated artist."

In a section of their book entitled "Eccentric Behavior and Noble Manners," the Wittkowers discuss Leonardo da Vinci's "aloofness." First, the authors analyze the writing of Leonardo himself. They explain how difficult it is to learn of Leonardo's emotions and personal thoughts from his notebooks: Although there are 5300 extant pages of Leonardo's notebooks, the entries are totally objective observations. It is this impersonality of his writing, however, that reinforces the Wittkowers' points regarding Leonardo's extremely aloof, and therefore eccentric, nature. Also, the Wittkowers provide a few quotations of Leonardo to document what they describe as "his desire to avoid, as far as humanly possible, the distractions of the humdrum of daily life and the temptations of personal attachment"

(p. 75). The following is an example: "While you are alone, you are entirely your own, and if you have one companion you are half your own, and the less so in proportion to the indiscretion of his behavior" (Leonardo, cited in Wittkower & Wittkower, 1963, p. 76).

The Wittkowers utilize Vasari's account of Leonardo in his *Lives of the Artists* to present and analyze Leonardo. In contrast to Vasari's discussion of this art maker, however, they focus exclusively on the psychology of Leonardo. The Wittkowers use Vasari's account to substantiate their speculation that "To the eyes of the world his [Leonardo's] impassibility, his utter control over affections and passions must have seemed as 'eccentric' as Michelangelo's hypersensitive involvements" (p. 76).

In their attempt to help the reader come to better understand this artist, other artists of the Renaissance, and a prevalent conception of artists, the Wittkowers conclude this section of their book by suggesting:

the Florentine artists between roughly 1470 and 1530 had to cope with difficulties for which their intellectual equals, the scholars, philosophers and writers, were better prepared. . . . Some of these artists sought refuge from their fellow-citizens in various forms of alienation and this, in turn, helped to foster the idea that artists were by nature a special and an odd kind of people. (Wittkower, 1963, p. 78)

The Wittkowers' explanation of the title of their book, *Born Under Saturn*, reiterates this supposition. They write:

Saturn is the planet of melancholics, and Renaissance philosophers discovered that the emancipated artists of their time showed the characteristics of the Saturnine temperament: they were contemplative, meditating, brooding, solitary creative. . . . At that critical moment in history arose the new image of the alienated artist. (p. xxiv)

Perhaps also "at that critical moment in history" there arose the impetus for a new kind of art history, one concerned with the psychology of artists. In any

case, by focusing on the emotional and behavioral characteristics of Leonardo and, what some consider to be, of artists in general, *Born Under Saturn* is a clear example of psychological art history.

Psychoanalytic art history. Psychoanalytic art history seeks to further penetrate and explore the psyche of the artist and make connections between it and the artist's creations. As Kleinbauer (1971/1989) explains, "the psychoanalytic approach probes the depths of individual consciousness and the unconscious" (p. 70). There are psychoanalysts' approaches to art history and, conversely, art historians' utilization of psychoanalysis, both often labeled as psychoanalytic art history (Spector, 1988).

*Leonardo da Vinci: A Psychosexual Study of an Infantile Reminiscence* by Sigmund Freud (1910/1916) is a prime example of psychoanalytic art history. I located two other, more recently published, psychoanalytic art histories of Leonardo and his art (Eissler, 1961; and Stites, R.S., with Stites, M. E., & Castiglione, P., 1970). However, I selected Freud's study to discuss, because it is the initiatives of Freud that have been predominantly influential in the formation and guidance of this type of art history.

Freud speculates on the meaning and significance of a childhood memory of Leonardo's and interprets Leonardo's paintings in light of it. He bases his analysis on a passage from one of Leonardo's notebooks: ". . . it comes to my mind as a very early memory, when I was still in the cradle, a vulture came down to me, he opened my mouth with his tail and struck me a few times with his tail against my lips" (Leonardo, cited in Freud, 1910/1916, p. 34). Freud hypothesizes how this memory became a fantasy for Leonardo:

While reading in the writings of a church father or in a book on natural science that the vultures are all females and that they know to procreate without the cooperation of a male, a memory emerged in him which became transformed into that phantasy,

but which meant to say that he also had been such a vulture child, which had a mother but no father. An echo of pleasure which he experienced at his mother's breast was added to this in the manner as so old impressions alone can manifest themselves. The allusion to the idea of the holy virgin with the child, formed by the authors, which is so dear to every artist, must have contributed to it to make this phantasy seem to him valuable and important. For this helped him to identify himself with the Christ child, the comforter and savior of not alone this one woman. (pp. 47-48)

Freud interprets Leonardo's fantasy that grew out of this childhood memory: "The replacement of the mother by the vulture indicates that the child missed the father and felt himself alone with his mother" (p. 48). Freud explains that this interpretation agrees with the fact that Leonardo was raised by his poor, unmarried mother until, sometime before the age of five, he went to live with his father and stepmother.

Freud suggests that Leonardo's paintings are an outgrowth of this vulture fantasy of his childhood. For example, in reference to Leonardo's painting the *Virgin and Child with Saint Anne* in the Louvre, Freud suggests that by portraying Mary's mother and Mary as similar in age, Leonardo symbolizes his own childhood that contained two mothers. Also, Freud speculates that the *Mona Lisa's* smile aroused in Leonardo the memory of his mother, and that he incorporated it into his paintings, such as the *Virgin and Child with Saint Anne*. In summary, Freud psychoanalyzes Leonardo and interprets Leonardo's paintings as representations of this artist's unconscious.

Freud's study of Leonardo is both revered and reprehended by scholars (Minor, 1994; Spitz, 1985). It is valued for its "contribution to a specific understanding of the visual arts . . . [and] the widespread influence it has had not only on other psychologists and psychoanalysts, but also on art historians, critics, aestheticians, even philosophers, historians, and sociologists"



(Kleinbauer, 1971/1989, p. 70). However, Freud's conclusions regarding Leonardo and his art have been refuted. Schapiro (1956) explains that it was based on an inaccurate translation of Leonardo's writing and that Freud's lack of research into the history of art led him to further misinterpret Leonardo's paintings. Nevertheless, *Leonardo da Vinci: A Psychosexual Study of an Infantile Reminiscence* by Freud (1910/1916) serves as a premier example of a type of art history that is accepted by many. It opened the door to a whole new pathway for art historical scholarship that in recent years has received renewed attention (e.g., Adams, 1993; Spector, 1988; Spitz, 1985).

### Genres of Art History that Focus on ART OBJECT

When the focus of an art historical investigation is not on the creator but rather on the *created*, then classification of the approach to art history utilized shifts categorically to what I have labeled as "Genres of Art History that Focus on Art Object." There are, however, a variety of different interests for absorption regarding works of art. I report on two predominant genres of art history within this category, each with several sub-variations.

#### Formalist Art History

When the focus of art historical study is on the artwork itself and, in particular, on the *manner* in which the artwork is constructed, this may be termed "formalist art history"—a title I base on Kleinbauer's (1971/1989) description of "the formalist tradition" (p. 48) of art historical scholarship. I

must emphasize that as the focus of investigation is on *art object*, rather than upon art maker, this type of art history varies categorically from biographical and psych-based art histories. Formalist art history analyzes the form or structure of the work of art and the subtleties of artistic technique. The emphasis is not on subject matter, *what* the artist has represented, but rather on modes of representation, *how* the artist has composed her or his artwork. This type of art history has a long tradition of popular employment by scholars and is still often utilized by many art historians today. However, I believe that like most genres of art history, it is most often seen combined with other approaches to art history. The analysis of the formal qualities of a work of art may fall within the domain of art criticism; it is generally the further step of placing the work of art within an historical framework that allows for the classification of formalist art studies as a type of art history.

There are at least two differing sub-types of formalist art history: (a) what may be termed stylistic art history and (b) connoisseurship. They may each be viewed and discussed as distinct types of art history, as does Kleinbauer (1971/1989). However, I have clustered these variations of art history together under one heading, for they both analyze the style or structural traits of artworks (Kleinbauer, 1971/1989).

The difference between the two sub-types is determined by the goal which guides the art historian's research. The goal of stylistic art history seems to be to gain a better understanding of a work of art through the analysis of form and exploration of its stylistic relation to other works of art (either by the same artist or other artists working in the same or other periods). With stylistic art history, the art historian seems to seek to extract essences from an artwork in order to establish an historical framework for

better understanding the formal qualities of that work of art and others. The development or support of a theory of style, for an artist or a period, seems to be the goal.

In contrast, connoisseurship studies the formal traits of an artwork for the express purpose of identifying the maker of it or verifying it as an original, not a forgery (Brown, 1979; Kleinbauer, 1971/1989). With connoisseurship, the art historian seems to approach a work of art with knowledge of other artworks and an existing art historical framework in mind. Then she or he attempts to classify that work of art within (or in the case of a forgery, outside) such (Brown, 1979). Hence, connoisseurship and stylistic art history vary in ends sought, although in means (the study of the formal qualities of works of art) they are similar. Both stylistic art history and connoisseurship are further defined below with specific examples of histories of art that analyze artworks by Leonardo.

Stylistic art history. In his distinguished essay entitled "Style," Meyer Schapiro (1953) defines style as "the constant form – and sometimes the constant elements, qualities, and expression – in art of an individual or a group" (p. 287). I use this definition of style to guide my conceptualization and discussion of stylistic art history.

Schapiro (1953) advocates a combination of intrinsic and extrinsic art historical approaches for the study of style. However, I discuss stylistic art history as one sub-type of formalist art history that, in its pure, theoretical form, does not look outside the work of art itself – or at least de-emphasizes such. I propose use of the term, "stylistic art history" to refer to the analysis of the form of an artwork for the purpose of increasing perception and

understanding of the history of an individual artist's style or the history of collective style.

An example of stylistic art history which focuses on the style of the individual artist is *Leonardo: A Study in Chronology and Style* by Carlo Pedretti (1973/1982). This monograph contains elements of connoisseurship and other approaches to art history; however, the overall emphasis is on the identification and exploration of various formal and expressive qualities of the drawings and paintings of Leonardo. For example, Pedretti analyzes Leonardo's depiction of water:

[Leonardo's] early drawings [of water] of about 1490 are somewhat timid and hesitant. . . . As he approaches the end of the century, in 1498, his drawings of water become much freer, thus conveying the effect of a greater speed and exuberance. . . . But it is only later, around 1508-10, that the principles of the High Renaissance are reflected in his drawings of water, which are now given the shape of vigorous diagrams showing the direction of the lines of force – just as muscles and tendons in his anatomical studies from the same time are rendered as wires which illustrate the action of the human machine. (p. 16)

As evidenced above and indicated by the title of his book, Pedretti concentrates on exploring the artistic style of one individual, Leonardo. I briefly mention this example in order to provide a comparison for the following, more detailed, discussion of my prime example of stylistic art history.

*Principles of Art History: The Problem of the Development of Style in Later Art* by Heinrich Wölfflin (1915/1950) is an excellent example of stylistic art history that focuses upon collective, rather than individual, style. Wölfflin was concerned with form, not content, and sought to classify works of art by period styles based only on visual considerations. Specifically, he identifies and analyzes period styles of the Renaissance and Baroque.

According to Werner (1957), the central idea in Wölfflin's writing is that "there is an evolution of artistic forms, with its own laws and dialectic, and these iron laws are independent likewise of social conditions and individual taste" (p. 82). Wölfflin was careful to point out that his theory of the development of period styles addresses classification, *not* evaluation, of style. This point is significant in that Wölfflin's attempt to develop an "objectivising," "scientific approach" for art history (Verzar, 1988) brought order and structure to the analysis of style and furthered the development of the discipline of art history (Werner, 1957).

Wölfflin, himself, explains that his *Principles of Art History* "does not analyze the beauty of Leonardo [his artwork] but the element in which that beauty became manifest" (p. 13). His approach is to contrast the commonalities he finds among Renaissance works of art to those commonalities he identifies among Baroque works of art. *Principles of Art History* is composed of the following chapters which address each of the five pairs of polar concepts Wölfflin developed to describe the change in style that occurred:

- . "Linear and Painterly"
- . "Plane and Recession"
- . "Closed and Open Form"
- . "Multiplicity and Unity"
- . "Clearness and Unclearness"

As it is period styles rather than attention to individual artists or artworks that are the priority for Wölfflin, he inserts references to Leonardo and his art only to clarify or substantiate points he makes about the classical style of the Renaissance. For example, to clarify the linear style of the

Renaissance in contrast to the painterly style of the Baroque, both of which give some attention to lights and shadows, Wölfflin makes the following reference to Leonardo and one specific painting by him:

Leonardo is rightly regarded as the father of chiaroscuro, and his *Last Supper* in particular is the picture in which, for the first time in later art, light and shade are applied as a factor of composition on a large scale, yet what would these lights and darks be without the royally sure guidance which is exercised by the line? Everything depends on how far a preponderating significance is assigned to or withdrawn from the edges, whether they *must* be read as lines or not. (p. 19)

Wölfflin continues to utilize Leonardo's *Last Supper* to clarify the other four polar concepts of period styles he focuses upon. He makes reference to the *Last Supper* as an exemplification of the planar quality of Renaissance art, contrasting it to Pieter Brueghel the Elder's *Village Wedding* which is recessional. He mentions its tectonic arrangement as distinguishable from the a-tectonic style of the Dutch 17th century. And, in his chapter on multiplicity versus unity, Wölfflin writes: "Leonardo's *Last Supper*, although it is conceived as a unity, still offers the spectator so many points of interest in comparison with later narrations that it looks thoroughly multiple" (p. 174). Similarly, in his chapter, "Clearness and Unclearness," Wölfflin mentions Leonardo's distinct depiction of the twelve disciples and Christ. He points out Leonardo's portrayal of all 26 hands as one reinforcement of his point that "for classic art, all beauty meant exhaustive revelation of the form" (p. 190).

Thus, throughout *Principles of Art History*, Wölfflin makes reference to Leonardo's *Last Supper*. These references are always relatively brief, however, and are never inserted as ends in themselves. Rather, they are used as but one of many examples given to clarify and substantiate points Wölfflin

is making regarding the history of style. He does not discuss Leonardo as an individual. In fact, when Wölfflin mentions an artist's name, it is only to identify the artwork being discussed. As Kleinbauer (1971/1989) writes, Wölfflin's "avowed purpose as an art historian was to reduce the individual to the general -- to the law" (p. 154).

In sum, *Principles of Art History* is a noteworthy example of stylistic art history which focuses upon collective style. It seeks to establish the classification of period styles of the Renaissance and Baroque. In reference to Leonardo and his art, it is a study *not* of Leonardo's life, personality, psyche, portrayal of subject matter, social or cultural milieu, patronage, or individual style. Instead, it is a study of the collective style of two periods in the history of art through the formal analysis of many works of art, one of which is Leonardo's *Last Supper*.

Connoisseurship. As explained earlier, I consider connoisseurship to be a sub-type of formalist art history although some classify it as a distinct type of art history itself. As an art historical enterprise, it deals with attribution and authentication. Making evaluative judgments regarding quality and value is also often a responsibility of the connoisseur (Brown, 1979). In my view, this is more within the realm of art criticism, however, so I do not discuss this aspect of connoisseurship.

Actually, the classification of connoisseurship as art history -- whether viewed as a sub-type of formalist art history or as a distinct type of art history itself -- is an issue of debate. Perhaps it is that some consider art history to be more theory-generating and connoisseurship to be a more theory-to-practice process that leads some to consider connoisseurship to be outside the realm of

art history. Panofsky (1955/1982) equates the relationship of the two to "a diagnostician and a researcher in medicine" (p. 19).

Some may snub connoisseurship to be less than "art history" because it traditionally serves a role in the art market rather than a purely scholarly role. But such distinctions are not easily made or maintained. Preziosi (1989) sums up the complexity of the issue, "there is no clear demarcation between art historical scholarship and its applications to the practices of the museum and the marketplace" (p. 9). Further explicating this point, he asserts "as a humanistic discipline, art history also produces, sustains, and perpetuates humanistic values, which are themselves marketable in direct ways and indeed provide an aura quite as manifest in a monetary sense as the commodity itself" (p. 10).

I find myself agreeing with Preziosi (1989), Kleinbauer (1971/1989), and others that connoisseurship justifiably comes under the umbrella of "art history." As Brown (1979) states, the connoisseur attempts to provide "anonymous productions [of art] their place in the history of art" (p. 11). Attribution and authentication are the objectives of connoisseurship, and I believe these may be considered art historical objectives.

Connoisseurship makes a distinct contribution to art historical scholarship. It develops and supports the identification of the oeuvres of artists (Salerno, 1958/1971) and adds the catalogue raisonne and the corpus to art historical scholarship (Kleinbauer, 1971/1989). I briefly define each of these two manifestations of connoisseurship and identify concrete examples of them. I then present and more extensively discuss an example of connoisseurship which is an even more enlightening example of this type of art history.



"Oeuvre" is French for "work" and refers to "the total output of a given artist" (Lucie-Smith, 1984, p. 133). "Catalogue raisonne" is French for "reasoned catalogue," and basically, it is a catalogue of the oeuvre of an artist. Lucie-Smith (1984) defines it as "a complete annotated catalogue of the works of one artist, usually giving provenance and bibliographical references for each work and listing attributed or doubtful works as well as engravings after the artist" (p. 45). One example of a catalogue raisonne is *The Complete Paintings of Leonardo da Vinci*, with introduction by L. D. Ettlinger and notes and catalogue by Angela Ottino della Chiesa. This book is listed under the authorship of Leonardo (1967), as the main contents of the book (the paintings) are by him. Full color plates of Leonardo's paintings and detail shots of them are presented followed by catalogue entries discussing each work.

"Corpus," a second contribution of connoisseurship to art history, refers to a large compilation of lists of works attributed to a group of artists or a school (Kleinbauer, 1971/1989). A prime example of a corpus is *Italian Pictures of the Renaissance: A List of the Principal Artists and Their Works with an Index of Places* by Bernard Berenson (1932). It is an exhaustive list Berenson developed late in the 19th century of Italian Renaissance paintings that he considered to be authentic (Brown, 1979). In this renowned corpus (which he revised and illustrated in 1963), Berenson attributes 19 artworks to Leonardo da Vinci, 6 of which he notes are unfinished, and also lists 13 works by Milanese followers of Leonardo. There is no indication of the attribution process indicated in the volume itself. Instead, it is limited to a listing of concise pronouncements.

*The Salvator Mundi of Leonardo da Vinci* by Joanne Snow-Smith (1982) is a recent and superb example of connoisseurship which lifts the veils of mystery regarding attribution cloaking Berenson's *Italian Pictures of the Renaissance*. It is devoted exclusively to scrutinizing one painting and attributing it to Leonardo. In 1972, Snow-Smith began her research on a *Salvator Mundi* (Savior of the World) painting in the collection of the Marquis de Ganay. In this 1982 publication of her research, she hypothesizes that the painting is by Leonardo da Vinci and presents evidence and comparative analyses that support this hypothesis.

The book indeed makes for fascinating reading. It is a scholarly version of a whodunit thriller, as the reader is led on an exciting chase where supersleuthing efforts uncover a variety of clues that assist in the solving of a captivating mystery. Snow-Smith functions as the art detective: She pieces together documentary evidence and keenly analyzes and compares the visual elements of this painting with that of known works by Leonardo and *Salvator Mundi* paintings by others. All done to convincingly solve the mystery of who "executed" this painting.

About these other paintings of the same subject, Snow-Smith declares:

From the generally broad accord visible among the Leonardesque paintings of a *Salvator Mundi* to be found . . . there may be postulated a prototype which is common to all. The painting of a *Salvator Mundi* . . . now belonging to the Marquis de Ganay . . . is here identified as that prototype. (p. 11)

Snow-Smith presents and discusses a total of nine versions of *Salvator Mundi* paintings, including the de Ganay version which she attributes to Leonardo. She explains that it was common for French kings who commissioned paintings to also commission copies of them. She posits that several versions of *Salvator Mundi* resulted from the commission of copies

of Leonardo's *Salvator Mundi* by Leonardo's patron, King Louis XII of France. Snow-Smith contends that differences in the embroidery pattern on the stole and neckband among the various versions are due to artists copying Leonardo's painting "in different stages of its execution" (p. 12). She discusses these differences to reinforce her hypothesis that the de Ganay *Salvator Mundi* is the prototype for the others.

Snow-Smith (1982) also compares the de Ganay *Salvator Mundi* to Leonardo's *Mona Lisa* and *Virgin and Child with Saint Anne* (in the Louvre), among other works. The following excerpt is meant to give a flavor of her writing aimed at attribution:

In the lighting of the *Mona Lisa* can be observed a pattern of shadows similar to that seen in the *Salvator Mundi*, and again, the same predilection of Leonardo for an overhead and off-set light orientation has been maintained. . . .

In a comparison of the mouth in the *Mona Lisa* . . . and in the *Salvator Mundi* . . . , the identical shape of both is readily visible, as are the delicacy of the soft shadowing between the lips and the similarity of the shadows beneath the lower lip and at the corners of the mouth.

It is also of significance on stylistic grounds to compare the physiognomy of the Savior . . . with that of the head of Saint Anne . . . in Leonardo's painting of the *Virgin and Child with Saint Anne* in the Louvre dated about 1509-11. Indeed, when these two details are juxtaposed, there appears a remarkable similarity of features. Both share the same ovoidal face, and a long slender nose with similar shape and proportions that is surmounted by the same high arch of the brow. Also of note for comparative purposes is the angle of the bridge of the nose as it turns into these brows. Furthermore, although Saint Anne looks downward, there is still a similarity in the deep shadowing of the eye-sockets which seems to follow the same idiom described by Leonardo in the Codex Madrid II . . . . (p. 48)

The above is but a small sampling of Snow-Smith's documentation of attributing the de Ganay *Salvator Mundi* to Leonardo da Vinci. In addition to making a stylistic analysis of this painting, Snow-Smith reports on the results

of various radiation tests conducted on it, and she traces the history of its iconographic imagery (Christ holding or standing upon the globe). Thus, Snow-Smith also draws upon content-based art history which I define next. The thoroughness of her research and the skill in which she presents her findings throughout her book, build a convincing case that support her contention that the painting in question was indeed made by Leonardo. Snow-Smith's book, *The Salvator Mundi of Leonardo da Vinci*, consequently, serves as an exemplar of connoisseurship, one sub-type of formalist art history.

### Content-based Art History

What I term as "content-based art history" is yet another distinct type of art history. It is similar to formalist art history in one basic regard but quite different in another. The *art object* is the center of attention for both. There the similarities end, however, as what is focused on within the work of art varies between these types of art history and actually distinguishes the two from each other. Content-based art history focuses on the *subject matter* represented in the artwork and often the *intrinsic meaning* expressed; formalist art history focuses upon the *manner* of expression (Kleinbauer, 1971/1989; Panofsky, 1939/1962). What I have labeled as "content-based art history" is more often referred to in art historical literature as "iconography" and "iconology." I have classified these as sub-types of content-based art history, however, and later discuss each more specifically.

Erwin Panofsky is most often recognized as the chief exponent of this genre of art history that I call content-based art history (Holly, 1984;

Kleinbauer & Slavens, 1982). He systematized and disseminated the methods and aims of this type of art history, publishing them in his renowned *Studies in Iconology: Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance* (1939/1962). In this work, Panofsky presents a three-tiered methodological approach to studying works of art, which he revised in his *Meaning in the Visual Arts* (1955/1982). Sub-types of content-based art history may be identified based upon these writings. Below is an overview of Panofsky's (1955/1982) approach. This is followed by an example of each corresponding sub-type of art history related to artworks by Leonardo da Vinci.

"Pre-iconographical description" is the beginning-level examination of the content of a work of art acknowledged by Panofsky. It refers to factual identification of objects and artistic motifs as representations of "primary or natural subject matter" (e.g., persons, animals, household items) and notation of their relationships to each other. Expressional qualities are also identified in this stage of analysis based on "practical experience." Primary or natural meaning of content is the focus of pre-iconographical description.

"Iconographical analysis" is a second-level inquiry into the content of a work of art articulated by Panofsky. It entails the recognition of specific themes represented by certain objects, specific artistic motifs, and combinations thereof. Panofsky writes: "The identification of such images, stories and allegories is the domain of what is normally referred to as 'iconography' " (p. 29). Identification of this "secondary or conventional subject matter" is based on knowledge of literature and/or artistic tradition. It is through the identification and decoding of themes that secondary or conventional meaning is conveyed.

"Iconological interpretation" is a third stratum of investigation into the content of a work of art proffered by Panofsky. It begins with the correct iconographical analysis and proceeds to attempt to decipher the "intrinsic meaning or content" of a work of art. Panofsky (1955/1982) writes:

It is apprehended by ascertaining those underlying principles which reveal the basic attitude of a nation, a period, a class, a religious or philosophical persuasion – qualified by one personality and condensed into one work. (p. 30)

Panofsky writes that this deeper level of analysis aims to indicate values (of the artist and his or her society), the attitude of the artist's cultural milieu, and the underlying significance of the work of art through a synthesizing, rather than analytic, process.

Due to the subjective nature of the process, at each level of inquiry into the content of a work of art, Panofsky indicates a work of art must be studied in light of tradition. At all levels of inquiry into the subject matter or meaning of a work of art, comparisons are to be made between the work under consideration and other works which have already been described, analyzed, and interpreted. Panofsky (1955/1982) suggests the following to guard against error: knowledge of the "history of style" as the "corrective principle" for pre-iconographical description; knowledge of the "history of types" ("specific themes or concepts") for iconographical analysis; and knowledge of the "history of cultural symptoms or 'symbols' in general" as the "corrective principle" for iconological interpretation (p. 41). Panofsky stresses that the three categories must be considered holistically when approaching a work of art.

One way in which Panofsky clarifies his points, which fits within the theme of my examples, is by referring to Leonardo da Vinci's *Last Supper*.

Panofsky writes:

As long as we limit ourselves to stating that Leonardo da Vinci's famous fresco shows a group of thirteen men around a dinner table [a pre-iconographical description], and that this group of men represents the Last Supper [an iconographical analysis], we deal with the work of art as such, and we interpret its compositional iconographical features as its own properties or qualifications. But when we try to understand it as a document of Leonardo's personality, or of the civilization of the Italian High Renaissance, or of a peculiar religious attitude, we deal with the work of art as a symptom of something else which expresses itself in a countless variety of other symptoms, and we interpret its compositional and iconographical features as more particularized evidence of this "something else." The discovery and interpretation of these "symbolical" values (which are often unknown to the artist himself and may even emphatically differ from what he consciously intended to express) is the object of what we may call "iconology" as opposed to "iconography." (p. 31).

Iconology, thus described, may be seen to be related to several other types of art history, such as psych-based art history and socio-cultural art history. While iconology does seek information outside a work of art to better interpret that work of art, it begins with the work of art and remains centrally concerned with it. Thus, iconology may be considered a sub-type of content-based art history, distinguishable from other types of art history.

Below are specific examples of the three sub-types of content-based art history. The examples again relate to the art of Leonardo to make similarities and differences between these sub-types, this type of art history, and others more easily recognizable.

Pre-Iconography. Based on Panofsky's (1955/1982) identification of pre-iconographical description, I propose "pre-iconography" be considered a

sub-type of content-based art history. Art historians consider pre-iconography to be an initial step of iconography and iconology rather than a "sub-type" of art history. However, I contend that art historical literature can be identified that may be labeled as such.

An example within the theme of Leonardo and his art is *Leonardo da Vinci: Drawings of Horses and Other Animals from the Royal Library at Windsor Castle* (Leonardo, 1984). Primarily this publication focuses on presenting certain natural subject matter depicted by Leonardo. I believe that this justifies labeling it as pre-iconography. Carlo Pedretti, who wrote the catalogue entries, discusses the style of Leonardo's drawings and Leonardo's representation of allegories which could also lead to classification of the book as formalist art history and iconography. However, the main thrust of the book places it, on the whole, more within the category of pre-iconography.

Natural meanings of content rather than conventional or deeper, intrinsic meanings are emphasized. Titles given for the figures in this book reinforce this idea. Examples of such titles include: *Study of a horse, with details of its hind-quarters*; *Sketch of a horse walking to the right seen slightly from behind*; and *Horses and horsemen in combat*. The catalogue entry for the latter, in part, reads:

The motif of two horses which continue to fight after both of their riders have been unseated, is not known to have been considered for any part of the Anghiari composition [a lost work by Leonardo depicting a Florentine army battle of the 15th century]. It might have occurred to Leonardo by way of digression as he came to work on a number of peripheral episodes. . . .

The lighter sketch below does indeed refer to a peripheral episode in the battlepiece . . . . It shows two wading soldiers about to scramble out of the water as in a commando action. . . . It is . . . possible . . . that the theme of men in the water introduced by Leonardo as a peripheral motif had inspired Michelangelo to



develop it as the central motif of his *Battle of Cascina* [a companion painting to Leonardo's *Battle of Anghiari*]. (p. 56)

Pedretti's emphasis in writing this entry for *Horses and horsemen in combat* is on the identification and description of natural subject matter. His discussion of the soldiers centers on the development of this as an artistic motif by Leonardo which was then repeated or utilized by Michelangelo. This type of art historical writing, thus, exemplifies pre-iconography, what I present as one sub-type of content-based art history.

Iconography. Iconography is generally regarded by art historians as a major approach to or type of art history (Kleinbauer, 1971/1989; Panofsky, 1955/1982). Because it is one way in which to investigate the content of a work of art but is not the only way, I have classified iconography as a sub-type of content-based art history. Iconography, as conceptualized by Panofsky, entails the decoding of stories and allegories represented in works of art. Because many of Leonardo da Vinci's paintings and drawings depict specific themes, examples of iconographic writings regarding his art may be found.

One prime example of such a decoding of Leonardo's *Last Supper* is presented by Jack Wasserman (1984). Quite in contrast to Wölfflin's (1915/1950) formal description of this painting, Wasserman provides a description of the conventional subject matter of the work:

In painting the *Last Supper*, Leonardo revealed the same propensity he had shown in the *Adoration of the Magi* for representing the totality of a scene as described in the Scriptures. The biblical Last Supper was an emotional occasion during which the apostles were stunned by Christ's unexpected and damning pronouncement that one of them would betray Him. Leonardo here had an opportunity to portray an explosive and highly dramatic scene and to delve more deeply than ever before into the psychological attitudes of his protagonists. The episode was also the occasion for a symbolic revelation in which Christ identified His body and blood with bread (the sacrifice) and with

wine (the remission of the sins of man), thereby establishing the sacrament of the Eucharist as the vehicle by which salvation can be attained. Christ's words to the apostles in the Gospel of St. John (6, 54) are these: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life and I will raise him up at the last day." Leonardo represented this aspect of the event also. (p. 94)

Wasserman continues to interpret Leonardo's *Last Supper* primarily by exploring conventional subject matter within the work. Each apostle is identified, based on passages of the Bible and consideration of artistic tradition. This referencing of literary sources and the history of types in an effort to divulge the conventional meaning of a work of art is characteristic of iconography.

Iconology. Iconology, as explained earlier, seeks to reveal the intrinsic meaning or content of a work of art. This identification of the embodiment of the underlying beliefs of the artist and/or her or his society proceeds from the correct iconographic decipherment of the work. An example of such that relates to the work of Leonardo da Vinci is found in Frederick Hartt's (1969) interpretation of Leonardo's *Last Supper*.

Hartt first decodes the theme of this painting, as in the tradition of iconography. He refers to both literary and artistic sources to explain the subject matter of the painting. Hartt asserts that Leonardo broke from the artistic tradition of portraying the Last Supper as the moment in which Judas is disclosed as the betrayer and instead chose to present:

for the first time in the history of art, a slightly earlier moment in the drama, recounted by Matthew, Mark, and John, "Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me. And they were exceeding[ly] sorrowful, and began every one to say unto him, Lord is it I?" This enables Leonardo to bypass the traditional meaning of the Last Supper in Christian art. He is not in the least concerned with the institution of the Eucharist, nor with the mystery of sacrificial death in which the Apostles participate and to which they will separately succumb, but with a single

aspect of the narrative – the speculation regarding the identity of the betrayer, and the consequent self-search of the Apostles. Instead of designating the betrayer, he has shown the bombshell effect of the announcement at the feast. (p. 399)

Like Wasserman, Hartt presents his assessment of the secondary or conventional meaning of Leonardo's *Last Supper*. However, unlike Wasserman's interpretation of Leonardo's *Last Supper*, Hartt does not stop with this iconographic analysis of the work. He proceeds to interpret it as the conveyor of symbolic attitudes and values of Leonardo and his cultural milieu. Hartt writes:

Everybody is celebrating the Passover. Suddenly a horrible announcement is made. How would people behave? Donatello had burst such a grenade in his *Feast of Herod* . . . Leonardo has gone further. He has, in fact, made the Apostles act according to his own mechanistic Renaissance view of psychology, thus revealing the underlying mathematical unity of all life. As if by inexorable law, the revelation of betrayal automatically factors the number twelve into four groups of three each. . . . (p. 399)

Hartt continues with his iconological interpretation of this work by discussing it as also representative of the High Renaissance "new and grander vision of ideal reality" (p. 401). Hartt proposes that Leonardo's *Last Supper* is:

a projection on an ideal plane of experience in which lower realities are subdued and synthesized. This is a perfect perspective, which could be seen by no pair of human eyes, and within it are set forth larger-than-life human beings who exist and act and move on a grander plane than we. Ideal volumes inhabit ideal space. The joy of the Quattrocento in visual reality has been replaced by a wholly different satisfaction, that to be obtained from imagined grandeur. We are now truly in the High Renaissance. . . .

[which] in both Florence and Rome has to be understood as an extension into an ideal plane of those images of human grandeur and power which the Italians knew were in real life doomed. It is a valiant but despairing effort, and there is always something dreamlike about even its noblest productions, as

compared with the more pedestrian solidity of the early Quattrocento images. (p. 401)

By studying this artwork and interpreting it in this manner, Hartt has functioned as a humanist as defined by Panofsky (1955/1982). A humanist, Panofsky explains, is interested in the past, the records left by man [and woman?], and the history of culture. For Panofsky, it is the role of the art historian to be a humanist, re-creating the society and philosophy of the culture in which a work of art was made (using literature, historic documents, etc.) to find out the intrinsic meaning of a work of art. Thus, Panofsky suggests that the art historian, functioning as a humanist, utilize an iconological approach to art history. Hartt's discussion of Leonardo's *Last Supper* is exemplary of iconology, this third sub-type of content-based art history.

#### Genres of Art History that Focus on CONTEXT OF CREATION

Up to this point, I have presented genres of art history that address either art makers or art objects as the focus of art historical study. I now shift attention to yet another categorical focus of investigation: the *contexts* in which artists have worked and artworks have been created. In mapping the art historical landscape, I have labeled this region of the terrain as "Genres of Art History that Focus on Context of Creation." Art historical studies residing within this area of scholarship analyze a variety of aspects of the conditions surrounding and/or impacting the creation of art. Although an assortment of genres of art history could be identified as distinct classifications within this

category, I have clustered what certainly is the preponderance of these approaches under one large umbrella term: "socio-cultural art history."

### Socio-Cultural Art History

"Socio-cultural art history" is the broad term that I propose be used to refer to a range of scholarly attention devoted to investigating varieties of social and cultural contexts and circumstances involved with the creation of art. It is indicative of two dominant, differing yet overlapping, perspectives that have been and may be utilized in approaching art history. "Social art history" is an established term in art history literature that is utilized to refer to much of such scholarship. However, as I have a more expansive conception of this genre of art history, I sought a wider descriptor for it. I believe "socio-cultural art history" well-accommodates this multifaceted genre of art history as I suggest it be conceptualized. I advocate the use of this term to refer to both (a) "social art history," a variation of art history widely recognized within the field of art history which intersects with social and cultural history and sociology, and (b) anthropological approaches to the study of art in which cultural anthropologists' and art historians' scholarship have cross-pollinated. I prefer the compound term of socio-cultural art history as it embraces both of these traditions of scholarship that study art as enmeshed in human life. Social art history has traditionally focused on societal contexts of the creation of Western fine art, while anthropologically based studies of art history have traditionally examined interrelationships of non-Western cultures and non-fine art. However, I believe each perspective can be applied to study connections between all peoples and their artistic creations. I have

proposed a genre of art history and heading for it that encompasses and embraces these varieties. It also represents how the broad academic disciplines of history, sociology, and anthropology overlap with each other and art history and seem, in recent years, to be becoming even more indistinguishable in their disciplinary boundaries of subject-matter focus. In the following several pages, I describe these two related modes of studying art's histories and how they together form another region of the art historical landscape. I then present an example of socio-cultural art history related to the theme of Leonardo and his art.

Generally, scholarship recognized as "social art history" approaches the study of art's history by beginning with and focusing upon the collective context in which artworks were created and artists worked, rather than upon discreet objects or individual art makers (Kleinbauer, 1971/1989; Minor, 1994). Social art historical scholarship is initiated by searching for and studying societal factors that are reflected in, influenced, and/or, some assert, determined the creation of artworks. It is the relationship of a society's artists and the world surrounding them that is explored, in either causal, expressive, or anecdotal terms (Wollheim, 1957 as cited in Kleinbauer, 1971/1989; Kleinbauer & Slavens, 1982; and Minor, 1994).

The fundamental premise of this approach to art history is that the makers of art do not create works of art in a vacuum. In the words of Arnold Hauser (1958/1959), a noted social art historian, "everything in history is the achievement of individuals; individuals always find themselves in a certain definite situation in time and place; their behavior is the product both of their inborn capacities and of the situation" (p. vi). It follows from this premise that in order to better understand art, the contexts in which artists

worked -- factors external to the physical artworks themselves -- must be studied. Hauser clarifies how artworks may be considered social products when he writes:

Art can express social aims in two different ways. Its social content can be clothed in the form of explicit avowal -- confessions of belief, express doctrines, direct propaganda -- or in that of mere implication, that is, in terms of the outlook tacitly presupposed in works which seem devoid of social reference. It can be frankly tendentious or a vehicle of an unconscious and unacknowledged ideology. (p. 29)

Art is conceived of as a social institution by art historians who work within the framework of social art history. It is art's functioning as such that is the target of their scholarly explorations. According to Kleinbauer and Slavens (1982):

Social historians of art ask questions about the relation of works of art to a given social situation, to a social, economic, political, religious, cultural, or intellectual factor or system. They strive to describe and pinpoint the influence of the action of external forces in society and/or ideas on art; some, especially Marxists, also strive to judge and evaluate the position of art in society. (p. 111)

Studies classified as social art history may generally explore the relationship of art and society. Or they may focus more specifically on the relationship of art to specific social institutions or factors such as those listed above.

Thus, "social art history" is actually a broad term that encompasses what could be viewed as several related types of art history, although, as I explained earlier, I propose classifying these varieties as sub-types of socio-cultural art history. In their *Research Guide to the History of Western Art*, Kleinbauer and Slavens (1982) provide clarification regarding what such subdivisions may be by presenting the variations they perceive in histories of art

related to art and society. Their chapter on art and society is organized under the following five headings:

- . "Correlational Social Histories of Art"
- . "The Varieties of Marxism"
- . "Cultural History"
- . "Geistesgeschichte"
- . "Alternative Intellectual Approaches"

The distinctions the authors make in describing these as ways of exploring connections between art and society are useful in considering variations in art historical scholarship, so I have elected to utilize these distinctions to briefly define alternative approaches to socio-cultural art history.

Correlational social art history is the loose term for those histories which suggest generalized links or parallels between art and society. A stronger stance is taken by scholars who write causal or deterministic social art history, such as Marxist art historians, for here the undergirding belief is that societal forces cause or determine artworks to be created. In Marxist ideology, artists are viewed as members of the working class (the proletariat) who are exploited by the ruling class (the bourgeoisie) (Adams, 1996; Minor, 1994). How society impacted art, and specifically what that impact was, is investigated. Further, according to Wallach (1984):

Marxist art historians have devoted a great deal of energy to the critical analysis of bourgeois art history's [the discipline of art history's] basic concepts and premises . . . . These efforts have helped Marxist art historians to overcome the narrow range and limiting assumptions of traditional art-historical discourse.  
(p. 31).

Certainly, Marxist art history is a particularly politically-charged and normative, rather than simply descriptive, approach to art history.



Based on the ideas of Kleinbauer and Slavens (1982), what I will term as "history-of-ideas-based art history" may be considered another sub-type of socio-cultural art history. It encompasses " 'Geistesgeschichte' (the history of ideas or of the human mind or 'intellectual history'), a specifically German method of inquiry that is a branch of the history of ideas. . . . [which] deal[s] with large systems or aggregates of idea complexes" (Kleinbauer & Slavens, 1982, pp. 114-115). Also, it includes other approaches to the history of art which study intellectual ideas as reflected in works of art.

Kleinbauer and Slavens (1982) introduce a cultural variation of social art history as follows: "When art historians regard the visual arts as a manifestation of culture and interpret them in relation to all human activity and thought, they *intrude* [italics added] upon cultural history" (p. 145). I believe it is not desirable to think of the overlapping of academic disciplines in negative terms as the use of the word "intrude" suggests. Depending on the emphasis taken, art history overlaps a number of other disciplines. I argue that such overlaps should be acknowledged and not disparaged. I see cultural art history as also significantly overlapping with anthropological approaches to art history which I discuss next. Regardless of how it is classified, the consideration and examination of art as a cultural phenomenon adds yet another perspective to the study of art's histories.

Anthropology brings valuable, alternative perspectives and emphases to art history. Anthropology-based studies related to art history are more holistically concerned with the interactions of social contexts, artists, art objects, and art audiences of the milieu in which artworks were made – they focus upon relationships of *art and culture*. But what is "culture?" Ember and Ember (1990) explain that "to an anthropologist, the term 'culture'

generally refers to the customary ways of thinking and behaving of a particular population or society" (p. 5). Peacock (1986) provides further insights:

The classic definition was provided by Sir Edward Tylor, the founder of social anthropology, in 1871: "Culture . . . taken in its wide ethnographic sense is that complex whole which includes knowledge, belief, art, morals, law, custom, and any other capabilities and habits acquired by man as a member of society." (Tylor, 1871/1958, p. 1 as cited in Peacock, 1986, p. 3)

A definition of "anthropology" and a brief examination of this field of study is in order here. Ember and Ember (1990) provide the following definition of anthropology:

anthropology is literally the *study of human beings*. It differs from other disciplines concerned with people in that it is broader in scope. It is concerned with humans in all places of the world . . . , and it traces human evolution and cultural development from millions of years ago to the present day. (p. 11)

It is important to note that while in the past, anthropology has studied cultures previously characterized as "primitive" and "exotic," in more recent years it has sought to utilize terms with less pejorative connotations for those cultures such as "less-complex," "non-Western," "small-scale," "tribal," and "non-commercial" (Anderson, 1989; Ember & Ember, 1990; Hatcher, 1985). Also, it has begun to study other cultures identified as "more complex," "industrial," "urban," and/or "Western" (Ember & Ember, 1990; Hatcher, 1985; Maquet, 1986). The field of anthropology is continuing to transform itself, as is art history and other disciplines, in response to both changes in the world – e. g., addressing "a globalized, deterritorialized world" (Appadurai, 1991) – and in the world of theory, such as in response to postmodern critiques (Fox, 1991). Nevertheless, I believe that the following overview provides a useful orientation to the field.

There are two main branches of anthropology: physical (biological) anthropology and cultural anthropology (Ember & Ember, 1990). Of course, it is the latter that is of interest here. According to Ember and Ember, cultural anthropology is composed of three major subfields: archeology, linguistics, and ethnology (with ethnology often referred to as "cultural anthropology").

It is in both the areas of archeology and ethnology that I see anthropology and art history converging in scholarly interest. Ember and Ember provide clarification on what researchers in these two areas of anthropology investigate:

The archeologist seeks not only to reconstruct the daily life and customs of peoples who lived in the past but also to trace cultural changes in their societies and to offer possible explanations of those changes. . . .

Most archeologists deal with prehistory, the time before written records. However, there is a specialty within archeology, called historical archeology, that studies the remains of recent peoples who left written records. . . . (p. 5)

The ethnologist seeks to understand how and why peoples of today and the recent past differ in their customary ways of thinking and acting. One type of ethnologist, the ethnographer, usually spends a year or so living with, talking to and observing the customs of a particular population. Later, he or she may prepare a detailed report of the group's behavior, which is called an ethnography. Another type of ethnologist, the ethno-historian, investigates written documents to determine how the ways of life of a particular group of people have changed over time. A third type of ethnologist -- the cross-cultural researcher -- studies data collected by ethnographers and ethnohistorians for a large number of societies and attempts to discover which explanations of particular customs may be generally applicable. (p. 12)

Generally, both archeology and ethnology explore art as material culture, as evidence and clues for learning more about different groups of humans from the past or present. Both emphasize considering art as it is broadly integrated

into life. This is a key aspect of anthropology relevant to art history: Anthropology has a holistic emphasis (Ember & Ember, 1990; Maquet, 1986; Peacock, 1986). Peacock (1986) postulates that this is perhaps the most prominent theme of anthropology, the orientation that "human life should be viewed as a whole – a configuration interwoven of many forces and aspects, all organized by culture" (p. 1). I concur with Maquet (1986) that this idea is a major contribution that anthropology brings to the study of art history.

Another ideational contribution is anthropology's emphasis on uncovering and identifying concepts and meanings of art *as defined by the culture in which it originates*. This reporting on a society in its own terms is a fundamental emphasis of cultural anthropological investigations (Anderson, 1989; Boas, 1927/1955; Dark, 1978; Hatcher, 1985). Sieber (1971) emphasizes "Art is a cultural manifestation finally to be *understood (as distinguished from 'appreciated')* [italics added] only in the light of its cultural origins" (p. 127). A third contribution is anthropology's comparative nature or "cross-cultural scope" (Hatcher, 1985; Maquet, 1986). Anthropological approaches to art history can assist the discipline of art history in broadening its scholarship to address, more frequently, non-Western art and artists and multicultural content and issues. Certainly, anthropology and art history offer much to each other's discipline – and together can greatly aid in our understandings of art and diverse peoples.

Next, to more clearly explicate socio-cultural art history, I present and analyze an example of a correlational social art history which is related to Leonardo da Vinci and his art. I selected this sub-type of this genre of art history to highlight and explore because it is the most prevalent form of social

art history (Kleinbauer & Slavens, 1982) and because correlational social art history seems to me to be a good basic primer with which to start to gain one's footing in exploring contexts in which artworks have been created. Certainly, it is another viable route of art historical investigation, whether chosen as the only path of excursion in this direction or taken in preparation for later delving into other variations of socio-cultural art history, such as Marxist art history or anthropologically-based approaches to art history.

Correlational social art history. Correlational social art histories have been written about the relationship of art and patronage, economics, politics, religion, and combinations thereof (Kleinbauer & Slavens, 1982). Kleinbauer and Slavens also consider those histories of art that address the history of taste to be another variety of correlational social art history; however, I place such within the category of those genres of art history that focus upon art audience which I present shortly. Of all the varieties of histories of art written to demonstrate the interrelatedness of art and society, according to Kleinbauer and Slavens, those that focus upon artistic patronage are most numerous. Certainly, patronage has played in the past and continues to play a key role in the production of art in many societies, although that role is not always perceived and acknowledged.

An eminent example of art historical writing that relates to both artistic patronage and Leonardo and his art is *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist: Projects and Patrons, Workshop and Art Market* by German art historian Martin Wackernagel (1938/1981). It is one of the numerous exemplary studies of artistic patronage identified by Kleinbauer (1971/1989), Kleinbauer and Slavens (1982), and Spencer (1983). This work is primarily concerned with the society in which the Renaissance artist worked

and more specifically with patronage and economic factors that played a pivotal role in the production of art at that time. Neither Leonardo da Vinci nor any of his contemporaries are specifically discussed in any length; attention is shifted to the figures, societal forces, and events surrounding these artists. Wackernagel deplored how artworks from the Renaissance are typically presented for consideration: in museums, devoid of the context for which they were created. He felt compelled to counteract this tendency and, by presenting information on the origin and function of Renaissance art, to enable that context to be visualized and the artworks to be better understood.

Wackernagel divides his book into three sections that indicate its scope and direction: "The Commissions;" "The Patrons;" and "The Artist's Workshop and the Art Market." He asserts there was an extraordinary demand for art during the Renaissance and relates each section of his book to this assertion. Wackernagel suggests that this demand for art came not just from one elite element of society but from the whole population. His recognition of this pervasive "need for art" and the theories he develops about it represent a significant departure from the routes many other scholars have taken in the study of the history of Renaissance art. It is quite a different emphasis than that of the other art histories related to Leonardo and his art discussed thus far.

In the first chapter of his section on commissions, Wackernagel discusses three "Great Projects and Work on Them from 1420 to 1530." It is when presenting information on the Palazzo Vecchio that Wackernagel first mentions Leonardo da Vinci. These comments are brief, however, and are limited to referencing his drawing of the battle of Anghiari as one of the commissioned works for the convent of Santa Maria Novella. Wackernagel

presents Leonardo as merely one of many artists delegated to do a specific artwork – which is but one of numerous Renaissance art commissions.

In later providing more information concerning Leonardo's *Battle of Anghiari*, Wackernagel begins by explaining that Piero Soderini, who was conferred as constitutional head of state in 1502 . . . , commissioned:

the painting of two mighty mural compositions with scenes from Florentine military history that, in the contemporary critical stage of the campaign against Pisa, were meant to stand before the eyes of the Senate and people of Florence during all proceedings in the council hall as a powerful exhortation to martial courage and energy. (p. 67)

Here, Wackernagel initiates his discussion of this work without even mentioning the artist. Instead, he first provides information on the *commissioner* of this painting and the *function* it was meant to serve – both factors usually ignored by other types of art history. He indicates the basic subject matter of the work, but does not explore this in any depth, nor does he touch on the formal qualities of the work.

It is only after presenting information on the commissioner and function of this work of art, when he proceeds to present the details of this commission, that Wackernagel gets to Leonardo, the artist of this painting:

Thus first of all Leonardo da Vinci, whose experience as a military engineer had already been *employed* [italics added] during the besiegement of Pisa in May 1503, received the commission in October of this year for the wall painting with the theme of the battle of Anghiari which had occurred in 1440. Work on the cartoon, in the papal hall at Santa Maria Novella, progressed so swiftly that, according to a note of 30 August 1504 in the account book, the painting was already begun by that time.

But only one main section of the whole composition came to definitive execution, the equestrian battle for the standard; the rest was probably also sketched in working drawings and worked out in advance in individual figure studies. Then, from the beginning of 1506, Leonardo remained in Milan, in spite of severe warnings from Soderini who had *granted him only two*

*months leave* [italics added]. He could not make up his mind to take up the work again after certain unsuccessful experiments with the painting technique in it had ruined the whole thing. [Wackernagel then proceeds to discuss "the commission for the counterpart on the other long wall of the Great Council Hall," a work that "Michelangelo had been proposed to execute" but never completed.] (p. 67)

I stress the words "employed" and "granted him only two months leave" to point out how -- unlike Vasari (1568/1946), who glowingly cast Leonardo as a divine being -- Wackernagel presents Leonardo in human terms and further desanctifies Leonardo by introducing him as but one employee of a government official, albeit one whose authority he challenged. Wackernagel is concerned with neither artist biography nor the psychological state of the artist, and he leaves his discussion of the artwork without ever exploring either the content or formal qualities of it. As far as Wackernagel is concerned, Leonardo's *Battle of Anghiari* is but one commission for the Great Council Hall of Florence. Art is presented by Wackernagel as economic products created to fulfill certain social functions.

Within the six chapters of "The Patrons," the second section of Wackernagel's book, only scattered references are made to Leonardo and the artworks he produced in connection to the patrons discussed. Artworks by Leonardo, even the *Mona Lisa*, are spoken of only in passing, listed as commissions of certain patrons who are focused upon. This is indicative of the reversal of emphasis concerning patrons in Wackernagel's book.

Even in the third and final part of his book, a section entitled "The Artist's Workshop and the Art Market," Wackernagel still only sporadically interjects points specifically regarding Leonardo and his art. These references are included to clarify or substantiate points he is making regarding the methods and manner in which Renaissance artists in general produced art.



Wackernagel is virtually unconcerned with individual artists and particular art objects; instead, he concentrates on collective aspects of the economics of art production during the Renaissance.

In summary, Wackernagel's *The World of the Florentine Renaissance Artist* is a premier example of correlational social art history -- and of socio-cultural art history in general. By concentrating on the relationship between artists and their world, rather than specific art objects or makers, this book sharply contrasts with other art histories relating to Leonardo and his art. It is worth noting that Wackernagel sought not to replace other approaches to art history, however. His aim was to supplement them. Specifically, he sought to build on the insights gained from the formalist approach to art history advocated by his revered teacher, Heinrich Wölfflin (Wackernagel, 1938/1981). Wackernagel convincingly justifies socio-cultural art history as another valid type of art history, especially in regard to the history of Renaissance art, when he asserts:

In the organization of the artistic life of all earlier epochs, even the Italian Renaissance, the artist's personal desire to create determined only the final touches, and in some cases a more or less perceptible modification. The primary, fundamental factors lay outside the artist's studio. One element was the commission -- the demand, the need for a work of art which an artist was called on to fulfill. The other was the patron -- the commissioner and user, who had to be present and active in order to set artistic ingenuity in motion and make the work of art materially possible. Thus the work of art did not simply originate from artistic initiative and, theoretically, as an end in itself. It did not take on its material value and function by way of the supply process (through exhibitions and art dealers). Rather, the constant and exceptionally powerful demand emerged as the decisive stimulus to production and even dictated its extent and intensity. Only with rare exceptions was art produced, throughout the whole fifteenth and early sixteenth centuries, without such concrete needs and stimuli; that is, without the order of a patron. (pp. 5-6)

### Genres of Art History that Focus on ART AUDIENCE

Similarly to the proverbial debate regarding a tree falling in the forest with no one around, *is it heard?*, when a work of art doesn't have an audience in attendance of it, *is it art?* Spitz (1985) articulates this position and posits that without the audiences of works of art, "there can be no art" (p. 136). She identifies this stance as "the point of view that works of art come into being only insofar as they are perceived" (p. 137) and further clarifies it by explaining that:

the extreme of such a position would be to hold that paintings on the walls of the Louvre, for example, simply cease to exist as works of art when the museum doors are barred and no one is there to observe them. Farfetched as this viewpoint may seem, it forces us to attend to the crucial role played by the responder in all forms of art, a role especially well known to performing artists, who are more immediately dependent on it than their counterparts in the visual arts and literature. . . . Something dynamic and reciprocal occurs between artists and audiences, not just in the performing arts but in all arts, and there are theorists who hold that we cannot legitimately speak about art without taking this dynamic into consideration. (p. 137)

While Spitz proceeds to explore psychoanalytic theories in regard to art audiences, other scholars have concerned themselves with other aspects of art spectators, theories of response, and/or the *attending to* rather than the creating of art. Although not often recognized as a form of art history within art historical scholarship, I contend that histories of art may be written and indeed have been written focusing on visual arts *audiences*. I believe that although *most* histories of art are written focused upon art makers or art objects and that many others are focused upon the contexts in which works of art are created, another shift in attention *can be* and *has been* taken to bring

the focus of art historical investigations to concentrate upon art viewers. This stance is supported by Kleinbauer and Slavens (1982), although I have a wider conception of this realm of studies and place it in a different conceptual framework than these authors. In this dissertation, I propose a category of histories of art concerned with various aspects of visual arts audiences and label it as "Genres of Art History that Focus on Art Audience."

Historical studies of aesthetic preferences of art viewers is one avenue of exploration that I place within this domain. Kleinbauer and Slavens (1982) present the history of taste, "that is, the history of art theories, exhibitions, art collecting, and art dealing" (p. 122) as a variation of social art history. This would then categorically place such an approach within my previously discussed art history category of Genres of Art History that Focus on Context of Creation. Again, as with the other genres of art history I have analyzed, the overlapping of categories of histories of art is evident. The position I am advocating is that if a particular history of art is most concerned about aesthetic preferences, critical responses, or other topics of investigation related to art audiences *at the time in which particular artworks were created*, then that study should be regarded as conceptually residing primarily within the realm of Genres of Art History that Focus on Context of Creation. In those cases, the art viewer is taken to be one contributing factor reflecting and/or impacting the creation of art at a certain place and time. Certainly, such an approach to art history also overlaps into the art history category I have proposed and entitled as "Genres of Art History that Focus on Art Audience." In contrast, when aesthetic preferences, critical responses, or other topics of investigation related to art audiences are studied in relation to *the passage of time beyond the timeframe of when an artwork was created*, then I suggest

that the study resides more exclusively within the category focused on art audiences. I next introduce and analyze one such genre.

### Response-based Art History

People are sexually aroused by pictures and sculptures; they break pictures and sculptures; they mutilate them, kiss them, cry before them, and go on journeys to them; they are calmed by them, stirred by them, and incited to revolt. They give thanks by means of them, expect to be elevated by them, and are moved to the highest levels of empathy and fear. They have always responded in these ways; they still do. They do so in societies we call primitive and in modern societies; in East and West, in Africa, America, Asia, and Europe. (Freedberg, 1989, p. 1)

So begins Chapter 1 of *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response* by David Freedberg (1989). This author is concerned with investigating visceral responses to art – ones that he asserts are most often repressed by individuals and are virtually totally ignored by art history scholars. Because it is not a topic that is either generally recognized or accepted within the field of art history and because Freedberg is disappointed in "art history's excessive emphasis on high art at the expense of other elements of visual culture" (p. xix), he chose to place his study outside the bounds of "art history." He begins the Introduction: "This book is not about the history of art. It is about the relations between images and people in history" (p. xix). In this opening statement, it seems that rather than asserting the rightfulness of his book to be classified as "art history" or to exert arguments that attempt to stretch the disciplinary boundaries of art history further to accommodate such, he simply chooses not to pick that fight. *I do*. Although some may see it as a slippery slope on which to build distinctions because there is limited support currently provided by the field of art history

for this view, I believe that concepts of "art history" should be expanded to include studies such as Freedberg's *The Power of Images: Studies in the History and Theory of Response*. In a review of this book in *The New York Times*, Kimmelman characterizes Freedberg's book as "the latest clarion call to expand the purview of art history" (cited in Freedberg, 1989, back cover page). I believe this indicates that some are ready to accept that concepts of "art history" should be expanded to include histories of human responses to art, with notions of "art" widened significantly to include more than traditionally-held notions of primarily only fine art paintings and sculptures. I contend that such a category of art history should include historical investigations of intellectual, artistic, emotional – all manner of – reactions to art and, further suggest, that studies of responses to *artists* over time as well as art objects fall within this area of art historical scholarship.

In summary, I propose that studies of the reactions people have had to art and artists over time be considered another genre of art history. Such studies may alternatively explore such varying differentiations as psychological responses, emotional responses, behavioral responses, creative responses, aesthetic responses, and/or critical responses to the visual arts or art makers or what Kleinbauer and Slavens labeled as "the history of taste." As I see these various types of responses as intertwined, however, I have clustered attention to all manner of reactions to art and artists under one heading which I have termed: "response-based art history." Within this heading, however, I do suggest and utilize two sub-headings to distinguish between responses focused on *art maker* versus those focused on *art object*. I have found specific examples of histories of art related to the theme of

Leonardo and his art to next present to further clarify both of these variations of this genre of art history.

Response-based art history focused upon art maker. *Inventing Leonardo* by A. Richard Turner (1994) is an analysis of scholars' changing responses to Leonardo da Vinci through the centuries. In my view, this is a stellar example of response-based art history focused upon critical reactions to an art maker over time. Turner begins by asking the reader to ponder with him such questions as the following:

Why after his death did figures as diverse as Vasari, Goethe, Michelet, Pater, Valery, and Freud – to mention only a few – offer such passionate but differing interpretations of Leonardo? What did they see in him? Why is it that essays written on him today inevitably address different issues than essays written a century ago? Can we achieve anything like historical certainty about Leonardo, or does the center of anything that could be called the holding truth about him lie more in the manner in which successive interpretations illuminate the nature of the era in which each was written? (p. 3)

Although Turner labels writing that addresses these questions as "essays in cultural consequences," again, I am suggesting that his book taking this approach be considered as an example of response-based art history, specifically one focused on *an historical account of critical responses to the artist, Leonardo*. It is particularly the second part of his book, the part entitled "The Anatomy of a Legend," that best exemplifies this genre of art history as I have defined it. The author offers an apropos metaphor and description for both this section of his book and for conceptualizing the focus of this type of research:

In his copious notes on anatomy, Leonardo records his frustration in attempting to distinguish among the various layers and systems when confronted with the moist viscera of the body cavity. So it is with the layers of the legend of Leonardo, extending from Vasari to Freud. There is a 1550

Leonardo, an 1800 one, an 1850 one, and so on. Each is a different character based on the needs of the given time that produced him, and each has ties to the Leonardo that went before. (pp. 5-6)

Turner devotes five chapters of his book toward the aim of presenting "layers of the legend of Leonardo." His Chapter 4, "Giorgio Vasari Invents Leonardo," initiates this dissection of historical responses to this artist. In this chapter, Turner begins by asserting that Vasari's claim that Leonardo died in the arms of King Francis I was fabricated -- but was a significant element in Vasari's creation of Leonardo as a legendary figure. Turner summarizes Vasari's response to Leonardo -- and the perspective of this artist that Vasari represented to others -- as follows:

For better or worse, by 1568 Vasari had drawn the literary portrait of Leonardo da Vinci that would become the point of departure for future generations. A divine genius, possessing the highest qualities of physical beauty, intelligence, and benign disposition, Leonardo had explored the physical phenomena of the world as no one before. But his mind conceived of ideas that ran beyond his powers of execution; hence, his frequent inability to finish what he started. Unconstrained by convention and blessed by a transforming grace, this genius recognized no God -- at least in Vasari's 1550 version, in which there are allegations of unbelief; in the 1568 edition, sanitized by the Catholic Counter-Reformation climate, Leonardo dies a good Christian.

That death and its occurrence in the arms of the French king mark the true beginning of the myth of Leonardo, a myth subsequently elaborated by others, but always indebted to Giorgio Vasari. (p. 68)

Turner then recounts many other, later critical responses to Leonardo in the next four chapters to compare to Vasari's account of this artist. For instance, in Chapter 5, "Playing by the Rules," Turner suggests that several European art writers during the late-16th and 17th centuries (in particular, the Milanese Gian Paolo Lomazzo and the circle of the French Royal Academy of

Fine Arts, founded in 1648) were concerned with art theories and establishing "rules" by which art should be produced and judged. It is then, according to Turner, that "although Leonardo the artist had all but faded from view, Leonardo the teacher-theorist was born" (p. 76). Turner further posits that from the mid-17th century onward and into the 18th century, "popular fascination with the paired ideas of expression of the passions and classification brought Leonardo the draftsman of grotesque heads to center stage together with Leonardo the theoretician" (p. 79).

In Chapter 6, "Leonardo Goes Public," Turner proposes when and how another metamorphosis of responses to Leonardo was created:

Around 1800, through the efforts of various artists and scholars, Leonardo went public. No longer merely the theoretician and draftsman of grotesque heads, Leonardo was now revealed as a man of wide-ranging interests, an anticipatory scientific thinker, his renovated *Last Supper* the painting of the academic tradition. (p. 84)

Turner suggests that a 1797 essay by Giovanni Battista Venturi, *Essay on the Physical-Mathematical Works of Leonardo da Vinci, with Extracts from the Manuscripts Brought from Italy*, "is fundamentally important as offering the first printed, broad-based selection of Leonardo's scientific thought" (p. 86). He then presents Carlo Amoretti as "the other substantial Leonardo scholar around 1800" (p. 87) and describes Amoretti's response to and characterization of Leonardo as follows: "On the whole, Amoretti's Leonardo is a man of high intellectual seriousness" (p. 87). He then recounts how due to the early 19th-century writings by Giuseppe Bossi; Goethe, the Sage of Weimar; and Stendhal:

*The Last Supper* had returned to the consciousness of the West. A classical tradition of centuries' standing was triumphantly



affirmed. *The Last Supper* shone as a paragon of art, and a jewel in the crown of the city that it adorned. (p. 99)

Turner posits that these writing contributed to the creation of Leonardo as a public man.

In Chapter 7, "Leonardo the Harbinger of Modernity," Turner describes how beginning in the mid-19th century Leonardo is regarded by scholars as a secular, modern man and his paintings are interpreted to substantiate this characterization of him. For example, Turner specifically presents excerpts of the writings of Edgar Quinet in his *Revolutions of Italy*, published in 1848-1852, and interprets them as representing this response to and depiction of Leonardo. While Turner proceeds to introduce and discuss numerous monographs focused upon or including attention to Leonardo written during the mid-19th century, he particularly spotlights the work of Walter Pater. Turner credits Pater for "the most memorable piece on Leonardo ever written" (p. 113), in reference to Pater's essay on Leonardo first published in 1869 and also included in his noted *Studies in the History of the Renaissance* of 1873. Turner contends that "the essay's extraordinary prose paints an unsettling portrait of Leonardo as an apostle of the modern condition" (p. 100). It is Turner's representation of Pater's writing on Leonardo as yet another response to this artist presented over time that is the interest of my study.

And in Chapter 8, "The Mind of the Maker," the concluding chapter of this section of *Inventing Leonardo*, Turner compares the writings of Gabriel Seailles, Paul Valery, and Sigmund Freud regarding Leonardo. Turner presents the 1890s writings of Seailles and Valery as reactions to and explorations of Leonardo as intellectual and explains that these writings suggest Leonardo's art be viewed as both a representation of Leonardo's

thought and as an arousal of thought in others. He then compares this focus to that of Freud's. Of course, Freud is interested in Leonardo's mind from a psychoanalytic perspective, as I explained earlier in this chapter of my dissertation when I discussed Freud's writing on Leonardo as an example of psych-based art history. Here, in the context of Turner's book, Freud's study of Leonardo is yet another depiction of this artist over time, one placed within a history of response to one particular artist by art audiences of different time periods. In summarizing Turner's *Inventing Leonardo* as an exemplar of a response-based art history focused upon an artist, a last quote of Turner, regarding his intent in writing this book, seems most fitting: "If Leonardo finally comes to be seen by the reader as a story with yet new chapters to be written, this book will have served its purpose" (p. 154). Certainly many histories of response to this and other artists remain to be told.

Response-based art history focused upon art object. I have proposed another version of response-based art history focused upon reactions to *art objects*, rather than to art makers, over time. George Boas (1950) provides a good description of this as a topic in the study of art, although he writes this in the context of art criticism:

since most works of art have a long history, the number of spectators can be arranged in a temporal as well as a cultural series. When this is done and essays critical of the works in question are read, it turns out that even when the essays are in praise of the works of art, their praises are based on such different qualities that to all intents and purposes the work of art has become a different object for each wave of writers. . . . Works of art grow and change as their spectators change. And the history of works of art is to a large extent the growth in the number and kinds of value which human interest finds in them. (p. 63)

Although Boas addresses this topic to art critics in his book *Wingless Pegasus: A Handbook for Critics*, I believe it has equal relevance to art history.

Obviously, in my view, art criticism and art history overlap in the area of historical art criticism and histories of art criticism. In the appendix to his book, Boas (1940/1950) presents an essay related to the theme of Leonardo da Vinci and his art, entitled "The *Mona Lisa* in the History of Taste," in which he "examine[s] briefly what critics or commentators of different periods have said about it" (p. 213). I consider this to be a solid example of response-based art history; however, I have found another, more recently published and more expansive study of such and I have opted to present this rather than Boas's noteworthy essay.

*Mona Lisa: The Picture and the Myth* by Roy McMullen (1975/1977) is this other, superb example of response-based art history focused upon a work of art that relates to the theme of Leonardo and his art. The emphasis of this book on *art audience* is immediately conveyed to the reader through *images* as well as words, for a reproduction of the *Mona Lisa* is first presented in the preface and then four photographs of *people engaged in viewing this painting* compose the totality of illustrations offered for Chapter 1. This departs significantly from the illustrations included in the other histories of art I have presented on the Leonardo theme and is indicative of the shift of focus taken in this genre of art history.

In the text for this introductory chapter, the author presents a brief summary of responses to the *Mona Lisa* over time:

When it was still in Leonardo's studio in Florence, and very probably not yet finished, it was already inspiring imitations. By the middle of the sixteenth century it was being pronounced divine rather than human in its perfection; by the middle of the nineteenth it was a goal for pilgrimages and the object of a cult

that mixed romantic religiosity with eroticism and rhetoric. It is decidedly not just a painting like other paintings; it might be better described, on the basis of the record, as a cross between a universal fetish and a Hollywood-era film star. (pp. 1-2)

The author then poses a question: How should an art viewer today respond to this painting? It is McMullen's assertion that present-day art audiences should respond to both the painting itself and to the aura of responses that now enshrine it or, in the author's words, "both the picture and the myth" (p. 2). These terms are defined as follows by the author:

By "the picture" will be meant the *Mona Lisa* in conjecturally its original state, context, and significance: in other words, the painting as it could have been, although not necessarily was, viewed and interpreted by Leonardo himself or by one of his close, knowledgeable contemporaries. By "the myth" will be meant the second mode of existence the work has had in millions of lively imaginations all over the world during the last four and a half centuries . . . . (pp. 3-4)

It is McMullen's narrative of how this painting has been variously responded to by art audiences during the time span since its creation that is of interest here as an exemplification of response-based art history. In the following pages, I present a sampling of reactions to this painting as chronicled by McMullen. One point of clarification first: McMullen explains that due to Vasari's identification of the *Mona Lisa* as a commissioned portrait of Lisa (the wife of Francesco) del Giocondo, the painting came to be referred to as "*La Gionconda*" in Italy; "*La Joconde*" in France; and the *Mona Lisa* in English-speaking countries.

Some of the early critical responses to the *Mona Lisa* are described by McMullen as follows:

if we can trust contemporary commentators, . . . early viewers were startled, dazzled, and obscurely troubled by Leonardo's skill

as an illusionist – by the fact that the [*Mona Lisa*] . . . looked magically alive.

Praising a painting for its lifelike quality was an ancient critical habit, of course, which during the Renaissance degenerated into a way of paying ready-made compliments. But in the minds of pioneer admirers and mythicizers of the *Mona Lisa* the commonplaces seem to have suddenly lost their triteness and acquired literal meanings. De'Beatis refers to the picture as "done from the life," *facta di naturale*, and "most perfect." Vasari is inspired by his informant to marvel ecstatically at "how faithfully art can imitate nature," at the "natural lustre and moistness" of the eyes, at the beating pulse in the pit of the throat, at the "living flesh" of the mouth, and at a general effect "as alive as the original," and the inaccuracies in the account do not weaken its validity as evidence of what was thought about the picture. In 1584 the Florentine writer Raffaello Borghini continues in the same vein, observing that the work is such "that art can do no more." In 1625 Cassiano dal Pozzo, one of the leading scholarly antiquarians in Rome . . . , visited the French court and wrote an exact description of the painting that makes Vasari look like a careless schoolgirl but supports the biographer's critical emphasis:

[a quoted passage of Dal Pozzo's description of the *Mona Lisa* is inserted here]

. . . . [In Dal Pozzo's description,] there is no sign of awareness of an allegedly enigmatic personality; the woman is dismissed offhandedly . . . as merely "a certain Gioconda." Dal Pozzo is mostly impressed by Leonardo's technique, and there is only the romantic word "bewitched" to hint at future developments of the myth. (pp. 145-147)

McMullen intertwines his report of these early rapturous responses to Leonardo's artistic proficiency in realistically rendering the *Mona Lisa* – and a presentation of numerous copies such admiration stimulated the creation of – with an explanation of another early response to this painting. Specifically, the author describes how Francis I's acquisition of this painting and display of it in his Appartement des Bains at Fontainebleau led to the creation of numerous *nude* versions of this painting. And, McMullen posits:

the effect of all this . . . seems to have been to give Leonardo's fictional character a reflected nuance of sophisticated sexuality, a

nuance she has never quite lost. . . . she apparently moved a bit in many imaginations toward that of a courtesan in the sense, already current in sixteenth-century French, of a high-class *prostitute* [italics added]. (p. 152).

Here, the context in which a work of art was displayed, affected responses to the work. I believe this factor that influences our reactions to works of art is not often noted or considered. McMullen forcefully demonstrates this concept at work by noting this dramatic effect on viewer response to the *Mona Lisa's* display in Francis I's elaborate bathhouse.

The author also devotes a chapter to a description of the reaction to the *Mona Lisa* as a depiction of a *femme fatale*. I provide two fairly lengthy excerpts of the author's writing on this theme of response to this artwork to best facilitate comparisons between this genre of art history and others described and exemplified through quotation in this dissertation. The following is this sampling of the history McMullen provides of the reactions to the *Mona Lisa* as a depiction of a *femme fatale*:

The art historian Charles Clement, writing shortly after the middle of the [18th] century, shook his head over "the thousands of men of all ages and all languages," who having looked at the painting and "listened to the lying words of those perfidious lips, carried to the four corners of the world the poisoned arrows in their hearts." A few years later the great Jules Michelet . . . almost confessed that he himself had become a victim of the fatal appeal:

Art, nature, genius of mystery and of discovery, master of profundity of the world, of the unfathomable abyss of the ages, speak, what do you want from me? This painting attracts me, calls me, invades me, absorbs me; I go to it in spite of myself, as the bird goes to the serpent. (pp. 169-170)

By the last third of the [18th] century, . . . avant-garde literary appreciation of the *Mona Lisa* in France was dominated by Theophile Gautier's opinion. . . . it has remained, Vasari's

account aside, one of the two most influential interpretations of the painting ever written:

. . . the expression, wise, deep velvety, full of promise, attracts you irresistibly and intoxicates you, while the sinuous, serpentine mouth, turned up at the corners, in the violet shadows, mocks you with so much so much gentleness, grace, and superiority, that you feel suddenly intimidated, like a schoolboy before a duchess. . . . you discover that your melancholy arises from the fact that Mona Lisa three hundred years ago greeted your avowal of love with this same mocking smile which she retains even today on her lips.

Here we are certainly a long way from the simple astonishment of the sixteenth century at Leonardo's skill. This is the world of Poe's tales, of Baudelaire's substitution of one sensation for another, and of Wagnerians listening with their heads in their hands. . . .

The other most influential account of this picture is, of course, Walter Pater's great organ peal . . . . [1869/1873]:  
. . . [*La Gioconda*] is older than the rocks among which she sits; like the vampire, she has been dead many times, and learned the secrets of the grave; and has been a diver in deep seas, and keeps their fallen day about her . . . .  
(pp. 172-174)

Here, the author provides a pulsating account of some of perhaps the most rousing responses to Leonardo's painting that, according to McMullen, influenced future art audiences' responses to this work of art. Also, this lengthy quotation simultaneously demonstrates both my liberal use of quotations as verbal illustrations of the histories of art I present -- as a worthy method of depicting varying genres of art history -- and how McMullen generously includes quotations to more accurately depict variations of responses to the *Mona Lisa* over time.

Freud's reaction to Leonardo's paintings, a view first published in a 1910 monograph by Freud, is the primary focus of another chapter of *Mona Lisa: The Picture and the Myth*. I previously identified and discussed this publication as an example of psychoanalytic art history; in contrast, here,

Freud's response to Leonardo's art is placed within a history of response to the *Mona Lisa*. McMullen characterizes this response as "the Freudian assumption that a work of art, like a dream, could be a symbolic transformation, or a psychic displacement, of sexual yearnings and frustration that in an undisguised form could not have passed the artist's inner censor" (p. 185). In specifically responding to the *Mona Lisa*, McMullen explains, Freud wrote "It may very well have been that Leonardo was fascinated by *Mona Lisa*'s smile for the reason that it awoke something in him which had for long lain dormant in his mind -- probably an old memory" (cited in McMullen, 1975/1977, pp. 187-188).

A variety of *negative* and/or irreverent reactions to the *Mona Lisa* which emerged in the early 20th century are next described. McMullen cleverly collectively labels individuals holding anti-*Mona Lisa* views as "Giocondoclasts." The author asserts, however, that "at the level of the general public the demythicizers were, and have continued to be, practically without influence" (p. 226). And then he offers assorted evidence of the multitude of individuals diametrically opposite Giocondoclasts on the spectrum of responses to this painting -- who he labels as "Giocondophiles."

In addition to his chronicle of differing critical responses to the *Mona Lisa*, McMullen provides illustrations of over 35 copies, derivatives, variations, homages, and caricatures of the *Mona Lisa*. By offering reproductions of many *Mona Lisa*-inspired artworks over time, McMullen's book presents a history of *artistic responses*, as well as critical responses, to this most widely recognized artwork. *Mona Lisas* by Storey (1980) takes the history of artistic responses to the *Mona Lisa* even further by presenting over 100 creative renditions of this painting! There is no doubt that many other



variations were not included in even this book and that more are being created today – and will be made in the future as art makers continue to respond to this proven-compelling artwork. It is when a chronicle is made of these responses, critical responses, or other types of responses to art that I suggest the endeavor be categorized as response-based art history. I contend that *Mona Lisa: The Picture and the Myth* provides an especially rich example of response-based art history focused on a particular art object. It is a well-researched and multifaceted account of responses to this artwork from its early-16th century creation through the mid 1970s.

#### Genres of Art History that have MULTIPLE FOCUSES

All of the genres of art history that I have presented thus far I have characterized as mono-focused; I have suggested that each approach is primarily concerned with *either* the histories of art makers, art objects, contexts of creation, or art audiences. Other types of approaches, however, focus on exploring some *combination* of these broad topics of investigation, and I propose simply categorizing such as "Genres of Art History that have Multiple Focuses."

I next identify, describe, and analyze three genres of art history that are multi-focused and which offer yet more ideas for noteworthy ways in which art history has been and may be approached. The first generally can be described as exploring connections between two, too-often separated, art disciplines: art production and art history. Within the realm of art historical studies, I suggest that another, less-often-visited but worth-investigating,

region of art history is the study of the processes of artistic production. Before explicating this approach, however, I explain the direction taken by the other two.

The other two genres that I present as multi-focused stem from recent revisionist movements in art history. Much of such critical discourse has been and continues to be recognized within the field of art history under the banner of "the new art history." *The New Art History*, edited by Rees and Borzello (1986/1988), is a premier and oft-cited reference on this scholarship. The term "the new art history" probably first appeared in 1982, although its formation may be traced back to T. J. Clark's 1974 article that called for a revised social history of art (Rees & Borzello, 1986/1988). "The new art history" is actually a generic name for several diverse challenges to traditional modes of art historical scholarship (Melville & Readings, 1995; Rees & Borzello, 1986/1988). The common denominator for the various approaches to art history often clustered under this umbrella-term is that each questions the subject matter, theoretical underpinnings, and theory structure of the discipline of art history; succinctly put, each questions the discipline of art history (Rees & Borzello, 1986/1988). Fernie (1995) elaborates just what it is that traditional art history is criticized for:

for the narrowness of its range of subject matter and concentration on individual artists whom it classified as geniuses; for its restricted set of methods, consisting chiefly of connoisseurship, the analysis of style and iconography, quality, the canon, dating arguments and biography; for the uniformity of degree curricula offered by departments of the history of art; for its ignoring not only of the social context of art, artist and public, but also structures of power, especially those of relations between art historians and the owners of valuable works of art; and perhaps most important of all, for the lack of attention paid to the changes which had been taking place in the related disciplines of literature and history in the 1960s. . . . (pp. 18-19)

Fernie also suggests the use of the term "the new art histories" to more clearly indicate the diversity of approaches often incorporated under the singular heading of "the new art history." I dislike the term "the new art history" and have chosen not to utilize it as a name indicating a particular approach to art history for two reasons: (1) I believe it is confusing in that "new" becomes old very quickly with the passage of time and it is an arbitrary referent and (2) I believe that this term is too nondescript -- I suggest it is best broken down and the various approaches that are often gathered under this heading be examined according to the more specific agenda of each position. That is the approach I have taken in this dissertation.

Based on the ideas presented in the Rees and Borzello (1986/1988) anthology, the following genres of art history that have collectively been labeled as "the new art history" may be identified: the new social art history, psychoanalytic art history, feminist art history, and semiotics-based art history. I believe it is very important for this study to include these recent excursions in art historical scholarship as other regions that may be explored in the art historical domain, although the terrain is rough in places and largely still unmapped at present. I propose that the attention devoted to the recent rethinking regarding social art history and psychoanalytic art history may be embraced as recent developments within the genres I have already presented as socio-cultural art history and psych-based art history. However, I have chosen to present feminist art history and semiotics-based art history as two other distinct genres of art history within the Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History I draw in this dissertation. Both of these approaches, in my view, bring additional topics and modes of art historical inquiry to art historical scholarship.

Both feminist art history and semiotics-based art history address *each* of the categories of *art maker, art object, art viewer, and context of creation*. *Beliefs concerning art maker, art object, context of creation, and art viewer and the interrelationships* of these categories are also analyzed by both of these versions of the new art history. Also, theory that impacts all these areas is a primary emphasis of each as is characteristic of the new art history. Thus, both feminist art history and semiotics-based art history fit well under the heading of "Genres of Art History that have Multiple Focuses." Both are representative of contemporary ideas currently being addressed and debated in the field of art history.

In keeping with the overriding theme of this dissertation as a journey through and an attempt to map the art historical landscape, Holly (1996) offers a perspective of where the new art histories bring us on our art historical journey:

The shapes of critical theory that have arisen in the metamorphosing guises of Marxism, feminism, semiotics, deconstruction, and psychoanalysis . . . have caught us up and transported us into territories which we only half recognize, lunar lands crisscrossed by paths on which only a few adventurers have left their traces.

. . . Either we dig our heels into the unfamiliar terrain and resolutely refuse to acknowledge that we have genuinely been expelled from the garden where the timeless work of art reigns supreme, or we take those objects as they appear before us in the shimmering atmosphere of the new world and use their visible deconstruction as the occasion to remap our own disciplinary universe. (p. 5)

As I have explained, we will press on in this dissertation to explore two areas of these new art history lands: feminist art history and semiotics-based art history. I agree with Holly (1996) that these are two regions of art historical scholarship that are, relatively speaking, as yet still not widely-traveled, but

should be, by art historians – and, I would add, art educators. I first present another genre of art history, however, that is *not* part of the new art history but is multi-focused in its approach to the study of art history.

### Artistic Processes-based Art History

What materials and techniques have humans used to create art during a particular time period or during a particular span of time? In what varying ways have humans utilized assorted materials and techniques to create art throughout history and in various cultures? How have modes, media, and methods of art production varied over time? Historically, what art-making practices may be identified and associated with differing artists, geographic locations, and/or societal contexts? What differing artists' views regarding processes of creating may be identified from the recent and distant past? When attempts are made to answer any of such questions, I propose labeling the investigation as "artistic processes-based art history." This is not a term previously or currently utilized in art historical discourse; I have conceptualized and termed this as such and advocate that it be considered as another genre of art history. Although there is scant discussion of such studies as a form of art history, under any heading, in the field's literature, I have found a variety of manifestations of it do exist and believe it is reasonable and desirable to recognize this as another region of the art historical landscape -- and one worth exploring. I conceive of it as a region of scholarship in which studies of art object and artist intersect and sometimes explorations of context of creation interconnect as well. Overlapping with other genres of art history residing within these categories certainly occurs,

particularly with formalist art history; however, I contend that it is useful to recognize accounts of modes and methods of artistic production as residing within a multi-focused category of "artistic processes-based art history."

Eugene Kleinbauer (1971/1989; Kleinbauer & Slavens, 1982) is one art historian who substantiates giving recognition to this as a topic of study for art history. However, he places such attention only in relation to studying the art object, particularly tying the study of materials and techniques to connoisseurship. He suggests that studying artistic materials and techniques has assisted art historians in making attributions, detecting forgeries, and dating artworks. Also, Kleinbauer does point out that historical studies of materials and techniques can be worthwhile for gaining understanding of the sometimes significant role that developments of media and processes have had on artistic creation.

While I am pleased that Kleinbauer acknowledges and discusses artistic materials and techniques within his overview of genres of art historical scholarship in his *Modern Perspectives in Western Art History*, I wish to place further emphasis on this. Also, I conceptualize the study differently from Kleinbauer. While Kleinbauer discusses materials and techniques as a physical property of the art object, I suggest that materials and techniques be considered as aspects of artistic *processes* and studied as *means of expression*, that is as points of interaction between art object and art maker. I propose that it is the *meeting* of art maker and material that should be considered as the focal point distinguishing another genre of art history. Exploring socio-cultural contexts may or may not be additionally part of such investigations. It is in the portrayal of the dynamics of *how* matter meets with human hand

and mind and/or emotion that I believe is found meaningful content for other art histories that have been and should be told.

Just as socio-cultural art history is an interdisciplinary approach to art history, with art history interacting with sociology, anthropology, and social and cultural history, so, too, is artistic processes-based art history interdisciplinary. While I believe it may interweave art history with these same disciplines, it also may be seen as "combining research in science, [art] conservation, and art history" as asserted by Miguel Angel Corzo (1995), Director, The Getty Conservation Institute, specifically in reference to the history of painting techniques. Twenty-seven studies with varying interpretations and explorations of this theme are represented in *Historical Painting Techniques, Materials, and Studio Practice* (Wallert, Hermens, & Peek, 1995). Published by The Getty Conservation Institute as preprints of an international symposium held in the Netherlands in 1995, this publication offers many insights into possibilities regarding what I have termed as artistic processes-based art history.

I must point out that a greater range of multicultural content and considerations, however, can and should be addressed within artistic processes-based art history than indicated by the topics of this publication and the examples I present next tied to the theme of Leonardo da Vinci and his art. When conceptualizing the range of possibilities to be found within this genre of art history, I advocate that a wide realm of types of materials, techniques, and artistic processes be considered as candidates for art historical investigations, going beyond Western fine art categories of art and *studio* production. Anderson (1989) affirms that the study of artistic processes may and should include the study of such within non-Western and small-scale

societies and that the study of the use of *tools*, as well as materials and techniques and practices, for creating art – *utilizing broad definitions of art* – can and should be addressed.

For the purposes of further clarifying the genre of artistic processes-based art history and how it compares to other genres of art history, I now briefly describe three publications as examples of variations encompassed under this heading and highlight how Leonardo and his art is referred to in these. The first example is *An Artist's Notebook: Techniques and Materials* by Bernard Chaet (1979). It illustrates the approach of centering an investigation of art materials and techniques around artistic *mode*, or type of artistic process, in this case, painting and drawing. The book covers a range of traditional and contemporary fine art media and methods of art production by discussing numerous noted Western artists' varied selections and uses of materials and by referring to over 200 reproductions of artwork included in this book.

In this monograph, Leonardo is only one of many artists referred to, and only two of his artworks are discussed and included as reproductions. It is a significant point of departure that here no mention is made of: Leonardo's life, personality, or status as "artistic genius;" the content of his artwork or the overall style of his work; the Renaissance context in which he worked; or audience response to him or any of his artworks. None of his usually noted "masterpieces" are referred to or discussed. Instead, only two drawing studies, one of flowers and one for a monument, are selected for examination. Specifically, it is solely Leonardo's drawing *techniques* – *how* he worked with a particular drawing tool and medium – in comparison to



how other artists have, that is pointed out. For example, in Chaet's section on steelpoints, he writes:

Feininger's *In the City at the End of the World* (Fig. 30) is executed with the crow-quill steel pen. It is a point that produces this kind of scratchy line as well as a very thin, textureless straight line. Feininger used the instrument often, obviously favoring such fine textural vibration.

Botticelli varied the pressure of a fine steelpoint, and may even have added a little water to the ink in places to make the line lighter (Fig. 31). The result is a beautiful parade of interlocking forms executed in a linear style. Using the same kind of steelpoint, Raphael develops a far more sculptural effect (Fig. 32). His contours dissolve into the forming lines that are cross-hatched around the simplified volumes. Once again, each vision finds a different technical means to fulfill its need.

*Leonardo took up a heavier steelpoint in order to produce firmer contours that undulate slightly (Fig. 33 ['Studies of Flowers,' c. 1483, Pen and ink over metalpoint, 7 x 8"]). He drew the thinner, parallel lines behind the flowers with a finer pen point. Notice how these parallel lines form a spreading film that weaves the flowers to the page, rather than keeping them strictly on top of the ground. [italics added]*

Sisley's landscape, *Moret-sur-Loing* (Fig. 34) illustrates both another form language and another technical effect possible with a flexible steelpoint. . . . (pp. 26-28).

Chaet, the author of *An Artist's Notebook: Techniques and Materials*, identifies himself as a studio teacher with over two decades of experience and explains that his purpose in writing this book is "to provide fundamental information on *process*. . . . to show student-artists how they can use various materials and techniques to serve their own inspiration" (p. v). Although the author does not claim to be writing a "history of art," I contend that that is what he has done (although I recognize that the book could wear other labels as well). I find it commendable that through this book Chaet makes connections between art history and art production and encourages others to explore such further.

A second example of artistic processes-based art history may be found in *The Renaissance Artist At Work* by Bruce Cole (1983). This publication as a whole is most appropriately classified as a socio-cultural art history, as one of its three sections is focused on presenting the social environment in which Renaissance artists worked and the third addresses the particular types and imagery of art that were created in response to the demands of Renaissance society. However, the second section of this publication, "The Materials of Renaissance Art," is devoted to presenting step by step descriptions of *how* Renaissance art was made. None of Leonardo's painting and drawing techniques, nor that of any other particular Renaissance artists for the most part, are specifically discussed; instead, the processes of Renaissance artistic creation and Renaissance artists' use of materials and techniques are presented in general terms covering the following range of topics:

*The Materials of Renaissance Art*  
 importance of materials . tempera painting on panels .  
 preparing the panel . underdrawing . drawings on paper .  
 gilding . colors . effects of tempera on style . effect of  
 varnish and overcleaning on temper . museum lighting  
 versus candlelight . impact of oil paint and canvas . priming  
 other than white, half-tones and subtle transitions of color  
 possible . fluency and modeling . collaborative nature of  
 fresco suited to Renaissance workshop practice . sinopia .  
 drawings on paper post-1450 . intonaco and plaster patches .  
 fresco secco . drawing in ink, charcoal, chalk and silverpoint .  
 rapid evolution of drawing . illumination . arrival of the  
 woodcut . niello and engraving . raw material and tools of  
 sculpture . painted sculpture . clay or wax models . relief,  
 rilievo schiacciato . bronze . lost-wax process . terracotta .  
 firing and glazes . woodcarving (p. vi)

The perspective offered by this approach to artistic processes-based art history is that artists often have followed cultural traditions of artistic creation which

we can learn about and compare to the production of art in other times and other places – by other peoples.

This directly contrasts with my third example of this genre of art history: *Leonardo on Painting* edited by Martin Kemp (1989). Here, rather than a general chorus on modes, media, and methods, it is an individual artist's voice regarding his own thoughts regarding artistic processes and advice to other artists that is presented to the reader. The book is an anthology of Leonardo's many, but disorderly, notes related to painting. All topical headings and words are Leonardo's own, as translated from Italian; it literally and figuratively represents his "perspective" of artistic production.

The editor, Kemp, has made selections from among a variety of primary sources of Leonardo's writings and organized and clustered them under sectional headings and sub-headings to more coherently present Leonardo's ideas on various processes involved in painting. The following are three major topics he addresses: the processes of seeing and depicting what is seen; (realistically) representing the human body and nature; and working practices for painters. I provide the following sampling of Leonardo's writing from this anthology, representing these three topics, to best facilitate comparisons with other approaches to art history:

*On the colours in shadow and to what extent they  
are darkened*

Just as all the colours are tinged with the darkness of the shadows of night, so the shadow of any colour ends in that darkness. Therefore, painter, do not make it the practice that in your final shadows you are able to discern the colours which border on one another, because if nature does not let this happen and you make claims to be an imitator of nature, as far as art allows, do not make it seem that you intend to rectify her errors, because there is not error in her, but you should understand that the error is in you.

Colours situated in shadow show less variety amongst each other to the extent that the shadow in which they are situate is darker. . . . (p. 73)

*How it is necessary for the painter to know the internal structure of man*

. . . . Remember, painter, that in the movements you depict as being made by your figures to disclose only those muscles which are involved in the motion and action of your figure, and in each case make the most relevant muscle the most apparent, and that which is less relevant less evident, while that which is not involved at all remains slack and limp and is little displayed. And for this reason I urge you to learn the anatomy of the muscles, chords and bones, without attention to which you will accomplish little. . . . (p. 130)

*How to portray landscapes*

. . . . Landscapes should be portrayed in such a manner that the trees are half illuminated and half shaded, but it is better to make them when the sun is covered by clouds, for then the trees are illuminated by the universal light of the sky and by the universal shade of the earth and these are so much darker in their parts to the extent that these parts are closer to the centre of the tree and to the earth. . . . (p. 162)

*Rules for composing narrative paintings*

O painter, when you compose a narrative painting, do not draw the limbs on your figures with hard contours or it will happen to you as to many different painters who wish every little stroke of charcoal to be definitive. . . . painter, decide broadly upon the position of the limbs of your figures and attend first to the movements appropriate to the mental attitudes of the creatures in the narrative rather than to the beauty and quality of their limbs. . . . (p. 222)

In summary, *Leonardo on Painting* illustrates a unique perspective on artistic process: the opportunity to learn how one particular artist literally sees the subjects that he draws and paints, how he transforms what he sees into works of art, and the ways that he advocates others approach creating works of art. It also portrays what I contend to be another valid approach to

artistic processes-based art history – which represents another way in which to approach the study of art history.

### Feminist Art History

There are varieties of scholarship that may be labeled as "feminist art history." Some feminist art historians seek to redress the marginalization of women artists by adding women artists and art objects created by women, as "the missing ingredient," to existing histories of art. Others, some in response to Linda Nochlin's (1971) notable call for "a feminist critique of the discipline of art history," have gone beyond this additive, "play by the [traditional] rules" of art historical scholarship approach. They challenge the theory structure of those histories of art, attempting to analyze and rewrite "the rules of the game" (Parker, 1979, cited in Pollock, 1988/1990, p. 23); they seek a paradigm shift in the discipline of art history (Pollock, 1988/1990). These feminist scholars attempt to reconstruct the discipline of art history: first, by uncovering how art and art history have in the past and continue to subordinate women and then by seeking alternative approaches to the history of art. All feminist art histories are written to question and challenge the status quo of the discipline of art history in some way or several ways. This is characteristic of the various forms of revisionist art history that are often termed "the new art history." While feminist art history fits under and is often subsumed under "the new art history" heading, as I explained earlier, I have chosen to present it under its own heading as a distinct genre of art history in its own right. It is a multifaceted approach to art history that has been receiving increasing attention in recent years (Broude & Garrard, 1992).

*Women, Art, and Society* (2nd ed.) by Whitney Chadwick (1997) is a particularly lucid example of feminist art history. It illustrates feminist art history in at least four ways. One way in which it represents feminist art history is clarified by looking at Chadwick's chapter entitled "The Renaissance Ideal," which is related to the theme of my examples of types of art history. Chadwick discusses the obstacles that women faced as artists in Renaissance Florence – which is quite a different subject than that of the other examples of types of art history discussed previously. Chadwick theorizes that:

The division between public and private in Florence at that time [the 15th century] restructured art as a public, primarily male, activity. This ideology was strengthened as the Republic and later the Medici princes organized Renaissance society as a culture in which male privilege and male lines of property and succession were strongly valued. (pp. 70-71)

She also suggests that:

as pictorial seeing established itself along learned and scientific principles taught only to men, it was increasingly organized according to male expectations and conventions. Painting became one of a growing list of activities in which women had intuitive, but not learned, knowledge and to whose laws they remained outsiders. (p. 74)

According to Pollock, (1988/1990), this approach (of presenting what stood in the way of women in their development as artists) is commonly used by feminist art historians, although she finds it to be a limited approach to feminist concerns. Nevertheless, this chapter in Chadwick's book, serves to illustrate one type of initiative which comes under the label of "feminist art history."

In her next chapter, Chadwick diverts from the established canon of artistic periods to present "The Other Renaissance." She begins this chapter by contending the following:

Art history's conception of the Renaissance as an historically, geographically, and culturally unique period is based on the lives and achievements of men. The history of women's contributions to visual culture does not necessarily fit neatly into categories produced by and around men's activities. . . (p. 87)

Chadwick's builds the thesis and focus of this chapter around this viewpoint and her assertion that "If women artists had a Renaissance, it surely took place in Bologna rather than Florence or Rome, and in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries rather than the fifteenth" (Chadwick, 1990, p. 78). The revisionist approach taken in this chapter is the second way in which *Women, Art, and Society* exemplifies feminist art history. For it clarifies by example the rethinking and restructuring of art history characteristic of feminist art history (and of all the recent revisionist approaches collectively labeled the new art history).

Another example of how Chadwick's book illustrates feminist art history's emphasis upon analyzing and challenging the discipline of art history is found in the preface to her book. She writes:

As an academic discipline, it [art history] has categorized cultural artifacts, privileging some forms of production over others and continually returning the focus to certain kinds of objects and the individuals who have produced them. The terms of art history's analysis are neither "neutral" nor "universal"; instead they reinforce widely held social values and beliefs and they inform a huge range of activities from teaching to publishing and to the buying and selling of works of art. (p. 12)

Here, Chadwick not only seeks to reveal biases of the discipline of art history but to also disclose the power it wields on society. She views the discipline as not merely reflecting the sexism existent in society but actually contributing to it.

Chadwick offers a "brief survey that indicates how writing about art has confused the issue of women artists by inscribing social constructions of

femininity on them" (p. 31). To substantiate the embedded claim she makes in this survey, Chadwick critiques art history's past discourse on women artists. This reiterates Parker's and Pollock's (1981/1986, p. 3) position that "To discover the history of women and art is in part to account for the way art history is written" (p. 11). As Vasari (1568/1946) is often considered the proto-art historian, it is appropriate that Chadwick traces the roots of art history's treatment of women artists back to his famous *Lives of the Artist*, which "mentions at least thirteen women artists" (p. 31). She finds that Vasari's writing models art history's continuous treatment of women artists as "exceptions" (p. 37) and its presentation of them as always inferior to their male counterparts in the visual arts. Chadwick analyzes and challenges this tradition; she calls for the restructuring of the discipline of art history, in particular its discourse regarding women artists. This makes *Women, Art, and Society* exemplary of feminist art history.

Another way in which Chadwick's chapter entitled "The Other Renaissance" illustrates scholarship that fits under the rubric of feminist art history is that it is categorically multi-focused. This varies significantly from the examples of other types of art history related to the theme of Leonardo da Vinci and his art discussed thus far. Art maker, art object, context of creation, and art audience are all considered, and the relationships among such are emphasized. First, the societal forces enacting upon gender relations that subsequently affect women artists in general at this time and place are explored. Then histories of specific women artists, such as Properzia de' Rossi, Lavinia Fontana, Artemisia Gentileschi, and Elisabetta Sirani, are presented using a biographical approach. Both the content and formal qualities of artworks by these artists, particularly the latter two, are analyzed.



The Renaissance art viewer is given noticeably less attention, yet it is significant that such is referred to even briefly in this history of "The Other Renaissance." For, combined with the other categories of objects under scrutiny in this chapter, it indeed makes this a multi-focused and integrative approach to art historical scholarship, as is characteristic of both feminist art history and the new art history in general.

For the purpose of further clarifying how *Women, Art, and Society*, as an example of feminist art history, compares to other types of art history, I present Chadwick's discussion of one painting by Gentileschi:

The most insistent feature of Gentileschi's *Judith Decapitating Holofernes* – the ferocious energy and sustained violence of the scene – has attracted extensive critical commentary, often by writers who have found intimations of Gentileschi's personal experience as the recipient of Tassi's [her teacher's] sexual advances in the scene. Yet the naturalistic details – the choice of the moment of the decapitation and the blood which jets from the severed arteries – are present in several other seventeenth-century versions. . . . A more relevant source for Gentileschi's representation may be a lost work by Rubens . . . which sheds light on the painting's iconography as well as its gruesome nature. . . . Despite pictorial sources in Caravaggio, Rubens, and Orazio Gentileschi [her father], there is nothing in the history of Western painting to prepare us for Gentileschi's expression of female physical power, brilliantly captured in the use of a pinwheel composition in which the interlocking, diagonally thrusting arms converge at Holofernes's head. It is not the physicality of the female figures alone, however, which makes it unusual, but its combination with restructured gazes. The coy glances and averted gazes of Western painting's female figures are missing here. The result is a direct confrontation which disrupts the conventional relationship between an "active" male spectator and a passive female recipient. Although Gentileschi's work shares subjects and female heroines with that of a great many other seventeenth-century painters . . . and active, muscular male figures appear in works [by others of that time and place] . . . , its celebration of female energy expressed in direct rather than arrested action was profoundly alien to the prevailing artistic temper. (pp. 112-113).

Chadwick gives a methodological tour of art history in her account of this one painting. She first alludes to biographical and psychoanalytic art histories as she refers to writings that tie the painting to an event in Gentileschi's life and see the manifest content of *Judith and Holofernes* as only a cover-up for the latent content of a sexual experience of the artist. Chadwick next summarily models the three varieties of content-based art history (pre-iconography, iconography, and iconology): (a) by pointing out the natural subject matter of the work, the natural meaning of the work is identified as a decapitation; (b) by discussing it as but one version of a certain artistic theme, its conventional meaning is referred to; and (c) by interpreting it as a depiction of "female physical power," she indicates the underlying significance of the work. Chadwick places this painting within the traditional framework of the history of male artists, although she points out Gentileschi's variance from such. She then proceeds to briefly explore the formal qualities of the work and concisely comments upon the relationship of art viewer and art object. Lastly, Chadwick touches upon the context of creation (the "artistic temper" of the times); actually, societal factors that affected this painting and others produced by Gentileschi were explored in more detail earlier in the chapter. Chadwick's discussion of women as subject matter of art (as the art object) and reference to power relationships between males and females clearly indicates the feminist concerns of the author and adds further diversity to this art historical smorgasbord.

It is the utilization of traditional approaches to art history that Mathews (1991) finds contradictory to Chadwick's (1990) pledge to challenge the status quo. Mathews writes, "Despite her [Chadwick's] advocacy of a radical, [feminist] revisionist stance, in the actual text she assumes several

different positions along the spectrum from mainstream to centrist to radical" (p. 336). However, this characteristic of being methodologically eclectic is the fourth reason that I find Chadwick's book (both 1990 and 1997 editions) to be such a particularly useful example for defining feminist art history. For Chadwick's book makes it evident that there are a variety of approaches utilized by those labeled as feminist art historians, some of which are new content or new twists to traditional art historical approaches. Pollock (1988/1990) proposes that "we no longer think of a feminist art history but a feminist intervention in the histories of art" (p. 17). I believe Chadwick's writing clearly illustrates this concept.

However, I do find Chadwick's (1997) *Women, Art, and Society* limited in three regards. While its title indicates a broad perspective on "women, art, and society," it focuses exclusively on Western women, Western art, and Western society. Perhaps this limitation should be reflected in the title. In the preface, Chadwick explains that her approach was, in essence, selected to accommodate the prevalent university art history survey course of Western art, although she recognizes that this privileges some female artists and women's artworks over others. A second limitation of Chadwick's book is that non-"fine art" objects are excluded, and even the attention that she gives to the fine arts is limited almost exclusively to paintings and sculpture. The author acknowledges this limitation and provides a justification of it in the preface:

I have focused on painting and sculpture because it is here that issues of production and representation are most often in conflict for the woman artist. Rather than attempting an inclusive survey of *all* women artists now known to us, I have organized the book around a series of specific historical conditions which have led women to negotiate new relationships to issues of representation, patronage, and ideology. (p. 15)

Some of her claims seem to me to be useful for justifying taking an opposite focus on non-fine art categories of art and artists. *Women, Art, and Society* is also somewhat restricted in its attention devoted to issues of class and race. For while Chadwick does a commendable job on introducing and discussing women artists of color and their art, as this discussion is confined within fine art parameters, it is limited in scope. Obviously, Chadwick had to place some restrictions on the content and coverage of topics in her book. I simply believe it is important to clarify here the limitations of her book and to point out that these are areas in which perhaps other feminist art histories may be found to be more noteworthy examples.

Nevertheless, *Women, Art, and Society* proves to be most useful in defining feminist art history. The rigor and type of challenge to the discipline of art history issued by feminist art historians varies. *Women, Art, and Society* illustrates the diversity of approaches to art history taken under the umbrella of "feminist art history." Also, it underscores the fact that feminist art history is still defining itself as it seeks to redefine the discipline of art history.

### Semiotics-based Art History

"Semiotics" may be interpreted as a variously construed and utilized term representing a variety of ideas and theoretical positions of differing theories of signs. Two early key figures, with differing theories, who have influenced the application of semiotics to art history are the American philosopher Charles Sanders Peirce (1834-1914) and the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure (1857-1913) (Adams, 1996; Bal & Bryson, 1991). Writings by Adams (1996), Bal and Bryson (1991), Bryson (1983, 1988), Fernie

(1995), Iverson (1988), Minor (1994), Moxey (1994), Potts (1996), Preziosi (1989), and Readings (1995) offer differing informative perspectives of semiotics theories and applications of it to art history. For the purposes of this study, I will highlight only some of what I consider to be the major, general points of semiotics as related to art history. I then discuss a particular example of a publication demonstrating several of the theoretical constructs in use.

As a starting point for explaining semiotics-based art history, I refer to Bal and Bryson's (1991) often-referenced article, "Semiotics and Art History." These authors explain:

Human culture is made up of signs, each of which stands for something other than itself, and the people inhabiting culture busy themselves making sense of those signs. The core of semiotic theory is the definition of the factors involved in this permanent process of signmaking and interpreting and the development of conceptual tools that help us to grasp that process as it goes on in various arenas of cultural activity. Art is one such arena, and it seems obvious that semiotics has something to contribute to the study of art. (p. 174)

The applicability of semiotics for use in studying art is also recognized by Moxey (1994) who further emphasizes semiotics' role as a communication system based on cultural conventions in this explanation of semiotics:

Semiotics views the work of art as a system of culturally and historically determined signs. It conceives of the work as part of a system of communication in which the artist makes use of conventional signs – that is, socially meaningful processes of signification – in order to construct a cultural object that articulates and disseminates the attitudes of the society of which he or she is a part. The work thus becomes a nexus of cultural activity through which social transactions circulate and flow. (p. 31)

So, at its most basic level, a semiotics position considers art to be a "sign," or combinations of signs, to be interpreted and meaning to be external to the art object and as something that is mediated. Semiotics is intent on addressing

the *interaction* the viewer has with the art object within a cultural context and the *creation of meaning*. While Panofsky (whose ideas were discussed previously in reference to content-based art history) approached works of art as containing symbols to be decoded, here, with semiotics, the emphasis is on questioning the *process* of meaning-making. As Potts (1996) asserts, "the value of semiotic theory lies in the way it makes us rethink the how of meaning, not in providing us with newfangled iconographical aids to determining what images mean" (p. 18).

It is important to emphasize that semiotics is not a uniform or static theoretical construct. There have been differing movements and applications of semiotic theories since the late-19th century, and semiotics has been variously applied to art history since the mid-20th century. For example, the writings of Schapiro (1969, 1973) utilize a semiotic perspective to approach the study of art history (Bal & Bryson, 1991; Iverson, 1988). More recently, however, semiotics has been utilized to challenge traditional (positivist and humanistic) art historical approaches (Ferne, 1995). In regard to its more recent applications to art history, "semiotics" may be used broadly to refer to structuralism, poststructuralism, and deconstruction (Adams, 1996; Bal & Bryson, 1991). I propose using the term "semiotics-based art history" to encompass all these diverse critical movements, briefly described below, as recent applications of sign theories to art history.

Structuralism grew out of the linguistic theories of Saussure. Ferne (1995) explains Saussure's position and structuralism as follows:

[Saussure] described language as consisting of signs and their meanings, or, as he put it, signifiers and their signifieds; signifiers only get their meaning from being different from other signifiers. He therefore proposed that language should be studied in terms of its structure rather than its content. To this

end he grouped signifiers in pairs such as light/dark, high/low, as the most direct way of establishing significance via comparison. . . .

Structuralism in the broadest sense can therefore be defined as the establishing and examining of the general and particular laws by which structures work. The structuralist extracts principles of classification from the confusion of individual messages. (p. 352)

Taking a structuralist view, art is a visual sign system developed within a cultural context but, according to Saussure's position, it is a system that is closed and static (Adams, 1996; Bal & Bryson, 1991). Universals of the sign system are sought in the structure rather than content of art, and, as Adams points out, "in their search for universals, Structuralists minimized the role of the individual author in conferring meaning on a text or image" (p. 134). This is in contrast to a humanist perspective which takes the view that individual artists, working as geniuses or heroes, endow their creations with fixed meanings that interpreters seek to uncover through empirical study (Ferne, 1995). Variations of conceptions and suggested usage of structuralism do exist as, for example, Bryson (1983) suggests modifications of Saussure's structuralism. Further challenges to humanist perspectives of art history, however, were developed by other movements within semiotics -- that challenge structuralism as well. These critical stances may collectively be labeled as poststructuralism.

Poststructuralism further questions how art comes to have meaning and attempts to provoke the discipline of art history to rethink its theoretical positions and current practices. Moxey (1994) describes how poststructuralism is disparaged by many in the field of art history but how it offers much of valuable import to the field. He also suggests that Peirce's sign theory is more applicable than Saussure's model to the study of art, a view supported by

other art historians (e.g., Iversen, 1988; Potts, 1996). The following implications of poststructuralist theory for the field of art history are identified by Moxey:

Instead of believing that art history discovers the ways things really are, that its narratives map neatly onto the way in which events might actually have unfolded, art historians must appreciate how language invests their practice with the values of the present. Art history must claim a more limited and relative status for its conception of knowledge, while expanding the imaginative scope of its interpretations as well as their political and cultural relevance. (p. 5)

To understand a poststructuralist approach to art history it is important to note the varying types of challenges poststructuralism makes to other modes of scholarship. Fernie (1995) explains that these challenges stem from three concerns "identified with the work in the 1960s and 1970s of Jacques Derrida (1930-), Roland Barthes (1915-80) and Michel Foucault (1926-84) concerning deconstruction, the death of the author and discourse analysis respectively" (pp. 352-353). Derrida challenged structuralism's static notion of meaning, asserting that meaning can never be absolutely defined; in Derrida's view, labeled as deconstruction, meaning is an ongoing and never-ending process as the interpretation of one meaning leads to another meaning that in turn leads to yet another ad infinitum. In a deconstructionist view, meaning is forever deferred. Poststructuralists may also further de-emphasize the artist by focusing attention on the interpreter and positing that meaning resides in the space between the artwork and interpreter -- "the result is what Barthes calls the death of the author [or artist when applied to the visual arts rather than literary theory]" (Fernie, 1995, p. 353). Foucault's poststructuralist challenge brings attention to issues of power. In his view, meanings are created through discourse in which power relationships are at



work. His views seek to provoke art history to work to uncover, call to question, and redress how power politics are at work in creating meaning.

The diverse ways in which all these variations of semiotics-based art history emphasize theory, raise questions, and extend challenges to traditional art history are characteristics that make these approaches also fit under the banner of "the new art history." Bal and Bryson (1991) identify the concerns of contemporary semiotics, which also summarizes the topics that recent semiotics positions are asking art history to rethink, as follows:

the polysemy of meaning; the problematics of authorship, context, and reception; the implications of the study of narrative for the study of images; the issue of sexual difference in relation to verbal and visual signs; and the claims to truth of interpretation. In all these areas, semiotics challenges the positivist view of knowledge, and it is this challenge that undoubtedly presents the most difficulties to the traditional practices of art history as a discipline. (p 174)

I propose that "semiotics-based art history" be primarily considered in terms of contemporary semiotics theory, rather than based on earlier interpretations and applications of it to art history. It is a multi-focused approach, as art object, art audience, and context of creation are studied as interrelating factors that affect the process of interpretation. To further clarify how this approach to art history differs from others, I again present an example of a publication that demonstrates some aspects of this approach at work in connection to the theme of Leonardo and his work.

In seeking an example of contemporary semiotics-based art history, I wondered if I could find anything connected to the theme of Leonardo and his art. Had the Leonardo-related scholarship turned to any of the semiotics-based "new art history" modes to approach its theme yet again but from a revisionist perspective? I was pleased to indeed find just such a book:

*Past Looking: Historical Imagination and the Rhetoric of the Image* by Michael Ann Holly (1996). In *Past Looking*, Holly draws from semiotics and revisionist positions currently being debated in the field and applies them to a reconsideration of primarily Renaissance art and art history. She includes a chapter specifically focused on Leonardo and his art. Yet certainly this author offers a substantially different topic of investigation and theoretical position regarding Leonardo and his art than the previously discussed histories of art related to this theme. For Holly focuses upon:

the rhetorical compositions of Leonardo's drawings and the provocative ways in which they provide a visual analogue for thinking about the content of all of his art, or perhaps even about the relation of historical explanation to picturing in general (p. 138)

In other words, she presents a discussion of the form of Leonardo's art as an "allegory" for the process of interpretation (Holly, 1996).

*Past Looking* serves as an example of semiotics-based art history in several ways. First and foremost, the author explicitly adopts the semiotic position of considering art as sign and interpretation as a negotiated act between art object and art historian/spectator. Holly acknowledges that a poststructuralist view emphasizes the interpreter's role, specifically his or her power and subjectivity, in that negotiation. However, she emphasizes the power of the *art object* and the role it plays in the process of meaning making, although she acknowledges reciprocity as well. She explains that it is poststructuralist's opening up of the discussion of objecthood and subjecthood as a topic of art historical investigation that makes her position possible even though she does not adopt the usual emphasis of poststructuralist inquiry. Holly uses semiotics terminology in summarizing the thrust of her book as follows:

My argument throughout this book is that historical artifacts, particularly visual ones, are themselves always laboring, more or less successfully, to systematize their own historical accounts, as signs producing other signs. . . . [and, secondarily,] that histories of art can and do shape their own historiographic successors. (p. 110)

Identification of Holly's commentary regarding the *Mona Lisa* provides an example of the basic premises of semiotics in use in *Past Looking*. The point she makes in reference to this painting is significantly at odds with traditional approaches to it. For Holly focuses not on the image of the woman and her mysterious smile or any of the contextual factors leading to its creation. Instead she points to a detail of the landscape background in this painting as an example to substantiate her position regarding the process of interpreting Leonardo's paintings. She writes:

even the surface skins of his paintings – think, for example, of the *Mona Lisa*'s rocks and water . . . – come to visibility by looking like writing on writing, an incandescent trail of inscription moving through and around paint. . . . Meaning, at least in Leonardo's case, resides as much in the density and textuality of the critical account as in its referentiality. (p. 145)

It is this exploration of how meaning is produced that demonstrates a fundamental concern of a semiotics approach in use in *Past Looking*.

Another way in which *Past Looking* demonstrates a semiotics approach at work is that art historical scholarship as well as works of art are a focus of study. Past discourse about works of art are re-examined, questioned, and reconsidered as part of the investigation of how works of art from the past come to have meaning to us today. This is the manner in which Leonardo and his art are addressed in this book. For Holly intertwines a re-examination of several noted art historical writings that address Renaissance painting with a study of selected art works of that period, including several artworks by

Leonardo. The most significant attention Holly gives to Leonardo and his art in this regard is her chapter entitled "Writing Leonardo Backwards." Here, she re-analyzes the conflicting writings on Leonardo by Freud (1910/1989) and Schapiro (1956/1968, 1994) (scholarship which I discussed previously under psychoanalytic art history) and a total of 2 paintings and 13 studies or sketches by Leonardo. Holly first describes selected works by Leonardo and proposes a theory of how they have functioned in the interpretive process undertaken in later historical accounts of Leonardo and his art. Specifically, she hypothesizes how Freud's and Schapiro's interpretations are affected by the form of the art they analyze.

Throughout this chapter Holly makes use of various aspects of semiotics theory. Early in this chapter she focuses the reader's attention on Leonardo's drawings with which he intermixes backward scrawled notes as he often did in his many notebooks. She provides an illustration of Leonardo's "Sketch of Armenian Mountains" as an example of such. Holly then posits that Leonardo's frequent practice of writing backwards on his artworks provides a model for considering the interrelatedness of words and images, with both functioning as signifiers. She presents illustrations of other artworks by Leonardo as metaphorically representing this thesis. Holly utilizes references to works of art to substantiate her position regarding how meaning is constructed, in which, in her view, the art object has the upper hand. She writes:

Leonardo's words and images scroll together in a vortex of unfolding mobility, much like his drawings of tempestuous whirlwinds or spiraling waters or the richly textured sleeve encircling his own arm . . . [the reader is referred to illustrations of Leonardo's "Deluge Study" and "Study for a Sleeve"]. Were the pattern to continue . . . . Meaning would be visibly deflected along an endless change of signifiers played out on the surface of

the work, and inquiry into this constantly effacing textuality always would be – that is to say, often has been – itself subject to the compulsions of an elegantly elusive work of art. (p. 117)

In *Past Looking*, the questions that Holly asks and proposes answers for differ significantly from that of other art historians' writings previously analyzed on the theme of Leonardo and his art. She poses the questions: "Might there be ways in which the parabolic exchanging of word and image in Leonardo has played or could come to play a role in subsequent readings of his works? Where does art stop and description begin?" (p. 120). Holly asserts that "In Leonardo there are no seams" (p. 120). Here, Holly revisits Freud's and Schapiro's contradictory writings interpreting a few of Leonardo's paintings. Specifically, regarding Freud's psychoanalysis of Leonardo and his paintings, Holly theorizes that "Freud read backwards from the known register of the visual script into the mythologically layered language of the unconscious" (p. 128). In other words, Holly parallels Freud's approach to Leonardo and his art with Leonardo's predilection for writing backwards and integrating word and image in the creation of art as signs to be interpreted.

In her discussion of Freud and Schapiro's writings regarding Leonardo, Holly also demonstrates the revisionist turn away from the positivist emphasis on truth seeking. Rather than hunting art historical "truths," of which there is now much skepticism, a more current position, and one embraced by poststructuralism is to instead seek to uncover varying agendas at work in the interpreting of art. In applying this concept to the re-examination of Freud's and Schapiro's conflicting positions, Holly writes:

Should we not be worried about incommensurability in these two historical accounts of Leonardo? Is Freud "right" or is Schapiro? Schapiro, of course, would reply, Let the historical evidence speak for itself. With our suspicion of historical accuracy in the late twentieth century, that is a difficult

assignment to complete. We tend to perform the same maneuver with a historical explanation as we do with a work of art: we now ask, What is this thing trying to do? instead of, Is this correct? (p. 143)

Elsewhere in *Past Looking* Holly further emphasizes the instability of meaning and the non-positivist nature of it. For example, she asserts:

. . . perception always involves a circulation of positions, a process of movement back and forth that will forever undermine the fixity of the two poles inside and outside. Herein lies the source of a historian's critical artistry. The trick is making what forever will be a provisional metaphorical construction at least partially consonant with that made visible in the reigning artistic metaphors of the period. (p. 83)

The author of *Past Looking* utilizes other revisionist theory embraced by poststructuralist semiotics as well to reconsider art historical practices and to substantiate her approach to art historical inquiry. For example, she points out that "postmodernism has reminded us that historical time is far from linear, and if that is the case, critical text and originary monument cannot be felicitously disjoined" (p. 82) and utilizes this view to substantiate her own claims. Holly also makes references to and use of Derrida's deconstructionist questioning of meaning production and Foucault's ideas regarding the functioning of power in the interpretive process. Holly takes an unusual twist in her use of semiotic positions, however: she utilizes deconstruction's practice of questioning interpretations of meaning and processes of meaning-making to challenge poststructuralism. Specifically it is poststructuralism's sole emphasis on the interpreter in the creation of meaning that she challenges. Holly's contends that "concentrating on the constructedness of historical discourse can sometimes reveal sources that lead, like the orthogonals in a Renaissance perspectival painting, right back into the

originating center of the work of art" (p. 185). Again, it is the art object's power and role in the interpretive process that Holly focuses upon.

This is another way in which Holly's monograph demonstrates semiotics-based art history. Specifically, it is her exploration of the poststructuralist concern with power relationships at work in the process of interpreting works of art -- albeit she provides a new twist to such discussions. For instead of exploring the power principles of the viewer/interpreter, she points out and argues for a recognition of the power factors generated by the art object that are at work in the interpretive process. She discusses such power plays as follows:

We have always known that objects of art have a numinous power about them. And yet, ironically, as art historians we repress that power with a power play of our own: an attempt to explain or describe or capture that hypnotic hold through labels and schemes of our own devising. Nietzsche, Bataille, Bryson -- among so many others, especially including film theorists -- have reminded us that any talk of the gaze is in the first place a political issue. The person who does the looking is the person with the power. No doubt about it: looking is power, but so too is the ability to make someone look. . . . (p. 90)

I believe Holly offers a noteworthy twist to Foucault's concern with power relationships as is an interest of poststructuralism.

Perhaps to facilitate further understanding of semiotics-based art history, as manifest in *Past Looking*, it would be helpful to identify what the author has *not* attempted to do. Holly has not presented an account of Leonardo's life or personality, or interpreted the style or meaning of Leonardo's art, or explicated socio-cultural factors at work at the time and place of Leonardo's creation of his art, or identified subsequent audience aesthetic responses to Leonardo and his paintings or been explicitly concerned with feminist issues -- as have other histories of art as described previously.

Instead, she has focused on how meaning is created by examining the correspondence between art historical scholarship and the artworks studied by such. Instead of seeking to reveal "truths" of meanings about Leonardo or his art, she refers to art historical accounts of this artist and his work to point out the process of meaning construction. She writes:

Good histories (in the sense of narratives), effective accounts, become as much a part of the experience of the painting as the history (in the sense of the past) that preceded it. If as critics or historians we renounce the compulsion to unveil, what remains? What was there all along, of course: the in between plane on which the work and history meet . . . , painting and explanation together determining the limits of what can be said, image and word pressed together in a circuit on the surface, each tattooing the other with its impress. (pp. 146-147)

I believe that the point Holly is positing here is that art history writings and art *together* create meaning – a significant point of departure from the views expounded by other approaches to art history but one indicative of a semiotics perspective.

To summarize, semiotics-based art history considers art as signs and addresses how meanings are produced regarding artworks. It replaces concern for what an artist's intent may or may not have been and what socio-cultural factors were at work when an artwork was produced – with considerations of the numerous factors that interpreters bring to the work of art and the process of meaning construction which is ongoing. Meaning is considered to reside not within the art object but instead between art object and viewer, created through a negotiated act of interpretation with both art object and viewer/interpreter playing roles in this process. Meaning is interpreted by the art viewer who may be variously influenced by: his or her own particular life experiences and views, contemporary thought and circumstances,



previous interpretations and others' discourse regarding the work, and, as Holly (1996) points out, by the art object itself as well.

### Other Genres of Art History

It is important to recognize that the conceptual map I have drawn is not *the* definitive chart of genres of art history. Often, differing representations of the same landscape are made that illustrate alternative perspectives and information. Also, the discovery of new lands has always caused the cartographer to redraw what previously had been considered to be an accurate representation of "place." The placement of "other" on my conceptual map acknowledges both the existence of other regions of scholarship that I have not specified and the inevitability of places yet undiscovered.

### Mementos to Keep Hold Of

The Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History that I have drawn in this chapter locates a diverse range of art historical scholarship. I have taken the reader with me on an investigation of five broad areas of this scholarship through an analytical exploration of art history literature. The areas or zones of scholarship identified and explored in this odyssey alternatively focus on *art maker, art object, context of creation, art audience, or have multiple focuses.*

Within these five zones of scholarship, nine specific regions of art historical studies, or "genres of art history," were identified, investigated, and placed within the conceptual map: *biographical art history* and *psych-based art history* within the area that focuses on art maker; *formalist art history* and *content-based art history* within the area that focuses on art object; *socio-cultural art history* within the area that focuses on context of creation; *response-based art history* within the area that focuses on art audience; and *artistic processes-based art history*, *feminist art history*, and *semiotics-based art history* within the area that contains scholarship that has multiple focuses. "Other" was identified as yet an additional category of genre of art history existing within the art history domain. The placement of "other" on the Conceptual Map of Art History is meant to serve as an indicator that the map I have drawn is not a closed theoretical construct.

All borders, including disciplinary bounds for "art history" and demarcations for the varying regions within art history's borders, were described as permeable (as overlapping of scholarship occurs), changeable, and subject to alternative interpretations. Certainly differing perspectives of how the art historical landscape could or should be mapped exist, as indicated in Chapter 2, and will continue to be developed in the future. I believe that my Conceptual Map of Art History, however, is particularly informative. By subdividing the academic landscape into broad areas and specific regions of scholarship, I contend that it provides -- art educators, in particular, with -- a useful means of beginning to conceptualize the diversity of theoretical positions that comprise the art history domain.

Further, I believe that the strategy I employed for leading the reader on an investigatory cross-country tour of the varied regions of art history that I

identified provides a valuable vehicle for facilitating further understandings of differing approaches to art history. As diverse as each region of scholarship is, in each, we found and toured an art historical monument (in the form of a published monograph) dedicated to exploring an aspect of art history that in some way related to Leonardo da Vinci and his art. By noting the similarities and differences in the construction of each monument, we have learned more about Leonardo and his art, but more importantly, more about the differing schools of thought guiding the architects of these monuments. The variety of approaches to research projects on this theme produced noticeably different forms of scholarship, in keeping with the prevailing viewpoints regarding art history in each region.

I believe that my Conceptual Map of Art History, as proposed and explicated through the guided investigation of the art historical terrain in this chapter, can be an appropriate and useful tool for clarifying the panorama of approaches to art history existing in art history literature and for conducting analyses of attention directed toward art history. In this chapter, the conceptual map and guided exploration of it were aimed at increasing awarenesses and understandings of a wide range of art historical scholarship; the next chapter researches the use of my conceptual map to identify and analyze varying positions regarding art history promoted within art education literature.

## CHAPTER 4

ART HISTORICAL EXCURSIONS IN ART EDUCATION:  
AN ANALYSIS OF GENRES OF ART HISTORY  
APPEARING IN *ART EDUCATION*, THE JOURNAL OF  
THE NATIONAL ART EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

So the Hieronymus Bosch bus headed out of Kesey's place with the destination sign in front reading "Further" and a sign in the back saying "Caution: Weird Load." It was weird, all right, but it was euphoria on board, barreling through all that warm California sun in July, on the road, and everything they had been working on at Kesey's was on board and heading on Further.

– Tom Wolfe (b. 1930)  
American Writer

What various regions of the art historical landscape have been explored by art educators and reported on in art education literature in recent years? What ideas have art educators formed regarding differing genres of art history from such travels and, in the pursuit of investigating art history as a component of art education, in which directions have they been taking these ideas? Specifically, which genres of art history found in art history literature may be detected in art education literature, *how* are they manifest in art education literature, and what similarities and differences in views may be

identified? In this chapter, I utilize the Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History that I developed and presented in the previous chapter to identify and analyze types of art history as they have appeared in recent years within a circumscribed body of art education literature.

MacGregor's (1986) article, "Who Speaks for Art Education?," is relevant for determining sources to utilize for identifying art educators' concepts of art history. MacGregor reminds us of the role the National Art Education Association (NAEA) has played and should play in providing professional leadership for the field of art education. I believe it is most appropriate to identify and analyze what views of art history the NAEA has presented to its membership. I have chosen to focus on researching what types of art history were implied or overtly presented from 1980 through 1996 in *Art Education*, the journal of the NAEA. I believe this restriction to analyzing *Art Education* is an appropriate limitation on the selection of art education literature to review for three primary reasons. First, some tight restrictions had to be placed on the scope of art education literature to be examined in order to make an in-depth study of varying genres of art history as manifest in art education literature possible – and this aspect of the study feasible. Secondly, I believe it is important to analyze what the NAEA, as the official "voice of art education" is saying to its membership and *Art Education* is sent to *every* member. Certainly what views of art history are promoted in *Studies in Art Education*, the research journal of the NAEA, are relevant and worth analysis; however, as *Studies* has a research focus and requires an additional subscription fee, it only reaches a select group of the NAEA membership and I therefore, chose not to analyze its attention to art history as part of this study. A third reason for the selection of *Art Education* is that its

articles and instructional resource materials indicate many specific individual art educators' views but, more broadly, are an indicator for the field of art education as well. As Lewis (1989) asserts, "*Art Education* is the barometer of the field. . . . Plot the changes in the content of articles over time, and you can trace the currents and cross-currents of change" (p. 4).

Sightings (Citings) of Genres of Art History  
Appearing in the Journal, *Art Education* from 1980 through 1996

All of the types of art history defined in the foregoing chapter have appeared in some way or another, with varying frequencies, within the pages of *Art Education* from January, 1980 through December, 1996. Within the scope of this investigation, I present what art educators have said regarding: *biographical* and *psych-based art histories* which focus on art maker, *formalist* and *content-based art histories* which focus on art object, and *socio-cultural art history* which focuses on context of creation. I also address what art educators have said about *response-based art history* which focuses on art audience; *artistic processes-based, feminist, and semiotics-based art histories* that each have multiple focuses.

This is an application of my Conceptual Map of Genres of Art History. The use of this conceptual map to chart art educators' explorations of varying regions of art historical scholarship clarifies conceptions and viewpoints of art history circulating in the field of art education. I present art educators' views of these types of art history in the same format and sequence as that of the previous response. Types of art history do not appear in either art education or art history literature as discretely as the format of my chapter implies.

However, I believe this structure is useful for exploring both similarities and differences between art educators' and art historians' conceptualizations of "art history" and for identifying what views of art history are being widely disseminated to art educators by the National Art Education Association. Notations of the manner in which genres of art history have been presented in *Art Education* and the prevalence or lack of attention given to each genre in this journal further defines both art educators' viewpoints of art history and what ideas regarding art history have been widely promoted within the domain of art education by art educators' professional organization.

### Genres of Art History that Focus on ART MAKER

#### Biographical Art History

While no articles emblazoned with "biographical art history" in the title have appeared in *Art Education* since 1980, biographical art history has been presented both directly and indirectly in this publication. It is clear that many art educators concur with those art historians who consider biographical art history to be one form of art history. This is evidenced in four ways in *Art Education*.

First, it is implied through the publication of at least eight articles since 1980 which may be classified as biographical art histories (or autobiographical art histories through the presentation of interview responses):

- . "On the Right Road: The Life of Mine Okubo" (La Duke, 1987)
- . "Mohammed Ashraf, National Treasure of Pakistan" (Rogers, 1987)

- . "Nigeria: Princess Elizabeth Olowu, Zero Hour" (La Duke, 1988)
- . "East African Painter Theresa Musoke: Uhuru or Freedom" (La Duke, 1989)
- . "An Interview with Jerry Uelsmann: Master Photographer and Teacher" (Roland, 1993)
- . "A Visit with Elizabeth Catlett" (Dufrene, 1994)
- . "Two Young Interviewers Get a Sense of Heritage from African/American Artist and Educator, Dr. J. Eugene Grigsby, Jr." (Young, 1995)
- . "Women's Handwork: Stories of Similarity and Diversity" (Kellman, 1996)

These eight articles present actual histories of art (in the form of histories of artists) -- rather than a discussion about art history as possible educational content. Certainly it is apparent that some art educators agree with those art historians who, following the precedence set by Vasari, equate "art history" with "lives of the artists."

Some agreement between art educators' and art historians' conceptualizations of "artist" is indicated by these *Art Education* articles. For, two of the artists focused upon are drawers/painters, one is a painter/printmaker, one is a sculptor, one is a sculptor/printmaker, and another a photographer: these are categories of art makers frequently recognized by art historians. However, in contrast to this fine-arts emphasis, another of these artists is identified as a "master craftsman in the ancient art of lacquerwork" and Kellman (1996) tells the life stories of a North American crocheter and a Northern Athapaskan beader. However, broadly speaking, neither art historians nor art educators historically have given crafts makers, industrial designers, illustrators, folk artists, and textile designers near the amount of attention they have afforded makers of "fine art" objects.



Certainly conceptions of "art" and "artist" have greatly affected both art historians' and art educators' selections of whom to focus on in biographical art histories.

A related point on which art educators' and art historians' views would seem to take different directions is also indicated by these articles. Six of the nine individual artists focused upon are women and all but two of the nine are of non-Western heritage. This is a reversal of the categorical "who" traditionally predominantly focused upon by the discipline of art history. Both art education and art history have been criticized in recent years for an overemphasis on Western male artists; however, and there have been movements and initiatives taken in both fields to redress the neglect of women and non-Western artists. The inclusion of these particular biographical art histories in *Art Education*, out of the infinite number of possibilities, seems directed toward this end.

A second way in which art educators' conceptions of biographical art history as a form of art history are presented in *Art Education* is implicitly through parallel example: reports on the lives of individual art educators. There has been a recurrent focus on the individual in histories of art education in *Art Education*. Judging from their titles, the following articles would seem to be biographical art education histories:

- . "Henry Schaefer-Simmern: His Life and Works" (Abrahamson, 1980)
- . a series of articles within a special issue of *Art Education* devoted to Viktor Lowenfeld (Youngblood, 1982)
- . "Rilla Jackman, Pioneer at Syracuse" (Stankiewicz, 1983)
- . "Natalie Robinson Cole: The American Cizek?" (Smith, 1984)

- . "Margaret Trowell and the Development of Art Education in East Africa" (Court, 1985)
- . "Franz Cizek: The Patriarch" (Smith, 1985)
- . "Oswego Normal's (and Art Education's) Forgotten Man: Johann Heinrich Hermann Krusi, M.A." (Stark, 1985)
- . "The Hampton Years: Lowenfeld's Forgotten Legacy" (Smith, 1988)
- . "Kathryn Bloom and the Genesis of the Arts in Education Movement" (Madeja, 1992)
- . "Colonel Francis Wayland Parker: Legacy of an Artist-Teacher" (Sidelnick, 1995)

Upon closer examination, however, most of these articles would be more correctly classified as predominantly histories of ideas rather than biographies of individuals. Still, some are parallel examples of biographical art history, and the others which focus more on ideas or philosophies emphasize that such is very much linked to individuals. In either case, by directing attention to the lives of art educators within a framework of looking at art education's past, these articles indicate that some art educators conceive of "history of art education" as a history of personages and thus indirectly present biographical art history as a type of art history. The "In Our Past" article on William P. Weston (Rogers, 1984) and the interviews with Nathan Oliveira, William McVey, Ruth Asawa (Dobbs, 1981a, b, & c), Patricia Renick (Clark, 1983), Arnold Bank (Gregory, 1985), Jerry Uelsmann (Roland, 1993), and Eugene Grigsby, Jr. (Young, 1995) illustrate the point that histories of art educators and histories of artists are sometimes one in the same.

A third way that art educators' visions of biographical art history are evidenced in *Art Education* is overtly by direct mention or discussion of biographical art history as an approach to art history. However, this occurs

very infrequently and when biographical art history is addressed, it is within articles much broader in scope. For example, Irvine (1984) presents the study of the lives of artists as one of ten approaches for "An Art Centered Art Curriculum."

In an article aimed at raising art teachers' recognition of "a multiplicity of histories and of the arts, and the necessity of selecting from among them according to educational purpose" (p. 69), Katan (1990) briefly discusses biographical art history – in negative terms. She describes it as appearing in the following form in university art history survey courses:

Slide images are grouped around individual biographies, tracing recurrent tides of youthful promise and mature realization, and building a mythology of transcendent figures. Expression is accepted as a power unique to the artist. (p. 67)

She cautions against utilizing this approach for teaching art history in the elementary and secondary schools; instead, she advocates teaching socio-cultural historical contexts of artistic production. Katan also argues for art history education connected to the study of the *multifarious* art forms infused in life "within ALL human cultures" (p. 65), not merely those art forms traditionally included in college textbooks for art history courses. She attempts to steer art educators away from approaches to art history that convey the notion of an artist as a special sort of person who transcends his or her cultural and social contexts – as biographical art history has the tendency to do. Katan has sought to make art educators aware of this and other elitist attitudes which may lurk in art history. She writes:

The academicians . . . , working from their notion of a content 'intrinsic' to a special sort of thing called 'an art object', produced by a special sort of person called an 'artist,' treat culture as an inalienable and timeless attribute of a special class of persons and of things – namely, of themselves. (p. 67)

Her article warns art educators of possible side-effects of administering art history as biographical art history – if not broadly dismisses it as an appropriate type of art history for art education curricula. Similar criticisms to those quoted above have been raised by art historians, most noticeably Marxist and feminist art historians, who challenge the status quo of their field. Overall, Katan staunchly argues that art educators need to reconsider their present conceptions of “art history” and she provides both an impassioned plea and assistance for them to do so. This is also the central assertion and aim of this dissertation.

Unlike Katan, Collins (1991) sees some value in the biographical approach to art history. Within his article entitled, “What is Art History?,” Collins explains that “Every art work is produced in a network of circumstances. . . . [which] can be categorized under three headings: artistic, personal, and socio-economic” (p. 56). Collins suggests that exploring the personal contexts of art is valuable for contributing to understanding the meanings of works of art; however, he clarifies that the appropriateness of biographical art history depends on the art focused upon. He writes:

For pre-Renaissance art biographical information is not only unavailable but insignificant because individuality was subsumed to tradition and communal standards. But for the years after about 1400, data on the personal history of Western artists constitutes an essential ingredient in understanding art because individuality was elevated above the respect for traditional methods and the requirements of the audience. (p. 58)

Thus, Collins recognizes biographical art history as one type of art history and suggests it is sometimes appropriate, in conjunction with other types of art history, for art curricula.

In contrast, Holt (1991) and Freedman (1991), like Katan (1991), try to steer art educators away from biographical art history. Holt voices a concern that too much contextual information, biographical or otherwise, diminishes students' aesthetic experiences with works of art. In presenting "Recent Theoretical Shifts in the Field of Art History and Some Classroom Applications," Freedman (1991) acknowledges biographical art history as an approach to art history. She asserts that "recently, however, more art historians have shifted attention away from the focus on individual artists and works of art, toward broader, more social concerns" (p. 42). Freedman advocates that art educators adopt these more contemporary theoretical positions regarding art history and move away from biographical art history.

The articles discussed above are virtually the only articles published in over fifteen years in *Art Education* that devote attention to biographical art history. This is surprising given the seeming popularity of biographical art history in art history literature and art education practice (my unsubstantiated claim is that attention is often devoted to biographical art history in elementary and secondary schools -- when and if attention is given to art history). The overall lack of discussion of this concept of art history in the articles, however, is counterbalanced by the attention given to it in the Instructional Resources segments which have been included in *Art Education* since September of 1985. Frequently, historical information provided in these segments focuses upon the life events of the art maker. This is the fourth way in which art educators' conceptions of art history as biographical art history appear in *Art Education*.

Artists whose lives receive a relatively significant amount of attention in the information given along with the visuals provided from September, 1985 through December, 1996 include the following:

- . Stuart Davis (Clark, 1986)
- . Romare Bearden (Judson, 1986)
- . Marc Chagall (White, 1986)
- . Joshua Johnson (Grana, 1987)
- . George Bellows (Myers, 1987)
- . Jean-Francois Millet (Smith, 1987)
- . Grant Wood (Fitzgerald, 1988)
- . Mark di Suvero (Galbraith, Spomer, & Wise, 1988)
- . Isamu Noguchi (Hill, 1988)
- . Rosa Bonheur (Hood, 1988)
- . Winslow Homer (Pond, 1988)
- . Kenojuak Ashevak (Schwartz, 1988)
- . Deborah Butterfield (Spomer, Galbraith, & Wise, 1988)
- . Henry Moore (Tucker, 1988)
- . Cy Twombly (Glasser, 1989)
- . Rodney Alan Greenblat (Presley & York, 1989)
- . Cindy Sherman (Hallowell with Broderick, James, & Russell, 1991d)
- . William Adams Delano (Eder, 1992d)
- . Vincent van Gogh (Grisham, 1993d)
- . Ivan Albright (Grisham, 1993b)

- . Beauford Delaney (Grisham, 1993a)
- . Alexander Calder (Miller, Schneider, Black, Clark, & Wrinkle, 1994)
- . David Smith (Miller, Schneider, Black, Clark, & Wrinkle, 1994)
- . Lucas Cranach the Elder (McKennee, Malone, Hazelroth, & Kinney, 1994)
- . John Mix Stanley (Krulick, 1995b)
- . Earnest Martin Hennings (Krulick, 1995a)
- . Francisco de Goya (Henderson & Wilson, 1995)
- . Hiroshige (Hartfield, 1995)
- . Edmonia Lewis (Falletta, 1996a)
- . Harriet Hosmer (Falletta, 1996b)
- . Fred Wilson (Kanatani & Prabhu, 1996)

I estimate that 10% to 12% of the Instructional Resources entries during this specified period of time of a little more than a decade have incorporated what could reasonably be considered a notable amount of biographical art history. Another approximately 20% to 25% give a bit of attention to such. However, in only three instances (in regard to Bearden and Ashevak) and in the Instructional Resources written by Berry (1995) is learning about the life of the artist explicitly mentioned in the introductory statements or the sometimes-suggested goals and/or objectives of the instructional materials. In five additional cases such was alluded to with introductory statements or objectives being for students to "learn about" or "identify" a particular artist. In sum, art educators' notions of "art history" as (at least in part) "biographical information on artists" is commonly observed in the Instructional Resources segments of *Art Education*; however,

acknowledgement (i.e. in stated goals or objectives) of the emphasis commonly placed on learning about the lives of artists is far less prevalent.

To summarize, the varied presence of biographical art history in *Art Education* indicates some parallel thinking in art historians' and art educators' regard for this region of art historical scholarship. Apparently, at least some art historians and art educators see attention devoted to the lives of individual art makers as "art history" – and as one valid way to approach the study of the history of art. This is evidenced by the number of verbal portraits of art makers created by both art historians and art educators and presented in their literatures. Others (in both fields) do not recognize information on the lives of artists as "art history," or do not share this enthusiasm for the value of such, or, more strongly, philosophically disagree that biographical art history is a worthwhile approach to art history.

### Psych-based Art History

Like glimpses of unidentified flying objects, sightings (and citings) of psych-based art history in *Art Education* are rare and fleeting. When appearing in the pages of this NAEA journal, usually only a blurry image of its form is decipherable. But if one looks carefully, there is definitely something there that does not fit other concepts of "art history." If art educators were to be asked whether they believe in psychological or psychoanalytic art history, I contend that many would deny that they believe in either form of what I have labeled as psych-based art history. And because its presence is not well-documented in *Art Education*, it is tempting to let psych-based art history go unreported here. However, it seems important to



confirm that some art educators do concur with those art historians who see study of intangible artists' personalities and psyches as a form of art history. A few visions of psych-based art history may be encountered in *Art Education* articles.

Through parallel example, psych-based art history appears in a special issue of *Art Education* focused on Viktor Lowenfeld (Youngblood, 1982). Like psychological art histories that explore the character and personality of artists, several articles within this issue seek to document the character and personality traits of an individual art educator. The psychology of Lowenfeld is presented within a context of the history of art education. Mattil (1982) provides an effusive account of Lowenfeld's manner of dealing with people and his personal approach to work. Hausman (1982) emphasizes Lowenfeld's "personal warmth" and suggests it and his "intellectual energy" are one of four factors that led to his "great influence and leadership" (pp. 16-17). Beittel (1982) makes it clear from the outset that he regards "the personhood of Lowenfeld" (p. 18) as of utmost importance to relate to readers. *Art Education's* inclusion of this attention to the personality of Lowenfeld would seem to indicate that at least some art educators are likely to consider psych-based art history to be a form of "art history" and place value upon this approach.

Only a faint outline of psychoanalytic art history is evident in "Seeing and Insight: An Interview with Jacob Lawrence" (Rosenblum (1982). Yet, by asking questions that probe Lawrence's feelings about his "roots," the creative process, and the aesthetic experience, and by posing questions that try to get at how his life experiences have influenced his paintings, I contend that a psychoanalytic approach to art history may be inferred as used by the

interviewer. The goal seems to be to get readers inside the artist's head and consider how Lawrence's psyche may be manifest in his art.

Psych-based art history appears more forthrightly in Stankiewicz's article "Rilla Jackman, Pioneer at Syracuse" (1983). For Stankiewicz focuses her article on this early 20th-century art educator's belief in the importance of studying the artist's personality. Stankiewicz suggests:

In her personal philosophy of art education, Rilla Jackman combined an idealist philosophy of education with expressive aesthetic theory. She emphasized the personality of the artists as expressed through their works. Those artists whose lives and works seemed to exemplify ideal virtues received more praise from her than less noble artists. The best works by the best artists were those most expressive of the artist's personality. (p. 15)

By also providing background information on this approach to art education, Stankiewicz offers an historical account of the psych-based concept of art history within art education curriculum theory and the philosophic contexts in which this view is anchored.

Grieder (1985) also presents psych-based art history within an historical perspective; however, he changes the focus to the more recent past and to current art education practice. Although not labeling it as such, he suggests that psych-based art history appears in art education theory and practice associated with Modernism. He explains the connection as follows:

Art was most important for the modernists as psychological expression. . . . As psychology emphasized the mind and personality of the individual, the personal expression of individual artists rose to primary importance. Authentic individual expression, in the view of the great psychologists, emerged from the unconscious mind. (p. 7)

The impact of this view of art and art history, he claims, was that art educators sought to assist their students in unleashing their unconscious. Grieder suggests that this resulted in a devaluing of art education, for if "the

creation of art is not basically an activity of the conscious mind, education is of little consequence, and learning may even interfere with the direct, spontaneous expression of the unconscious" (p. 7). He contends that Post-Modern art theory endorses other concepts of art and art history that should lead art educators to emphasize cultural rather than personal contexts of artistic creation. His article points out that art movements not only potentially affect what concepts of art history may be appropriately taught but can also more broadly affect how art education is approached and ultimately valued. Both art educators and art historians reflect the reverberations of art movements in their literature.

Within her advocacy of the consideration of "art as visual metaphor," Feinstein (1985) presents an image of psychoanalytic art history. She writes that artists' feelings are sometimes symbolized in works of art which must then be metaphorically interpreted. She credits Langer (1967) for this idea that "the artist translates feeling into form" (Feinstein, 1985, p. 28). Feinstein's article demonstrates how ideas in aesthetics, art history, and art education may interrelate and impact conceptions of "art history."

Smith (1989) seems to envisage and advocate psych-based art history by suggesting that the Emotionalist (or Expressivist) theory of art should be one of three art theories used to determine an art curriculum. He recommends "emphasizing expressive or emotionalist art in the early grades" and notes that "Romanticism and Expressionism, the two art movements most obviously related to the emotionalist theory of art, are based on the ideas that the artist's reaction to experience is the truly vital part of art" (p. 12). Although there is a difference between studying the expressive qualities exuded by some works of art and focusing on the personalities and the

unconscious of artists, the two are definitely related. Smith might disagree that his article intimates teaching psych-based art history to young children, however, as he asserts that "art history is far too grandiose a term for what must, for developmental reasons, go on in an elementary art class" (p. 12). Nevertheless, by suggesting that art instruction for young children be based on the concept that art expresses emotion, I suggest that Smith implies that learning about the thoughts, feelings, personalities, and even the unconscious of artists might be part of the "art history-related activities" he advocates. Smith's article is valuable for placing concepts of art history within the framework of theories of art and for raising the issue of a developmental sequence for teaching various concepts of art history to children.

In March of 1993, *Art Education* was devoted to the "Special Theme: Art History." In this issue, one brief mention is made to the genre of art history that I have termed psych-based art history. To be specific, in their article, "Teaching Art History: Getting Started," Stinespring and Steele (1993) simply identify "psychoanalytic research" and studies that "relate the work [of art] to the psychology of the artist" (p.8) as examples of topics, among several others they mention, that are currently being addressed in the field of art history. However, they explicitly state that they chose *not* to address this or any other approaches to art history that they considered to be "more controversial methods" (p. 8) and instead chose "to examine traditional techniques of investigation" (p. 8). Stinespring and Steele centered their article on the traditional approach of formalist art history, specifically style.

While there was some attention given to several varieties of genres of art history within this special issue of *Art Education*, in my analysis of the

five art history articles included, I found a prevailing emphasis on formalist art history throughout the whole issue. I found it both surprising and disappointing that none of the five articles in this special issue, which was devoted to exploring the discipline of art history, addressed or discussed any of the revisionist or non-traditional approaches to art history. In my view, this particular issue of *Art Education* does contain quite a number of good points, relevant information, and divergent ideas worth exploring in developing curricular plans for art history education. However, I believe more diversity of positions regarding art history, particularly to *include* some “controversial” ones would have strengthened this as an art history education resource for art educators.

Many more appearances of psych-based art history may be spotted in the Instructional Resources segments of *Art Education*. This would seem to indicate that more art educators believe in it as a form of art history than may be assumed from noting the above few references to it in *Art Education* articles. It is not a predominant approach to art history in these resource materials, yet neither is it an obscure rarity; approximately 15% to 20% of the resources from September, 1985 through December, 1996 give some attention to psych-based art history. A relatively significant emphasis is placed on the personality or psyche of the following artists and/or the infusion of the artist’s feelings or psyche in his or her artwork:

- . Edvard Munch (Ingram, 1985)
- . Charles Burchfield (Fitzgerald, 1986)
- . Adolph Gottlieb (Nichols-Dietrich, 1986)
- . Marc Chagall (White, 1986)
- . Mark Tobey (Crosier, 1987)

- . Edward Hopper (Hoeft, 1987)
- . Roger Brown (Pulsifer, 1987)
- . Marsden Hartley (Covington, 1988)
- . Willem de Kooning (Nelson, 1988)
- . Adelaide Robineau (Irvine, 1989)
- . Betye Saar (Prabhu, 1990)
- . Jackson Pollock (Springer, 1990c)
- . Jackie Ferrara (Henry, 1991)
- . Edvard Munch (McCarty-Procopio, Richards, Spackman, Sutton, & Brigham, 1991b)
- . Christopher Pratt (Stephen, 1991a)
- . Max Beckmann (Grisham, 1993c)
- . Elizabeth Layton (Cahan & Kocur, 1994)
- . Pablo Picasso (Henderson & Wilson, 1995b)
- . Francisco de Goya (Henderson & Wilson, 1995a)

But specifically how are art educators' concepts of psych-based art history revealed in these *Art Education* Instructional Resources? I suggest that, among goals and objectives, the presence of such is announced as, for example, students will: (a) "recognize that artists paint what is familiar to them and express their personal perceptions" (Hoeft, 1987, p. 26), (b) "recognize art as a personal statement of the artist" (Pulsifer, 1987, p. 25), and (c) "discuss the personal characteristics of Adelaide Robineau and some conclusions about themselves" (Irvine, 1989, p. 27). Examples of how it is manifest in the information sections include the following:

- Ingram (1985) presents Munch's work as a "portrayal of his own anxieties" (p. 30).
- Fitzgerald (1986) discusses Burchfield's paintings as revelations of "his moods and beliefs" (p. 30).
- Nichols-Dietrich (1986) focuses on Gottlieb's personal symbolic imagery in *Forgotten Dream*, imagery which "represent persons, places, or things from the artist's subconscious" (p. 31).
- Covington (1988) writes "Marsden Hartley's childhood was sad and lonely" (p. 38) and proceeds to recount his life events and art in relation to his degree of happiness.
- Nelson (1988) asserts that De Kooning's *Marilyn Monroe* "expresses the artist's feelings about women as a religious cult image and sex symbol" (p. 38).
- McCarty-Procopio et al. (1991b) state that Munch "has used painting to communicate personal emotions," (p. 27) and describe his *Starry Night* as "a landscape haunted by the memory of Munch's most meaningful romantic relationship which ended in pain and disillusionment" (p. 30).
- Grisham (1993), in reference to Max Beckmann and one of his many self-portraits, asserts that "Avoiding naturalistic depiction in order to more graphically portray his psychological state at the time, Beckmann favored abstracted elements . . ." (p. 38). Within the "Classroom Discussion" segment, two of the many questions she asks are: "What significance do his hands have? What do they tell you about how he feels?" (p. 38).
- Henderson & Wilson (1995b) report that "Although Picasso benefited much from the artistic atmosphere in Paris, he was lonely, unhappy, and terribly poor. During this period Picasso's sympathy for outcasts of society was reflected in his art . . . As his personal affairs gradually improved, his palette became somewhat lighter" (p. 27).
- Henderson and Wilson (1995a) write that "When he was forty-six, Goya suffered from a mysterious illness that left him permanently deaf. His work after this time reflects an expressiveness and introspection that may have grown from his isolation" (p. 31).

In summary, psych-based art history is a vision of art history held by some art educators and art historians. Although it scarcely makes an appearance in *Art Education* articles, it shows up in the Instructional Resources segments fairly often. There, several art educators forthrightly present artworks as conscious or unconscious expressions of artists' feelings and personal responses to life events. In so doing, they bear witness that a number of art educators see psych-based art history as a type of art history – and one that is appropriate for elementary and secondary school education. In the overall picture, however, it seems to be a comparatively small group of art educators and art historians who focus on exploring the personalities or inner worlds of artists.

### Genres of Art History that Focus on ART OBJECT

#### Formalist Art History

In the previous chapter, I identified formalist art history as a traditionally popular concept of art history among art historians. I defined two sub-varieties of it seen in art history literature: (a) stylistic art history (which focuses on an individual artist's style or on the collective style of a group of artists or a period) and (b) connoisseurship (which aims at making attributions and authenticating works of art). It appears that these views of art history have been widely adopted and considered by many art educators. My review of *Art Education* suggests that formalist art history is pervasively recognized by art educators as a type of art historical scholarship and that



many attend to promoting and/or planning investigations of this region of the art historical landscape with students, although a few others voice concerns about these exploits.

Several art educators whose articles offer frameworks and recommendations for art curriculum development recognize and advocate formalist art history. Irvine (1984) offers the "stylistic" approach as one of ten approaches to art curricula aimed at integrating the study of works of art with studio production. She writes that the purpose of the stylistic approach is "to point out similarities among objects created in different times and places by different artists" (p. 17). Irvine also indirectly advocates connoisseurship for art curricula by suggesting a chronological approach by which students learn to identify works of art by individual artists (make attributions). Mittler (1980) endorses stylistic art history under the heading of "analysis," one of four art history operations he proposes in his advocacy of the sequencing of art criticism and art history operations for secondary school art appreciation programs. Mittler (1986) later proposes another framework for secondary school art curricula, advocating both response and studio experiences for all units and lessons in introductory courses. Here, he suggests "Period or Style" as one of four response categories and further emphasizes formalist art history in his examples clarifying the use of his framework. Smith (1989) recommends formalist art theory as the emphasis of art curricula for children beginning at age 12 in his "modest proposal" for art curricula. He suggests having adolescents study the stylistic characteristics of "significant" works of art. He, thus, presents stylistic art history as a concept of art history and recommends exploratory travels through this area of the art history terrain, but he is also careful to point out its links to social and content-based art

histories and to encourage investigations of these areas of art history scholarship as well.

Amdur (1993), Marschalek (1995), and Szekely (1996) also propose ideas for art education curricula that incorporate attention directed toward formalist art history. In his advocacy of "A Curriculum Integrating Discipline-Based Art Education with Other Humanities Subjects at the Secondary Level," Amdur calls attention to the formalist aesthetic that he claims has had a major impact on art curricula but which "tends to effectively isolate art from the rest of culture" (p. 12). Negative repercussions of approaching art history from an exclusively formalist perspective are implied. However, Amdur does not seek to exclude study of the formal, stylistic qualities of works of art from curricula; instead, he promotes the study of such within or in conjunction with a socio-cultural approach to art curricula. Amdur (1993) contends:

While a formalist would argue that interest in an image's original context takes away from interest in its formal qualities, I have found that formal qualities are given closer inspection by students when they are seen as clues to the lived experience of the people who made and used art objects. . . . Better understanding of formal qualities and greater aesthetic appreciation follow.

When art is considered comprehensively, including not only its formal qualities, but also its "literary" content and its role as a social document, opportunities for learning art are enhanced." (pp. 12-13)

Here, he also poses a possible justification for formalist art history education in that he argues that it can lead students to a heightened appreciation of artworks and better understandings of art, specifically when the study of stylistic characteristics is tied to a study of the cultural contexts of creation. In essence, Amdur is recommending an emphasis on socio-cultural art history

for art curricula that favors the inclusion of formalist art history, particularly the study of period styles, within this approach.

Marschalek (1995) staunchly advocates a wider realm of objects to be studied in art curricula. Specifically, he promotes the study of design products. Within his suggested guidelines for art curriculum development, Marschalek proposes the study of the forms of a variety of common, utilitarian products and the analysis of how the forms these items take have changed over the years. In this way, Marschalek advocates formalist art history, specifically stylistic art history, for art education curricula. The significant point to note here is that rather than endorsing the study of various styles of paintings or other fine arts objects, the author makes a departure from the traditional focus of this approach to art history, to promote formalist art history *focused on the study of styles of design products*. Certainly, this brings up a key question for art educators to consider: what categories of objects should be selected for art historical study utilizing any of the approaches that have been identified? Also, he recommends various educational concepts regarding stylistic art history to be addressed at primary, middle school, and high school levels. In this way, he proposes a developmental framework for this type of art historical exploration with students. The developmental sequencing of art history education experiences is a topic that I believe is in need of further consideration and research in the field of art education.

Szekely (1996) makes suggestions in "Preparation for a New Art World," that I propose may loosely be interpreted to promote connoisseurship-based art history. He encourages students to energetically and inquisitively investigate their worlds in search of "art," which he seems

to define as *any* object that yields some sort of aesthetic encounter for the viewer. Szekely claims that he and his students “demonstrate daily that any object from any field can be subject matter for art studies” (p. 7). He espouses the value of students identifying a variety of objects that speak to them of creativity, from the design of “the latest Nike shoe” (p. 7) to that of the newest toy, and emphasizes the value of students presenting their “finds” to classmates for consideration. The discovery process that Szekely advocates seems to me to be connoisseurship-in-action as it is a process of identifying, collecting, describing, and making justifications in defense of authenticating specified objects as works of art that he encourages students to engage in – albeit his conception of art is eminently wider than that of any typical connoisseur! Szekely explains his point of view as follows:

Our profession has been very successful in bringing art history into the school curriculum [a debatable point I would add], introducing children to the accomplishments of adult artists. Similar intensity is needed to teach our students about their own history of great box artists, wrapping artists, peeling artists, interior designers (doll house decorators), and fashion artists (dress-up players), who happen to be children. To be prepared for our changing art world, children need to learn of their roots and understand connections between their early environmental interests and new forms of art. (pp. 10-11)

Here, like Marschalek (1995), Szekely challenges art educators to widen the spectrum of objects that they consider to be candidates for art and art historical study. While Marschalek advocates attention be given to design products of which adult worlds are comprised, however, Szekely champions the gamut of objects that children find to be aesthetically exciting in their worlds. Perhaps he’s on to something?

Articles by Gryszkowiec (1986), Costanzo (1981), Kauppinen (1987), and Zurmuehlen (1992) are other examples of how formalist art history,

specifically stylistic art history, appears in *Art Education* as a genre of art history accepted and advocated by art educators. Gryszkowiec's elementary school unit of instruction illustrates a focus on the style of an individual artist by emphasizing an analysis of the elements of art in Beatrix Potter's artwork. Costanzo, too, emphasizes individual artistic style when reporting on a junior high school art lesson in which she introduced students to Picasso's abstract style. Kauppinen presents the study of period style as the conception of art history which is most appropriate for historical study of architecture. She credits Wölfflin, the premier formal art historian who advocated the study of period style (as discussed in my previous chapter), for the genesis of several of the ideas she presents. This exemplifies the direct impact art historians' concepts of art history may have upon art educators' views of art history education.

Zurmuehlen (1992) presents art educators with an encapsulation of the style of Post-Modernist art. She provides a brief history of this movement and describes specific architectural works, dinnerware items, furniture, and other Post-Modernist art to further identify its characteristics. Also, she explores the implications of Post-Modernist ideas for art education. Zurmuehlen's article offers ideas for incorporating attention to stylistic art history, specifically the style of Post-Modernist art, within art curricula. Further, however, her article serves as a reminder to art educators to keep abreast of current movements in the art world for both contemporary art content to cover – and for the ideas behind these movement that may offer concepts worth considering for revising curriculum theory and philosophies of art teaching.

Collins (1991) also presents the concept of stylistic art history. In one of only a few articles explicitly aimed at defining art history for art educators, he explains that art historians study art using the dual processes of visual analysis and contextual study. And he indicates that style is one of two broad approaches to visual analysis. Collins clarifies and supports stylistic art history when he writes that "much of the appearance and effect of any given work depends on extra-representational elements, on 'how' the subject is painted or sculpted, on how the 'formal' elements of the painting or building are handled" (p. 55). However, he cautions that the appropriateness of this approach depends on whether formal qualities are important in the particular work under scrutiny. Also, he indicates that study of art's formal qualities and subject matter are but preliminary procedures for contextual study aimed at determining meanings of artworks.

As mentioned earlier within the discussion of appearances of psych-based art history in *Art Education*, the March 1993 issue of *Art Education* was devoted to the theme of art history, and in my analysis of the five art history articles included on this topic, I found a significant emphasis on formalist art history, specifically stylistic art history. Here, I will briefly review how the articles by Stinespring and Steele (1993), Calabrese (1993), and Lechner (1993) focus attention on stylistic art history and advise art educators on developing instructional strategies for art history education that incorporate formal analyses of works of art.

Stinespring and Steele (1993) explicitly promote stylistic art history for the teaching of art history. They explicate Wölfflin's (1915/1950) stylistic polarities with which he contrasted Renaissance and Baroque art and suggest students engage in making stylistic analyses using Wölfflin's terminology and

system for classifying works of art based on shared stylistic characteristics. The authors also offer a worksheet format to guide student investigations of art styles, suggest engaging students in studio production that demonstrates specific artistic styles, and encourage having students investigate socio-cultural factors that influenced the creation of the works of art they study.

Calabrese (1993) focuses exclusively on stylistic art history in his article. He advocates engaging students in comparing artworks representing period styles that contrast significantly from each other, an approach to art history education that he terms “the bipolar approach to art history” (p. 14). He proposes this as a basis for a college-level interdisciplinary art history course, although he claims it “can easily be adapted to schools on any level, depending on the complexity or simplicity desired by the instructor” (p. 18). Calabrese thus suggests a *method* for teaching stylistic art history. The comparison of artworks in categories opposite in style is proposed as the focus of art historical investigations. The art historical approach that Calabrese proposes would seem to be indebted to the method of comparison and contrast of artworks from differing stylistic periods through the analysis of dually-projected art images proposed by Wölfflin (1915/1950), although Wölfflin’s ideas are not referenced in this article.

Lechner (1993) seeks to expand the category of art objects studied in art education classes to include picturebooks. In my view, she emphasizes stylistic art history within her article. She first identifies some possible justifications for students engaging in analyzing picturebooks, including the following hypothesis:

Focusing on the problems faced by the visual artist as storyteller, children might begin to see problems of composition, going beyond the stage of describing the content or responding with “I

like this," "I don't like that," while developing a vocabulary with which to express what they see. (p. 34)

She proceeds to discuss illustrations from a variety of picturebooks. In these discussions, she primarily focuses on exploring the formal qualities and stylistic characteristics of the artworks, while emphasizing that it is the book in its entirety that is also a focus of investigation. Lechner suggests having children examine several visual interpretations of the same story as created by different illustrators as a means of identifying alternative approaches to visual representation. In my view, the most significant point made by Lechner is not the attention she brings to stylistic art history, however, but is her invitation to art educators to explore picturebooks as resources for art learning.

Thus far, my identification and analysis of art educators' investigations of formalist art history has primarily focused on the attention devoted to stylistic art history. Connoisseurship is another region of the art history landscape that falls within the area of formalist art history and it, too, has been explored and contemplated by art educators as indicated in articles by Erikson (1983), Freedman (1991), and Bennett and Hamben (1995) (as well as by Szekely, 1996, as was earlier discussed). Both Erickson (1983) and Freedman (1991) seek to expand art educators' conceptions of "art history," and they present connoisseurship as one of several types of art history that art educators should be knowledgeable of when planning art history instruction. However, they differ in their opinions of the merit of connoisseurship for art history education. Erickson, advocates connoisseurship by presenting attribution as one of five art historical processes appropriate for art history education, although she does not identify this as "connoisseurship." In essence, Erickson endorses connoisseurship as one of several concepts of art



history to explore with students. She advocates, in particular, having students *not* simply study *about* connoisseurship but engaging in connoisseurship-focused art historical investigations. For the view of art history education that Erickson promotes is that "not only *what* art historians conclude, but also *how* they reach those conclusions can serve as content for art history instruction" (p. 28). This view requires students to function as art detectives rather than simply memorizers of information – and challenges art educators to reconsider their approaches to teaching art history. Also, Erickson makes suggestions regarding how to engage students in art historical inquiry by providing examples of inquiry activities focused on "the study of an ordinary, mass-produced visual object" (p. 28) rather than a famous fine-art masterpiece. In so doing, Erickson further challenges art educators to reconsider what it means to teach "art history."

Freedman, in contrast to Erickson, explicitly defines connoisseurship for art educators and stresses its limitations. She explains that connoisseurship is a genre of art history that "focuses upon the attribution of works of art, based on stylistic qualities, to particular artists and periods" (p. 40). Freedman claims this is the predominant approach to art history in the schools. However, she asserts that it is "more about *how* an artist's work looks than about *why* the art of a particular time and place looks the way it does" (p. 41), and she concludes "to focus the study of art history on the development of skills in connoisseurship only promotes the social differentiation that cultural capital is to overcome" (p. 45). Freedman does agree with Erickson that the practice of art historians should be utilized in art history education but contends that art historians have moved away from

connoisseurship in recent years to focus more on social contexts and concerns.

Bennett and Hamblen (1995), however, cause us to take another look at connoisseurship and to pause and reconsider its educational value once again. Their article, "The Mysterious Lady from Surinam," is one of the rarely included histories of art in *Art Education*. Usually, only references to *such* are made and educational theorizing *about such* are included; however, here an art historical narrative is directly provided for art educators to consider, with educational applications discussed in an epilogue. Like *The Salvator Mundi of Leonardo da Vinci* (Snow-Smith, 1982) discussed in the previous chapter, it presents a gripping detective story of an art historical scholarly adventure. It tells of a real-life, 10-year search for the identification of the artist, provenance, history of creation, and specific human subject of a particular portrait. I suggest that this article is a compelling portrait of connoisseurship, although "connoisseurship" is not acknowledged by the authors. Instead, co-author Hamblen characterizes this study as a "narrative [that] reveals many layers of interpretation and meaning that are encountered in art historical investigations" (p. 10). Certainly, connoisseurship, socio-cultural art history, and content-based art history are intertwined as I suggest her commentary points out to art educators. As is advocated by Erickson (1983) and others, it is the consideration of art history as an inquiry process that co-author Hamblen suggests is of utmost importance for art educators to consider when planning for art history education. Hamblen also notes the varieties of detective skills needed and further developed through art historical inquiry. Additionally, she advises that investigations with students be developed around artworks having personal relevance to the students and

that students “should be encouraged to chronicle their investigatory processes” (p. 11). Certainly Erikson (1983), Freedman (1991), Bennett and Hamben (1995), and Szekely (1996) all offer many ideas to consider for art history education initiatives – including alternative points of view regarding incorporating connoisseurship in art curricula.

Several criticisms of formalist art history have been voiced by art educators in *Art Education* (other than by Freedman, 1991, whose concerns were previously discussed). This simultaneously confirms that art educators hold formalist art history as a view of art history and challenges the use of this notion of art history for art education curricula. In advocating a humanities (interdisciplinary) approach to art education, Zeller (1989) asserts that stylistic art history is unfortunately the most common conception of art history promulgated by art education theories and is all too frequently utilized by art educators in the classroom. Like Freedman, he stresses that art educators should look to contemporary revisionist art historians for guidance in adopting more social-cultural concepts of art history.

In my view, Katan (1990) also raises criticisms about formalist art history because she criticizes art teaching centered on the formal qualities of artworks within the context of her article focused on exploring varying notions of art history. She pointedly declares that when art educators “accept the elements and principles of design as organizational concepts for instruction . . . . [they] study the many ways in which line can be varied, instead of the many urgent statements that demand expression” (p. 67). She further lambasts this approach to instruction, claiming:

The result is an art education so one-dimensional it excludes the meanings of most students; so subjective it ill serves a public education; so elitist, it ignores the values of the community; so

technical it draws little of the teachers' artistic sensibility into play. It is exactly what the larger public has labeled it: a 'frill.'  
(p. 68)

Katan's criticism of art instruction that focuses on the formal qualities of art, however, is placed within a diatribe against what she claims to be the elitist form art history takes as a "discipline." In encouraging art educators to reconsider their concepts of art history and approaches to art history education, Katan suggests that choices boil down to a decision between two conflicting positions. She presents alternatives as a dichotomy when she asks art teachers "shall art history remain a 'discipline' or become a part of life, as it was before and will be after academia . . . ?" (p. 69). In contrast, I suggest that there are *multiple* alternatives for conceptualizing art history and that considering art history as a "discipline" does not preclude it also being considered as "a part of life." What is most valuable, in my view, in Katan's article is her challenge to art educators to look for "art histories supportive of the social role and democratic purposes of the public school teacher" (p. 68) – and to look to and value teachers themselves as sources for these ideas and for ideas for ways to put these ideas into practice in the schools.

Returning now to the topic of formalist art history, Katan (1990), Zeller (1989), and Freedman (1991) all cause readers to pause and reconsider concepts of art history and the ramifications formalist art history may hold for the field of art education. These and other criticisms of formalist art history which have surfaced in recent publications of *Art Education* indicate the perception of formalist art history as a widespread concept of art history among art educators – albeit one that several now challenge.

In recent years, as art education has placed more emphasis on including art history in art curricula, questions have arisen concerning the

developmental abilities of children to comprehend art history and their capabilities to engage in art historical inquiry. Erickson (1994, 1995a, 1995b, 1995c) has recently begun conducting research on this topic. Within the publication of her research in *Art Education*, Erickson (1995) addresses the development of students' understandings of individual artists' styles, in particular the development of the understanding that "a great many art makers of the past (as well as today) chose not to represent the world just as it appeared to them" (p. 35). I believe that she here advocates attention be directed toward formalist art history, specifically stylistic art history, for school curricula; however, in the broader scope of her article and study, she primarily advocates assisting students in their development of socio-cultural art historical understandings. Also, harkening back to the theme of her article published in 1983 in *Art Education*, Erickson emphasizes that she focuses "not on the sequencing of art history information, but on the sequencing of art historical inquiry" (p. 23).

A review of the Instructional Resources segments of *Art Education* reinforces the idea that formalist art history is a concept of art history entrenched in the minds of art educators. Overall, it is a recurrently appearing concept of art history in these resource materials; it seems that almost half of the entries give a rather substantial amount of attention to formalist art history. In many of these cases it is acknowledged in goals and/or objectives as well.

Actually, in a majority of the Instructional Resources formal qualities of the works of art reproduced are discussed, however, in many cases such is more correctly classified as art criticism rather than a type of art history. It is when the study of formal qualities of works of art is aimed at learning to

recognize a particular artist's style or the collective style of a group of artists or a period, that such then categorically moves within the realm of art history. Certainly art criticism and formalist art history are closely related, and both approaches to the study of art are often used in tandem in the resource materials. Sometimes they are inextricably linked. Yet, formalist art history focused on an individual artist's style often may be clearly recognized (e.g., Clark, 1986; Northup, 1986; Grana, 1987; Berry, 1988; Covington, 1988; Donahue & Gabor, 1989; Miller, 1989; Stephen, 1991a; York, Harris, Herrington, 1993a,c; Fantozzi, Borenzweig, & Elliott, 1994; Miller, Schneider, Black, Clark, Wrinkle, 1994a, b; Berry, 1995a).

Similarly, many examples of formalist art history addressing collective style are readily apparent (e.g., Tolbert, 1985; Blocker, 1987; Blume, 1987; Davidson, 1987; Guip, 1987; Park, 1987; Moreno, 1988; Kauppinen, 1989; Lambert, 1989; Matteo, 1989; Neu, 1989; Braaten & Ellingson, 1992; Clarkin & Rawson, 1992; Hellwege, 1993; York, Harris, Herrington, 1993b, Jacobsen, 1994 ; Osaki, 1996). Also, formalist art history which emphasizes both individual and collective style is noticeable in the Instructional Resources (e.g., Yenawine, 1985; Thoman, 1986; Tollifson, 1986; Friedman, 1987; Nelson, 1988). And, in one issue of *Art Education*, an exploration of various approaches to style is the focus of the set of materials (Johnson & Walpole, 1990a, b, c, d).

Connoisseurship is rarely directly or even indirectly referred to in the Instructional Resources (a few scarce examples are Jenke, 1986; Davidson, 1987; Johnson & Walpole, 1990d; Berry, 1995b; Hartfield, 1995 ). However, depending upon how a teacher might use the above materials focused on

style, the concept of art history as connoisseurship might appear in the classroom as a result of the resource materials provided.

To recapitulate, art educators, like art historians, commonly consider formalist art history to be a type of art history; many recognize stylistic art history and connoisseurship as possible approaches to the study of the history of art. There are several ways that formalist art history appears in *Art Education* as an ingrained conception of art history among art educators: (a) several articles directly or indirectly advocate it for art education curricula, (b) it seems to be the most frequently appearing concept of art history in the Instructional Resources segments, and (c) recently, several note its prevalence in art education theory and practice before then proceeding to unveil what they perceive to be problems with using it as an approach to the study of art. It seems that the traditional popularity and current questioning of formalist art history in art education literature echoes that found in art history literature.

### Content-based Art History

Introducing content-based art history to students may come as naturally to some art educators as reading a story to children comes to many parents (and grandparents) – and that is in large part what content-based art history translates into in practice. If a picturebook is referred to, then both processes may be combined into one learning experience. What do you see in this picture? What story is the artist trying to tell us? And for the older picture reader, what deeper meanings are encoded in this image? Such may be considered art criticism; however, when knowledge of artistic traditions of

the portrayal of subject matter and expressive content of art is taken into account or learned about then such may be labeled "art history."

As explained in the previous chapter, Panofsky (1955/1982) proposes three ways that subject matter of works of art may be studied as a focus of art history:

- . *pre-iconography* (the description of objects and relationships of such portrayed in artworks)
- . *iconography* (the identification of themes, stories, and allegories depicted in artworks)
- . *iconology* (the decipherment of deeper meanings inherent in artworks)

I have suggested that these be considered three sub-types of what I have labeled as content-based art history. Evidence that some art educators perceive of these three variations of content-based art history as "art history" is provided in *Art Education*.

My research of art history literature suggests that pre-iconography is not a well-recognized or accepted concept of art history among art historians, as most consider it simply to be an initial step to iconography, iconology, or other forms of art history. However, I have offered it as a legitimate concept of art history suggested by Panofsky's work. It seems that some art educators, perhaps unconsciously, consider pre-iconography to be a form of art history, as it has occasionally been indirectly noted in *Art Education* articles as an appropriate type of art history to introduce to children. As it is such a controversial concept of art history that is, it seems, never directly acknowledged, I believe that it is particularly important to briefly describe below seven glimmerings of pre-iconography which illuminate art educators' views of it.

Irvine (1984) suggests the "topical" approach as one of ten ways to involve students in "our human art heritage." This seems to me to be



another name for pre-iconography. For, as an example of the topical approach, she suggests introducing children to paintings of flowers, suggesting students examine "a variety of flower still lifes by Van Gogh, Cezanne, de Heem, Redon, Nolde" (p. 19). "Animals through the Ages" is another example she provides for this approach.

Smith (1989) proposes that art curricula for children during the middle years be based on the Imitationist theory of art and suggests that the art history component of such curricula center around "examples chosen on the basis of realism" (p. 11). Although he emphasizes study of the techniques used to create realistic images, I believe he also alludes to pre-iconography as a type of art history by suggesting that the (realistic) depiction of objects in works of art be the focus of art history education.

Glenn (1981) advocates the integration of art with science, specifically suggesting the study of landforms depicted in landscape paintings, such as *Oxbow: The Connecticut River Near Northampton* by Thomas Cole. He does not specifically advocate the inclusion of "art history" in school curricula, much less actually endorse "pre-iconology" as a concept of art history. However, by proposing that the subject matter of artworks be studied, he alludes to such.

By making art educators aware of a unique art museum, the National Art Museum of Sport, Field (1982) raises art educators' awarenesses of pre-iconography. He justifies the particular focus of this museum by writing:

The tradition of representing athletes in sculpture and on a flat surface is as ancient as Greek statuary and vase painting; thus it seems fitting that this theme which is so pervasive in American life be given its own place in the sun. (p. 27)

By bringing attention to the portrayal of sport in art, Field indirectly reminds art educators that pre-iconography holds innumerable possibilities for the study of art's history and spotlights one art museum that has selected pre-iconography as its approach to presenting art's history.

In making a case for the inclusion of comic books in junior high art curricula, Hoff (1982) also indirectly supports a view of pre-iconography as art history. He presents a brief history of the visual narrative as an art form, mentioning cave drawings of bison hunts, stylized medieval manuscript illustrations, imagery depicted on the *Bayeux Tapestry*, and Giotto's frescos. Hoff ends his article by suggesting that study of such, as well as imagery in comic books, could help students with their own artistic development and lead to the "appreciation of different forms of art" (p. 23) – thus, I suggest, he supports pre-iconography as an appropriate concept of art history for art curricula.

Certainly there are other art educators, however, who seem not to consider Irvine's (1984) topical approach or the other examples of what I have described as pre-iconography to be "art history." For example, Erickson (1983) writes:

Some art teachers contend that they teach art history whenever they employ art works from the past in their classroom. In this sense "art history" is synonymous with "art works," and art history is taught through exposure. A teacher with this view of art history makes an effort to use art works of the past as examples of whatever art content is to be taught. . . . Almost incidentally, identifying facts about the works may be presented, e.g., date, artists, or culture of origin. This sense of art history is so very loosely defined and so minimally developed historically that it can be considered to be art history only through a great stretch of traditional usage. (p. 28)

I interpret Erickson's stance to include criticism of conceptions of art history as the display and discussion of art reproductions that depict a particular topic or theme. To me, this indicates an agreement with those art historians who do not consider pre-iconography to be a viable concept of art history -- although I understand her emphasis is to discourage views of art history as information and to promote notions of art history as inquiry. However, later in her article when presenting description as an art historical process, Erickson hints that she does consider pre-iconography to be a legitimate form of art history. For she suggests that description of subject matter is one aspect of artworks that art historians report, as did "nineteenth century art historians [who] provided extraordinarily detailed description of works which their readers might never see in original form or in reproduction" (p. 29). In either case, regardless of whether Erickson considers pre-iconography to be a justifiable type of art history or not, imbedded in her article seems to be an acknowledgment that some art educators hold it as a conception of art history.

Like art historians, art educators seem to often see pre-iconography as a stepping stone to iconography (as the names imply). Although they do not acknowledge this linkage of concepts of art history in these terms, art educators' combination of these views of art history is evident in *Art Education* articles. For example, it appears in Petit's (1988) advocacy of the study of the history of Flemish and French still life painting for art curricula. Petit focuses on providing two types of art historical information. The first may be labeled as pre-iconography for he offers classifications of Flemish and French still life paintings primarily based on what objects were depicted. The second goes beyond the identification of overt subject matter to the identification of symbolic meanings of still life objects. This is characteristic

of iconography. By suggesting that teachers help their students to learn both historic subject matter and symbolism of Flemish and French still life paintings, Petit is, in effect, recommending both pre-iconography and iconography as concepts of art history appropriate for art education.

The linkage of pre-iconography and iconography is also evident in Collins' (1991) essay which is directly aimed at answering the question "What Is Art History?" As explained previously when discussing formalist art history, Collins writes that art historical scholarship consists of both visual and contextual analysis of works of art and that visual analysis focuses on both subject matter and style. In elaborating on the visual analysis of subject matter, Collins explicitly presents the term "iconography," defining it as follows for art educators:

For a representational painting or sculpture it means a consideration of "what" is represented -- the person or people, their action(s), their location, the weather, time, season, etc. Here, as elsewhere, the aim of study is specificity. Are the characters old or young? Happy or unhappy? Aristocrats or peasants? Ordinary looking or idealized? What do they seem to be thinking? How do they relate to one another? What has happened just before this moment? What will happen next? and so on. (p. 55)

Based on Panofsky's (1955/1982) introduction of these terms, I consider the above to be a description not of art history as "iconography" but of art history as "pre-iconography." It is in the continuation of the quote above that I find Collins to refer to iconography as Panofsky described it. Collins writes:

The question of who the individuals are or what the story is may require information the analyst does not have. While most people in the West know who the man dying on the cross is, they may be unsure about who the two women are who are crying beneath him. A certain amount of "additional" information is usually required for the operation of direct analysis. (p. 55)

Thus, Collins presents the term "iconography" to art educators, broadly defining it as the subject matter of works of art. Yet, by explaining that art historians study both the natural and traditional meanings of imagery, he actually indirectly presents both pre-iconography and iconography as concepts of art history.

Erickson (1983) recommends iconography as a concept of art history for art educators to consider for art history instruction when she presents "interpretation" as an art historical process. She explains that "historical interpretation is finding a meaning which could have been expressed and understood in the era when the work was produced" (p. 30). Like Panofsky, Erickson advocates translating messages in works of art by deciphering "symbols, metaphors, or themes" told by imagery, referring to contextual information to assist in this process.

An emphasis is placed on iconography by Wardle (1990) who proposes that the symbolism in Native American art be studied in art classrooms. She presents this as an example of the larger issue she takes a proactive stand on: multicultural art education. Wardle explains a variety of symbols used in Native American art, emphasizing the significance of the symbols to Native American culture. Wardle, thus, suggests to art educators that iconography is a concept of art history suitable for studying non-European as well as European art. She also emphasizes its close relationships to socio-cultural art history.

It is apparent from reviewing *Art Education* articles that some art educators also recognize iconology as a type of art history. Feinstein (1985) indirectly acknowledges iconology, along with a mixture of other concepts of art history, when she proffers the idea of "art as visual metaphor." She

implies pre-iconography, iconography, and iconology by suggesting that "visual forms are instances of presentational symbolization, the interpretation of which ranges on a continuum from literal to metaphoric" (p. 29). And, she further connotes iconology as a type of art history when she writes:

The metaphoric process can be used to interpret art periods as well as individual works. Each period in the history of art is marked by particular characteristics that reflect its society, myths, and values. We can grasp the essence of a period by making a tentative metaphor, an overarching grabber, to capture those characteristics and to direct us back to the parts. Then, we can create a more delineated and comprehensive whole. (p. 28)

In sum, Feinstein indirectly presents iconology as a concept of art history and advocates its use by art educators in the form of metaphoric readings of societal characteristics symbolized in works of art.

Ettinger and Hoffman (1990) also direct art educators' attention to iconology as a type of art history under the label of "metaphor." They primarily use quilting as a metaphor for a participatory curriculum, raising a viable option for higher education art education courses. However, they also provide background information on the historic functions of quilts and discuss quilts as metaphors for women's lives. For example, the authors explain that for some, quilts became a symbol of women's subjugation during the suffrage movement. This interpretation of quilts as symbolic of societal attitudes goes beyond iconographical analysis. By identifying such intrinsic meaning or content of quilts during the late 19th and early 20th century, Ettinger and Hoffman briefly allude to iconology as a concept of art history for art educators to consider.

Petit (1990) emphasizes iconology as a concept of art history, although the term "iconology" never appears in his article, "The Object as Subject in

20th Century American Art." For Petit encourages art educators to explore with their students the deeper intrinsic meanings of objects depicted in selected 20th-century American paintings, in particular focusing on how objects in such paintings are symbolic expressions of American society. For example, Petit writes that paintings by Charles Sheeler, Charles Demuth, and Edward Hopper which present architecture as object "went beyond what is termed landscape painting and became a statement about America in the industrial revolution and later the great depression" (p. 36). I contend that Petit strongly advocates iconology for art curricula as it explores more than the "technical virtuosity" of still life painting and probes beyond superficial interpretations of works of art.

Pre-iconography, iconography, and iconology regularly appear in the *Instructional Resources of Art Education*, confirming that art educators commonly hold such concepts of art history. It is not too surprising that the majority of resource materials focus some discussion on the content of artworks reproduced – considering that the majority of artworks selected for reproduction are paintings and sculptures which realistically or abstractly depict subject matter. Discussions of art content range from minimal to significant amounts of addressing one or more of the three sub-types of content-based art history.

Numerous resource materials emphasize learning about the natural subject matter depicted in artworks (e.g., Brubaker, 1986; Davidson, 1986; Smenner, 1987; Smith, 1987; Hood, 1988; Lander, 1988; Schaefer, 1989). For example: (a) Brubaker presents the American West as artistic subject matter in the 19th century, specifically focusing on Thomas Moran's depiction of the Grand Canyon; (b) Smith introduces genre painting of the 19th century,

focusing on Jean-Francois Millet's portrayal of peasants; and (c) Hood describes Rosa Bonheur's history of depicting animals. These examples serve as evidence that some art educators see pre-iconography as a concept of art history appropriate for use in art instruction.

Based on the number of Instructional Resources that emphasize iconography, it seems that even more art educators accept and value iconography as a type of art history. Although they do not directly acknowledge this belief in the resource materials, it is evident in the materials they write. Examples include resources focused on the following:

- the depiction of *stories* (Andre, 1989; McArthur, Kunny, & Kuliak, 1990b)
- the representation of *historical figures or events* (Gelman, 1986; Irvine, 1986; Koetsch, 1988; Cappetta & Fitzgerald, 1989; Solender & Buchanan, 1989; Gaither, 1990b; Hallowell et al., 1991a, b, c)
- the illustration of *religious themes* (Linerode, 1986; Northup, 1986; Blocker, 1987; Guip, 1987; Lowe, 1987; Prabhu, 1987; Adams, 1988; Eder, 1992a)
- the portrayal of *myths* (Shoemaker, 1986)
- the presentation of *allegories* (Luik, 1987; Sousa, 1987; Andre, 1988; Lind, 1988; Pond, 1988; Cole, 1989; McCarty-Procopio et al., 1991a)

A few verbal illustrations of how iconography is presented in the above examples include the following:

- McArthur et al. (1990b) explains how Bernardo Martorell's painting *Saint George Killing the Dragon* is a depiction of a scene from a 13th-century collection of stories, *The Golden Legend*.
- Irvine (1986) relays the event that Ben Shahn portrays in his mosaic mural, *The Passion of Sacco and Vanzetti*.
- Eder (1992a) provides an historical interpretation of the figure carved in a 2nd-century *Railing Pillar* from India, identifying it as a yaksi, or female nature spirit.



- Shoemaker (1986) deciphers Pieter Paul Rubens' painting, *Prometheus Bound*, as the depiction of a myth.
- Sousa (1987) explains how Ivan Albright's painting, *Into The World There Came A Soul Called Ida*, is "a personification of Vanity," not simply the portrait of an old woman.

Although iconology appears less frequently than other types of art history, art educators' conceptions of art history as the decoding of deeper social content embedded in imagery is also apparent in *Art Education Instructional Resources* (e.g., Hausman, 1986; Jenke, 1986; Zeller, 1986; Friedman, 1987; Gaither, 1990a; Eder, 1992b; Hellwege, 1993 ; Henry, 1995 ). As is characteristic of iconology, most of these examples incorporate some attention to pre-iconography and iconography in route to focusing on what deeper intrinsic meaning may be incorporated in the works of art showcased. For instance, Jenke explains that Pieter Claesz's *Still-life* "represents a breakfast piece or light meal that could be eaten throughout the day. . . . The artist presents a simple but delectable fare of bread, wine, and oysters, with salt and pepper as spices." Jenke also notes the allegorical content of the work, stating: "Some still lifes also served as reminders of the transience of life." She then discusses how "such paintings were evidence of an interest current in the Seventeenth Century . . . scientific interest in the nature of perception and image making" (p. 26). This demonstrates how the three sub-types of content-based art history are sometimes combined by art educators to approach the history of art. It follows the methodological pattern for art historical study proposed by Panofsky and utilized by many art historians.

In summary, art educators seem to commonly consider content-based art history as a type of art history. Perhaps this is to be expected as it addresses two questions fundamental to gaining art historical knowledge of many

works of art: "What is it?" and "What does it mean?" Pre-iconography, iconography, and iconology together comprise what I have termed content-based art history. Although I believe that pre-iconography is not largely accepted by art historians as "art history," I find that some art educators accept it as such and consider it to be a type of art history approachable by children. Iconography seems well accepted and often represented in both art history and art education literature. And iconology appears to be a noted concept of art history in both fields, although art educators (and perhaps art historians) seem to give less frequent attention to it than other types of art history.

#### Genres of Art History that Focus on CONTEXT OF CREATION

##### Socio-Cultural Art History

The concept of "art history" as the study of the socio-cultural contexts in which works of art were created is clearly a notion of art history held by art educators as well as art historians. "Social art history" is a term often used by art historians to refer to broadly denote a conglomeration of ideas. As Kleinbauer and Slavens (1982) explain, it may "refer not only to the individual's [artist's] institutional life -- in social, economic, and political conditions -- but also to such other collective creations of the human mind as religion, culture, and the history of ideas" (p. 111). Certainly this indicates the multifaceted nature of the social context of artistic creation and hints at the complexity of studying histories of art using such an approach. I have

proposed the use of the heading of “socio-cultural art history” to additionally incorporated anthropological approaches to art history.

Quite a few authors of *Art Education* articles have been very vocal and direct in proclaiming the need for art educators to address socio-cultural art history in their classrooms, albeit not specifically labeling it with this term. This is in contrast to the more indirect way in which other concepts of art history are presented in *Art Education*. It seems biographical, psych-based, formalist, and content-based concepts of art history are ingrained notions of art history that are only rarely explicitly referred to; socio-cultural art history seems to be much more forthrightly presented, discussed, and advocated. Certainly those who favor socio-cultural art history and appeal to art educators to adopt this concept of art history challenge de-contextual notions of art history which appear *Art Education*.

In the previous chapter, I identified correlational social art history, causal social art history (which includes Marxist art history), cultural history, and history-of-ideas-based art history as sub-varieties of social art history evident in art history literature (as suggested by Kleinbauer's & Slavens, 1982). I suggested that anthropology-based art history could be integrated with these varieties of social art history to form “socio-cultural art history.” I find that art educators have taken many investigatory journeys through this region of the art history landscape. However, like all of the various types and sub-types of art history I have identified thus far, the appearance of this genre of art history in both art education and art history literature is not as clear cut and discretely packaged as the label I have provided may imply. Similar to the tangle and flurry of activity on the trading floor of the New York Stock Exchange, there is lots of verbal action, including both strident declarations

and more subtle cuing, regarding socio-cultural art history within the pages of *Art Education*. However, deciphering and reporting a clear picture of exactly what is occurring is a challenging task. Below I report on a variety of ways in which art educators' concepts of socio-cultural art history appear in *Art Education* articles.

One of the most direct and significant references to socio-cultural art history and most pointed of appeals for art educators to adopt such a conceptualization of art history is made by Feldman (1980). He spotlights and endorses socio-cultural art history in his advocacy of anthropologically-oriented art curricula when he writes:

The virtue of an anthropological focus is that it obliges teachers and students to examine the physical, social, and economic contexts of so-called "primitive" artistic production. . . . [Anthropologists and art historians] may . . . examine the connections between the creation of art and institutional factors such as hunting, food production, war, magic, human fertility, health, worship, and so on. . . . the art-anthropology combination generates good practical ideas for curriculum construction and classroom teaching: one can *see* the connection between a visual form and its social function. (p. 7)

This amounts to a proposal that art teachers utilize correlational social art history (as described by Kleinbauer & Slavens, 1982) and anthropology-based art history in art curricula. Feldman also supports cultural history for art curricula by suggesting a broad perspective for studying art: "Anthropological and historical conceptions of art curriculum shift our attention . . . toward *the study of humanity* through art" (p. 7). Feldman contends that an anthropologically-based art curriculum could assist students in gaining understanding of the diverse cultures that constitute American culture and art as the manifestation of such. In this way, he again encourages art teachers to adopt socio-cultural art history as a concept of art history.

Advocacy for teaching about the social contextual factors of artistic creation is not new in the field of art education. Johnson (1982) clarifies this point while placing the concept of socio-cultural art history within the scope of a history of the attention directed toward social goals in art education. She explores how art was created and taught in late 19th- and early to mid 20th-century America in response to contemporary life. And, she highlights how Lanier (1976), McFee and Degge (1977), and Chapman (1978) contend that children should learn about social contexts of artistic production and consumption. Johnson's presentation of the concept of socio-cultural art history is thus twofold:

- . She indirectly acknowledges both correlational social art history and history-of-ideas-based art history through parallel example, by presenting a brief overview of the social context surrounding the history of art education theory and practice which addresses social goals.
- . She then presents art curriculum ideas, by several noted art educators, that espouse learning about the socio-cultural factors related to the creation of art -- thus, in my view, promoting socio-cultural art history.

The significant point here is that Johnson not only potentially raises art educators' awarenesses of socio-cultural art history and the history of this concept in art education theory and practice, but she also points out how concepts of art history may relate to goals of art education.

Anderson (1985) continues in this vein in his advocacy of a socially-defined studio curriculum. Clearly, Anderson's art curriculum is studio-oriented but not studio-exclusive. Coming from the orientation that art is a reflection and transmitter of culture, he emphasizes that art is not made in a sphere external to an artist's society. And he asserts "if social content is intrinsic to the processes and products of art, it seems logical that the teaching

of art, at least to some extent, should be consciously socially defined" (p. 16). Anderson proposes that art teachers assist their students in creating art that consciously connects their personal world to their social context. He suggests that studying how societal factors have influenced artists in the past (in students' own and others' cultures) will help students in this process; in this way, he touts socio-cultural art history as a concept of art history appropriate for art curricula. Anderson's view of socio-cultural art history seems to encompass both correlational social art history, cultural history, and anthropology-based art history. His article is useful for clarifying how parallel concepts of art making and art history may interrelate to have a complementary affect on studio and non-studio components of art curricula.

Although neither White (1983) nor Mavigliano (1984) advocate art history instruction in school curricula, by each writing a socio-cultural history of art which appears in *Art Education*, they indirectly espouse socio-cultural art history for art instruction. While White's aim is to get art educators to embrace the computer as "a medium of artistic expression," he leads up to this pitch by providing art educators with a broad, causal social art history of how the creation of art for the past two millennia has altered as a result of social-technological changes. Mavigliano provides art educators with a chronicle of support given to artistic production in America, specifically reporting Uncle Sam's initiatives as a patron of the arts from 1933 to 1943. He deems it important for art educators to be knowledgeable of how numerous works of art came to be produced in America during this time period and of the history of ideas that led up to the creation of these Federal art programs. In this way, Mavigliano indirectly designates correlational and history-of-

ideas-based social art histories as forms of art history that art educators should be aware of and consider using in teaching.

Several art educators endorse socio-cultural art history by suggesting that the contexts of artistic creation be studied as a part of the art education programs they advocate. For example, Mittler (1980) alludes to socio-cultural art history by proposing that students "investigate the influences of time and place upon the artist" in order to address "interpretation," one of four art history operations he recommends for his art-criticism-to-art-history-sequenced secondary school art appreciation program. Madeja (1980) contends that art curricula need to be developed from the perspective that art is "a discipline with a history, a level of quality, and a knowledge base that must be learned" (p. 24). He implies that teaching art history would help to make art education curricula more substantial. One rationale Madeja provides for art education is that art is "an essential part of the history of human development" (p. 26). By further noting that "the accomplishments of humanity are reflected in art history and the role of art in society," he advocates correlational social art history for school curricula. Grossman (1984) presents a children's art program that is centered upon socio-cultural art history. A sampling of how this concept of art history is manifest in the outline of lessons she provides is as follows:

- Grossman writes that in a lesson focused on the art of Ancient Rome, "children learn that the Ancient Romans erected buildings, arches, and tall columns such as the Column of Trajan to tell of their travels" (p. 8).
- In a lesson regarding the art of the people of Alaska, Grossman explains that "emphasis will be on the Eskimo's dependence on the sea for food and survival" (p. 8).

- . In a lesson about petroglyphs by Northwest Coast American Indians, Grossman notes that one aim is for children to learn how the art of American Indian cultures reflects their respect for nature.

Grossman sanctions socio-cultural history for art programs by describing lessons generally aimed at assisting children with becoming knowledgeable of histories of art's function in various societies and how art is reflective of certain cultural aspects of different societies.

Irvine (1984) offers multi-disciplinary and enrichment approaches as two ways of selecting works of art for "an art centered art curriculum." These suggest socio-cultural art history, because art making is connected to other disciplines and to the cultural context in which works of art are made. By offering ways to go beyond works of art and art makers, Irvine endorses studying the contexts of artistic creation. She explains that the purpose of her "enrichment" approach is "to enhance the general knowledge of a culture through its art and artifacts" (p. 17).

Johns (1986), Eisner (1987), and Zeller (1989) also advocate incorporating the study of socio-cultural history in art curricula. Johns proposes that art education should address global education. He clarifies the term "global education" by providing the National Council for the Social Studies (NCSS) Position Statement on Global Education:

Global education refers to efforts to cultivate in young people a perspective of the world which emphasizes the interconnections among cultures, species, and the planet. The purpose of global education is to develop in youth the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed to live effectively in a world possessing limited natural resources and characterized by ethnic diversity, cultural pluralism, and increasing interdependence. (NCSS, 1981)  
(Johns, 1986, p. 17)

He contends that social studies education needs art education to address global education, in part, because "art is exceptionally suited to reflect the



world views of cultures" (p. 18). Via this rationale and the teaching strategy he offers for addressing global education through art and social studies, Johns suggests socio-cultural history for such joint educational ventures. His article points out that art history education is a field of study that social studies educators as well as art educators need to address.

Eisner (1987) puts forth a particular notion of art history in his presentation of art history as one of four content areas for discipline-based art education (DBAE). As DBAE has become a major movement in the field of art education in recent years, it seems important to note precisely how Eisner, a key spokesperson for this movement, espouses art history. He presents the art history plank of the DBAE platform as follows:

History and culture constitute a third important area for learning discipline-based art education. Here we are interested in helping children understand that art does not emerge in the proverbial vacuum. All art is part of a culture. All cultures give direction to art, sometimes by rejecting what artists have made and at other times by rewarding them for it. To understand culture, one needs to understand its manifestations in art, and, to understand art, one needs to understand how culture is expressed through its content and form. The austerity of a Shaker chair or table is a reflection of the religious convictions of the Shakers and how they thought life should be lived. The aggressive force and movement of futuristic artists in early 20th-century Italy reflect powerful ideological beliefs about what Italian society should become. The pristine and lean qualities of the steel and glass skyscraper embody a view of the optimal relationship of man and machine. Such art forms in each period, each location, each culture mutually influence each other. Just as culture shapes art, art shapes culture. Our convictions, our technology, and our imagination shape our images, and our images, in turn, shape our perceptions of the world. One major aim of discipline-based art education is to help students understand these relationships by examining the interaction between art and culture over time. (p. 18)

Thus, in his advocacy of art history for art curricula, Eisner proposes that art educators conceive of art history as socio-cultural art history. He particularly emphasizes cultural history but also alludes to correlational social art history.

In his proposal for a humanities approach to art education, Zeller (1989) concurs with Eisner by advocating socio-cultural art history as the most desirable approach to studying art's histories. He describes the birth and growth of social art history as a recognized form of art history among art historians and declares that this should be the approach used toward what he claims should be the major goal of art education: "understanding and valuing our own and other cultures, both past and present" (p. 56). In this way, Zeller not only authorizes socio-cultural art history for art history education curricula, but he proposes it be the central focus for art educators to build their whole art programs around.

Art educators' views of "art history" as socio-cultural art history not only surface in *Art Education* articles. They also appear in the Instructional Resources segments of this journal. While attention directed toward studying contexts of creation seems less common in these materials than consideration given to the intrinsic qualities of art objects themselves, it is more prevalent than attention focused on art makers. Overall, I estimate that 30% to 40% of the Instructional Resources (September, 1985 through December, 1996) direct noteworthy attention toward social art history.

Often the resource materials that present social art history offer it in the form of correlational social art history. A few focus attention on *patronage* (e.g., Suarez, 1986; Neu, 1989; Zawatsky, 1989; Eder, 1992d). Several note *art's connection to religious beliefs and customs* (e.g., Guip, 1987; Lowe, 1987; McArthur et al., 1990b, c; McCarty-Procopio et al., 1991d; Eder, 1992a). And

quite a few place an emphasis on *art as reflective of political or other societal events or situations* (e.g., Bush, 1985; Day, 1986; Nichols-Dietrich, 1986; Talbot-Stanaway, 1987; Koetsch, 1988; Selle, 1988; Fish, 1989; Talbot-Stanaway & Timm, 1989; Hallowell et al., 1991a, b; Stephen, 1991b; Eder, 1992c).

A few other Instructional Resources submit that society plays a more forceful role in the creation of art. These resources that suggest societies largely determine artistic production provide evidence that some art educators consider causal social art history to be a valid concept of art history. Horner (1989), Lambert (1989), and McCarty-Procopio et al. (1991c) provide examples of such notions.

Shannon (1986) and Springer (1990b) offer views of art history as history-of-ideas-based art history by linking art to the history of intellectual thought. In a resource segment centered on "Twentieth-Century Art: Issues of Representation," Springer (1990a, b, c, & d) also presents art history as the history of artistic thought.

Cultural history occasionally appears in the Instructional Resources. Materials that emphasize the cultural context of creation include those by Friedman (1987), Mitchem (1987), Park (1987, 1988), Abbott (1989), Cappetta and Fitzgerald (1989), Kauppinen (1989), Quinn (1989), Johnson and Walpole (1990c, d), McArthur et al. (1990a, c, d), and Vallance (1991).

In summary, a review of *Art Education* articles indicates that some art educators, like some art historians, hold socio-cultural art history as a conception of "art history." It seems correlational social art history and cultural history or anthropology-based art history are the most predominant sub-types of socio-cultural art history appearing in these articles although causal and history-of-ideas-based social art histories make brief appearances as

well. This pattern is repeated in the Instructional Resources provided in *Art Education*.

### Genres of Art History that Focus on ART AUDIENCE

#### Response-based Art History

In the previous chapter, I proposed that investigations of the reactions people have had to art and artists over time be considered another region of the art history domain, albeit one that is not well-explored or widely recognized within the field of art history. Given only the very limited coverage of this genre within art history literature, it is reasonable to wonder if any references to it may be found in *Art Education* during the 16 year period analyzed in this study. In my view, a few articles do make brief allusions to the focus of this type of art history: Lanier (1981), Hamblen (1985), Ettinger and Hoffman (1990), Irvine (1991), Freedman (1991), Lee (1993), Leshnoff (1995), and Erickson (1995). Certainly it is not a primary focus of any of these articles. Nor is it identified in these articles as a type of art history. Nevertheless, it is appropriate to report on these few art education excursions that cross into this region of scholarship – while attempting to be clear as to the limited scope and context in which these appearances of response-based art history occur.

Within their advocacy of aesthetics content for art curricula, toward the aim of promoting aesthetic literacy, I suggest that both Lanier (1981) and Hamblen (1985) also, in part, promote inclusion of response-based art history

in art curricula. One of the three aesthetic elements that Lanier suggests for art content is "history" and within his discussion of this focus of aesthetic inquiry, he discusses contextual factors that affect aesthetic response to objects. In reference to predispositions interacting with viewing experiences, Lanier writes "In a very real sense they [these attitudes] are parts of the history of the object or more specifically the history of the circumstances in which the object is or has been negotiated by the viewer" (p. 8). Lanier's views would seem to support considering response-based art history, in terms of attitudes toward art and aesthetic responses to objects, as part of art's histories. Hamblen proposes seven "thematic categories for the generation of aesthetic concepts" (p. 21), one of which is audience. She also presents three levels of discussions in which to involve students. Her Level II Discussion "consists of an examination of an object in relationship to its artistic status and the responses it elicits" (p. 21). She suggests that a Level II Discussion within the audience thematic category focus on discussing "over time and space, an object's users as well as meanings and evaluations will change" (p. 22). Like Lanier, in effect she seems to be advocating that some attention be directed toward response-based art history education within the context of aesthetics-focused art curricula.

Ettinger and Hoffman (1990) present a brief history of response to quilt making within their article promoting participatory curriculum and women's art. Learning about the devaluing and valuing of quilts over time is presented as significant information about this art form. The authors seem to be suggesting, by example, that art educators consider including response-based art history in art instruction, although this is not the focus of their article.

Within an essay entitled "The Dangers of Art 'Appreciation'," Irvine (1991) presents a very brief history of responses to the *Mona Lisa*. She describes both the intense interest of a group of individuals and the seeming indifference by one person to this work of art as reactions that she recently witnessed when observing people viewing the original in the Louvre. Irvine also lists numerous responses to this painting that have taken the form of kitch takeoffs and media spin-offs made for advertising purposes. She ends her essay by asking about the effect this type of creative response to the *Mona Lisa* has had, specifically asking "has exploitation of a priceless work like the *Mona Lisa* paradoxically depreciated its value as work of art?" (p. 15). Irvine's thesis of this essay is that unless we involve our students in considering questions like this, they may not become involved with art and may simply be indifferent to it. I suggest that Irvine presents a mini-version of a response-based art history regarding one particular artwork. Further, by asking art educators to involve their students in considering what effect kitch and marketing visual references to this work have had on subsequent responses to it, she proposes another level of investigation of response-based art history with students.

Although neither Lee (1993) or Leshnoff (1995) place their ideas within the framework of art history education, I believe that their articles also allude to response-based art history and have relevant perspectives for considering the inclusion of it in school curricula. Within the context of her article focused on teaching art criticism, Lee suggests that students study art critics' writings representing differing reactions to specified artworks. I consider art history and art criticism as overlapping in the area of audience response to works of art and propose that when art educators involve their students in

examining records of past critical responses to works of art that this may dually be considered (historical) “art criticism” and “response-based art history.” In this way, Lee’s article focused on art criticism, in my view, simultaneously spotlights response-based art history. Leshnoff (1995), although also placing the focus of her article on art criticism, seems to directly acknowledge response-based art history when she writes “in the history of art, diverse interpretations of artwork abound that are dependent upon the orientation of viewers” (p. 52). She indicates that art teachers’ responses to artworks are affected by both their knowledge of art history and theories of art – factors which she points out may be quite different from students’ experiences and cause students and teachers to respond entirely differently to the same artworks. Leshnoff (1995) suggests teachers encourage their students to think critically about artworks and consider them from a variety of points of view. I believe in this way she promotes the inclusion of response-based art history in art curriculum.

Both Freedman (1991) and Erickson (1995c) directly address art history and directly propose considerations for art history education. Within these articles both authors seem to give some recognition to response-based art history. Freedman offers “five suggestions for teaching artistic heritage in school” (p. 43), one of which she identifies as follows:

focusing upon the interpretive “reading” of visual art can illustrate to students the social purposes of art. It can help students to become active viewers and show them that interpretation is vital to viewing art at all levels of knowledge. Various readings, interpretations, and understandings become attached to a work of art and, in a sense, become part of it. A historical work of art becomes transformed by the ways it is read over time.

The intents and purposes of artists and other art professionals can be examined in school to illustrate the importance of

critically reflecting on opinion. Through comparisons between different written accounts of the same works of art, students can see how interpretations change over time. Comparisons such as these can lay bare the interpretive aspects of written accounts, even when the opinion stated is based on expertise. (p. 44)

Here, in my view, Freedman both substantiates considering response-based art history as a genre of art history and including attention to it in school curricula.

Erickson (1995c) proposes nine art historical understandings identified and ordered for “the sequencing of art historical inquiry” (p. 23). Understanding #9, identified as the most cognitively challenging, is specified as “Students learn that a viewer’s perception (including their own) is conditioned by the viewer’s culture” (p. 36). It seems to me that gaining awareness that socio-cultural factors influence reactions to works of art could be considered an exploration of response-based art history – or a step in preparing to make investigations in this direction.

Overall, only brief allusions to response-based art history are presented in *Art Education* articles. And, I found no focus on this genre of art history in the Instructional Resource segments. The minimal attention that is given to this area of study in the above described articles, however, I believe raises several issues worth investigating for considerations of art history education and art education in general. Research regarding, for example, how response-based art history and aesthetics, art appreciation, and art criticism can and do overlap seems warranted.



## Genres of Art History that have MULTIPLE FOCUSES

### Artistic Processes-based Art History

In Chapter 3, I suggested that the study of artistic materials, techniques, modes, processes, and practices from times past be considered a type of art historical inquiry, one that I proposed be labeled as “artistic processes-based art history.” Art educators have demonstrated some interest in this area of study as indicated by at least 15 indirect references to this genre of art history scattered throughout the articles published in *Art Education* from 1980 through 1996 and by *numerous* other brief references to art content on this topic in the Instructional Resource segments published from 1985 through 1996. In the next several pages, I chronicle examples of how I perceive this genre of art history to be manifest in *Art Education* articles and the issues these articles raise.

Kozlowski and Yakel (1980) advocate copying for art instruction. They promote copying as an established artistic practice, a process of learning that artists have often used in developing creatively, and one that art educators should utilize in teaching art. By presenting a look back in time at how a variety of specific artists have used and recommended copying as a technique for artistic development, the authors provide a short artistic processes-based art history. For example, they cite Leonardo’s ideas regarding copying as an advisable artistic process for learning: “The youth should first learn perspective, then the proportions of objects. Then he may copy from some good master to accustom himself to fine forms. Then . . . .” (cited, p. 26). If teachers do indeed adopt copying as an approach to teaching art and if they

inform their students about how artists in the past have used this practice and explore with students how these artists have used copying as a process in their creative development, then it would seem they are also teaching their students artistic processes-based art history. This article stirs art educators to reflect on their teaching practices. Because copying is a controversial artistic practice for art instruction, this article challenges art educators to reflect on how their philosophies of teaching, as well as specific curricular goals, lead them to select or avoid teaching specific artistic techniques or practices.

Szekely (1982), Stankiewicz (1984), and Borgmann (1986) also offer relevant issues regarding artistic processes-based art history education to contemplate. Szekely (1982) seems to offer a rationale for artistic processes-based art history education when he writes “the more children understand the work habits, techniques, and creative processes of others, the more likely they are to understand their own impetus toward artwork and to continue working on their own, outside the classroom, directing their own ideas and taking more charge of their own work” (p. 16). If this is so, it makes a strong case for including artistic processes-based art history in art curricula. Research to investigate Szekely’s claim seems warranted.

Stankiewicz (1984) provides a history of the artistic medium of finger-paint and the techniques and methods of creating with it as recommended by Ruth Shaw, its creator. Stankiewicz presents this history in support of her thesis that “examination of the Shaw System of Finger-Painting illustrates how potent teacher influence can be in transmitting artistic style” (p. 23). Certainly, Stankiewicz raises a significant point for art educators to consider: when teaching about artistic techniques and practices – or any aspect of art or art history – to what degree are we advocating children replicate what is

taught versus gain knowledge and skills regarding possibilities for developing their own personal artistic expressions.

Borgmann (1986) showcases an art education endeavor that involved K-12 public school students in (a) studying the artistic processes Christo undertakes in the creation of his work and then (b) engaging in these processes in the creation of their own Christo-inspired projects. Borgmann posits that “the end result gave students far more than a Christo-like wrapping experience” (p. 20). In her view, by engaging students in Christo’s process of artistic creation, they investigated aesthetic concepts and engaged in meaningful dialogue about art. This suggests that artistic processes-based art history may be included in curricula not only as a means of assisting students in developing their skills in artistic techniques but as a means of learning about and through art.

In my view, both Anderson (1987) and Roland (1993) investigate artistic processes-based art history and take readers on explorations of this region of art historical scholarship within their articles that introduce two artists/art educators and their artwork. Anderson (1987) presents a history of Alexander Nepote’s methods and materials as a landscape painter and his thoughts regarding the creative process within a multifaceted introduction to this artist and his work. While Roland (1993) presents a brief artistic processes-based art history within his published interview of photographer and teacher, Jerry Uelsmann. Specifically, this genre of art history is investigated through Roland asking Uelsmann “How would you describe your creative process? How do you go about creating an image and thinking about the images you create?” Also, Roland’s article demonstrates one means of engaging students in art historical inquiry: interviewing artists.

Several articles in *Art Education* incorporate attention to artistic processes-based art history within articles that encourage art educators, specifically, to include textiles in art curricula and, more broadly, to address feminist issues and bias against decorative arts and domestic art. For example, Grossman and Boykin (1988) provide an artistic processes-based art history focused on the traditional steps of weaving a tartan plaid and a description of their experience in introducing this genre of art history to children and university students as part of a fiber arts unit. Ettinger and Hoffman (1990) present a history of quilt making within their presentation of the incorporation of a quilt making project in a university art education course entitled "Women and Their Art." The history of quilt making as an art form, traditional practices in quilt making, the processes of how a quilt was made as part of this university course, and learner outcomes from participation in these artistic processes are presented for the consideration of art educators. Blandy and Hoffman (1991) present categories of resources and specific examples of resources on the topic of the "domestic art" of textiles. They offer numerous leads for locating references for artistic processes-based art history education on this broad artistic-medium category which has many sub-varieties. Further, they challenge art educators to expand the range of objects considered for art and art historical study beyond fine art traditions. Also, they point to a key topic in considering art history education of any sort: the tracking down of relevant, useful resources. Kellman (1996) presents an historical account of two forms of women's handwork: North American crochet and Athapaskan beadwork. She includes commentary regarding traditional methods and materials of production amidst connecting the production of these art forms to the lives of two specific women. Personal

histories of the lives of these two women, feminist art history, socio-cultural art history, and artistic processes-based art history are interwoven in this multifaceted art history. This demonstrates how varieties of genres of art history may be and often are combined in art instruction.

Articles by Dyson (1989) and Steele (1993) explicitly focus their articles on art history education and also direct attention, in part, toward what I have labeled as artistic processes-based art history. British art educator, Dyson directly promotes the incorporation of this aspect of art's histories as a focus of art history education. He advocates style, *technique*, and context as headings for the art and design history examination in Britain's General Certificate of Secondary Education. He suggests that "technical study will focus on the working methods of artists, architects, designers, and craftsmen, and on their tools, equipment, and materials" (p. 19). Dyson's advocacy of what I have termed as artistic processes-based art history is presented within his promotion of "a recognition that there is more than one legitimate way of studying the history of art, and that pupils may be helped to make a rational choice among them" (p. 14). I have aimed this study at assisting art educators in gaining awarenesses and understandings of a variety of genres of art history to assist them in selecting among alternatives for art curricula. In this article Dyson presents yet another alternative to art teachers: the option teachers have to present a range of art history alternatives for their *students* to choose among. Steele (1993) offers "an art historian's perspective" (p. 41) regarding art education in which he advocates the integration of art production, art history, and "historically-based criticism." In his example of an art unit, which is centered on Renaissance panel painting, he places particular emphasis on students learning about the creative processes and

techniques involved in producing this art form during the Renaissance. Steele's article demonstrates both how artistic processes-based art history may be taught through art production activities (as well as through lecture and research) and how it may be selected as the focus of artmaking experiences and art learning.

"Zen and the Art of Pottery" by Beittel (1990) serves as a final example of an *Art Education* article that includes attention to artistic processes-based art history. It presents yet another perspective for art educators to consider. In this article, Beittel gives art educators pause to consider the spiritual processes of creation. I suggest that this article be considered a history of this artist's and art educator's views regarding Zen and artmaking, specifically pottery making, and in this way, an example of artistic processes-based art history. The author's claim is that "in following this view [of Zen beliefs applied to pottery making], a student becomes an initiate practicing pottery as an esoteric spiritual discipline" (p. 15). Beittel's article stirs us to consider another realm of artistic processes in art's histories, beyond the physical and technical processes of art production.

The articles discussed in the previous several pages raise an assortment of various points for art educators to consider regarding artistic processes-based art history. Art educators' interest in this type of art historical study is emphasized by the numerous Instructional Resources that include some historical information on artistic materials, techniques, modes, processes, and practices (e.g., El-Omami, 1985; Davidson, 1986; Blume, 1987; Fantozzi, 1987; Schwartz, 1988; Hood, 1988; Kanatani, 1988; Moreno, 1988; Koetsch, 1988; Andre, 1988; Park, 1988; Spomer, Galbraith, & Wise, 1988; Zawatsky, 1989; Abbott, 1989; Quinn, 1989; Smenner, 1989; Springer, 1990c; Prabhu, 1990b;

Hallowell with Broderick, James, & Russell, 1991b; Braaten & Ellingson, 1992; Guip, 1993; Miller, Schneider, Black, Clark, & Wrinkle, 1994d; Osaki, 1996; Brubaker, Downing, Swezy, & Bay, 1996; Rusak, 1996; Loudon, 1996).

It is also worth noting that in the stated goals and/or objectives of many of these Instructional Resources some mention is made regarding the content of artistic processes-based art historical investigations (e. g., Fantozzi, 1987; Schwartz, 1988; Hood, 1988; Koetsch, 1988; Andre, 1988; Zawatsky, 1989; Abbott, 1989; Quinn, 1989; Smenner, 1989; Springer, 1990c; Brubaker, Downing, Swezy, & Bay, 1996; Loudon, 1996).

In summary, based on this examination of *Art Education*, it seems many art educators place value on incorporating some attention to artistic processes-based art history within art curricula.

### Feminist Art History

Over the past decade and a half, there has been some attention directed toward feminist art history in *Art Education* articles and Instructional Resource segments. As indicated by my discussion of *Women, Art, and Society* (2nd ed.) by Whitney Chadwick (1997), there are varying approaches to feminist art history. These range from additive approaches to existing art historical canons, in which women artists and their artworks are identified to supplement traditional art historical texts, to more radical approaches that forthrightly challenge existing structures in terms of their male bias and sometimes propose alternative theoretical frameworks for considering art history. The following art educators present a variety of stances and issues regarding feminist art history within their articles: Zimmerman (1981),

Sherman (1982), Clark (1983), Lewis (1987), Saunders (1987), Collins and Sandell (1987), Huber (1987), LaDuke (1987), Nadaner (1987), LaDuke (1988), Soucy (1989), LaDuke (1989), Ettinger and Hoffman (1990), Blandy and Hoffman (1991), Hausman (1992), Niceley (1992), Anderson (1992), Hicks (1992), LaDuke (1992), Garber (1992), Blaikie (1992), Lampela (1993), Klein (1993), Dufrene (1994), Kellman 1996, Stinespring, 1996). These references include articles published in two *Art Education* issues that were devoted to feminist concerns: the the May 1987 issue (Volume 40, No. 3) and March 1992 issue (Volume 45, No. 2).

Varying degrees and types of attention to feminist art history are also seen in the Instructional Resources segments of *Art Education*.

Reproductions of artworks by the following women artists are presented:

- . Mary Cassatt (Amdursky, 1985)
- . Georgia O'Keeffe (McCoy, 1986)
- . Kenojuak Ashevak (Schwartz, 1988)
- . Rosa Bonheur (Hood, 1988)
- . Toshi Maruki (Koetsch, 1988)
- . Deborah Butterfield (Spomer, Galbraith, & Wise, 1988)
- . Marilyn Levine (Williams, 1988)
- . Adelaide Robineau (Irvine, 1989)
- . Tsayutitsa (Abbott, 1989)
- . Louise Nevelson (Prabhu, 1990b)
- . Betye Saar (Prabhu, 1990b)
- . Augusta Savage (Gaither, 1990a)
- . Cindy Sherman (Hallowell with Broderick, James, & Russell, 1991d)
- . Jackie Ferrara (Henry, 1991b)



- . Deborah Butterfield (Henry, 1991a)
- . Elizabeth Layton (Cahan & Kocur, 1994)
- . Judith Leyster (Springer, 1994)
- . Andrea Mantegna (Springer, 1994)
- . Kathe Kollwitz (Springer, 1994)
- . Dorothea Lange (Henry, 1995)
- . Helen Frankenthaler (Young, 1995)
- . Louisa Lander (Falletta, 1996)
- . Edmonia Lewis (Falletta, 1996)
- . Harriet Hosmer (Falletta, 1996)
- . Guerilla Girls (Kanatani & Prabhu, 1996)
- . Barbara Bloom (Kanatani & Prabhu, 1996)

Each of these cited articles and Instructional Resource segments challenge art educators to reconsider the kind and amount of attention that they direct toward women artists, women's artwork, and feminist concerns in art curricula. In my view, each author brings feminist art history to the attention of readers. My analysis of *Art Education* indicates that some art educators are currently aware of and committed to the concerns and content of feminist art history. They challenge others to become so.

#### Semiotics-based art history

I found no substantive attention given to semiotics-based art history in *Art Education* articles or Instructional Resources between the years of 1980 through 1996.

## Ruminations

All art teachers are faced with the dilemma of determining what they will attempt to teach in the limited allotment of time they have with their students. As Clark (1990) points out, art education theory often intensifies the discomfort and frustration that many art teachers feel by bombarding them with a cacophony of calls to teach EVERYTHING. The amount of time spent with students does not allow for instruction in such a vast expanse of content and causes. Choices must be made.

Attempting to assist art teachers with the task of planning educational content for school-year-long instruction, the field of art education offers art teachers literature overflowing with advice for preparing art curricula. As evidenced in this chapter, through *Art Education*, the National Art Education Association has presented its members with many curriculum ingredients that are or could be generically labeled as "art history." What art teachers need is better labeling information that will help them to identify and better understand a range of choices of subject-matter focuses that they have to select among for incorporating art history in art curricula.

This dissertation analyzes what is packaged as "art history" and what is referred to in curricular writings that call for "art history" to be put in or left out of educational schemes. The ultimate aim of the study is to assist art educators with making decisions regarding "art history" as a possible component of their curricula. This final part of the study has been dedicated to preparing labeling information on "art history" as presented in art education literature, specifically the National Art Education Association's journal, *Art Education*.

## CHAPTER 5

### REFLECTIONS ON THESE ART HISTORICAL JOURNEYS AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FURTHER TRAVEL: IMPLICATIONS FOR ART EDUCATION

. . . travel is more than the seeing of sights; it is a change that goes on, deep and permanent, in the ideas of living.

– Miriam Beard (b. 1901)  
American Writer

Through this dissertation, we have taken two art historical journeys. An exploration of art history literature was taken to assist art educators in developing better understandings of diverse regions of art historical scholarship. A conceptual map was provided for this journey and for later use as a guide for other investigations of the art history domain and considerations of art history education. The second journey taken via this dissertation was an investigation of the journal, *Art Education*. This expedition was undertaken both (a) to demonstrate the use of the conceptual map drawn in Chapter 3 as a navigation tool for critically analyzing art history education ideas and initiatives and (b) to identify and analyze what views of art history have been presented to art educators during the past 16 years.

## Research Findings and Value to the Field of Art Education

Through my doctoral study, I have added to the literature that makes the case that “art history” is not a monolithic concept. This helps art educators to talk more than in generalities about art history education. Also, this assists art educators with increasing their awarenesses of and abilities to recognize the multiple perspectives that art history encompasses and in understanding that art historical scholarship is not a static phenomenon. I have also provided a conceptual map of various regions of art historical scholarship. This conceptual map makes a contribution to the field of art education in several ways:

- it clarifies a range of genres of art history and thereby identifies an assortment of concepts of art history for art educators to consider and provides more precise terminology for dialogues.
- this map empowers teachers in their curriculum development efforts by assisting them in being knowledgeable of a range of curricular options rather than a limited understanding of choices available to them regarding art history education.
- this conceptual map can be utilized to identify and analyze the approaches to art history promoted in a variety of curriculum resources: art education journals, art teaching guides, instructional resources, children’s art books, videos, etc.
- further, this map can be used as an analysis tool for art history education practice, by utilizing it to identify teaching practices.
- this conceptual map could be useful in the development of assessment tools for students’ art historical understandings.

Also in this dissertation I have demonstrated one use of my conceptual map of art history by utilizing it to critique the journal, *Art Education* in its coverage of assorted views of art history that it has promoted to the National

Art Education Association membership. This analysis is valuable for clarifying art educators' diverse views regarding art history, stimulating reconsiderations of what it can mean to teach "art history," and providing art educators with assistance in deliberating educational uses of a range of genres of art history. Also, by identifying the coverage of views of art history in the journal that the NAEA sends to every art educator who has joined their professional association, a portrait of current views of art history held by art educators has been painted for examination and contemplation.

#### Recommendations to Art Educators Regarding Art History Education

The first step in my post-doctoral research is to create a guide based on my study that art educators will find attractive and practical to utilize as a resource. After providing this for the field, the following is a list of recommendations to art educators regarding art history education based on my research:

- . I recommend that art educators utilize my conceptual map of art history to analyze their curriculum, teaching, and instructional resources and identify their current approaches to art history education.
- . I recommend that art educators utilize my conceptual map of art history to identify curricular options for their teaching and that they then revise (as needed) their selections of particular genres of art history to focus on in their teaching based on their particular curriculum/goals/student population.
- . I recommend that art educators utilize my conceptual map to (a) identify differing emphases of assorted art history curriculum resources and (b) assist them with making reasoned, informed selection decisions rather than ad hoc choices.

- I recommend that art educators further investigate the art historical landscape to inform their teaching.

### Suggestions for Further Research

I propose the following suggestions for further research, building on my doctoral study, to assist with the improvement of art history education and art teaching and learning in general:

- the genres of art history that I have identified and explicated need to be researched as to the various pros and cons of incorporating each of these concepts of art history in various contexts.
- developmental issues related to the teaching of the assorted genres of art history need to be researched.
- methods of implementing the teaching of the various genres of art history need to be researched (both instructional strategies and educational resources need to be developed).
- an analysis of art textbooks, art education journals (other than *Art Education*), videos, instructional resources, and other curriculum resources needs to be done and reported on to art educators to assist them in making selections and use of the variety of curriculum resources available.
- an analysis of art books for children needs to be conducted utilizing my conceptual map to differentiate among the plethora of choices currently available to assist those making selections among these (I have listed this separately from the above suggestion as findings from this research is relevant to school librarians and parents as well as art educators while the above suggestion more specifically targets art educators.)
- the use of computer technologies for art history education needs to be researched and reported on to the field . . . perhaps my conceptual map could serve in some capacity to strengthen further developments of ways to use this new art history education resource with far-reaching potential.

- . the conceptual map of genres of art history could be used in the development of new instructional materials for art history education.
- . the conceptual map could also be used for action research to analyze approaches to art history currently utilized in teaching and to assist in the development of instructional strategies for art history education.

### Closing Remarks

My intent in this “concluding” chapter of my study is that of “inviting possibilities rather than closure” (May, 1992, p. 239). It is my hope that my research can assist in improving art teaching and student learning in the visual arts, specifically in the area of art history education.

I realize that this dissertation is meant to be a *beginning* of research endeavors and should be considered a “launching pad” as asserted by Kenneth Marantz (1977). Marantz, who by now has served as the doctoral advisor for over 40 art education graduate students at The Ohio State University, describes this moment in dissertation writing as follows:

After the studying, the writing, the ongoing criticisms and readjustments, the time comes to say “Basta.” Never will the self be totally satisfied nor can enough rewriting ever be done such that some paragraph couldn’t be more elegantly phrased or some new detail interjected. Yet this is an exercise, not a last will and testament and as such needs to be concluded as a thought in process.

## LIST OF REFERENCES

- Abbott, P. R. (1989). Tsayutita: Ceramic drum jar, 1928. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(1), 51-52.
- Adams, L. S. (1996). *The methodologies of art: An introduction*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Adams, M. (1988). Karel Dujardin: Hagar and Ishmael in the wilderness. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(3), 25-26.
- Adiss, S., & Erickson, M. (1993). *Art history and Education*. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.
- Amdur, D. (1993). Arts and cultural context: A curriculum integrating discipline-based art education with other humanities subjects at the secondary level. *Art Education*, 46(3), 12-19.
- Amdursky, M. T. (1985). Mary Cassatt: The family. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 38(6), 31-32.
- Anderson, H. (1987). Alexander Nepote: Art educator and landscape painter. *Art Education*, 40(2), 12-21.
- Anderson, H. (1992). Making women artists visible. *Art Education*, 45(2), 14-22.
- Anderson, R. L. (1989). *Art in small-scale societies* (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Anderson, T. (1985). Toward a socially defined studio curriculum. *Art Education*, 38(5), 16-18.
- Andre, L. (1988). Francisco Goya: The sleep of reason produces monsters. Dreams, fantasies, memories. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(4), 39-40.



- Andre, L. (1989). Anthony van Dyck: Rinaldo and Armida. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(6), 31-32.
- Appadurai, A. (1991). Global ethnoscaples: Notes and queries for a transnational anthropology. In R.G. Fox (Ed.), *Recapturing anthropology: Working in the Present* (pp.191-210). Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Bal, M., & Bryson, N. (1991). Semiotics and art history. *The Art Bulletin*, 73(2), 174-208.
- Barkan, M. (1966). Curriculum problems in art education. In E. Mattil (Ed.), *A seminar in art education for research and curriculum development* (pp.240-255). (U.S. Office of Education Cooperative Research Project No. V-002). Universty park: Pennsylvania State University.
- Beittel, K. R. (1982). Lowenfeld and art for a new age. *Art Education*, 35(6), 18-21.
- Beittel, K. R. (1990). Zen and the art of pottery. *Art Education*, 43(2), 6-15.
- Bennet, R. G., & Hamblen, K. A. (1995). The mysterious lady from Surinam. *Art Education*, 48(2), 6-11.
- Berenson, B. (1932). *Italian pictures of the Renaissance: A list of the principal artists and their works with an index of places*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Berry, N. (1988). Gerald Murphy: Watch. Technology. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(2), 29-30.
- Berry, N. (1995a). Making connections: A comprehensive look at art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 48(6), 25-32.
- Berry, N. (1995b). Students at the Pestalozzian Academy: Francisco Goya. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 48(6), 27 & 30.
- Blaikie, F. (1992). Thoughts concerning a feminist emphasis in art education. *Art Education*, 45(2), 49-52.
- Blandy, D., & Hoffman, E. (1991). Resources for research and teaching about textiles as a domestic art in art education. *Art Education*, 44(1), 60-71.
- Blocker, J. S. (1987). Nicholas Poussin: The Holy Family. Religious art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(5), 41-42.

- Blume, S. (1987). Richard Estes: Facade. Cityscapes. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(4), 27-28.
- Boas, G. (1950). *Wingless Pegasus: A handbook for critics*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins Press.
- Boas, F. (1955). *Primitive Art*. New York: Dover Publications. (Original work published 1927)
- Borgmann, C. B. (1986). As Christo wraps the art scene . . . are educators ready?. *Art Education*, 39(5), 19-22.
- Braaten, A. W., & Ellingson, S. P. (1992). Art from the American Indians of the Plains and the Woodlands regions. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 45(6), 25-33.
- Broude, N., & Garrard, M. D. (Eds.). (1992). *The expanding discourse: Feminism and art history*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Brown, D. A. (1979). *Berenson and connoisseurship of Italian painting: A handbook to the exhibition*. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art.
- Brubaker, A. (1986). Thomas Moran: The Grand Canyon. Landscape/ Seascape. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(6), 27-28.
- Brubaker, A., Downing, C., Swezy, D., & Bay, R. (1996). Comparing: Four figures [from] the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 49(4), 25-32.
- Bryson, N. (1983). *Vision and painting: The logic of the gaze*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Bryson, N. (Ed.). (1988). *Calligram: Essays in New Art History from France*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bryson, N., Holly, A., & Moxey, K. (Eds.). (1991). *Visual theory: Painting and interpretation*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Bryson, N., Holly, M.A., & Moxey, K. (Eds.). (1994). *Visual culture: Images and interpretations*. Hanover, NH: University Press of New England.
- Buchmann, M. & Floden, R. E. (1990). On doing philosophy of education. *Oxford Review of Education*, 16(3), 343-366.

- Bush, T. (1985). David Alfaro Siqueiros: Zapata. Focus on faces (portraiture). Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 38(6), 29-30.
- Cahan, S., & Kocur, Z. (1994). Elizabeth Layton. Contemporary art and multicultural education, Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 47(2),30.
- Calabrese, J. A. (1993). The bipolar approach: A model for interdisciplinary art history courses. *Art Education*, 46(2), 14-18.
- Calvert, A. E. (1985). *A rationale and model for using cultural content in teaching art history*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Oregon, 1985.
- Calvert, A. E. (1988a). A rationale and model for a cultural contextual art history curriculum. *Canadian Review of Art Education: Research and Issues*, 15(2), 19-28.
- Calvert, A. E. (1988b). Native art history and DBAE: An analysis of key concepts. *Journal of Multi-cultural and Cross-cultural Research in Art Education*, 6(1), 112-122.
- Calvert, A. E. (1992). The exhibition as curriculum: Doing art history. *Visual Arts Research*. 18(2), 74-80.
- Caputo, J. (1987). *Radical hermeneutics: Repetition, deconstruction, and the hermeneutic project*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press.
- Cappetta, A., & Fitzgerald, D. (1989). Chiang Xiong: Story cloth. The significance of form: Decorative arts. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(4), 35-36.
- Chadwick, W. (1990). *Women, art, and society*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Chadwick, W. (1996). *Women, art, and society* (rev. ed.). London: Thames and Hudson.
- Chaet, B. (1979). *An artist's notebooks: Techniques and materials*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Chanda, J. (1992). Alternative concepts and terminologies for teaching African art. *Art Education*, 45(1), 56-61.
- Chanda, J. (1993a). *African arts & cultures*. Worcester, MA: Davis Publications.

- Chanda, J. (1993b). A theoretical basis for non-Western art history instruction. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 27(3), 73-84.
- Chanda, J. (1994). Exploring cultural concepts through art: A cross-cultural comparison. *Journal of Multicultural and Cross-Cultural Research in Art Education*, 12, 15-25.
- Chanda, J. (1996). *Discovering African art*. Worcester, MA: Davis Publications.
- Chapman, L. H. (1978). *Approaches to art in education*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Chapman, L. H. (1985). *Discover art, Grades 1 - 6*. Worcester, MA: Davis Publications.
- Cherryholmes, C. H. (1988). *Power and criticism: Poststructural investigations in education*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Clark, G. (1983). Other aspects of the life: An interview with Patricia Renick. *Art Education*, 36(5), 9-13.
- Clark, G. (1986). Stuart Davis: Swing landscape. Window on the world (landscapes and cityscapes). Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(2), 29-30.
- Clark, G. (1990). Art in the schizophrenic fast lane: A response. *Art Education*, 43(6), 8-23.
- Clarkin, M. A., & Rawson, C. (1992). Marsden Hatley: painting No. 50. The Terra Museum of American Art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 45(5), 42.
- Clark, G. A., Day, M. D., & Greer, W. D. (1987). Discipline-based art education: Becoming students of art. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 21(2), 129-193.
- Clark, T. J. (1974, May 24). On the conditions of artistic creation. *Times Literary Supplement*, p. 562.
- Cole, B. (1983). *The Renaissance artist at work: From Pisano to Titian*. New York: Harper Row.
- Cole, E. (1989). Tournai, Flanders: The allegory of the unicorn. The significance of form: The decorative arts. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(4), 25-26.

- Collins, B. R. (1991). What is art history? *Art Education*, 44(1), 53-59.
- Collins, G. C., & Sandell, R. (1987). Women's achievements in art: An issues approach for the classroom. *Art Education*, 40(3), 12-21.
- Consortium of National Arts Education Associations. (1994). *National standards for arts education*. Reston, VA: Music Educators National Conference.
- Costanzo, N. (1981). Introducing abstraction to junior high students. *Art Education*, 34(1), 37-38.
- Court, E. J. (1985). Margaret Trowell and the development of art education in East Africa. *Art Education*, 38(6), 35-41.
- Covington, J. (1988). Marsden Hartley: Indian fantasy. Dreams, fantasies, memories. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(4), 37-38.
- Crosier, W. R. (1987). Mark Tobey: Flow of the night. Cityscapes. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(4), 31-32.
- Davidson, M. (1986). William J. Glackens: The Cedar Walk. Landscape/Seascape. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(6), 25-26.
- Davidson, E. (1987). William M. Harnett: After the Hunt, 1884. Still Life. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(3), 29-30.
- Dark, P. J. C. (1978). What is art for anthropologists? In M.Greenhalgh & V. Megaw (Eds.), *Art in society: Studies in style, culture and aesthetics* (pp.31-50). New York: St. Martins Press.
- Day, M., & DiBlasio, M. (1983). Contributions of research to the teaching of art. *Studies in Art Education*, 24(3), 169-176.
- Derrida, J. (1981). *Positions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Derrida, J. (1982). *Margins of philosophy*. (A. Bass, Trans.) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Day, M. (1986). Maynard Dixon: Free speech. Art as social comment. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(5), 31-32.
- Dobbs, S. (1981a). Destiny and dedication: An interview with Nathan Oliveira. *Art Education*, 34(2), 20-23.

- Dobbs, S. (1981b). Carving out a career: An interview with William McVey. *Art Education*, 34(4), 12-15.
- Dobbs, S. (1981c). Community and commitment: An interview with Ruth Asawa. *Art Education*, 34(5), 14-17.
- Donahue, K., & Gabor, S. (1989). Frank Lloyd Wright: Oak Park home and studio. The significance of form: Domestic architecture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(2), 33-34.
- Dufrene, P. (1994). A visit with Elizabeth Catlett. *Art Education*, 47(1), 68-72.
- Dyson, A. (1989). Style, technique, context: Art and design history in the General Certificate of Secondary Education. *Art Education*, 42(1), 12-19.
- Eder, E. K. (1992a). India: Railing pillar. Architecture from the inside. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 45(1), 25-28, 49-55.
- Eder, E. K. (1992b). Central Italian School: View of an ideal city. Architecture from the inside. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 45(1), 25-28, 49-55.
- Eder, E. K. (1992c). French: Cabinet. Architecture from the inside. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 45(1), 25-28, 49-55.
- Eder, E. K. (1992d). Delano & Aldrich, architects: Renaissance sculpture court. Architecture from the inside. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 45(1), 25-28, 49-55.
- Efland, A., Freedman, K., & Stuhr, P. (1996). *Postmodern art education: An approach to curriculum*. Reston, VA: The National Art Education Association.
- Eisner, E. W. (1987). The role of discipline-based art education in America's schools. *Art Education*, 40(5), 6-26, 43-45.
- Eissler, K. R. (1961). *Leonardo da Vinci: Psychoanalytic notes on the enigma*. New York: International Universities Press.
- El-Omami, A. (1985). Camille Pissarro: Haymakers, Evening, Eragny, 1893. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 38(5), 27-28.
- Ember, C. R., & Ember, M. (1990). *Anthropology* (6th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NY: Prentice-Hall

- Erickson, M. (1974). *Art history: An art education analysis*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Ohio State University, 1974.
- Erikson, M (1983). Teaching history as an inquiry process. *Art Education*, 36(5), 28-31.
- Erickson, M. (1992). *Lessons about art in history and history in art*. Bloomington, IN: ERIC:ART.
- Erickson, M. (1994a). Evidence for art historical interpretation referred to by young people and adults. *Studies in Art Education*. 35(2), 71-78.
- Erickson, M. (1994b). Using new resources for teaching art history. *School Arts*. 93(8), 37-39.
- Erickson, M. (1995a). Second and sixth grade students' art historical interpretation abilities: A one-year study. *Studies in Art Education*. 37(1), 19-28.
- Erickson, M. (1995b). Second grade students' developing art historical understanding. *Visual Arts Research*. 21(1), 15-24.
- Erickson, M. (1995c). A sequence of developing art historical understandings: Merging teaching, service, research, and curriculum development. *Art Education*. 48(6), 23-24, 33-37.
- Erickson, M., Rogers, P., & Short, G. (1997, March). *Thematic curriculum design on the Internet*. Paper presented at the National Art Education Association annual conference, New Orleans, LA.
- Ettinger, L. F., & Hoffman, E. (1990). Quilt making in art education: Toward a participatory curriculum metaphor. *Art Education*, 43(4), 41-47.
- Falletta, B. (1996a). Edmonia Lewis. Images of women by women in nineteenth-century American sculpture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 49(1), 27, 50.
- Falletta, B. (1996b). Harriet Hosmer. Images of women by women in nineteenth-century American sculpture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 49(1), 50-51.
- Falletta, B. (1996c). Images of women by women in nineteenth-century American sculpture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 49(1), 25-28, 49-52.

- Fantozzi, C. (1987). Tony Berlant: I, 1982. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(6), 27-28.
- Fantozzi, C., Borenzweig, I., & Elliott, K. (1994). Frank Lloyd Wright's Hollyhock House. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 47(3), 25-28, 37-42.
- Feinstein, H. (1985). Art as visual metaphor. *Art Education*, 38(4), 26-29.
- Feldman, E. B. (1980). Anthropological and historical conceptions of art curricula. *Art Education*, 33(6), 6-9.
- Feldman, E. B. (1990, June). *More than names and dates: Art history and the humanities*. Paper presented for The Ohio Partnership for the Visual Arts: Regional Institute for Educators, Columbus, OH.
- Fernie, E. (Ed.). (1995). *Art history and its methods: A critical anthology*. London: Phaidon Press.
- Field, D. A. (1982). The National Art Museum of Sport. *Art Education*, 35(1), 26-27.
- Fish, L. D. (1989). Moshe Safdie: The National Gallery of Canada. The significance of form: The architecture of public buildings. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(3), 39-40.
- Fitzgibbons, R. E. (1981). *Making educational decisions: An introduction to the philosophy of education*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Fitzgerald, D. (1988). Grant Wood: American Gothic. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(3) 39-40.
- Fitzpatrick, V. L. (1992). *Art history: A contextual inquiry course*. Reston, VA: The National Art Education Association.
- Fitzgerald, G. (1986). Charles Burchfield: October wind an sunlight in the woods. Landscape/Seascape. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(6), 29-30.
- Foucault, M. (1972). *The archaeology of knowledge*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish*. New York: Vintage.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge*. New York: Pantheon Books.



- Fox, R. G. (ed.). (1991). *Recapturing anthropology: Working in the present*. Santa Fe, NM: School of American Research Press.
- Freedberg, D. (1989). *The power of images: Studies in the history and theory of response*. Chicago: The University Press of Chicago.
- Freedman, K. (1991). Recent theoretical shifts in the field of art history and some classroom applications. *Art Education*, 44(6), 40-45.
- Friedman, B. (1987). Stuart Davis: Super table, 1925. Still life. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(3), 31-32.
- Freud, S. (1916). *Leonardo da Vinci: A psychosexual study of an infantile reminiscence* (A. A. Brill, Trans.). New York: Moffat, Yard. (Original work published 1910)
- Funk & Wagnalls (1983). *Standard dictionary*. New York: The New American Library.
- Gaither, E. B. (1990a). Augusta Savage: Lift every voice and sing. Afro-American art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(6), 25-26.
- Gaither, E. B. (1990b). Lenwood Morris: Portrait of Alain Leroy Locke. Afro-American art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(6), 27-28.
- Galbraith, L. Spomer, M. J., & Wise, S. (1988). Mark di Suvero: Old Glory. Issues in public sculpture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(6), 29-30.
- Garber, E. (1992). Art critics on Frida Kahlo: A comparison of feminist and non-feminist voices. *Art Education*, 45(2), 42-48.
- Geahigan, G. (1992). Educating future teachers of art: The role of educational philosophy. In N. C. Yakel (Ed.), *The future: Challenge of change* (pp. 15-32). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Gelman, J. (1986). George Bellows: Edith Cavell. History, myth, and religion. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(3), 29-30.
- Getty Center for Education in the Arts. (1985). *Beyond creating: The place for art in America's schools*. Los Angeles: Author.
- Glasser, S. (1989). Cy Twombly: Synopsis of a battle. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(6), 29-30.

- Glenn, W. H. (1981). Studying landforms through landscape painting. *Art Education*, 34(5), 34-36.
- Gombrich, E. H. (1978). *The story of art* (13th ed.). Oxford: Phaidon Press Limited.
- Grana, T. C. (1987). Joshua Johnson: The Westward children. Portraits. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(1), 25-26.
- Green, K. (1995). *The woman of reason: Feminism, humanism and political thought*. New York: Continuum.
- Gregory, A. (1985). An interview with Arnold Bank: Designer, letterer, and master calligrapher. *Art Education*, 38(2), 32-37.
- Grieder, T. (1985). A post-modern theory of art education. *Art Education*, 38(1), 6-8.
- Grisham, E. E. (1993a). Beauford Delaney: Self-Portrait. Four self-portraits. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 46(4), 39.
- Grisham, E. E. (1993b). Ivan Albright: Self-Portrait. Four self-portraits. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 46(4), 27-28, 38.
- Grisham, E. E. (1993c). Max Beckmann: Self-Portrait. Four self portraits. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 46(4), 38-39.
- Grisham, E. E. (1993d). Vincent van Gogh: Self-Portrait. Four self-portraits. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 46(4), 26-27.
- Grossman, E. (1984). Program planning for the visual arts. *Art Education*, 37(3), 6-14.
- Grossman, E., & Boykin, M. A. (1988). Perceiving the grid: Weaving the tartan plaid. *Art Education*, 41(3), 14-17.
- Gryszkowiec, M. (1986). Beatrix Potter: An elementary school unit. *Art Education*, 39(4), 22-24.
- Guip, D. (1987). African, Nigeria: Sculpture of a Benin queen. Religious art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(5), 27-28.
- Guip, D. (1993). Sacred relics, ritual objects: Instructional resources from the Toledo Museum of Art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 46(6), 27-34.

- Hallowell, B. with Broderick, E., James, C., & Russell, M. M. (1991a). Sir Peter Lely: Louise de Penancoet, Duchess of Portsmouth. Roles and reality: People in art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(2), 23-32.
- Hallowell, B. with Broderick, E., James, C., & Russell, M. M. (1991b). Utagawa Kunisada: Nakamura Shikan IV in the role of Jirosaku of Naniwa. Roles and reality: People in art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(2), 23-32.
- Hallowell, B. with Broderick, E., James, C., & Russell, M. M. (1991c). David Hockney: Divine. Roles and reality: People in art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(2), 23-32.
- Hallowell, B. with Broderick, E., James, C., & Russell, M. M. (1991d). Cindy Sherman: No. 147. Roles and reality: People in art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(2), 23-32.
- Hamblen, K. (1985). Developing aesthetic literacy through contested concepts. *Art Education*, 38(5), 19-24.
- Hartfield, R. (1995). Turning the museum inside out: New connections between art, history, and culture. Instructional Resources. *Art Education*, 48(5), 25-28, 41-44.
- Hartfield, R. (1995). The adoration of the Magi. Turning the museum inside out: New connections between art, history, and culture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 48(5), 27 & 42.
- Hartt, F. (1969). *History of Italian Renaissance art: painting, sculpture, architecture*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
- Hatcher, E. P. (1985). *Art as culture: An introduction to the anthropology of art*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Hauser, A. (1959). *The philosophy of art history* (Trans. from German). New York: Alfred A. Knopf. (Original work published 1958)
- Hausman J. J. (1982). Viktor Lowenfeld--Remembrances of a friend and colleague. *Art Education*, 35(6), 15-17.
- Hausman, J. (1986). George Tooker: Highway. Memories, dreams, and fantasies. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(4), 27-28.
- Hausman, J. J. (1992). From gender competition to creative interdependence -- an editorial. *Art Education*, 45(2), 4-5.

- Hellwege, P. (1993a). Seed Jar. Aesthetic Dialogue: Art and interdisciplinary curriculum. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 46(5), 27.
- Hellwege, P. (1993b). Max Beckman: The Dream. Aesthetic Dialogue: Art and interdisciplinary curriculum. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 46(5), 43.
- Henderson, A., & Wilson, M. E. (1995a). Francisco De Goya: Bartolome Sureda y Miserol. Spanish art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 48(4), 31-32.
- Henderson, A., & Wilson, M. E. (1995b). Pablo Picasso: Family of Saltimbanques. Spanish art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 48(4), 26-27, 30.
- Henry, C. (1995). Migrant Mother by Dorothea Lange. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 48(3), 2528, 37-40.
- Henry, D. J. (1991a). Deborah Butterfield: Woodrow, 1988. Art in public. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(1), 25-28, 49-52.
- Henry, D. J. (1991b). Jackie Ferrara: Belvedere. Art in public. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(1), 25-28, 49-52.
- Hicks, L. E. (1992). The construction of meaning: Feminist criticism. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 45(2), 23-32.
- Hill, J. L. (1988). Isamu Noguchi. Playscapes. Issues in public sculpture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(6), 25-26.
- Hoeft, P. (1987). Edward Hopper: November, Washington Square. Cityscapes. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(4), 25-26.
- Hoff, G. R. (1982). The visual narrative: Kids, comic books, and creativity. *Art Education*, 35(2), 20-23.
- Holly, M. A. (1984). *Panofsky and the foundation of art history*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Holly, M. A. (1996). *Past looking: Historical imagination and the rhetoric of the image*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Holt, D. (1991). The sculpture park as a teaching resource. *Art Education*, 44(5), 26-28 & 37-39.

- Hood, S. (1988). Rosa Bonheur: Studies of a fawn. Animals in art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(1), 45-46.
- Horner, E. (1989). Scogin, Elam & Bray: Clayton County Library. The significance of form: The architecture of public buildings. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(3), 27-28.
- Huber, B. W. (1987). What does feminism have to offer DBAE? or So what if Little Red Riding Hood puts aside her crayons to deliver groceries for her mother? *Art Education*, 40(3), 36-41.
- Ingram, M. (1985). Edvard Munch: Girls on a Bridge. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 38(5), 29-30.
- Irvine, H. (1984). An art centered art curriculum. *Art Education*, 37(3), 16-19.
- Irvine, H. (1986). Ben Shahn: The passion of sacco and Vanzetti. Art as social comment. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(5), 29-30.
- Irvine, H. (1989). Adelaide Robineau: Poppy vase. The significance of form: Ceramics. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(1), 27-28.
- Irvine, H. (1991). The dangers of art "appreciation." *Art Education*, 44(1), 14-15.
- Iversen, M. (1988). Saussure versus Peirce: Models for a semiotics of visual art. In A. L. Rees & F. Borzello (Eds.). *The New Art History*. (pp.82-94). Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.
- Jacobsen, S. (1994). Edgar Manet: Mademoiselle Hortense Valpincon. Take a closer look. *Art Education*, 47(1), 50-51.
- Jenke, V. (1986). Pieter Claesz: Still Life. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(1), 25-26.
- Johns, R. W. (1986). Help wanted: Art educators for global education. *Art Education*, 39(3), 17-24.
- Johnson, A. (1992). *Art education: Elementary*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Johnson, N. R. (1992). Metaphor and design. *Studies in Art Education*, 33(3), 144-153.

- Johnson, N. R. (1982). Social goals and education in the visual arts. *Art Education*, 35(1), 22-25.
- Johnson, K., & Walpole, R. (1990a). Henri Matisse: Boy with a butterfly net. The significance of style: Various approaches. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(2), 25-32.
- Johnson, K., & Walpole, R. (1990b). Andre Derain: St. Paul's from the Thames. The significance of style: Various approaches. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(2), 25-32.
- Johnson, K., & Walpole, R. (1990c). Paul Revere: The Templeman Tea Service. The significance of style: Various approaches. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(2), 25-32.
- Johnson, K., & Walpole, R. (1990d). Papua New Guinea, New Ireland: Architectural carving with birds and snake. The significance of style: Various approaches. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(2), 25-32.
- Judson, B. (1986). Romare Bearden: Pittsburgh memories. Window on the world. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(2), 25-26.
- Kanatani, K. (1988). Michael Heizer: Double Negative, 1969-70. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(2), 27-28.
- Kanatani, K., & Prabhu, V. (1996). Artists comment on museum practices. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 49(2), 29.
- Katan, E. (1990). Beyond art history . . . and before . . . and beyond . . . and before . . . and beyond. *Art Education*, 43(1), 60-69.
- Kauppinen, H. (1987). Teaching about architecture. *Art Education*, 40(1), 44-49.
- Kauppinen, H. (1989). American Indian: San Geronimo de Taos (Taos pueblo). The significance of form: domestic architecture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(2), 35-36.
- Kellman, J. (1996). Women's handwork: Stories of similarity and diversity. *Art Education*, 49(2), 33-39.
- Kemp, M. (Ed.). (1989). *Leonardo on painting*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

- Klein, S. (1993). Breaking the mold with humor: Images of women in the visual media. *Art Education*, 46(5), 60-65.
- Kleinbauer, W. E., & Slavens, T. P. (1982). *Research guide to the history of Western art*. Chicago: American Library Association.
- Kleinbauer, W. E. (1989). *Modern perspectives in Western art history: An anthology of twentieth-century writings on the visual arts*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press. (Original work published 1971)
- Koetsch, P. (1988). Iri Maruki & Tashi Maruki: Water, 1950. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(3), 27-28.
- Kostakis, M. S. J. (1985). *A hermeneutic account of the biographical attitude in art education: Toward a meaningful experience for children with American paintings*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1985.
- Kozlowski, P. J., & Yakel, N. C. (1980). Copying . . . . The direct line to creativity. *Art Education*, 33(8), 24-27.
- Krulic, J. (1995). Images of the American West: Phoenix Art Museum. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 48(2), 25-31.
- LaDuke, B. (1987). On the right road: The life of Mine Okubo. *Art Education*, 40(3), 43-48.
- LaDuke, B. (1988). Nigeria: Princess Elizabeth Olowu, zero hour. *Art Education*, 41(6), 33-37.
- LaDuke, B. (1989). East African painter Theresa Musoke: Uhuru or freedom. *Art Education*, 42(6), 16-24.
- LaDuke, B. (1992). Inji Efflatoun: Art, feminism, and politics in Egypt. *Art Education*, 45(2), 33-41.
- Lambert, A. (1989). Philadelphia, American: Queen Anne side chair. The significance of form: The decorative arts. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(4), 27-28.
- Lampela, L. (1993). Women's art education institutions in 19th century England. *Art Education*, 46(1), 64-67.
- Lander, J. B. (1988). Vito Acconci: Face of the earth. Issues in public sculpture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(6), 31-32.

- Lanier, V. (1981). Popularization without misrepresentation: Curriculum content for aesthetic literacy. *Art Education*, 34(6), 5-12.
- Langer, S. (1967). *Mind: An essay on human feeling* (Vol. 1). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Lankford, E. L. (1989, October). *Introduction to philosophical inquiry*. Lecture delivered to graduate course AE 795K, Overview of Research Methods in Art Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Lankford, E. L. (1992). Philosophy of Art Education: Focusing our vision. *Studies in Art Education*, 33(4), 195-200.
- Lanier, V. (1976). *Essays in art education* (2nd ed.). New York: MSS Information Corp.
- Lanier, V. (1981). Popularization without misrepresentation: Curriculum content for aesthetic literacy. *Art Education*, 34(6), 5-12.
- Lather, P. (1991). *Getting smart: Feminist research and pedagogy within the postmodern*. New York: Routledge.
- Lechner, J. V. (1993). Picture books as portable art galleries. *Art Education*, 46(2), 34-40.
- Lee, S. Y. (1993). Professional criticism in the secondary classroom: Opposing judgments of contemporary art enhance the teaching of art criticism. *Art Education*, 46(3), 42-51.
- Leonardo da Vinci. (1967). *The complete paintings of Leonardo da Vinci* (notes and catalogue by A. O. della Chiesa). New York: Harry N. Abrams.
- Leonardo da Vinci. (1984). *Drawings of horses and other animals from the Royal Library at Windsor Castle* (catalogue by C. Pedretti). New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Leshnoff, S. K. (1995). Art, ambiguity and critical thinking. *Art Education*, 48(5), 51-56.
- Lewis, H. P. (1987). Women as artists and teachers. *Art Education*, 40(3), 5.
- Lewis, H. P. (1989). Overview: Currents and cross-currents. *Art Education*, 42(3), 4-5.
- Lind, T. (1988). Asher Brown Durand: An old man's reminiscences. Dreams, fantasies, memories. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(4), 27-28.



- Linerode, D. (1986). Jacopo del Sellaio: The adoration of the Magi. History, myth, and religion. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(3), 27-28.
- Loudon, S. (1996). Wearable arts of Japan [from the] Seattle Art Museum. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 49(6), 25-32.
- Lowe, L. (1987). Japanese, unknown: Daruma. Religious art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(5), 29-30.
- Lucie-Smith, E. (1984). *The Thames and Hudson dictionary of art terms*. New York: Thames & Hudson.
- Luik, K. (1987). John F. Peto: A closet door. Still life. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(3), 27-28.
- MacGregor, N. P. (1986). Who speaks for art education? *Art Education*, 39(5), 33-35.
- Madeja, S. S. (1980). The art curriculum: Sins of omission. *Art Education*, 33(6), 24-26.
- Madeja, S. S. (1992). Kathryn Bloom and the genesis of the arts in education movement. *Art Education*, 45(4), 45-51.
- Maquet, J. (1986). *The aesthetic experience: An anthropologist looks at the visual arts*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Marantz, K. (1966). The work of art and the object of appreciation. In D. W. Ecker (Ed.), *Improving the Teaching of Art Appreciation* (pp. 147-178). Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Marantz, K. (1977, October 25). Doctoral study: Cul-de-sac or launching pad? Paper presented at faculty symposium, Department of Art Education, Ohio State University, Columbus, OH.
- Marschalek, D. G. (1996). Conceptual issues. In *NAEA Commission on Research in Art Education. Creating a visual arts research agenda toward the 21st century*, (pp. 21-31), Reston: VA: National Art Education Association.
- Mathews, P. (1991). [Review of *Women, Art, and Society*]. *The Art Bulletin*, 73(2), 336-339.
- Matteo, B. (1989). William Michael Harnett: Plucked clean. Painting. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(5), 43-44.

- Mattil, E. L. (1982). Yes, I remember Viktor. *Art Education*, 35(6), 8-11.
- Mavigliano, G. J. (1984). The Federal art project: Holger Cahill's program of action. *Art Education*, 37(3), 26-30.
- May, W. T. (1992). Philosopher as researcher and/or begging the question(s). *Studies in Art Education*, 33(4), 226-243.
- McArthur, S., Kunny, C., & Kuliak, S. (1990a). Georges Seurat: Sunday afternoon on the island of La Grande Jatte. The art of appearance. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(1), 25-28, 49-53.
- McArthur, S., Kunny, C., & Kuliak, S. (1990b). Bernardo Martarell: Saint George killing the dragon. The art of appearance. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(1), 25-28, 49-53.
- McArthur, S., Kunny, C., & Kuliak, S. (1990c). African democratic republic of Zaire, Kuba People: Mukyeem mask. The art of appearance. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(1), 25-28, 49-53.
- McArthur, S., Kunny, C., & Kuliak, S. (1990d). Late classic Mayan, Mexican or Guatemalan: Panel with a ballgame scene. The art of appearance. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(1), 25-28, 49-53.
- McCarty-Procopio, C., Richards, W., Spackman, A., Sutton, C., & Brigham, D. (1991a). Jan Steen: The drawing lesson. Making meaning with your eyes. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(4), 24-33.
- McCarty-Procopio, C., Richards, W., Spackman, A., Sutton, C., & Brigham, D. (1991b). Edvard Munch: Starry Night. Making meaning with your eyes. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(4), 24-33.
- McCarty-Procopio, C., Richards, W., Spackman, A., Sutton, C., & Brigham, D. (1991c). Andre-Charles Boulle: Cabinet on stand. Making meaning with your eyes. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(4), 24-33.
- McCarty-Procopio, C., Richards, W., Spackman, A., Sutton, C., & Brigham, D. (1991d). Unknown artist working in South Italy or Sicily: Cult state of Aphrodite (?). Making meaning with your eyes. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(4), 24-33.
- McCoy, E. S. (1986). Georgia O'Keeffe: Two jimson weeds with green leaves and sky, 1938. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(1), 27-28.

- McFee, J. K., & Degge, R. M. (1977). *Art, culture and environment*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- McKennee, A., Malone, L., Hazelroth, S., & Kinney, B. (1994). What is represented in a portrait?: The John and Mable Ringling Museum of Art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 47(6), 25-34.
- McMullen, R. (1977). *Mona Lisa: The picture and the myth*. New York: da Capa Press.
- Melville, S., & Readings, B. (Eds.). (1995). *Vision & Textuality*. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Miller, P. K., Schneider, D. B., Clark, C., & Wrinkle, G. (1994a). Alexander Calder: The Crab. Learning through art: The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston Instructional Resources. *Art Education*, 47(4), 26-27.
- Miller, P. K., Schneider, D. B., Clark, C., & Wrinkle, G. (1994b). David Smith: Two Circle Sentinel. Learning through art: The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 47(4), 27.
- Miller, P. K., Schneider, D. B., Clark, C., & Wrinkle, G. (1994c). Ekpeye Peole: pangolin Headress. Learning through art: The Museum of Fine Arts, Houston. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 47(4), 27 & 46.
- Miller, P. K., Schneider, D. B., Clark, C., & Wrinkle, G. (1994d). Learning through art, the Museum of Fine Arts, Houston. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 47(4), 25-28, 45-48.
- Miller, S. (1989). Vincent van Gogh: The Postman Roulin. Painting. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(5), 25-26.
- Minor, V. H. (1994). *Art history's history*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Mitchem, H. (1987). Lew Davis: Shift change at the Magma. Historical theme. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(2), 25-26.
- Mittler, G. A. (1980). Learning to look/looking to learn: A proposed approach to art appreciation at the secondary school level. *Art Education*, 33(3), 17-21.
- Mittler, G. A. (1986). Toward a more complete introduction to art in the high school. *Art Education*, 39(6), 10-13.

- Moilanen, M. B. (1989). *Identifying teachers' concepts of art history in secondary school programs*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1989.
- Moreno, C. L. (1988). Ralph Goings: Collins diner. Technology. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(2), 31-32.
- Moxey, K. (1994). *The practice of theory: Poststructuralism, cultural politics, and art history*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University press.
- Myers, S. (1987). George Wesley Bellows: Polo at Lakewood. Genre. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(6), 31-32.
- Nadaner, D. (1987). Patterns of feeling and action, a review of *Companeras: Women, Art, and Social Change in Latin America* by Betty La Duke. *Art Education*, 40(3), 49-51.
- National Art Education Association. (1986). *Quality art education: Goals for schools, an interpretation*. Reston, VA: Author.
- National Art Education Association Research Commission. (1993). *Art education: Creating a visual arts research agenda toward the 21st century*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- National Art Education Association Commission on Research in Art Education. (1996). *Art education: Creating a visual arts research agenda toward the 21st century*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- National Endowment for the Arts. (1988). *Toward civilization: A report on arts education*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Council for the Social Studies. (1981). *Position statement on global education*. Washington, D.C.: Author.
- Nelson, K. G. (1988). Willem de Kooning: Marilyn Monroe. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(3), 37-38.
- Neu, R. E. (1989). Frank Furness and George W. Hewitt: The Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. The significance of form: The architecture of public buildings. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(3), 37-38.
- Ng, S. K. (1992). The tale of the Genji. The Asian Art Museum of San Francisco. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 45(4), 24-28, 33-36.

- Niceley, H. T. (1992). A door ajar: The professional position of women artists. *Art Education*, 45(2), 6-13.
- Nichols-Dietrich, P. (1986). Adolph Gottlieb: Forgotten dream. Memories, dreams, and fantasies. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(4), 31-32.
- Nochlin, L. (1971). Why have there been no great women artists? In T. B. Hess & E.C. Baker (Eds.), *Art and Sexual Politics* London: Collier Macmillan.
- Noddings, N. (1984). *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Northup, M. (1986). Edward Hicks: Peaceable Kingdom of the Branch. History, myth, and religion. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(3), 25-26.
- Nozick, R. (1981). *Philosophical explanations*. Cambridge, MA: The Belnap Press of Harvard University.
- Osaki, A. B. (1996). The floating world revisited: 18th century Japanese art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 49(3), 26-28, 33-36.
- Ozmon, H., & Craver, S. (1990). *Philosophical foundations of education*. Columbus, OH: Merrill.
- Panofsky, E. (1962). *Studies in iconology: Humanistic themes in the art of the Renaissance*. New York: Harper & Row. (Original work published 1939)
- Panofsky, E. (1982). *Meaning in the visual arts*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. (Original work published 1955).
- Park, T. (1987). Attributed to Katsikodi, North American, Shoshoni: Elkhide with representation of a sun dance. Historical theme. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(2), 29-30.
- Park, T. (1988). Japan, Kofun Period: Haniwa figure of a horse. The significance of form: Sculpture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(5), 25-26.
- Parker, R. (1979). Breaking the mould. *New Statesman*, 98 (2537), 682.
- Parker, R., & Pollock, G. (1986). *Old mistresses: Women, art and ideology*. London: Pandora Press. (Original work published 1981)

- Parrish, D. C. (1987, Fall Semester). Lectures presented for the course *Art History Methods* at Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
- Parker, R. (1979). Breaking the mould. *New Statesman*, 98 (2537), 682.
- Parker, R., & Pollock, G. (1986). *Old mistresses: Women, art and ideology*. London: Pandora Press. (Original work published 1981)
- Parrish, D. C. (1987, Fall Semester). Lectures presented for the course *Art History Methods* at Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN.
- Pasch, M., Sparks-Langer, G., Gardner, T. G., Starko, A. J., & Moody C. D. (1991). *Teaching as decision making: Instructional practices for the successful teacher*. New York: Longman.
- Pazienza, J. (1989). *Modes of historical inquiry: Teaching art to children*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University, 1989.
- Pazienza, J. (1992). The lost Las Merinas, a who done it and more!: Teaching art history to children. In A. Johnson (Ed.), *Art education: Elementary*. Reston, VA: The National Art Education Association (pp.131-152).
- Peacock, J.L. (1986). *The anthropological lens: Harsh light, soft focus*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Pedretti, C. (1982). *Leonardo: A study in chronology and style*. New York: First Johnson Reprint. (Original work published 1973)
- Peters, R. S., & White, J. P. (1973). The philosopher's contribution to educational research. In W. Taylor (Ed.), *Research perspectives in education* (pp. 93-112). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Petit, D. A. (1988). A historical overview of Dutch and French still life painting: A guide for the classroom. *Art Education*, 41(5), 14-19.
- Petit, D. A. (1990). The object as subject in 20th century American Art. *Art Education*, 43(2), 36-41.
- Pond, J. C. (1988). Winslow Homer: The fox hunt. Animals in art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(1), 27-28.
- Pollock, G. (1990). *Vision and difference: Femininity, feminism and the histories of art*. London: Routledge. (Original work published 1988)

- Potts, A. (1996). Sign. In R. S. Nelson & R. Shift (eds.). *Critical terms for art history*. (pp17-30). Chicago: The University of Chicago press.
- Prabhu, V. (1987). South Indian: Shiva Nataraja, king of dancers. Religious art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(5), 39-40.
- Prabhu, V. (1990a). Betye Saar: Record for Hattie. Contemporary art: Familiar objects in new contexts. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(4), 25-32.
- Prabhu, V. 1990b). Contemporary art: Familiar objects in new contexts. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(4), 25-32.
- Pratte, R. (1992). *Philosophy of education: Two traditions*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Presley, D. D., & York, J. J. (1989). Rodney Alan Greenblat: The control chair. The significance of form: The decorative arts. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(4), 33-34.
- Preziosi, D. (1989). *Rethinking art history: Meditations on a coy science*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Pulsifer, M. (1987). Roger Brown: Autobiography in the shape of Alabama (Mammy's door). Genre. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(6), 25-26.
- Putnam, H. (1989). After empiricism. In J. Rajchman, & C. West, (Eds.). *Post-analytical philosophy* (pp. 20-30). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Quinn, J. (1989). Western Mexican Indian: The Tarascan Indian house. The significance of form: Domestic architecture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(2), 25-26.
- Readings, B. (1995). How obvious is art?: Kitsch and the semiotician. In S. Melville, and B. Readings (eds.), *Vision & Textuality* (pp. 143-146). Durham: Duke University Press.
- Rees, A. L., & Borzello, F. (Eds.). (1986). *The new art history*. London: Camden Press.
- Rees, A. L., & Borzello, F. (Eds.). (1988). *The new art history*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.

- Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York. Oxford University Press.
- Rogers, Tony. (1984). William P. Weston, artists and educator. *Art Education*, 37(5), 27-29.
- Rogers, Turner. (1987). Mohammed Ashraf, national treasure of Pakistan. *Art Education*, 40(4), 16-17.
- Roland, C. (1993). An interview with Jerry Uelsmann master photographer and teacher. *Art Education*, 46(3), 56-61.
- Rosenblum, P. (1982). Seeing and insight: An interview with Jacob Lawrence. *Art Education*, 35(4), 4-5.
- Rusak, S. (1996). African art [from the] Virginia Museum of Fine Arts. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 49(5), 25-28, 45-48.
- Salerno, L. (1971). Historiography of art in Western tradition. In *Encyclopedia of world art: Volume 7*. New York: McGraw-Hill. (Original work published 1958)
- Saunders, R. J. (1987). *American Gothic* and the division of labor. *Art Education*, 40(3), 6-11.
- Schaefer, C. (1989). Don Eddy: Jewelry. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(6), 25-26.
- Schapiro, M. (1953). Style. In A. L. Kroeber (Ed.), *Anthropology today* (pp. 287-312). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Schapiro, M. (1956). Leonardo and Freud: An art-historical study. *Journal of the History of Ideas*, 17(2), 147-178.
- Schwartz, B. (1988). Kenojuak Ashevak: Young owl takes a ride. Animals in art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(1), 25-26.
- Scriven, M. (1988). Philosophical inquiry methods in education. In R. M. Jaeger (Ed.), *Complementary methods: for research in education* (pp.131-148). Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Selle, P. (1988). T'ang Dynasty: Tomb figure. Animals in art. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(1), 47-48.



- Shannon, H. (1986). Henry Fuseli: The Nightmare. Memories, dreams, and fantasies. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(4), 29-30.
- Shoemaker, M. K. (1986). Pieter Paul Rubens: Prometheus Bound. History, myth, and religion. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(3), 31-32.
- Sedelnick, M. (1995). Colonel Francis Wayland Parker: Legacy of an artist-teacher. *Art Education*, 48(6), 18-22.
- Sherman, A. (1982). Questions that those concerned with non-sexist art education should ask. *Art Education*, 35(3), 26-29.
- Sieber, R. (1971). The aesthetics of traditional African art. In C. F. Jopling (Ed.), *Art and aesthetics in primitive societies: A critical anthology* (pp.127-131). New York: Dutton.
- Smenner, R. (1987). Hugh Yorty: Vacuum Still Life V. Still life. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(3), 25-26.
- Smenner, R. (1989). Robert Nelson: Pads and Pals, 1978. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(6), 27-28.
- Smith, P. (1984). Natalie Robinson Cole: The American Cizek? *Art Education*, 37(1), 36-39.
- Smith, P. (1985). Franz Cizek: The patriarch. *Art Education*, 38(2), 28-31.
- Smith, P. (1987). Jean-Francois Millet: The knitting lesson. Genre. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(6), 29-30.
- Smith, P. (1988). The Hampton years: Lowenfeld's forgotten legacy. *Art Education*, 41(6), 38-43.
- Smith, P. (1989). A modest proposal, or using ingredients at hand to make an art curriculum. *Art Education*, 42(6), 8-15.
- Smith, R. A. (1986). *Excellence in art education: Ideas and initiatives*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.
- Snow-Smith, J. (1982). *The Salvator Mundi of Leonardo da Vinci*. Seattle: University of Washington.
- Solender, K., & Buchanan, P. D. (1989). Joseph Mallord William Turner: Burning of the Houses of Parliament. Painting. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(5), 41-42.

- Soltis, J. F. (1978). *An introduction to the analysis of educational concepts* (2nd ed.). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Soucy, D. (1989). More than a polite pursuit: Art college education for women in Nova Scotia, 1887-1930s. *Art Education*, 42(2), 23-24, 37-40.
- Sousa, J. (1987). Ivan Albright: Into the world there came a soul called Ida. Portraits. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(1), 39-49.
- Spector, J. (1988). The state of psychoanalytic research in art history. *Art Bulletin*, 70(1), 49-76.
- Spiro, R., Coulson, R., Feltovich, P., & Anderson, D. (1988). Cognitive flexibility theory: Advanced knowledge acquisition in ill-structured domains. In *Technical Report No 441*. Campaign: Center for the Study of Reading, University of Illinois. (pp.95-96).
- Spitz, E. H. (1995). *Art and psyche: A study in psychoanalysis and aesthetics*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Spomer, M. J., Galbraith, L., Wise, S. (1988). Deborah Butterfield: Derby horse, 1985. The significance of form: sculpture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(5), 37-38.
- Springer, J. (1990a). Pablo Picasso: Guitar. Twentieth-century art : Issues of representation. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(3), 25-28, 37-40.
- Springer, J. (1990b). Rene Magritte: La condition humaine (the human condition). Twentieth-century art : Issues of representation. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(3), 25-28, 37-40.
- Springer, J. (1990c). Jackson Pollock: Number 1, 1950 (Lavender mist). Twentieth-century art : Issues of representation. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(3), 25-28, 37-40.
- Springer, J. (1990d). David Smith: Sentinel I. Twentieth-century art : Issues of representation. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 43(3), 25-28, 37-40.
- Springer, J. (1994). Women, power, and empowering imagery. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 47(5), 27-30, 43-46.
- Stankiewicz, M. A. (1983). Rilla Jackman, pioneer at Syracuse. *Art Education*, 36(1), 13-15.

- Stankiewicz, M. A. (1984). Self-expression or teacher influence: The Shaw system of finger-painting. *Art Education*, 37(2), 20-24.
- Stark, G. K. (1985). Oswego Normal's (and art education's) forgotten man: Johann Heinrich Hermann Krusi, M.A. *Art Education*, 38(1), 40-44.
- Steele, B. D. (1993). Renaissance art, education, and history: An art historian's perspective. *Art Education*, 46(2), 41-47.
- Stephen, V. (1991a). Christopher Pratt: Big Boat. Behind the image. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(6), 25-33.
- Stephen, V. (1991b). John O'Brien: HMS GALATEA, steamship in Halifax Harbour. Behind the image. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(6), 25-33.
- Stinespring, J. A. (1993). Teaching art history: Getting started. *Art Education*, 46(2), 8-13.
- Stinespring, J. A. (1996). Moving from first-stage to second-stage multiculturalism in the art classroom. *Art Education*, 49(4), 48-53.
- Stites, R. S., with Stites, M. E., & Castiglione, P. (1970). *The sublimations of Leonardo da Vinci, with a translation of the "Codex Trivulzianus"* (P. Castiglione, coTrans. of the "Codex"). Washington, D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Story, M. R. (1980). *Mona Lisas*. New York: Harry, N. Abrams.
- Suarez, D. (1986). Canaletto: The Rialto Bridge. Window on the world (landscapes and cityscapes). Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(2), 27-28.
- Szekely, G. (1982). Conversations in the art class. *Art Education*, 35(3), 14-17.
- Szekely, G. (1996). Preparation for a new art world. *Art Education*, 49(4), 6-13.
- Talbot-Stanaway, S. (1987). Joe Jones: Threshing the wheat. Historical theme. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 40(2), 27-28.
- Talbot-Stanaway, S., & Timm, H. (1989). William Waters: The Oshkosh Grand Opera House. The significance of form: The architecture of public buildings. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(3), 25-26.

- Thoman, C. (1986). Robert S. Duncanson: Blue hole, Little Miami River. Window on the world (landscapes and cityscapes). Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(2), 31-32.
- Tolbert, P. M. (1985). Jean-Baptiste Oudry: Portrait of a hunter and his dog. Focuses on faces (portraiture). Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 38(6), 27-28.
- Tollifson, J. (1986). Pablo Picasso: Still life with compote and glass. Everyday things (still life). Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(1), 37-38.
- Toulmin, S., Rieke, R., & Janik, A. (1984). *An introduction to reasoning* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Tucker, S. C. (1988). Henry Moore: The Dallas piece. Issues in public sculpture. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(6), 27-28.
- Turner, A. R. (1994). *Inventing Leonardo*. Berkley, CA: University of California Press.
- Tylor, E. (1958). *Primitive culture* (vol. 1). New York: Harper & Row. (Original work published 1871)
- Vallance, E. (1991). Something fishy: Cross-cultural subject matter. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 44(3), 25-28, 37-40.
- Vasari, G. (1946). *Lives of the artists: Biographies of the most eminent architects, painters, and sculptors of Italy* (B. Burroughs, Ed.). New York: Simon & Schuster. (Original work published in 2 vols., 1550; expanded ed. in 3 vols., 1568)
- Vasari, G. (1963). *The lives of the painters, sculptors and architects: Vol. 2* (rev. ed., A. B. Hinds, Trans., W. Gaunt, Ed.). New York: Dutton. (Original work published in 2 vols., 1550; expanded ed. in 3 vols., 1568; Original Trans., 1927)
- Verzar, C. (1988, Autumn Quarter). Lectures presented for the course *Historiography and Methodology of History of Art* at The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH
- Wackernagel, M. (1981). *The world of the Florentine Renaissance artist: Projects and patrons, workshop and art market* (A. Luchs, Trans.). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. (Original work published 1938)

- Wallach, A. (1984). Marxism and art history. In B. Ollman & E. Vernoff (Eds.), *The left academy: Marxist scholarship on American Campuses: Volume 2* (pp. 25-53). New York: Praeger.
- Wallert, A., Hermens, E., & Peek, M. (Eds.). (1995). Historical painting techniques, materials, and studio practice. *Preprints of a Symposium [held at] University of Leiden, the Netherlands*. The Getty Conservation Institute.
- Wardle, B. L. (1990). Native American symbolism in the classroom. *Art Education*, 43(5), 12-24.
- Wasserman, J. (1984). *Leonardo da Vinci: Leonardo*. New York: Harry N. Abrams.
- Werner, A. (1957). New perspectives on the old masters. In *Arts Yearbook 1* (pp. 79-98). New York: Art Digest.
- White, C. (1986). Marc Chagall: Wild poppies. Memories, dreams, and fantasies. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(4), 25-26.
- White, D. W. (1983). Advanced technology, art, and art education: Reaching toward the third millennium. *Art Education*, 36(3), 8-10.
- Williams, R. (1988), Marilyn Levine: Brown boots, leather laces, 1973. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 41(5), 39-40.
- Wilson, J. (1976). *Thinking with concepts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wittkower, R., & Wittkower, M. (1963). *Born under Saturn; The character and conduct of artists: A documented history from Antiquity to the French Revolution*. New York: Random House.
- Wölfflin, H. (1950). *Principles of art history: The problem of the development of style in later art* (M. D. Hottinger, Trans.). New York: Dover Publications. (Original work published 1915)
- Wollheim, R. (1957). Sociological explanation of the arts: Some distinctions. In *Atti del III Congresso Internazionale di Estetica, Venezia 3-5 settembre 1956* (pp.404-410). Turin.
- Yenawine P. (1985). Henri Matisse: Piano lesson. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 38(5), 31-32.

- York, J., Harris, S., & Herrington, C. (1993a). Albert Bierstadt: Looking Down Yosemite Valley, California. Art and the environment: A sense of place. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 46(1), 26-27.
- York, J., Harris, S., & Herrington, C. (1993b). Christophe Huet: The Cold Drink. Art and the environment: A sense of place. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 46(1), 54-55.
- York, J., Harris, S., & Herrington, C. (1993c). Elyn Zimmerman: Untitled Site-Specific Sculpture. Art and the environment: A sense of place. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 46(1), 55-57.
- Young, B. (1995). Two young interviewers get a sense of heritage from African/American artist and educator Dr. J. Eugene Grigsby, Jr. *Art Education*, 48(2), 37-43.
- Young, P. (1995). The abstract landscape of expressionism. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 48(1), 25-28, 49-52.
- Youngblood, M. S. (1982). Lowenfeld revisited: An introduction. *Art Education*, 35(6), 7.
- Zawatsky, C. (1989). Chantilly porcelain factory: Wall clock, c. 1740. The significance of form: Ceramics. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 42(1), 25-26.
- Zeller, T. (1986). John Rogers: Checkers up at the farm. Art as social comment. Instructional resources. *Art Education*, 39(5), 25-26.
- Zeller, T. (1989). The role of the humanities in art education. *Art Education*, 42(4), 48-57.
- Zimmerman, E. (1981). Women also created art. *Art Education*, 34(3), 5.
- Zurmuehlen, M. (1992). Post-modernist objects: A relation between the past and the present. *Art Education*, 45(5), 10-16.