UNIVERSITY OF AMSTERDAM

UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

'An appendix of manageable proportions': Heinrich Wölfflin and Hans Rose between Baroque Studies and National-Socialism

Witte, A.

Publication date
2016
Document Version
Final published version
Published in
Journal of Art Historiography
License
CC BY-NC

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Witte, A. (2016). 'An appendix of manageable proportions': Heinrich Wölfflin and Hans Rose between Baroque Studies and National-Socialism. *Journal of Art Historiography*, *14*, Article AW1. https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2016/05/witte.pdf

General rights
It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, P.O. Box 19185, 1000 GD Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (https://dare.uva.nl)

Download date:16 Oct 2026

‘An appendix of manageable proportions’: Heinrich Wölfflin and Hans Rose between Baroque Studies and National-Socialism

Arnold Witte

The text by Hans Rose translated here stems from the 1926 version of Heinrich Wölfflin’s *Renaissance and Baroque*, and was published as an appendix to the fourth edition of the original book. This 'Commentary' by Rose provides an insight into the slowly widening gap between the master's work and the progress made by younger students – amongst which his own pupils – in the study of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century Italian architecture. Rose's addition was ignored by later students of seventeenth-century Italian art, however. Especially the private life of its author became an issue as Rose was arrested for homosexual behaviour in 1937, sacked from his position of professor and deprived of his academic title.[1] He died during the last days of the Second World War, when Russian forces liberated Berlin.[2] He could never request rehabilitation and as a result his art historical publications have never been reconsidered – and also this complex episode between master and pupil in 1926 has not yet been dealt with.

In this introduction to the translation, both the personal relations between Wölfflin and Rose will be discussed in the light of contemporary politics, and the impact of especially Rose's intellectual trajectory on his art-historical views will be reconsidered, showing how a victim of the Fascist regime had actually been one of its early academic supporters. This transpires in many of his publications, including the Commentary to Wölfflin's *Renaissance und Barock*.

Republishing Wölfflin: from the first to the fourth edition

The 1888 study *Renaissance und Barock – Eine Untersuchung über Wesen und Entstehung des Barockstils in Italien* marked Wölfflin's nascent fame as art historian, and his subsequent steep career meant that there was an increasing request for his

[1] See Stefanie Harrecker, *Degradierte Doktoren. Die Aberkennung der Doktorwürde an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München während der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*, München: Utz, 2007, 347–48.

[2] Bernd-Ulrich Hergemöller, *Mann für Mann: Biographisches Lexikon*, vol. 2, Berlin etc: LIT Verlag, 2010: 993, which however contains a number of errors; see also Andreas Sternweiler (ed.), *Liebe, Forschung, Lehre. Der Kunsthistoriker Christian Adolf Isermeyer*, Berlin: Verlag Rosa Winkel, 1998, 57-59, and Christian Führmeister, 'Hans Rose. Eine biographische Skizze' in Pablo Schneider and Philipp Zitzlsperger, eds, *Bernini in Paris. Das Tagebuch des Paul Fréart de Chantelou über den Aufenthalt Gianlorenzo Berninis am Hof Ludwigs XIV*, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2006, 448.

older books. Therefore, *Renaissance und Barock* was republished a number of times.[3] During his lifetime four editions were printed; and Wölfflin had had his text twice revised by pupils or assistants. The second edition of 1907 was revised by Hans Willich, an architect who had concluded his Ph.D. in 1905 with Joseph Bühlmann at the Technische Hochschule in Munich on Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola's ecclesiastical architecture and its status in the nascent Baroque.[4] The proximity of this subject to Wölfflin's original book must have given the latter confidence in the abilities of the former.[5] Willich primarily added a short discussion on recent literature and reformulated a number of sentences in Wölfflin's text if the state of research required so. The third edition of the book appeared in 1908 in direct response to the edition in the same year of Alois Riegl's book on the Baroque, but this was not updated.[6] The fourth and last edition of the book appeared in 1926, and constituted a last revision of the original. All the re-editions published after Wölfflin's death in 1945 returned to the original text of the book as published in 1888, omitting the revisions by Willich and Rose.[7]

The edition curated by Rose was different in every sense from Willich's revision. Both the textual additions and the preface to the third edition were written by Hans Rose, explaining the constraints he was subjected to in his task of revising the original book:

> The new publication of this book in its fourth edition was not unconditional from the side of Heinrich Wölfflin. Its text was to be updated in conformity with the present state of research, its language should be edited, it was to be furnished with plates and it had to be expanded into a strong volume that was to be perceived by its author himself as something entirely new. In opposition to this stood the wish of many readers to possess the book in its original form. It was not easy to reconcile these conflicting demands. I believed, however, that I had to put aside my hesitations so that I could render visible the peculiar beauty of the book to its present readership. After several attempts in various directions, I decided merely to add the absolutely necessary to the original text and summarize my own research in an appendix of manageable proportions.[8]

[3] See also Andrew Hopkins, 'Reprinting and republishing Wölfflin and others in the 1920s' in *Journal of Art Historiography*, 2016, Number 14.
[4] Hans Willich, *Die Kirchenbauten des Giacomo Barozzi da Vignola, Ein Beitr. z. Entwicklungsgeschichte d. Barockstils*, München: Bruckmann, 1905.
[5] This was confirmed in Wölfflin's preface: 'Ich habe ihm, der von Hause aus Architekt und als Biograph Vignolas ein trefflicher Kenner der Epoche ist, vollständig freie Hand gelassen.' See Heinrich Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock. Eine Untersuchung über Wesen und Entstehung des Barockstils in Italien*, München: F. Bruckmann, 1926, VIII.
[6] Alois Riegl, *Die Entstehung der Barockkunst in Rom*, Wien: Schroll, 1908; see also Alois Riegl, *The origins of baroque art in Rome*, Andrew Hopkins and Arnold Witte, eds. and transl., Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2010.
[7] Later German editions of the book appeared in 1961 (two editions), 1986 (likewise two editions), and 2009.
[8] Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock*, VIII-IX: 'Die Herausgabe dieses Buches in vierter Auflage was von seiten Heinrich Wölfflins keine bedingungslose. Der Text sollte auf den heutigen

So, Rose returned to the original text – Willich's paragraph on recent literature in the second edition was omitted – and added his own Commentary. But while the original text counted 178 pages, this Commentary comprised a respectable 146 pages. Moreover, this addition was only loosely related to the original book, as merely the first 'article' on Subjectivism regularly referenced Wölfflin's argument on the stylistic changes from Renaissance to Baroque. The three consecutive articles (which might also be termed paragraphs or even chapters considering their considerable and varying length) discussed material and colour, urbanism and the building history of St Peter's. Rose's Commentary thus took up themes that Wölfflin had not at all dealt with in his book, the latter being focused predominantly on single architectural elements and their respective use in the two styles and not on historical context.

The Commentary made the entire volume lopsided and unbalanced – which was noted in reviews such as the one by Dagobert Frey. He concluded his discussion of the new edition by stating:

> In any case, Rose's Commentary constitutes an important and autonomous achievement, and one could only wish that it would be extended into a comprehensive study on *Cinquecento* architecture in Rome, without the constraints of this special occasion.[9]

This certainly had not been intended by Wölfflin when he asked Rose to 'update' his book. By the time he requested Rose – or Bruckmann might have done so, as will be discussed below – neither he nor the publisher might have expected a result that would put into sharp relief the changes in the field of Baroque studies as the Commentary would do. It is surprising that Wölfflin never looked through the additions to this edition.[10] The lack of letters exchanged between Rose and Wölfflin in the latter's papers in Basel might indicate the autonomy of Rose in the

---

Stand der Forschung gebracht, sprachlich revidiert, mit Abbildungen versehen und zu einem starken Band erweitert werden, der dem Verfasser selbst als ein Neues entgegentreten würde. Dem stand // der Wunsch aller früheren Leser gegenüber, das Buch in der gewohnten Form zu besitzen. Es war nicht leicht, diesen gegensätzlichen Forderungen gerecht zu werden. ... Nach mancherlei anders gerichteten Versuchen habe ich mich entschlossen, dem ursprünglichen Text nur das sachlich Notwendigste hinzuzufügen und meine eigene Studien in einen Anhang von handlichem Format zusammenzufassen.'

[9] Dagobert Frey, 'Rezension von: Renaissance und Barock' in *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* 18:4, 1926, 204: 'Roses "Kommentar" bedeutet jedenfalls eine durchaus selbständige bedeutende Leistung. Man würde nur wünschen, daß sie befreit von den Bindungen des besonderen Anlasses, zu einer umfassenden Arbeit über die Cinquecento-Baukunst Roms ausgestaltet wird.'

[10] Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock*, IX (Vorwort zur vierten Auflage): 'Für die Erweiterungen, in die Herr Geheimrat Wölfflin keinen Einblick genommen hat, trage ich die Verantwortung allein.'

preparation of the fourth edition.[11] But the silence of the sources on this matter might also have been the result of a later tidying of his papers, and this was probably related to the trouble that Rose ran into a decade after the publication of this fourth edition.

Hans Rose as a pupil of Wölfflin

Already from the start of his academic career, Hans Rose (1888-1945) modelled his approach in art history on that of Wölfflin. After studying in Berlin, Vienna and Halle, Rose moved to Munich where he wrote his dissertation with Wölfflin on the subject of early Gothic architecture of the Cistercian order.[12] Rose's analysis of the churches of this order was based upon the beholder's impression of space and visual characteristics of specific architectural details such as facades, windows, pillars and pilasters. The terminology chosen to discuss this – *Raumgefühl* and *Massengefühl*, the perception of space and of mass or volume – was derived from Wölfflin's psychological approach to architecture of his dissertation *Prolegomena*, of 1886.[13] It is significant that Rose's thesis was published by the Munich publishing house Bruckmann, with whom Wölfflin published almost all of his books. This relation would become important for Rose in his later career.

In 1919, Rose published a German translation of the diary of the French diplomat Chantelou in which Bernini's 1648 visit to Paris was recorded, with a brief introduction. This study diverted from Wölfflin's approach as it paid attention to historical and cultural contexts instead of focusing on the autonomous artistic form.[14] It was an approach that Rose must have taken from historically oriented art historians, and surely reminds one of the commentary of Baldinucci's *Life of Bernini* on which Alois Riegl had been working towards the end of his life.[15]

Rose however did not turn his back on formalism; in 1920, Wölfflin granted Rose his *Habilitation* on the basis of the latter's study on Late Baroque architecture in Germany. This study, entitled *Spätbarock*, was published in 1922 (again by Bruckmann) and discussed artistic development in Germany from 1660 to 1760. It transposed Wölfflin's own approach towards a later period, but it again went beyond the latter's formalistic concepts. Rose's introduction stated that the book combined *formgeschichtliche* and *geistesgeschichtliche* – formalistic and historically contextualizing – approaches, and with this, he partially reapplied the approach

[11] Heinrich Wölfflin, *Autobiographie, Tagebücher und Briefe*, Joseph Gantner, ed., Basel: Schwabe & Co, 1984 does not contain references to contacts between the two in the years between 1924 and 1926.
[12] Führmeister, 'Hans Rose', 435-36.
[13] Frank Büttner, 'Das Paradigma "Einfühlung" bei Robert Vischer, Heinrich Wölfflin und Wilhelm Wörringer. Die problematische Karriere einer Kunsttheoretischen Fragestellung' in Christian Drude and Hubertus Kohle, eds, *200 Jahre Kunstgeschichte in München*, München: Deutscher Kunstverlag, 2003, 82-93.
[14] Review by Rosa Schapire in *Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft* 14:1, 1921, 147-48.
[15] Alois Riegl, *Filippo Baldinuccis Vita des Gio. Lorenzo Bernini mit Übersetzung und Kommentar von Alois Riegl*, Wien: Schroll, 1912.

promoted by Burckhardt.[16] Thus he analysed the historical interdependence of art, politics and social context, equating classicist tendencies in art with political individualism and artistic genius, and the opposing forces – which we could call Baroque – as related to the Gesamtkunstwerk, collectivistic tendencies and absolutist politics. His main thesis was that in the course of the late 17th and 18th centuries, collectivistic politics led to the disappearance of the individualistic artist and thus the loss of genius; it cumulated in art being a 'bewundernswerte Machinerie', a total work of art with more documentary than artistic value. This made it necessary to concentrate on style per se, the 'Kunstgeschichte ohne Namen', and with this, he adhered again to Wölfflin's approach.

The most explicit example of Rose following Wölfflin's example is his 1937 book *Klassik als künstlerische Denkform des Abendlandes,* 'Classicism as artistic concept of the Occident'.[17] It repeated the basic subject of many books by Wölfflin, which discussed the classical as the formalistic equation to Winckelmann's 'stille Einfalt, edle Grösse.' In Rose's view, true classicist art had been possible only during a few brief moments in human history, due to particular contexts. This interpretation followed Wölfflin but, even more explicitly, adapted the concepts of the latter's teacher Burckhardt, who had declared the Renaissance as a moment of ideal society and ideal art. Rose assumed that the classical was a 'spiritual attitude' and as such represented ethical value.[18]

So, in comparison with Wölfflin, Rose combined an idealization of a particular style – Renaissance – with an ideal about society in which individualistic and collectivistic tendencies were the crucial factors determining the course of art. This approach connected very well to contemporary tendencies in philosophical thinking and art history – as Daniela Bohde has recently argued. The methodical approach of art history in the Third Reich was, during the 1930s, steering away from formalism *per se* as being too limited and unrelated to the issues of racial theory and

[16] Hans Rose, *Spätbarock. Studien zur Geschichte des Profanbaues in den Jahren 1660 – 1760*, München: Bruckmann, 1922, VII: 'Der Wert und die Anwendbarkeit kunsthistorischer Systeme wechseln je nach dem Stoff, auf den sie sich beziehen. Als Jakob Burckhardt es unternahm, die Geschichte der Renaissance zu schreiben, hat er die Aufrichtung eines Systems ausdrücklich von der Hand gewiesen. Es war seine Absicht, den Stoff zu sammeln "wie man eine Herde ins Stadttor treibt", mit all jenem Reiz des Zufalls und der Improvisation, der darauf hinausläuft, die Kunstwerke für sich selbst sprechen zu lassen. Die Barockforschung verhielt sich in diesem Punkt schon weniger liberal. Wölfflins Frühwerk: "Renaissance und Barock" ist bereits von der Überzeugung getragen, daß die Entstehung des Barockstiles auf einem kunsthistorischen Gesetz beruhen müsse. Und auf diesem Weg ist er weitergeschritten zu einer Systematik des Hochbarock, die vor einigen Jahren in den "Kunstgeschichtlichen Grundbegriffen" ihre literarische Fixierung erhalten hat.'

[17] Hans Rose, *Klassik als künstlerische Denkform des Abendlandes*, München: Beck, 1937.

[18] Margarete Riemschneider, review of Rose's *Klassik als künstlerische Denkform* in *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft* 32:4, 1938, 312-13: 'Wenn wir über Stil als Weltanschauung überhaupt etwas aussagen wollen, so ist // jede Annahme eines Auseinanderfallens in den verschiedenen Gebieten des Lebens und der Kunst irrig und verwirrend.'

geographical studies.[19] So, while making use of Wölfflin's collectivistic concept of 'Kunstgeschichte ohne Namen', a contextual approach was also furthered by Nazi art history (if one can subsume the development of art history in this period under a single denominator). From this perspective, Rose's increasing attention to geographical particularities, social developments and political context suggests he was associating his work with the dominant ideology, which was developed especially in the Munich circles to which Wölfflin was known to have belonged before his move back to Switzerland.

The Bruckmann Salon and National Socialism

During his sojourn in Munich, Wölfflin frequented the salon of Hugo Bruckmann and his wife Elsa. At the start of the 20th century, this salon developed into a major focus of Munich high society and academic life. Hugo Bruckmann was heir to the Bruckmann publishing house with its many contacts in the world of academics, writers and politicians; Elsa Bruckmann came from the princely Romanian family Cantacuzène.[20] Her personality was one of the main attractions of the salon and she was also the one to involve thinkers such as Houston Stewart Chamberlain, who early on expressed racist views on society – and who published his ideas with the Bruckmann Verlag.[21] We must not understand the Bruckmann soirees as exclusively politically oriented, as it was also frequented by a host of artists and literary authors such as Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Rainer Maria Rilke, and maybe even Thomas Mann, who subscribed to other political views. But in this high society context thoughts about the renewal of society were discussed, and the individualistic fragmentation after World War I was often criticized. Especially the impact of Chamberlain suggests that this circle might be considered part of the 'Konservative Revolution', be it that in this case there was a natural development towards the later Facist regime.[22] Hitler actually gained access to Munich's upper echelons through this salon, and it was Elsa Bruckmann who, in 1923, became one of his earliest supporters. The Bruckmann couple donated money, offered him a podium for his ideas and introduced him into the world of entrepreneurs, which contributed to his political rise in the late 1920s.[23]

[19] Daniela Bohde, 'Kulturhistorische und ikonographische Ansätze in der Kunstgeschichte im Nationalsozialismus' in Ruth Heftrig, Olaf Peeters and Barbara Schellewald, eds, *Kunstgeschichte im "Dritten Reich". Theorien, Methoden, Praktiken*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008, 192-93.
[20] Wolfgang Martynkewicz, *Salon Deutschland. Geist und Macht 1900 – 1945*, Berlin: Aufbau, 2011, 21-36. Elsa Bruckmann also published one art historical article: 'Scherenschnitte von Else Stegen' in *Die Kunst* 69, 1934, 21-23.
[21] Geoffrey Field, *The Evangelist of Race. The Germanic Vision of Houston Stewart Chamberlain*, New York: Columbia UP, 1981, 169-70.
[22] Stefan Breuer, *Anatomie der Konservativen Revolution*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995, 100.
[23] Martynkewicz, *Salon Deutschland,* 382 and 408 ff; see also Miriam Käfer, 'Hitlers frühe Förderer aus dem Münchner Großbürgertum – das Verlegerehepaar Elsa und Hugo Bruckmann' in Marita Krauss, ed, *Rechte Karrieren in München. Von der Weimarer Zeit bis in die Nachkriegsjahre*, München: Volk Verlag 2010, 52-79.

In the context of art history, the Bruckmann Verlag was one of the important publishing houses of its day. And quite a few of its authors belonged to the supporters of the regime after 1933.[24] Art historians such as Hermann Beenken (also a pupil of Wölfflin), Eberhard Hanfstaengl (director of the Lenbachhaus in Munich, a personal friend of Hitler and from 1933 to 1937 director of the Nationalgalerie in Berlin) and Wilhelm Pinder had their books published by Bruckmann. As a result, quite some art historians connected to Munich university visited these *soirées* where the relation between biology and culture became ever more important. The issue of the German racially based spirit in national history was therefore furthered, and we must assume that the salon played a role of some importance in diffusing this concept in art historical circles.

That Rose also belonged to this salon and subscribed to its right-wing political philosophy is documented by an incriminating article he published in 1934, 'Jean Baptiste Nétivier. Der Erbauer des Braunen Hauses in München'. It appeared in the *Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* and discussed the architectural history of neoclassical Palais Barlow at the Briennerstraße in Munich, which had been bought by the NSDAP in 1930 with financial support of Fritz Thyssen – who also belonged to the circles of the Bruckmann family, and who had supported the Nazi party with his private fortune until he turned against the regime in the later 1930s.[25] The acquisition of these premises for the Nazi party had even been suggested to Hitler by Elsa Bruckmann herself, and the building was located only one block from the Bruckmann residence. Rose's article referred to sources close to the Bruckmann salon, called the building, baptised 'brown house' in reference to the colour of the NSDAP party, the 'cradle of new Germany'. It actually heralded the status of the building as an architectural monument that deserved to be preserved for posterity, on the basis of its classical aesthetic qualities.[26] He also cited 'from trustworthy sources' that Hitler had been personally involved in the project of restoring the building to new splendour – thus implicitly supporting the regime by identifying its headquarters with universal artistic values that were also embodied by its leader.[27]

[24] Anne Bechstedt, Anja Deutsch und Daniela Stoppel, 'Der Verlag F. Bruckmann im Nationalsozialismus.' In Ruth Heftrig, Olaf Peters und Barbara Schellewald (eds): *Kunstgeschichte im "Dritten Reich". Theorien, Methoden, Praktiken*, Berlin: Akademie Verlag 2008, 286 and 299-302. From 1942 onwards, Bruckmann published the important series "Deutschen Kriegseinsatz der Geisteswisschenschaften" with as subseries "Ausstrahlungen der deutschen Kunst" and "Sonderleistungen der deutschen Kunst".

[25] Günter Brakelmann, *Zwischen Mitschuld und Widerstand. Fritz Thyssen und der Nationalsozialismus,* Essen: Klartext Verlag, 2010. See Martynkewitz, *Salon Deutschland*, 66 for the acquisition of Palais Barlow.

[26] Hans Rose, 'Jean Baptiste Nétivier. Der Erbauer des Braunen Hauses in München' in *Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* 1, 1934, 49.

[27] Rose, 'Jean Baptiste Nétivier', 49: 'Man hörte, daß der Führer an den Arbeiten persönlich Anteil nehme. Bald stellte sich auch der Wunsch ein, über den Schöpfer und die Vorgeschichte des Bauwerks näheres zu erfahren. Damals hat mich Frau Elsa Brückmann-Cantacuzene mit dem Auftrag beehrt, die geschichtlichen Daten zusammenzustellen, eine Anregung, für die ich ihr zum herzlichem Dank verpflichtet bin. Die Autorschaft Jean

Rose, Jena university and the Nazi authorities

With his 1934 article on the Braunes Haus Rose voiced his support of the Nazi regime; the question is however whether he did so out of a will to survive, or whether he really subscribed to (a part of) national-socialist ideas. Rose's homosexuality and his conviction in 1938 because of this speaks in favour of the first option, just as the 1937 report on Rose by the *Kreispersonalamtsleiter* of Jena. In this memorandum, which probably was written to support a request for travel funds, it was stated that Rose was not a party member and did not participate actively in NSDAP events, but he was deemed to be loyal to the government and *au fond* a trustworthy German Arian citizen. He was noted to be somewhat of an intellectual, 'overly cultivated', and aloof in his attitude.[28]

On the other hand, Rose had been appointed professor in Jena in 1931, and he had been nominated for a post explicitly attuned to the teaching and research of German, and even regional Thuringian, art and folklore. This new alignment had been arranged by the NSDAP party in the state of Thüringen, which was the first state to appoint NSDAP ministers in its government in 1930; the party seized full power here in 1932, before it gained control in the rest of the country in 1933.[29] Rose seems to have attuned his research and his didactic activities along the lines of the NSDAP, speaking about regional castles not only in front of his university students but also for a public of party members.[30] Especially his regular lectures for the *Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur* (Militant League for German Culture), a cultural organization semi-dependent on the Fascist party, can be regarded as Rose's implicit agreement with national-socialist cultural policies – since he did not start lecturing for this organization *after* his appointment in Jena, but already in 1930.[31] And also in this case the connection with the Bruckmann circles was probably the reason he became involved, as many of the prominent members of their *coterie* joined this society furthering the cultural purification of Germany especially amongst the educated middle classes.[32]

Rose was appointed in Jena at a moment when this university was being re-conquered by the authorities. Before 1930, the university and the civic and regional authorities were not directly linked – to the contrary, the university had

---

Baptiste Métivier war bald nachgewiesen. Inzwischen hat sich um diesen Namen ein reiches Werk zusammengefunden, das nicht unwert ist, die Öffentlichkeit unterbreitet zu werden."

[28] Universitätsarchiv Jena, D.2146 page 64, dated 28 February 1937, cited by Führmeister, 'Hans Rose', 442-43.

[29] Steffen Raßloff, *Der 'Mustergau'. Thüringen zur Zeit des Nationalsozialismus,* München: Bucher, 2014.

[30] Führmeister, 'Hans Rose', 444 ff gives a list of seminars and talks by Rose.

[31] Führmeister, 'Hans Rose', 439 suggested that the lectures for the Kampfbund were the result of his appointment, while the chronology shows these lectures preceded his professorship in Jena.

[32] Jürgen Gimmel, *Die politische Organisation kulturellen Ressentiments: Der "Kampfbund für deutsche Kultur" und das bildungsbürgliche Unbehagen an der Moderne*, Münster/Hamburg/London: LIT Verlag, 1999, 20, 25 and Martynkewicz, *Salon Deutschland*, 439f.

considerably grown in size and therefore gained more autonomy. This was counteracted from the early 1930s onwards and in fact, Rose was nominated by the NSDAP minister for education Wilhelm Frick as a 'non-tenured professor with a personal teaching assignment'.[33] This had been the result of a negation by the authorities of the university's request for a tenured professor in art history, which was finally consented with the requirement that the candidate to be appointed should also advocate regional history and art.

In other words, Rose cannot have expected the average academic context when he applied there. The Friedrich Schiller Universität Jena had been one of the first to have a chair dedicated to racial social anthropology, even though this field was by far not exclusively practiced only in Jena.[34] More in general it can be stated that in the course of the 1930s, universities did not resist the increasing totalitarian regime, but acquiesced with it, if not outright supporting the new regime.[35] Notwithstanding the absence of clear party politics towards the universities, this academic stance inadvertently supported the fragmented approach of diverse (semi) state parties towards 'self-nazification' of the universities.[36] It has been argued that from the late 1920s onwards, in Jena and also elsewhere the academic elite consciously embraced concepts of nation and race in public acts such as academic addresses for a general public.[37]

The debate following Ian Kershaw's publication on the collaboration of the German elites in the rise to power of Hitler has also found resonance in the study of the academic community in the 1930s, and it has become clear that many professors and others joined the NSDAP, and supported its aims at an early moment.[38] That Rose responded to this atmosphere in his publications, talks and other public appearances may not have meant that he subscribed to all aspects of the Nazi regime as we know it now, but it suggests that he was at least not ducking out or secretly opposing it. He probably agreed with other professors in the institution who favourably considered the national goals of the NSDAP as part of the *Bildungsbürgertum*, but detested its populist elements.[39]

[33] Führmeister, 'Hans Rose ', 437.
[34] Uwe Hoßfeld, Jürgen John, and Rüdiger Stutz, '"Kämpferische Wissenschaft". Zum Profilwandlung der Jenaer Universität im Nationalsozialismus' in Uwe Hoßfeld, Jürgen John, Oliver Lemuth and Rüdiger Stutz, eds, *Kämpferische Wissenschaft. Studien zur Universität Jena im Nationalsozialismus*, Köln/Weimar/Wien: Böhlau, 2003, 23.
[35] Hoßfeld, John, and Stutz, "Kämpferische Wissenschaft", 28-32.
[36] Michael Grüttner, 'Die nationalsozialistische Wissenschaftspolitik und die Geisteswissenschaften' in Holger Dainat, ed, *Literaturwissenschaft und Nationalsozialismus*, Tübingen: Niemeyer, 2003, 14-18.
[37] Hoßfeld, John and Stutz, "Kämpferische Wissenschaft", 43 and Christian Jansen, '"Deutsches Wesen", "deutsche Seele", "deutscher Geist". Der Volkscharakter als nationales Identifikationsmuster im Gelehrtenmilieu' in Reinhard Blomert, Helmut Kuzmics and Annette Treibel, eds, *Transformationen des Wir-Gefühls. Studien zum nationalen Habitus*, Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 1993, 199-278.
[38] Otto Gerhard Oexle, '"Zusammenarbeit mit Baal". Über die Mentalitäten deutscher Geisteswissenschaftler 1933 – nach 1945' in *Historische Anthropologie : Kultur, Gesellschaft, Alltag*, 8, 2000, 3-4.
[39] Hoßfeld, John, and Stutz, "Kämpferische Wissenschaft", 43.

Rose's response to changing contexts

All this suggests that Rose was at least functioning within the expectations of the new regime. His lectures for groups in the context of the *Kampfbund*, on subjects that were close to the range of interests of the Thuringian NSDAP bureaucrats, show that he adhered to it. The same can be said for his regular university courses in which subjects such as 'Art history of Thüringen', excursions to Bamberg, and even a lecture series on 'the art of the German East' were discussed.[40] Things were slowly changing, however, in both the intellectual and the social spheres, and these will have complicated Rose's situation in due time.

Firstly, the position of the humanities became weaker as several contemporary accounts attest to. This was related to other factors, such as the on-going uncertainty as to what constituted 'national-socialist' science (this became a question even for academics who wholeheartedly agreed with the fascist party), and the increasing favour of the hard sciences in contrast to the decrease in funding for the philosophical faculties to which art history often belonged.[41] Secondly, social circumstances shifted and in particular those concerning homosexuality. Even if gay identity had been unacceptable to the authorities before, it became a public issue after the 'Röhm-Putsch' in 1934, when the SA leader Ernst Röhm was murdered together with others in a purge arranged by the NSDAP party. In order to justify these political assassinations, Röhm was not only accused of having prepared a plot against the fascist regime but also of depraved morals as he was homosexual.[42] As a result, homosexuality was increasingly suppressed by the Nazi authorities.[43]

These changes seem to have surprised Rose. He was denounced by a former lover, and arrested on 18 November 1937 in Jena on the basis of law §175 against 'lechery between men'.[44] His trial took place the following year, and he himself wrote to the authorities in 1939, after his conviction, that his doctor had confirmed his sexual orientation had no effect on his intellectual capacities.[45] In other words, he still considered his work as being in agreement with the dominant political ideology, and in doing so, he referred back to the situation he had experienced in the Bruckmann intellectual salon in which these issues obviously had not been a problem at all. In the meantime, however, the intellectual approach of a right-wing *Bildungsbürgertum* as it existed before 1933 had been left behind in the more popular

[40] Führmeister, 'Hans Rose', 452-55 lists the subjects of his courses taught in Munich and Jena.

[41] Grüttner, 'nationalsozialistische Wissenschaftspolitik', 34-35.

[42] The issue of homosexuality in Nazi Germany is a subject of debate – see Alexander Zinn, *Die soziale Konstruktion des homosexuellen Nationalsozialisten. Zu Genese und Etablierung eines Stereotyps*. Frankfurt/New York: Lang, 1997, and Harry Oosterhuis, 'Medicine, Male Bonding and Homosexuality in Nazi Germany' in *Journal of Contemporary History* 32:2, 1997: 187-205, esp. 189.

[43] Stefan Micheler, 'Homophobic Propaganda and the Denunciation of Same-Sex-Desiring Men under National Socialism' in *Journal of the History of Sexuality* 11, 2002, 95-130.

[44] Führmeister, 'Hans Rose, 443-44.

[45] Führmeister, 'Hans Rose', 446 and Stefanie Harrecker, *Degradierte Doktoren. Die Aberkennung der Doktorwürde an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München während der Zeit des Nationalsozialismus*, München: Utz, 2007, 124.

mass movement that Nazism had become since then. In these new circumstances, thanks to the changing position of the humanities, academic adherence to right-wing concepts no longer counted much, and therefore could not save Rose's social and academic position.

The commentary

In the light of this personal trajectory, the question arises whether it is possible to read Rose's Commentary to Wölfflin's *Renaissance und Barock* of 1926 with new eyes – not only on the methodological level, as Andrew Hopkins has done in his introduction to this translation, and not as an indication of explicit national-socialist ideas, but as an attempt to realign Wölfflin's ideas with the new contextual approach of formalism with a particular attention to right-wing politics and nationalism. How did the Bruckmann salon and the concepts of culture, politics and society impact Rose's update of his teacher's first masterpiece?

First of all, it strikes one as significant that Rose's Commentary indeed moved towards a combination of strict formalist interpretation with biological-geographical contextualization. Some chapters such as the last one on the building of St Peter's is predominantly an explanation of how various regional stylistic currents influenced the new church being built from Julius II onwards. In other parts of the Commentary, Rose stressed the ideological backgrounds of certain stylistic developments, seeking to explain an artistic style through its socio-historical context. For example, in his definition of classicism, he stated that 'classical art in its exclusive meaning is only possible at a particular level of individualistic ideology, namely when the emancipation of the individual is perceived from a higher idealistic standpoint as fragmenting, and when a general cultural idea, or an elevated type of humanity, is constructed above the concept of the perfection of the individual.'[46] Just as in his later book on classicism as an artistic concept, Rose here saw aesthetics and ethics as closely related concepts.

Rose also related style in an explicit way (in negative terms) to particular political worldviews: 'At the end of the eighteenth century, classicism remained impure because the awareness of individuality in this age was tainted by democratic ideas.'[47] We might also take the stress laid on the use of building materials and the discussion of brick as the characteristic of the Roman Baroque as a possible reference to local identity as rooted in geological circumstances. The ample description of the historical genesis of materials such as travertine, and through this, its meaning as expression of the specific qualities of Roman architecture, are indications of biological-geographical approaches of architectural style, and thus the move from strict formalism into an approach that coincided with the dominant right-wing political ideologies of the mid 1920s.

The same might be supposed for Rose's infrequent use of racial characteristics, such as the reference to the Slavonic background of Sixtus V as an explanation for the design of the Villa Montalto.[48] It is especially the garden layout

[46] Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock*, 184.
[47] Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock*, 185.
[48] Wölfflin, *Renaissance und Barock*, 242.

under this pope by Domenico Fontana, which led to the negation of geographical characteristics in the design of the Villa Montalto. Finally, the explicit reference in his chapter on urbanism to an author such as Albert Erich Brinckmann, who just as Rose followed a trajectory in which he aligned himself with the ideology of the Fascist government in the course of the 1930s, might be taken as a further indication that the Commentary moulded Wölfflin's ideas so that they conformed to new political insights.[49]

Conclusion

Wölfflin had introduced his pupil Rose to the Bruckmann salon, where political debates led to a new orientation in art history, and where the contextual approach was merged with formalism. It was only through this combination that the scientific approach in art history could be aligned with social-biological explanations of stylistic change. And these currents influenced both Rose's own work, and the Commentary he wrote for the 1926 edition of Wölfflin's *Renaissance und Barock*. Since Wölfflin had belonged to the same circles, he probably agreed with this addition on a methodical and political level.

After 1945, however, the use of geographical and biological contexts in explaining stylistic changes had become suspect, and Rose's Commentary led away from the strict formalist art history, which could still be deemed 'scientific' and therefore free from ideological infections.[50] As a result, the addition by Rose diverted from that part of Wölfflin's work that could 'save' art history from post-1945 criticism. But also the biographical issue here prevented a reception of Rose's text: as he died at the closure of the war, he neither could ask for rehabilitation, nor re-embark upon an academic career.

In hindsight, we have to ask what his position was; did he merely attempt to adapt to the current political situation up to a certain point?[51] In the light of his involvement – and that of Wölfflin – in the Bruckmann salon, we have to assume he did not comply merely to obtain a position, but he was involved in right-wing avant-gardist circles where the 'Konservative Revolution' evolved into early support for the NSDAP. The recent attempt to restore Rose's academic contribution to art history, however, glossed over his right-wing leanings, and therefore presented him exclusively as a victim of the Fascist regime. A more detailed look at Rose's academic career in relation to his personal life as homosexual, however, must lead us to the insight that art historians in the years before and after the rise to power of

[49] Evonne Levy, *Baroque and the Political Language of Formalism (1845–1945): Burckhardt, Wölfflin, Gurlitt, Brinckmann, Sedlmayr*, Basel: Schwabe, 2015, 244f.
[50] See Christian Fuhrmeister, '"Reine Wissenschaft". Art history in Germany and the notions of "pure science" and "objective scholarship", 1920 – 1950' in Mitchell B. Frank and Daniel Adler, eds, *German art history and scientific thought – Beyond Formalism*, Farnham etc: Ashgate: 2012, 161-77.
[51] See Grüttner, 'nationalsozialistische Wissenschaftspolitik', 26-27 for a useful 'scale' from adaptation to active involvement of academics in national-socialist thinking in post-1933 Germany.

the German national socialist party navigated the stormy waters in far more complex ways.

a.a.witte@uva.nl / a.witte@knir.it

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License.