Art Historiography and Iconologies Between West and East

Edited by Wojciech Bałus and Magdalena Kunińska

First published 2024

ISBN: 978-0-367-68434-1 (hbk)
ISBN: 978-0-367-68435-8 (pbk)
ISBN: 978-1-003-13752-8 (ebk)

8 Zofia Ameisenowa, William S. Heckscher and 'The Genesis of Iconology' (Bonn 1964)

Magdalena Kunińska

DOI: 10.4324/9781003137528-10

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
NEW YORK AND LONDON

8 Zofia Ameisenowa, William S. Heckscher and 'The Genesis of Iconology' (Bonn 1964)[1]

Magdalena Kunińska

Christopher Wood, in his remarks on the reception and re-reading of Aby Warburg's legacy, '*Homo Victor*', did not appreciate the statements and conclusions of William S. Heckscher and wrote:

> The influential article by William S. Heckscher, 'The Genesis of Iconology', in '*Stil und Überlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes: Akten des 21. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte, Bonn, 1964*', associates, naively and anecdotally, Warburg's introduction of the term 'iconology' with the 'spirit of synthesis' of the years just before the First World War.[2]

Furthermore, Wood declared and identified the article to be an influential one, while at the same time he wrote:

> Panofsky did not cite Warburg either in his seminal paper "Iconography and Iconology: An Introduction to the Study of Renaissance Art" (1939), or in the later essay "Three Decades of Art History in the United States: Impressions of a Transplanted European" (1955).[3]

Wood points out that Heckscher makes Warburg the prototype of the method of Panofsky, G. J. Hoogewerff, Guy de Tervarent, and Jan Białostocki.

It was the latter of these scholars who initiated the invitation of William Sebastian Heckscher to participate in the 21st Congress of Art History in Bonn. Białostocki, who had been invited to chair the section 'Stilgeschichte und Ikonographie', emphasised in a letter in 1962 that in his opinion, Heckscher could make an important contribution to the discussion.[4] In his reply, Heckscher stressed that he was only a 'humble disciple' of Białostocki, pointing out that he was not a theorist but only a person who tries to work in the 'vineyard of iconology'.[5] Eventually, having spent, in his own words, a 'hectic summer in London'[6] discussing with Gertrud Bing and reading Aby Warburg's notes for a lecture he delivered at the 10th Congress in Rome in 1912, Heckscher prepared the paper that was so harshly judged by Wood. In this chapter, I would like to add some remarks to this 'influential' (but naïve?) article by putting some reflections from the letter of its author, dated 23 October 1964 and sent to Zofia Ameisenowa.[7]

I think that this can shed new light on the relationships of art history, methods, and the time and goals of creating specific texts and discourses and – in a unique way – shows the limits of the universal discursive style as applied to certain objects, crossing

DOI: 10.4324/9781003137528-10

the borders of aesthetic judgements and applied periodisation. I will try to show why Heckscher admired one of Ameisenowa's books, one literally devoted to the anatomical models – *écorches*[8] – published in 1963.

Iconology of Art-Historical Research?

When trying to answer the question of what Heckscher's article actually is, it is worth pointing out a specific feature. When we suspend the evaluation of Heckscher's reflection on Warburg as being too severe, the most inspiring element of a lecture lies in his attempt to show the construction of what I would call 'narration' as being analogous to the situation of the *belle époque*. Moreover, he even found resemblances in the way Warburg was making his notes and structuring his writings on contemporary collage art.[9] In his very individual manner, Heckscher tries to evoke 'the actual moment in which the modern iconological method came into being',[10] intersecting a reflection on Warburg's lecture on Schifanoia frescoes[11] with general characteristics of the epoch of 1910–1912.

I will not analyse Heckscher's statements about the role of the collage, but I would like to emphasise that this way of thinking – by linking the 'visuality' typical for the period being analysed with the structure of Warburg's narration in its era, with its general cultural and artistic milieus, is – in a provocative way – a kind of para-iconology of a discourse. Heckscher has an uncanny ability to translate the visual side of contemporary epochs into terms that describe the state of culture. Referring to the nostalgic attitude of the 1964 Congress, he invokes the costumes for the film *My Fair Lady*[12] in a footnote. He does so by using his methodological approach, described as 'Disconnected observations – *petites* perceptions – arising from a patiently tended reserve of knowledge, will in time resolve themselves into a mosaic that makes sense',[13] firmly rooted in Freud's legacy, and allowing the researcher to produce new, heuristic connections. When this is considered, following the authors of the volume on Heckscher's method,[14] these transitions between the spheres of techniques, culture, and forms of art lose their sense of naivety when the creative act of the researcher leads to the creation of a new, meaningful mosaic. In this context, it is tempting to say that in Bonn in 1964 he gave a lecture on 'the iconology of iconology', reconstructing the moment in a broadly documented context.

'Style and Iconography'

Another interpretative moment is the history of art history as a discipline. Heckscher's paper was delivered at a certain historical moment, as a kind of exploration of the relationship between the assembled generations of art historians. He describes them as looking back with some nostalgia to the heyday of the great-grandparents of iconology, a discipline within a discipline.[15] Moreover, it was delivered within a section that explicitly pointed to two branches of art-historical research. More importantly, he also chose Warburg's lecture on the astrological cycle at the Schifanoia Palace[16] because of his aim, which was to re-set the boundaries for the field of art history research. This was shared with Zofia Ameisenowa, who attempted throughout her life to work not with the classical formal-genetic method (described by her as 'putting the object in its place and time' and applied mainly to Polish monuments) but with the 'spherical method' she developed towards works of art, embedding it in the field of science, which she called 'comparative studies of religions', while religions were understood as cultural tracings. She used the latter mainly to study the persistence of iconographic motifs over time, particularly to

explore the relevance between Jewish art and Christianity. It is a broad view, operating on a different temporal model and an often extra-aesthetic choice of objects (such as Jewish cut-outs), and constantly intertwined with describing 'people's faith and history beyond the transparent surface of art' (as described by Stanisław Mossakowski).[17]

Moreover, Heckscher had shown Aby Warburg's lecture as a response to a specific, defined tradition of art historical studies: that of Heinrich Wölfflin and the Vienna school of art history. By using Warburg's lecture, Heckscher seems to declare his position on methods, which is perceptible from the letter and evaluation of the works by Ameisenowa. He wrote that Warburg:

> with his daring crossing of frontiers hitherto secured by near-impenetrable taboos, by stressing the interpretation of the textual with that of the pictorial tradition as a principle valid beyond the one case under investigation – in short, with his decompartmentalization (to appropriate a term applied by Panofsky to the Renaissance), Warburg moved in, a direction diametrically opposed to the path followed and steadfastly adhered to by colleagues of great renown and merit. Let me mention here only two names, those of Wölfflin and Dvořák. Heinrich Wölfflin had delivered on 7 December 1911 his important address on the 'Problems of Style' in his maiden speech before the Prussian Academy of Sciences. In this he had asserted that stylistic changes were brought about by changes in the human eye.[18]

He emphasised that Max Dvořák delivered before Warburg's 'the Schifanoia lecture; two important papers where scholar outlined the task of art historian. [Dvořák] warned of the danger of shallowness with which the young discipline was threatened'.[19] It is not an accident that Heckscher chose these two positions. Dvořák, before he turned toward the *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*, as a faithful pupil of the Vienna school of art history 'postulated a return to the *Erforschung des erforschbaren Tatbestandes der Kunstgeschichte*' ('research into the researchable' – understood as the possibility of verified facts in art history). This was an essential part of the striving of the time to scientise the history of art, which was in force in 'the most powerful fortress' of the Vienna school, built on the Morellian method of the concept of stylistic research.[20] When both Wölfflin and Vienna-oriented Dvořák proposed a coherent model of art history based, as Heckscher wanted, 'on the intensive study of the development of style', defined as 'essential task of art history as a science',[21] it is crucial to analyse motifs of their stubborn objections to 'shallowness' and the courage of Warburg in terms of the history of art history in general.

I assume that these different assumptions concerning essential tenets of art history as a discipline became the reason for his deep admiration for the Kraków-based scholar. The first book of Ameisenowa that he had an opportunity to read was *The Problem of the Écorché and the Three Anatomical Models in the Jagiellonian Library*, which Ameisenowa sent him shortly after the publication of the English version.[22]

He writes in a typewritten letter to the scholar who suffered heavily from her sight problems:

> Let me begin by saying how much I enjoyed it. If it is the right word, reading your *Problem of the Écorché and Three Anatomical Models in the Jagiellonian Library*. It is, indeed a *Fundgrube* of recondite knowledge; in reading it and in looking at your marvellous illustrations, I often wished I had known of your opus when I wrote my own study on Rembrandt's *Tulp*.[23]

He admires 'the humanistic approach' and style of Ameisenowa's work – which was, we should add, typical for this time – as summarised in the famous Panofsky essay on art history as a humanistic discipline.[24] Heckscher brings together his own work and that of Ameisenowa in open words:

> It may astonish you that I read the last paragraph of your book with intense interest. The reasons are selfish: I have been Lecturing in Bonn on GENESIS OF ICONOLOGY [capitalisation his]; in doing this, I focused on the Xth International Congress of Art History in Rome, 1912.[25]

He declares that he had chosen Warburg's lecture not without reason: 'From this vivacious and interesting Congress I selected, unavoidably, Warburg's Schifanoia lecture as the first and most significant manifestation of the discipline within the discipline'.[26]

The likely reason for such a high level of interest in Zofia Ameisenova's work is her practice of expanding the boundaries of art history in line with Warburgian thinking, while Heckscher himself declares also this interdisciplinary *avant la lettre* attitude. As C. Schoell-Glass and Elizabeth Sears pointed out, 'At the time, one can say that [Heckscher] was working in the no-man's-land between the disciplines, because interdisciplinary work in today's sense was still a long way off'.[27] At the same time, they identified the study on Rembrandt's *Tulp* as paradigmatic for Heckscher.[28] This widening Heckscher also ascribes to the discipline of art history, when he compared the general outlook of the time with the structure of collage followed by the critics of the one-sided stylistic method:

> The widening of borders (*Grenzüberschreitung*) seemed to me symptomatic of the time and so I went into a closer scrutiny of the cultural world around year 1912. My attention was soon drawn to then modern art. Far from shuddering at its synthetic features (the collages), I pricked up my ears & eyes as it dawned on me that possibly Warburg's own method of compounding a new historical entity out of many small details from many hitherto unconnected fields, might be a reflexion of a similar spirit. I am still too deep in the gathering of material for my footnotes, to be able to tell what value my associations may have to others. But Brauque (sic) and Duchamp, especially the latter's . . . *Descendant un escalier* (1912), in spite of the obvious deviation from Renaissance standards, gained my – limited – admiration.[29]

Then the situation is translated into art history's disciplinary situation:

> Of course, I need not add that the entire tendency which in the years before August 4 1914 spelled the end of la Belle Epoque, shows iconology as one of many premonitions of both synthesis and disintegration. Art history as a compact field for specialists will never be the same as it was when Dvořák and Riegl, Wölfflin and so many other great men were firmly convinced that the problem of style were the one and only task of the art historian. In retrospect, therefore, I feel as if this widening of the self-imposed delimitation of the field of Art History or *Kunstwissenschaft* was an un-gentlemanly, low-class, realistic, non-idealistic movement that is still engulfing us. But the iconology of the Warburgian brand is, at the same time, to me at least, a true revival of the beautiful aspects of the 18th century. And in the latter sense, I read and enjoyed your book.[30]

He posited a bold thesis and dared to show the adequacy of a structure of a narrative in terms of formal analysis with the fragmentary nature of the world just before the First World War. Meanwhile, 'Our beautiful, dry, and distant' – to paraphrase James Elkins – stories of the style based on linear temporality, exclude by definition the persistence of the motives and, repeating all the racist assumptions established since the publication of *Geschichte der bildenden Künste* by Karl Schnaase in 1843, prevented the inclusion of some phenomena, like Jewish art (as it had no forms of its own) and the work of scholars going beyond the Western-centred model, like Ameisenowa.

'Mirrors of the cultural ambient' and reading 'people's faith and history beyond the transparent surface of art'

In addition to criticising the single model of formal-genetic analysis, what is really interesting for Heckscher in Ameisenowa's study is her choice of anatomical models, which are rather ambivalent for 'high' art. But above all, her decision that the book is not devoted to 'description and positioning these figures in a certain time', but 'the role of anatomy and dissection in art'. Moreover, Ameisenowa provides detailed analyses of literary and philosophical sources, like St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, in parallel with her analysis of changing the attitude to the human body as a 'symptom' of cultural, religious, and philosophical changes. I believe the aforementioned book meets Heckscher's statement from his *Rembrandt's Anatomy of Dr. Nicolaas Tulp* that:

> My study was undertaken in the belief that every great work of art, apart from its forever changing aesthetic appeal to posterity, is an unchanging mirror of its cultural ambient. This is the reason I have done my best to interpret Rembrandt's painting in terms used by the cultured people in his Amsterdam environment who 'talked art' while he realized it.[31]

Ameisenowa, meanwhile, uses the study of *écorchés* as a starting point for an extended, erudite analysis of the variability in attitudes to mortality and anatomy throughout history. Using theological arguments, elements of theology and medical history, and references to works of art, she draws a picture of change from the quasi-magical attitude of the Middle Ages to the aesthetic fascination of the Renaissance (by analysing, for example, 'Fighting Nudes' by Antonio Pollaiuolo). Using Heckscher's approach, the object becomes a pretext for drawing a reflection of the cultural situation.

It is not surprising that Heckscher finds Ameisenowa's book extremely inspiring, as they seem to follow analogous paths – tracing the fate of culture and people behind the objects. Ameisenowa shared with Heckscher her plans to publish works on Jewish iconology, as well as her never-finished work on the permanence of the double-headed eagle motif.[32]

Moreover, defining research work with the notion of *comparativa inquisitio*[33] borrowed from Nicolai of Cusa, and following Warburg's path (as he understood it), Heckscher points to iconological analysis as a creative act that crosses borders. Heckscher refers directly to Warburg's comment that 'an iconological analysis does not allow itself to be hemmed in by the restrictions of the border police'. For Heckscher, Warburg courageously managed to break with the current construction of art historiographical narratives based on the rhythm of stylistic change, modelled on recognised spatial-temporal patterns, allowing Warburg to draw completely different conclusions.

The breakdown of the existing grid allowed Matthew Rampley to call this way of practicing art history 'a wild art history', but Georges Didi-Huberman, another commentator of Warburg's epistemological strategy summarised in *Mnemosyne Atlas*, compared it to conducting dissections of the existing model of art history, using the epistemology of fragments. Quoting from Lautremont, it was 'beautiful, like the fortuitous meeting on a dissecting table between a sewing machine and an umbrella'. These two surprising objects, the sewing machine and the umbrella, are not the most important features; what matters is the support for engagement that defines the table itself as a resource of beauty or new knowledge – analytical knowledge, knowledge through cuts, reframings, or 'dissections',[34] or 'Verzetteln als Methode',[35] or works by Polish scholars, gathered in boxes, currently stored at Jagiellonian Library – thousands of examples of the presence and persistence of specific iconographic motives (like the Gemini sign, the double-headed bird, and many others).

Another entanglement between Heckscher, Zofia Ameisenowa's (and Warburg's) research is the aforementioned crossing of the boundary between high art and objects that today we would refer to as belonging to visual culture (e.g., anatomical models, cut-outs). This was due to the transgression of the aesthetic perception inherited from Warburg (as Heckscher explicitly discusses) in favour of tracing 'carriers of psychological significance' (in Ameisenowa's case, indicators of the connectivity of Jewish and Christian civilisation, in her idealistic project of 'harmonising the world'[36] through art history).

To examine some points of Ameisenowa's methodological approach,[37] we should start with what was identified by the author of this chapter as the paradigmatic article on the persistence of the 'Tree of Life' motif.[38] Ameisenowa leads a consistent argument of the history of the Christian cross, beginning with this remark:

> There is scarcely any symbol more ancient or more widely distributed than that of the cosmic Tree of Life with its promise of immortality and everlasting youth – a remarkable product of the Semitic imagination in Western Asia. Except for the Cross of Christ, which is itself an embodiment of the Tree of Life in another form, no other symbol has been the subject of so much published research.

In the listed examples of motif, crossing the borders of art and popular objects are clearly visible:

> At this point we should conclude the investigation. As such a small number of examples have been adequately described and reproduced, it would be unsafe to discuss the occurrence of the Tree of Life on Jewish frescoes and works of applied arts in the baroque, rococo and Empire. We shall therefore limit ourselves to two examples of Jewish folk-art to illustrate the persistence of the Tree of Life symbol even down to our own times. These are firstly the tomb-stones and secondly the pieces of paper cut out by school-boys in the little Polish towns and pasted on windows or framed in honour of certain festivals. A Polish scholar recently pointed out that the most frequent motive on eastern Jewish graves decorative in the baroque period was the Tree of Life in most diverse types and variants, sometimes combined with the candlestick. . . . There has thus been no fundamental change since late antiquity; only the formal ornamental treatment of the motive has been modified. The Tree of Life as a symbol of Paradise and the food of the righteous, was the same among the Jews in the days of the apocalyptic writers, in the Middle Ages and the life-time of Voltaire.[39]

Working on the permanence of motifs adopted by successive cultures as carriers of symbolic meaning and identities, emphasising their invariability from deep antiquity to her contemporary Jewish cut-outs, Ameisenowa goes beyond the obligatory structure of the formal narrative, linked to an imposing temporal structure firmly rooted in the Hegelian scheme of history. She is dealing with the problem of the duration of certain motifs and their openness for new meanings – or even for the loss of meaning, as in her paper 'Neglected Representations of the Harmony of the Universe', published in *Essays in Honour of Hans Tietze*.[40]

Similar conclusions can be drawn from all iconographic studies of the scholar. For example, in 1949 she published a vast study, 'Animal-headed Gods, Evangelists, Saints and Righteous Men', starting with the following superposition:

> Among the most remarkable and the most puzzling representations in all civilizations and all periods until the end of the Middle Ages must be numbered the human forms bearing the heads of animals. I refer, of course, only to those hybrid figures which occur in a religious, magical or symbolical context and must therefore be expected to embody religious superstitious practices. Without undertaking an exhaustive study of the earlier history of the problem in the oriental religions, my intention is to publish selected representative monuments which elucidate the history, morphology and changes in the symbolic meaning of these hybrid forms from Roman times onwards.[41]

What is noteworthy is the presence in the works of the association of motifs with the most general symbolic meaning (the Tree of Life transforms into a cross, and figures with animal heads are each time associated with distinction or exaltation). Starting from Fritz Saxl's work on the winged human figure,[42] Ameisenowa apparently built her concept, reminiscent of (or preceding?) Jan Białostocki's concept of the 'framework image/theme'.[43]

In summary, the most general distinguishing feature of Zofia Ameisenowa's work remains a focus on the permanence (versus stylistic change) of the iconographic motif – on the one hand, a study that does not fit into the school's formal method, and on the other, an attempt to link specific forms with manifestations of religious life, and more generally with cultural forms. Its premise was to seek an answer to the question of 'why' a certain motif appeared at a certain point in time, rather than merely setting objects in a linear narrative. These elaborate, erudite studies, which bear the hallmarks of scrupulous scholarship, are a fascinating example of thinking in the paradigm of the Warburg circle.

Conclusion

William S. Heckscher brought Aby Warburg's presentation from 1912 as a case study of the 'iconology in its full panoply' to attack some strict ways of conducting art historical studies and promoting his positions. The lecture was not just a 'naïve' linking of Warburg's iconological analysis to the 'spirit of synthesis' of the period c. 1910–1912, but taking a stand on the titular axis for the session pairing 'style vs iconography'. Heckscher emphasised Warburg's great importance in transcending the paradigm of scientism which was then associated with Wölfflin's method and the achievements of the Viennese School – that is, the identification of scientific research with the formal method.

Zofia Ameisenowa showed the limits of stylistic analysis – based more or less consciously, as Keith Moxey proved, on Hegelian presuppositions[44] – and the idea of the

development of art inscribed in the chronology illustrated by changing forms (which are, in fact, a metaphor of temporality).

By adding durations and presence-type of motifs Ameisenowa also deals with the similar problem. That is why this type of research is like a warning sign of the naturalisation of some methods and the reality created by them that were not ready to accomplish anything different than the examination of European artefacts, because, as Dan Karlholm and Keith Moxey remarked:

> The unquestioned assumption of the discipline of the history of art since its creation in the late nineteenth century is that time unfolds chronologically, in an orderly manner leading somewhere. The chronological shape of historical writing has its ancient roots in natural metaphors of birth, maturity, and decay, as much as in the purposive direction ascribed to the passage of time by Christianity. In the late eighteenth century, intellectual and social events, epitomized by the Enlightenment and the French Revolution, encouraged philosophers to develop concepts of history that depended on notions of progress. Hegel, writing in the 1820s, argues that time is self-motivated and that its passage coincides with the workings of the 'Spirit' as it wends its way through the ages. The founders of art history similarly sketched a developmental history of art, where each period contained the seeds of that which was to come.[45]

As we have seen, both Heckscher and Ameisenowa tried to deal with this problem and their paths met to some degree. When artefacts are considered records of human mentality, culture, and religion, they become carriers of symbolic meanings, which in their insistence do not yield either to schematic temporality or to the paradigm of historical changes. Both were close to excursions outside the artistic canon, and regrettably, the health of Ameisenowa and her husband never allowed her to travel to the Netherlands, where Heckscher wanted 'to have time to talk quietly to each other' in the idealistic world of humanists practising 'the wonderfully useless field' of studies.[46]

Notes

1 This chapter is an outcome of the project *Art Historiographies in Central and Eastern Europe. An Inquiry from the Perspective of Entangled Histories* granted by European Research Council, based in New Europe College, Bucharest. The project was planned for 2018–2023, but the unexpected death of prime investigator Ada Hajdu (see the chapter 'The Absence of Iconology in Romania. A Possible Answer' in this volume) caused the project to be terminated in 2021. The project team was formed by Shona Kallestrup, Magdalena Kunińska, Mihnea Mikhail, Anna Adashinskaya, and Cosmin Minea. The title refers to Heckscher 1967.
2 Wood 2014, here note 20 on page 9.
3 *Ibid*.
4 Jan Białostocki, letter to W. S. Heckscher, Christmas 1962; ms, Heckscher-Archive, Warburg Haus, Hamburg.
5 W. S. Hecksher, letter to Jan Białostocki, 5 January 1963, ms, Heckscher-Archiv, Warburg Haus, Hamburg.
6 Heckscher, letter to Zofia Ameisenowa; 23 October1964, Heckscher-Archiv, Warburg Haus, Hamburg.
7 Ameisenowa's Jewish background played a major role in shaping her research attitude. It is worth mentioning that she was born in 1897 in Nowy Sącz, the daughter of a well-known doctor of medicine, Maurycy Ameisen (this is significant: even in documents of the Jewish Community in Nowy Sącz, Dr Ameisen is noted with the Polish pronunciation of his name, while Zofia's mother – Jadwiga of Schodmaks – is given as Jachtet). Her family was fully assimilated

and Dr Ameisen had socialist beliefs, which were common among well-educated Jews. He was a social activist and one of Lenin's defenders in 1914, as Zofia mentioned in 1956 in her letter to a prime minister of the Communist Polish government, when she described being discriminated against because of her ethnic background. The father's role is constituting Zofia's outlook is hard to overestimate. She was raised in a home with a rich library and in the atmosphere of liberal culture. Her father had facilitated her travels to major museums in Europe (Dresden, Copenhagen) even before she started her education of art history and classical archaeology at Jagiellonian University. She graduated from a humanistic gymnasium (a type of preparatory high school) in Kraków, not a Jewish school. In her memories we can find a statement that a love of science and culture was born at her home. Ameisens' family was not a religious one due to its liberal outlook but was connected with her Jewish identity as a cultural factor. She received her traditional education in art history in Kraków (1915–1920), writing her doctoral thesis on medieval wall painting in Kraków (1923). She remained outside the structures of the department of art history but was employed at the Jagiellonian Library. She conducted her work on the persistence of iconographic motifs and the so-called 'comparative studies of civilisation' outside her full-time position, according to her work diary entries. For more, see Kunińska 2015, 255–261.

8 Ameisenowa 1963.
9 Heckscher 1967.
10 *Ibid*., 239.
11 *Ibid*., note 1.
12 *Ibid*., note 4 on page 241.
13 After Sears 1990, 107; Heckscher 1974, 101–134.
14 Schoell-Glass and Sears 2008.
15 Heckscher 1967.
16 Warburg 1999.
17 Stanisław Mossakowski interview, May 2014 (notes in the private archive of the author).
18 Heckscher 1967, 246. In accompanying note 15 he widely comments on Wölfflin's methodological approach.
19 Following Heckscher 1967, note 16 on page 247.
20 Heckscher 1967, 246.
21 *Ibid*.
22 Ameisenowa 1963.
23 Heckscher, letter to Zofia Ameisenowa; 23.10.1964, Heckscher-Archiv Warburg Haus, Hamburg, Original spelling.
24 Panofsky 1955, 1–25.
25 Heckscher, letter to Zofia Ameisenowa; 23 October 1964.
26 *Ibid*.
27 Schoell-Glass and Sears 2008, 4.
28 Heckscher 1958.
29 Heckscher, letter to Zofia Ameisenowa; 23 October 1964.
30 *Ibid*.
31 Heckscher 1958.
32 As he acknowledged in a second letter to Ameisenowa, 11 November 1964.
33 Heckscher 1967, 249.
34 Matthew Rampley, Lecture delivered during Getty 'Connecting Art Histories' Seminar, November 2019, New Europe College, Bucharest.
35 See: Schoell-Glass, Charlotte and Sears 2008.
36 Mossakowski, Interview.
37 For more detailed analysis of the counter-Hegelian approach see Kunińska 2018, 145–157.
38 Ameisenowa 1938–1939, 326–345.
39 *Ibid*.
40 Ameisenowa 1958. Interesting is the fact that she shared her paper with E. Panofsky, as is noted in one letter from him.
41 Ameisenowa 1949, 21.
42 Saxl 1957.
43 It is interesting that Białostocki never mentioned her influence despite the proven acquaintance of her works and Ameisenowa herself. For Białostocki's concept, see Ryszard Kasperowicz's chapter in this volume.

44 Moxey 1998, 25–51.
45 Karlholm and Moxey 2018, 1.
46 Both quotes are from the analysed letter (23.10.1964).

Bibliography

Ameisenowa, Zofia. 'The "Tree of Life" in Jewish Iconography'. *Journal of the Warburg Institute* 2 (1938–1939): 326–345.

Ameisenowa, Zofia. 'Animal-Headed Gods, Evangelists, Saints and Righteous Men'. *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 12 (1949): 21–45.

Ameisenowa, Zofia. 'Some Neglected Representations of the Harmony of the Universe'. In *Essays in Honor of Hans Tietze*, edited by Ernst H. Gombrich, Julius S. Held and Otto Kurz, 349–364. New York: Gazette des Beaux-Arts, 1958.

Ameisenowa, Zofia. *The Problem of the Écorché and the Three Anatomical Models in the Jagiellonian Library*. Wrocław: Ossolineum, 1963.

Heckscher, William S. *Rembrandt's Anatomy of Dr. Nicolaas Tulp: An Iconological Study*. New York: New York University Press, 1958.

Heckscher, William S. 'The Genesis of Iconology'. In *Stil und Überlieferung in der Kunst des Abendlandes Akten des 21. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte in Bonn 1964*, edited by Florens Deuchler, 239–262. Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1967.

Heckscher, William S. 'Petites Perceptions: An Account of "Sortes Warburgianae"'. *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 4 (1974): 101–134.

Karlholm, Dan and Moxey, Keith. 'Introduction: Telling Art's Time'. In *Time in the History of Art: Temporality, Chronology and Anachrony*, edited by Dan Karlholm and Keith Moxey, 1–10. London and New York: Routledge, 2018.

Kunińska, Magdalena. 'In Search of the Jewish Identity: Zofia Ameisenowa and Research into Jewish Iconography and Its Place in Polish Art History Discourse'. In *Art in Jewish Society*, edited by Jerzy Malinowski et al., 255–261. Warszawa and Toruń: Polski Instytut Badań nad Sztuką Świata and Tako, 2015.

Kunińska, Magdalena. 'Memory as Matter: The Art Historical Approach to the Endurance of Iconographic Motifs Beyond Time, Space (and Style) – Forgotten Studies on Jewish Art by Zofia Ameisenowa'. In *DeMaterialisations in Art and Art-Historical Discourse in the Twentieth Century*, edited by Wojciech Bałus and Magdalena Kunińska, 145–157. Kraków: IRSA, 2018.

Moxey, Keith. 'Art History's Hegelian Unconscious: Naturalism as Nationalism in the Study of Early Netherlandish Painting'. In *The Subject of Art History. Historical Objects in Contemporary Perspectives*, edited by Mark A. Cheetham, Michael Ann Holly and Keith Moxey, 25–51. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Panofsky, Erwin. 'The History of Art as Humanistic Discipline'. In *Meaning in the Visual Arts* Meaning in the Visual Arts, 1–25. Garden City, NY: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1955.

Saxl, Fritz. 'Continuity and Variation in the Meaning of Images'. In *Lectures*, 1–12. London: Warburg Institute, University of London, 1957.

Schoell-Glass, Charlotte and Sears, Elizabeth. *Verzetteln als Methode, Der humanistische Ikonologie William S. Heckscher (1904–1999)*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2008.

Sears, Elizabeth. 'The Life and Work of William S. Heckscher'. *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 53, no. 1 (1990): 107–133.

Warburg, Aby. 'Italian Art and International Astrology in the Palazzo Schifanoia, Ferrara'. In *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity: Contributions to the Cultural History of the European Renaissance*, translated by David Brett, 563–592. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 1999.

Wood, Christopher S. 'Aby Warburg, Homo Victor'. *Journal of Art Historiography* 11 (2014). Accessed 10.04.2019. https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2014/11/wood.pdf.