

BOOK REVIEW

Eric Fernie, *Art History and Its Methods a Critical Anthology*

Irfan Palippui

Indonesia

Of many history and approach arguments, it is true that approach Art history becomes complicated. There are few perspective to view and position how to read art history. To understand chronology of that and method, Eric Fernie, one of historians from Scotland gave good and interesting elucidation to tackle it. "Art History and Methods a Critical Anthology" summarized commentary was written in 1995. This book contained a variety of notion and oncoming from Giorgio "the lives of the artists" (1568) to Olu Oguibe "in the heart of darkness" (1993). A very good introduction of this book is properly due to before entering into the subject matter discussed by each character, Fernie first gives a preliminary consideration to make it easier for the reader to understand the core idea of each approach. For the purposes of this paper, as well as introductions and how to see different ways of looking at each other, only a few approaches, I count and select.

For first of all, we can see how the idea of Vasari's description of the book is. Giorgio Vasari (1511-1574) is an artist and art historian who wrote both the history and development of art in his time. Two of his best works were born through interaction with a family of art lovers, the Medici, in Florence and Rome. Such works can be found in the Uffizi Palace (till now a gallery) and the frescoes in the Palazzo Vecchio. In addition to continue working in the field, also become biographer Vasari renowned artists, and write a history of the Italian Renaissance. The first work was published in 1550, is a dedication to Cosimo de' Medici. Then, in 1568, revised and expanded again in the lives of other artists, including himself.

The Vasari's composed book consists of three parts, first: The dawn of ancient art history and the early Renaissance artists - Cimabue and Giotto. Secondly, in the 16th century, Vasari explained the art character, such as, Masaccio, Piero Della Francesca and Mantegna. Third, the life context of art maestros in the Renaissance era, such as, Leonardo, Raphael and Michelangelo. Of the three phases that was mentioned by Vasari and then distinguished from some main points of intended stage. For the first, he appointed Tuscany as an introduction discussing the early artistic journey of ancient Greek-Romans. Second, he consolidated artist's position from artist to a society. Then, the last, he put the work of artists in a context that he saw as a great art at that time. Here, Vasari pointed out the important purpose of his observations of the Artist and

Patron. He wanted to show how to differentiate and place the artist's expertise in history and contribution to civilization.

Artists and patrons became signified that explained Vasari's selection of biography as a basis for constructing historical notions. Artists are the actor subject of artistic activity, while patrons deal with to statement emerge about cultural values, anecdotes being of all available biographically. Biography provided an illustrated explanation of a brief history of art, from the early period to the next. Vasari asserted that the work of an artist was related to one another. The development of art called "internal cycle" as a biological creature; Born, growth, mature, and died. These are used to observe the antique art from nothing and slowly emerging into various techniques to its peak under Greek and Roman rule, then into Caesarean times in the 14th century, and again to experience decay. According to his presupposes that it is unavoidable because it happens to run in a natural order. After its decline, Western art returned to the Renaissance - the resurrection. Here, can be seen how the art growth through biological model as Vasari's idea. That the emergence of the real Renaissance is because of the traced existence toward internal rotation of art itself. This is what continues to giving an embryo for the next stages.

Vasari's research focused on environmet of artits while placed on subject history context. So far, he used *Lives* in organized principal. He did not content with just narrating the facts, but "investigated the ways and means and methods used by successful men in forwarding ther enterprises...recognizing that history is the true mirror of life, which keeps the motive power of history within the control of the individual."

Furthermore, Vasari examined artist works by questioning connoisseurship technique. What is *connoisseurship*? This Term comes from the word "connoisseur or *connaître*,(French language) *describes a person who possesses the ability to evaluate and render critical judgments about a given cultural product*. Shorhtly, Vasari used *connoisseurship* to dishtinguish good, better and the best works for showing art quality between absolute and relative.

From the beginning of the 14th, 15th and 16th centuries, Vassari illustrated the three development stages for Renaissance art: *Giotto, Marriage of the Virgin, 1305*. The Giotto style showed many standing figures cladded in profile and clear lines. In addition, there was interaction between the subjects standing in front of the building where the scene occured. *Masaccio, The Tribute Money, 1424*. The use of clothing or long cloth strands used posed very diverse in which line was a more open and the placement of figures more organized and convinced, and back to the scene. *Michelangelo, The Sacrifice of Noah, 1508* had many indentations. The pull of the line was also more varied, and the figure integrated in the space where they moved. There are three things that are required for estimating this work component, first: we view drawings with trained eyes in the Renaissance tradition and allow for errors to be affected by Vasari's writings. Second, the themes of the three works are different from each other. Giotto's work concerns solemn figures in ritual performing, Masaccio shows dramatic moments as if in a ritual. Thirdly, Micheangelo further presents

the stylistic differences of the two artists above. According to Vasari, in the 15th century the works were strongly influenced by natural paintings whose results were somewhat dry and soothing. However, it appears that the work of Michelangelo has surpassed it. Michelangelo has entered “the realm of ideal beauty,” Vasari said. The standard meaning of a work by Vasari depends on what it calls, style. In terms of these assessments, Vasari does not emphasize the chronological importance of historical writing, but based on the educational background of the artist and the style. Style is something that refers to the highest quality of a work of art. The quality of art is exemplified in an “ugly” work and becomes an extraordinary one. For example, the 14th century BC carvings in Constantinople were later reused with an amazing relic in Trajan in the 2nd century AD. What Vasari does is not just recording what the artist has done, but distinguishing which works are good, better, and best. Vasari uses methods, ways, styles, actions, and ideas of artists.

By accidentally not reviewing Karel van Mander’s idea of “Dutch and Flemish Painters (1604) and Giovanni Bellori” ideas of painters, sculptors and architects selected from the higher natural beauty of nature (1672) put in second and third positions by Fernie, we see the next character idea. Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1769) was also one of the most important figures in art history. He studied Theology and Medicine, and became a library manager in Dresden. Certainly, encountering with books (in the library), he finally found himself concerning the practice of art and cultural research - on the art and culture of Antique, Greece. From this interest also, he published a book of art history that was different from previous art history, because it is no longer centered on the theory of history through the artist. And these writings positioned him as the first to work on art history with cross-perspective. From that time he got the title as the father of art history, as well as the father of archeology, which introduced the methodology of science in the history of art and by the excavation of antiquities. Drawing on previous art historians, Winckelmann was also still greatly appreciated by Vasari. He strongly believes in the birth of a work of art associated with the relationship between art and culture, in which the subject or artist must be related to it.

Winckelmann places a strong connection between art and culture. This is the key word distinguishing it from other art historians, mainly Vasari, who later became the novelty of the method in art history. As Vasari’s most influenced person, namely: (1) in the early stages of his analysis, he borrowed the ‘Biological cycle’ to see the birth, progress, and decline of an art tradition. The original study was focused on Roman art, second century BC. Winckelmann illustrates how art was in the time of King Antonine. It is like the light of a petromax lamp, before it goes out will collect the remaining oil that creates a bright light, after it goes out again. Winckelmann believes that the only thing to be able to restore our confidence or greatness is to turn and imitate classical Greek - and of course this is a common feature of renaissance (neo-classical). Therefore, (2) he stressed the importance of studying it, one of them, by examining the monument. To get to the writing of antique Greek art history, is to do it in Rome. At least, a historian, to understand his artistic connoisseurship, must stay for a year to examine and project the workings of, for example, carvings. Here, Winckelmann, as well as many writers who disregarded the direct experience of the art work. (3) He also criticized the

inability of most writers to see how art works from the eyes of their artists - this point is also influenced by Vasari. (4) Winckelmann measured the development of these technical advances, which in turn bring together the distinction between personal and ideal beauty. Point of tap, Ideal beauty can only be achieved from election of the beauty of a personal nature, then the result of that becomes unity.

The differences between Winckelmann and Vasari are: First: of the most essential how to make distinct between Vasari and Winckelmann is reference. Winckelmann experienced directly through field research while Vasari extracted his information from the book. Winckelmann wrote the history of art through direct observation by taking many samples in the context of which he studied, such as: the relevance of the period and location, including the setting of the situation, the form of government, the way of thinking, the status of the artist, the usefulness of the art is laid, and the study of the knowledge of the members of the surrounding community. In short, he examines the culture as a whole based on the context.

Second: by Vasari who pioneered a new model of Biological Cycle: new and setbacks. He proposed sustainability from the outset based on the need to move to understand beauty and lower it into something more. For that stage of the cycle called it a very metaphorical naming. The period of antique art, that all are the same in the earliest stage, just as the birth of the handsomest of human beings are misshapen. *In the (adult) period as the peak of antique Greek culture, like a river with clear waters flowing through a fertile valley. And its decline is like a river which divides into rivulets or rage and crashes against the rock (like Etruscan).*

Furthermore, we jumped on the idea of Jakob Burckhardt (1818-1897). Burchardt was a modern Professor who spent his life on campus. His touch with art began when he studied art history at Berlin, which was fostered by Franz Kugler (1808-1858). The civilitation of the Renaissance was the most influential paper on the subsequent works. Beside that, he was also strongly influenced by humanism, so that the works he was born are the result of a diagnosis of pathological events.

In this book, Fernie selected the Burckhardt essay, *Reflection on History*, written during university. This essay provided a very clear introduction to the proposed method or approach used in viewing the history of art as a whole. He asserted that the practice of the creation of a work can be traced through direct observation to see and discover what is the basis for the birth of a great idea of a person or artist. To research history, he offered observations with *half-random*, then broken it down and heard the data to see the reaction from the compaction of the subject matter. From here, we are able to reconstruct the past events in detail.

Burckhardt also commented on Hegel and gave an overview of why he did not follow his method. Hegel argued that the history of the world was rational and refused the philosophy of history as something associated with many components (*centaurs*). By that, Burchdat said this to Hegel, I did not follow Hegel for not knowing the eternal wisdom secret.

Burckhardt himself was more in agreement with Winckelmann and used his method of examining the various cases in the history of Greek and Roman art, then testing

them in different ways. In his rejection of the Hegelian method as a common tradition developed in Germany, he proposed the path of Empirical Humanism in writing a complete history of culture - and of course has included the history of art - in which the humanity achievement and every aspect of social life presented it.

Furthermore, Fernie held out the idea of art history from Heinrich Wölfflin (1915). Fernie said, Wölfflin deliberately wrote the book of principles of art history aiming to strengthen the classification of art history, in the sense of classification style. As a historian interested in style, and primarily recognizing the process of imagination before he determines each case, Wölfflin reinforced the claim that imagination was necessary to know the content of the imagination itself, moreover to discover the concept of history as part of the history of thought itself. The pressure on the imagination as a worldview was not based on external aspects, but rather on how it manifests in life.

Wölfflin follows Vasari's steps to find a method about style. His contribution is about three phases in the history cycle, namely: early, classic, and baroque. Here, he does not follow Vasari in proving the quality of art by pointing to the biological cycle, but borrowing it to assess the relativity of the above three phases. For Wölfflin, to give an assessment of the history of art is not merely in the linearity of the cycle, such as classics, renaissans and Baroq, but can be examined, through the style category of the artwork through different periods.

Wölfflin exemplified the building differences (SS Apostoli, Rome, 15th Century) and (S. Andrea della Valle, 17th Century) by showing the Baroque character at the same time distinguishing the early Renaissance and Renaissance styles. The two buildings of this distinct century represent the contrast between the line and the quality of *Painterly*. The buildings of the 15th century seemed simpler and the composition of the lines became clearer than in the 17th century, where so many individual lines of detail were inadequate to explain. Additionally, it appears that on the surface was given a fairly thick staining.

Subsequently, two paintings of the same title: *The Assumption of the Virgin*, by Titian and Rubens (16th and 17th centuries). Both of these works showed contrast. The 16th century painting closed and 17 shapes were openly. In the 16th century the form pointed back on themselves, on the contrary the 17th century, a pointing outward form of themselves. The gesture in these two paintings also clearly distinguished them as the Apostles' fossils with the drawing plane under the painting. At the Palazzo della Cancelleria, Rome 1486 (15th century) and Bemini, Palazzo Odescalchi, Rome, 1664 (17th century) the most striking difference here was the diversity and unity of form. The workings of the individual showed the independence of the work done, while others mixed whole. Here is a projection between the absolute (Da Vinci) and the Relative (Rembrandt). Absolute = more explicit and Relative = less explicit.

At Chartres Cathedral (mid-12th century) and St. Maclou (late 15th century), here Wölfflin read the monument by using a distinctive example of period or style (Gothic in France). Chartres Cathedral had characteristics being linear with characters in the early renaissance (classic). The composition of the field was very easy to identify. The

individual element looked also very young readable and the absolute sense so clear. St. Maclou (late 15th century) had a baroque character. The composition of the field interrelated and had an open shape. The composition was very medetail so it must be read thoroughly (relative sense).

Differentiating from before, the next character was Erwin Panofsky (1892-1968). He was an art historian, Hegelian, most prominent in the 20th century. Here, Fernie, focused more on Panofsky's review of humanism and art history. According to him, art historians were *Humanist*, because the artwork was the main material. In addition, the main purpose of art work created aesthetic significance. Like a humanist, art historians are able to reconstruct such significance at the base of intuition.

In the meantime, Panofsky then extended three strata of subject matter or meaning. It was Panofsky's bid to find three levels of understanding in art history. First, natural subject matter: This stratum was part of understanding the way and the pure form of an art work activity. For example: Last Supper, when we decay at the first stratum, this work is only understood by a group of people or there are 13 people in front of the dining table. This first level was the most fundamental of understanding something. At the first level, there was no cultural knowledge in it. Second, conventional subject matter (iconography): This stratum went a step further and brought to the equation of cultural and iconographic knowledge. For the westerner's view, he would understand that the 13-man painting at the banquet is a representation of the Last Supper. Third, intrinsic meaning or content (iconology): To understand the birth of a work depends on the knowledge of the person, technique and cultural history that surrounded his birth. For example, when we ask why Da Vinci painted Last Supper? What does it represent? This third part is a synthesis and becomes the whole question of an art historian. What's the point of it all?

For Panofsky, art history, as a branch of humanism, illustrated that his approach could find such art experts on the Moreli approach. Although different from the way art historians place the limits of contribution in identifying; Sources, authors, quality evaluations and diagnoses of historical concepts.

For Pernie, Panofsky's approach described as archetypal art historians. It was like reading old books or mythology, and religion. Thus, studying this humanistic approach required to explore antique traditions, including "multiplying ancient tombs." However, the method of investigation was not in all types as some do in the 20th century. The investigations that he intends to see similarities such as in antique and renaissance periods, Look out (similarity) as in Islamic and modern traditions.

What to know and do, said Panofsky (1) Have prior knowledge before conducting an investigation. To understand a document, we are required to understand other documents. (2) The workings of aesthetic recreation and investigative rationality require instinct and judgmental subjectivity as a basis. (3) Understanding the rational form of investigation and form of art theory. Both become the basis, essentially to conduct a rational investigation otherwise.

Furthermore, Fernie, referring to Arnold Hauser (1892-1978), who wrote *The Social History Art* whose effects were extraordinary, especially in the relationship between

art history and sociology. Hauser was a German historian and Marxist theorist. He maintained a unique connection between social history and art itself. Art, for him, always presents life in it, so art as part of culture became a part of something that protects society itself.

Hauser understood three boundaries to view when examining art, believe in: naturality in art, sociology does not explain the quality of work and sociology does not explain the relationship between artistic quality and popularity. Art history is closely related to individual work and social history in art, as well as its overall social relation. Hauser refers to it as the principle of individual action that produces both. This then gives a new capacity and situation found from them.

Hauser's history of art was a discipline that places social as its greatest content, also without alienating its artistic value as its major. Hauser criticized his predecessor who saw only one side of the art event. In the *Social History of Art*, says Fernie, he shows how the behavior of the bourgeoisie, liberal groups, and others can be seen from these artistic events. Using sociology in view of material and art history, Hauser focuses on "High Art" and avoids basic questions, for example, how the work was made. From the method offered by Hauser, we enable to compare the proximity or the difference between the writings of Winckelmann and Burckhardt.

In addition to Hauser, the next Marxist art historian is T.J. Clark (1974). Clark can be called one who pursues the idea of the artistic social history of Arnold Hauser in his social context and locus on works or art work. In a paper on the creation of art, Clark gives a historical view, art history, 20th century divided into three periods: the Era of Maturity, the Age of postwar generation, and the Era (future) of art and ideology.

What does Clark mean by the Golden Age Era? This era is shown in the development of Marxist Philosophers, George Lucas, 1920. According to Clark, the intellectuals of the time dare to ask important questions about how art is produced and accepted by the audience. Here, Clark also highly praises Panofsky's particular work of perception as a symbolic form, in which subjects can use clarify and explain the way how people think about everything, not just visual representations.

Post-War generation for Clark is how art historians no longer question is what previous generations have proposed and changed methods into formal analysis. They use 'Iconography' for example, not in order to understand the relationship between the artist and the context, but rather on something that is not systematic and thematic or desultory theme-chasing. They are no longer like Panofsky who are continuously to provoke the study in a perspective and lower it into the professional literature; They also ignore Hegel as the basis of the Golden Age Era. Clark's emphasis, precisely this time, they become servants, art as a market that is provider of ideas for the sake of the market.

The Future Era is an attempt to rebuild the order of high-quality art history, exploring the most useful in one period, primarily denial of Hegel. Clark proposes to replace the idea of creation in one of the artistic productions and build an important hierarchy among artist's resources, ie between the technical means, the drawing tradition, and the ideas that surround it.

According to Fernie, Clark made ideology as a research center. He wanted facts about the patronage, art and status of an artist, and the question of the relationship between art and artists. There, we will see how social classes are used in art work, and styles are seen as expressions of an ideology in visible form. Then it would be thoroughly explored and the relationship explaining the artistisk production relationship, and how to accept and understand by patrons and audiences. The results of this investigation will guide us how the ideology works.

Clark seemed strongly influenced by Lucas. He longed freely the alienation of man dominated by the means of production. Here he believed that art (literature) has a liberating role. He also strongly believes that the aesthetic structure is created from the ideological character and daily life of the community. Art, is an inseparable thing from society, not simply bringing back the consciousness and experience of life but forging that experience with each other. This is what allegedly can raise awareness of life and change human consciousness. If philosophy speaks rigidly, art (literature) presents experience with a straightforward, communicative and flexible language. Science shows facts and links, while art influences the soul and certainty. Under the stranglehold of capitalism, art loses its original meaning as an expression of freedom to give new meaning to reality. Art is stolen by money, art becomes a commodity product of capitalist negotiations with artists. Because the capitalist has no interest in art, but sees it as a commodity.

What is *the End of the History of Art*? That question arose in the essay of Hans Belting (1984), which Fernie selected, saw the sunglasses of the next art historian. As to previous artists, such as Giorgio Vasary and other artists, today artists are not in a position to participate in art formulating history. Today both artists and art historians choose their own path, even the way to combine art and also in the process of artsistic history apart from one another.

Belting said, *The End of the History of Art* is a new bridge connecting contemporary art and the history of contemporary art, and some of the concepts that Vasari has implanted. He stated art historians having lost their way in creating a more rational process of art history, called Vasari as a universal concept of art history itself. Vasari confessed about the autonomy of art, understood only by the artist, as well as the patron (primarily a chatter of style). This is what Belting has replaced, by new concepts, new questions, new tools, to see art in its social context.

New (contemporary) art today is a global art. The similiar way road is to a network connected to the rest of the world. Like the internet, the word global is defined as something that is used everywhere, although it does not imply, the message, the charge and the universal meaning. It makes it possible to be accessed by anyone and gives kesempatan to anyone to respond (events) the world. This is where the position of global art gives space to anyone to be able to be equivalent to various art perspectives in the world, as well as distinguish it from the world art as impressed by modernism-universalism as a high artistic view called Belting with the end of art history. The end of the world art that imposed the vacuum of universalism, and the particular of the sounds of third world art with all the richness of its visual vocabulary.

Contemporary art or global art allows everyone to present themselves and express their own entities through the production of works

The change in art history can be seen from the historical roots of modernism itself. For Belting, from here can be found two different traditions, both from the emergence of avant-garde art that rejects tradition as the history of pre-modern art and the period of modern art. From here the path is available to bring these two concepts of art history together in order to see the boundary between art and culture that gave a new concept.

According to Fernie, *"He (Belting) believes that contemporary artists are already mounting this new challenge, as they place themselves in an autonomous aesthetic context and immerse themselves in anthropological awareness of their culture in particular and all cultures in general, by using all visual and Linguistic media."* Belting reminded us, in the current era, art historians must provide full attention to the writing of art history, because its fast motion and uncertain. Therefore, the most likely thing done by art historians is the concentration on three problems in the creation of an artwork (image), first, what brings the truth, what distinguishes modernism and what has been achieved therein.

The position confirmed that Beltin was convinced of modernism as central, which he claimed to be the cause of separating art history of art itself. This will remove that splitted by bringing art historians into contemporary art as a support and view of contemporary art as historical.

Finally, it is Griselda Pollock (1988). Pollock was one of the most prominent writers and researchers of feminism and art history, while successfully searching and researching the relationship between the contexts of painting in the 19th and 20th centuries. The books he has composed including *Mary Cassat (1980)*, *Old Mistresses Women, Art and Ideology with Rozsika Parker (1981)*, and *Dealing with Degas: Representations of Women and the Politics of Vision, with Richard Kendal (1992)*. He was also a professor in the field of art and social history criticism at the University of Leeds. We will see Pollock's main idea of the relationship between feminism and art history. Pollock's main foundation, based on his view of the structured sexism that he had learned from the formation of such a political discipline, and operated through the class, the race, which continued to preserve the status quo. So even if there is a female artist in the arts (who can represent a feminist), she will not be seen as something extraordinary, because the criterion of greatness has been frozen by man.

For Pollcock, feminist art historians should be able to unveil the art history bias, and not necessarily be concerned with female artists, but as a thorough discipline. In particular, paradigm shifts, rejected and perceived the view that creativity existed in aesthetic reality and separated from the social context. Pollock bid (by borrowing Marx's terms) to replace the term artistic creation with artistic production, to model totality as a social force. By looking at art as a result of social relationships indicating Pollock's offering to view art as a social context as a whole.

Pollock pursuits on approaches with other research fields, including: social history and art, literary studies and film theory. For Pollock, images and texts are not mirrors of the world, but everything is coding with their conventions. The forms and conventions

then come and represent each subject. This is the work of the ideology of Pollock, defined in a form of meaning. These meanings are then used by power in relation to the formation of society - herein is the formation of culture. The culture that brings us to be part of the ideology and helps us understand our position in there.

Follock pointed out two things to read how the two things gave a role in the formation, consisting the role of art. First, see art as a class struggle, race, and gender. Second, how it was produced and how and for whom (this can be seen in some cases). In this study, Pollock, provided psychoanalysis and stdma sign systems. He questioned, "What has art history to do with the struggle for liberation of women? Pollock made great hope to the feminist role for the world, also able to attend and engage in political struggle. For Pollock, the feminist goal revolutionized the practical space and theories - and we needed them all.

Pollock's proffer, for example, in communicating the history of traditional art as an old model, written in a new model of cultural history. The feminist contribution in this regard was not intended as in the new art history merely aimed at improving the style of thought, but making it part of the women's movement in the changing world. That there was a commitment and optimism shown there, in support of the women's movement - by placing itself from outside of art history for inward intervention.

According to Fernie, there are two polemical statements from Pollock: First, he considered that the history of modernist art saw women to be great artists, because of lack of phallus. It did not accept the whole concept of modernism. Second, men dominated authorship, so the definition of beauty was presented from their perspective. This of course ignored the contribution of female artists in the late 20th century. Even removing women from *Canon of Great writers*.

In closing, following the Pollock statement at the end, this book is also very "male" so that we made curiously to discuss the anniversary that feels happening in our environment, both in the academic environment and in the arts environment (especially writing art history). Then, as an introduction, Fernie has been quite helpful in deciphering the history of ideas developed in art history. It is also helped that novice readers by providing an introductory understanding of each of the essays of his choice in this book. This is very interesting and of course important to read by art students (or who pursue art history). However, as a preliminary introduction, this is just enough to give a map of historical art thinking only. Furthermore, the reader's job is to map out and start an adventure to the next ideas.