

VIOLETTA KORSAKOVA  
Institut of Art History, Jagiellonian University in Cracow

---

## ON LVIV ART HISTORIANS AND A SCHOOL THAT NEVER WAS

*Being set on the idea  
Of getting to Atlantis,  
You have discovered of course  
Only the Ship of Fools is  
Making the voyage this year...*<sup>1</sup>

- W.H. Auden, *Atlantis*

Apart from the 150<sup>th</sup> jubilee of the Commission of Art History at the Academy of Sciences and Arts in Cracow - acknowledged by the conference where this paper was first presented - the year 2023 marked yet another anniversary: 130 years since the establishing of the first professorship of art history (1893) at Lviv University for Jan Bołoz Antoniewicz.<sup>2</sup> During its short history this academic chair educated several generations of Polish art historians, associated many prominent scholars and turned into a potent place for scientific research. Then it was extinguished along with the Jan Kazimir University and Polish Lviv altogether by the tragic currents of the Second World War. What interests me is its afterlife - at this point more lengthy than its actual presence - and the historiographical writings on the matter, out of which a concept of a scientifically coherent and distinctive 'Lviv school of art history' gradually emerged. Fully developed in the works of Adam Małkiewicz, the term characterizes Lviv academics' intellectual output by their interest in European and contemporary art, art theory, and interdisciplinary and formalist methodology, while emphasizing its modernity and receptivity in contrast to that of the first representa-

tives of the so-called 'Cracow school'. With a closer look at this retrospective re-calling, I would like to question its two key narratives: that of Lviv scholars' scientific consonance and their opposition to art history in Cracow.

\*

The simple fact that Cracow and Lviv universities held the two first - and for some time only - Polish chairs of art history, accounts for their initial juxtaposition in the earliest overviews of the discipline's history and institutionalization. That comparison, in turn, drew attention to an apparent contrast between the professors who ran them: Marian Sokołowski and Jan Bołoz Antoniewicz. Władysław Podlacha - aptly a student of both - compared them in an obituary to the latter.<sup>3</sup> Of the two Sokołowski was described as an academic who devoted himself to studying Polish art and in his evaluation of the artistic material never relied solely on the objects, but strove to present the most detailed historical findings on their subject. Bołoz, on the other hand, was renowned for his interest in the Italian Renaissance and contemporary art, an emotionally engaged approach to art works and an interdisciplinary take on art historical methodology. Since both had been set to educate future colleagues in accordance with their own views, those approaches were often treated as formative for their respective academic circles.

Such an assumption was made by Adam Bochnak in one of the first comprehensive overviews of Polish academic art history, *Zarys dziejów polskiej historii sztuki*,

---

<sup>1</sup> W.H. AUDEN, 'Atlantis', in *Selected Poems*, ed. E. MENDELSON, London 2009, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> W. WALANUS, 'Powstanie Komisji Historii Sztuki Akademii Umiejętności - karta z dziejów instytucjonalizacji dyscypliny', *Folia Historiae Artium*, s.n., 21, 2023, pp. 5-23

<sup>3</sup> WŁ. PODLACHA, *Jan Bołoz Antoniewicz 1858-1922*, Lwów 1923 [Osobne odbicie z I-go tomu Prac Sekcji Historii Sztuki i Kultury Towarzystwa Naukowego we Lwowie], pp. 1-21.

published in 1948.<sup>4</sup> There he identified two of its directions dominant at the turn of the 20<sup>th</sup> c. as the 'Bołoz programme' and the 'Sokołowski programme', with the former favouring European and world art, while the latter concentrated on objects located in Poland, and was said to have been chosen 'even by some of Bołoz's students'.<sup>5</sup> Other than that, Bochnak didn't note any particular differences between the two chairs and when he occasionally used the word 'school' it described merely an affiliation (as in 'Cracow school', 'Lviv school', 'Warsaw school') or a personal association (as in 'Batowski's school in Warsaw', denoting the department he ran<sup>6</sup>). The term was used in a similarly colloquial fashion a few years later by Juliusz Starzyński in his *Badania nad sztuką. Dorobek, stan i potrzeby* (1951), which was already a forthrightly socialist critique of Polish art history's erstwhile development.<sup>7</sup> For him, what was distinctive about the academics of the 'Lviv school' (and he mentioned only the oldest among them: Władysław Łoziński, Kazimierz Chłędowski and Bołoz) was not so much 'wider horizons', as compared to the school in Cracow, but rather 'an idealistic outlook, reactionary ideology and aristocratically-manorial slant'.<sup>8</sup> He sharply criticized Bochnak's study for its lack of such value judgements.<sup>9</sup> This direct reproof, along with the general cultural and political climate, discouraged attempts to publish similar surveys for some time.

The subject made a comeback in 1967 in an article written by Ksawery Piwocki and dedicated exclusively to the Lviv art historians' milieu (*Lwowskie środowisko historyków sztuki*).<sup>10</sup> Piwocki was a Lviv-educated scholar himself: he had attended Bołoz's lectures on contemporary art in the years 1921-1922 and later studied under Bołoz's pupil Władysław Podlacha.<sup>11</sup> With his article he sought to describe the 'Lviv milieu of Polish art historians' – fields of research and methodological paradigms, 'which clearly distinguished it from Cracow and Warsaw'.<sup>12</sup> It was Bołoz's take on the role of art history, which moved it further away from a factographical investigation and towards a 'philological' and 'psychological' examination of a work of art as a historically independent entity, that Piwocki saw as precursory for later research advances in Lviv.<sup>13</sup> Tracing

Bołoz's 'personal influence' on his pupils, he noted his interest in Renaissance and modern art being passed on to Władysław Kozicki, Karolina Lanckorońska and Helena Schorrówna in the case of European art heritage, to Zbigniew Hornung and Antonina Betterówna for the Polish early modern, and to Kozicki and Mieczysław Treter in contemporary art criticism.<sup>14</sup> Aside from this lineage Piwocki also pointed to an interest in medieval period among Lviv academics: Podlacha, Władysław Terlecki, Władysław Stoner, and Mieczysław Gębarowicz.<sup>15</sup> After Bołoz, Podlacha was a second centerpiece figure in Piwocki's recollection: in terms of methodology, he was the most prominent 'representative of the [...] views that developed in this milieu'.<sup>16</sup> However, as Ryszard Kasperowicz has pointed out, when comparing the methodological positions of the two professors, he emphasized the consistency of their perspectives, rather than their uniformity.<sup>17</sup> Piwocki's motives for writing the article remain unknown, although by the end of the 1960s Polish art history was entering a period of theoretical and methodological 'revival',<sup>18</sup> while in Wrocław a Memorial for the Lviv University Professors killed in World War II had finally been unveiled in 1964.<sup>19</sup> Piwocki's text was timely, but moreover personal, articulated in a register of subtle nostalgia – and eventually revived the interest in Lviv art historians.

It was no earlier than the 1990s, however, when the studies on historical identities of particular academic chairs and overall Polish art history peaked. Finally reviewed without censorship limitations, some topics could be properly assessed for the first time in decades. That was the case of the Polish scholars' forced deportation from Lviv and the interwar intellectual traditions of Polish art research, which had previously been written off as bourgeois. The 1995 seminar on the history of the discipline in Poland, organized by Poznań University, seems to be evidence of a general interest in the topic at the time.

There, in his paper on the first years of art history at Wrocław University, Mieczysław Zlat drew a direct lineage between the Lviv art history chair and the Wrocław post-war department.<sup>20</sup> Admittedly, many refugee scholars of the former Jan Kazimir University found positions

<sup>4</sup> A. BOCHNAK, *Zarys dziejów polskiej historii sztuki*, Kraków 1948 [=Historia Nauki Polskiej w Monografiach, 22].

<sup>5</sup> Ibidem, p. 62.

<sup>6</sup> Ibidem, pp. 31, 40, 52.

<sup>7</sup> J. STARZYŃSKI, *Badania nad sztuką. Dorobek, stan i potrzeby. Z powodu 1. Kongresu Nauki Polskiej*, Warszawa 1951.

<sup>8</sup> Ibidem, pp. 20-21.

<sup>9</sup> Ibidem, p. 51.

<sup>10</sup> K. PIWOCKI, 'Lwowskie środowisko historyków sztuki', *Folia Historiae Artium*, 4, 1967, pp. 117-125.

<sup>11</sup> R. KASPEROWICZ, 'Ksawery Piwocki (1901-1974)', *Rocznik Historii Sztuki*, 36, 2011, pp. 103-104.

<sup>12</sup> K. PIWOCKI, 'Lwowskie środowisko historyków sztuki', p. 117 (as in note 10).

<sup>13</sup> Ibidem, pp. 119-120.

<sup>14</sup> Ibidem, pp. 120-121.

<sup>15</sup> Ibidem, p. 121.

<sup>16</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>17</sup> R. KASPEROWICZ, *Ksawery Piwocki (1901-1974)*, p. 104 (as in note 11).

<sup>18</sup> M. BRYL, 'Czy samobójstwo teorii historii sztuki? O "Bildwissenschaft", bałkanizacji, polskim kontekście i suwerenności sztuki', *Rocznik Historii Sztuki*, 26, 2001, p. 7.

<sup>19</sup> Even though for the time being the government authorities preferred to interpret it as a memorial to the 'victims of Hitlerism' among all Polish academics. R. MIERZECKI, 'Budowa wrocławskiego pomnika w latach 1956-1964 ku czci polskich profesorów zamordowanych we Lwowie w 1941 roku', *Analecta. Studia i Materiały z Dziejów Nauki*, 16, 2017, 1-2 (31-32), pp. 341-352.

<sup>20</sup> M. ZLAT, 'Pierwsze lata historii sztuki na Uniwersytecie i Politechnice we Wrocławiu', in *Dzieje historii sztuki w Polsce. Kształtowanie*

at the newly staffed Polish university in the so-called 'Recovered Lands', with a couple of art historians among them. In 1946 Władysław Podlacha arrived to take over the recently established university unit, three years later joined by his pupil Zbigniew Hornung.<sup>21</sup> However in 1951 Podlacha died, the next year the chair was reduced to only two positions and by the time the art historical courses were finally reinstated in 1957, among the Lviv scholars only Hornung remained. Zlat emphasized, nevertheless, that in Wrocław the 'organizational shape, academic collective and the work atmosphere [...] were almost entirely brought from Lviv'<sup>22</sup> and 'the content of Podlacha's lectures was Lviv throughout.'<sup>23</sup> At its origin the Wrocław art history department was being identified as a 'spiritual successor' of the Lviv one.

Another speaker who decided to talk about Lviv art historians at the Poznań seminar was Adam Małkiewicz. At this event he was presenting alongside his mentor Lech Kalinowski, who had first sparked his interest in the history of art history in 1982, asking him to prepare Adam Bochnak's biography for an upcoming celebration of the 100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the establishment of the art history chair in Cracow.<sup>24</sup> The glove fit, and during his academic career Małkiewicz wrote overall more than twenty studies on Polish art history. Concentrating on the discipline's institutionalization in Galicia and Poland, for a while he was the only expert and thus an authority on the subject. Back in 1995 he presented his first paper on art history in Lviv.<sup>25</sup> It opens with the thesis that in the years 1893-1939 'the Lviv milieu of academic art history formed and maintained a specific attitude to the discipline and its scholarly practice, which distinguished it from other university centers in Poland, creating a clearly outlined, local scientific school.'<sup>26</sup> To buttress his argument Małkiewicz singled out prominent scholars from 'three generations of Lviv art historians' (a systematization resembling that of the 'older' and the 'younger' generations of the Vienna school) and stressed common points in their intellectual legacy. The first was Bołoz, driven to 'a particular ahistorical formalism' by his interdisciplinary methodological approach and concentrating on the Italian renaissance, modern and contemporary art. The second was Podlacha, with 'methodology inspired by the works of Dessoire, Utitz, Wundt, Dilthey and Twardowski', a teacher for most Lviv scholars

and later the founder of art history in Wrocław.<sup>27</sup> From the 'third generation' he chose Mieczysław Gębarowicz and Karolina Lanckorońska. Gębarowicz was interested in 'enriching' art historical investigation with historical methods, somewhat contrary to the previously described tradition of Lviv art history, as Małkiewicz had to admit.<sup>28</sup> Lanckorońska, although correctly categorized by Bochnak in 1948 as 'a Polish scholar educated abroad'<sup>29</sup> (in Vienna), for Małkiewicz was the one who during a 3-year-long tenure at Lviv University 'transplanted, onto ground prepared by Podlacha, the methodological attitude of the Vienna school of art history'.<sup>30</sup> The legacy of those scholars was continued 'especially in Wrocław' after the Second World War.<sup>31</sup> The article concludes with a list of features distinctive to the 'Lviv school of art history', which in this instance should be quoted *in extenso*:

1. deep interest in the methodology of the discipline (Bołoz Antoniewicz, Podlacha, Gębarowicz) [...];
2. constant contact with the European humanities [...] (Bołoz Antoniewicz, Podlacha, Lanckorońska) [...];
3. moving away from the archaeological treatment of art within a framework of cultural history, recognizing art's full autonomy and focusing on the form of the artwork, understood as a symptom of human thought and feeling, as a manifestation of a creative genius [...];
4. going beyond local themes and taking up issues of current relevance to European science [...] (Bołoz Antoniewicz, Kozicki, Lanckorońska [that point referred to research on the Italian Renaissance – V. K.]);
5. an interest in modern art, including contemporary art [...] (Bołoz Antoniewicz, Kozicki).<sup>32</sup>

The key conclusion of Małkiewicz's argument was that at the time in question Lviv art historians were the only ones who 'practiced art history in accordance to international scientific standards'.<sup>33</sup>

The extreme degree to which it simplified the whole picture is easily traced in an article by another participant of the Poznań seminar, Elżbieta Gieysztor-Miłobędzka (there she presented a paper on art history at Warsaw University). In the aftermath of the event, five years later,

się instytucji naukowych w XIX i XX wieku, ed. A.S. LABUDA, Poznań 1996 [=Prace Komisji Historii Sztuki, 25], pp. 224-236.

<sup>21</sup> Ibidem, pp. 226, 230.

<sup>22</sup> Ibidem, pp. 228-229.

<sup>23</sup> Ibidem, p. 231.

<sup>24</sup> A. MAŁKIEWICZ, 'Wstęp', in idem, *Z dziejów polskiej historii sztuki. Studia i szkice*, Kraków 2005 [=Ars Vetus et Nova, 18], p. 9.

<sup>25</sup> A. MAŁKIEWICZ, 'Historia sztuki na uniwersytecie Lwowskim 1893-1939', in *Dzieje historii sztuki w Polsce*, pp. 58-73 (as in note 20).

<sup>26</sup> Ibidem, p. 58.

<sup>27</sup> It is likely that his relation to Wrocław art history was emphasized in the published paper after Małkiewicz learned more about it from Zlat's presentation at the seminar, as we know from the footnotes to this text that the two scholars exchanged some remarks on Lviv scholars. See: A. MAŁKIEWICZ, *Historia sztuki na uniwersytecie Lwowskim*, p. 69, fn. 33 (as in note 25).

<sup>28</sup> Ibidem, p. 68.

<sup>29</sup> A. BOCHNAK, *Zarys dziejów polskiej historii sztuki*, p. 38 (as in note 4).

<sup>30</sup> A. MAŁKIEWICZ, 'Historia sztuki na uniwersytecie Lwowskim', p. 68 (as in note 25).

<sup>31</sup> Ibidem, pp. 70-72.

<sup>32</sup> Ibidem, pp. 69-70.

<sup>33</sup> Ibidem, p. 70.

she published an article with the telling title *Polish art history – its conservatism and the attempts to overcome it*.<sup>34</sup> Dividing the text into smaller thematic sections, she titled the one dedicated to the 'Lviv school of art history' no less explicitly: *Breaking out of the positivist-nationalist 'jams', 'europeanness' – or the Lviv milieu*.<sup>35</sup> Bołoz, Podlacha and the Lviv school as a whole were declared to be anticipating the New Art History and a «postmodern and anthropological post-postmodern paradigm» *avant la lettre*.<sup>36</sup> For Miłobędzka-Gieysztor the 'Lviv school' was 'an explosion of cutting-edge art history' – unlike Cracow or Warsaw – with a post-war 'Wrocław continuation'.<sup>37</sup>

In the year 2005 some of the studies on the history of Polish art history produced by Małkiewicz were reissued in a special thematic publication.<sup>38</sup> Older texts were revised and partly rewritten, and footnotes updated.<sup>39</sup> It is in this volume, that the author's concept of Lviv art history got its final touch in the chapter entitled 'Cracow school' and 'Lviv school' of Polish art history.<sup>40</sup> Both terms soon lose the prudish title quotes, as Małkiewicz proceeds with 'extraction of the tendencies prevalent [in each] milieu'.<sup>41</sup> He finds those tendencies already in Sokołowski and Bołoz and traces them onwards, since 'the institutionalization of scientific life stimulated a transmission, by the founders of these two environments, of their own attitudes to colleagues, students and continuators and thus stimulated the crystallization and consolidation of environmental distinctiveness'.<sup>42</sup> The differences between the two academic milieux, according to Małkiewicz, 'showed themselves from the first programme publications of Bołoz'.<sup>43</sup> Describing the 'Lviv school' he repeats his earlier findings. It is its juxtaposition with the 'Cracow school' that is the essence of the argument this time. The latter is characterized as practicing 'traditional', 'patriotic' and 'pragmatic' art history, while the former is portrayed as open to external influences and, rather vaguely, to an 'abstract improvement of the theoretical research apparatus'.<sup>44</sup> A lack of quality that is found characteristic of one 'school' becomes in itself a characteristic quality of the other, in a comparison drawn out though subsequent pages and which includes such criteria as understanding

of art history as a discipline, interest in contemporary art and methodology, and ways and platforms of art historical practice.<sup>45</sup> In conclusion this opposition turns into complementarity: 'both these schools complemented each other, representing two main components of Polish art history before 1939'.<sup>46</sup>

It is hard to agree with Małkiewicz's take on the Lviv scholars. Limiting their intellectual biographies to better fit his description simplifies them considerably, allowing Małkiewicz to present them merely as a repetition of Bołoz's original scholarly predilections. In any case, understood *sensu stricto* these predilections can refer only to Bołoz himself, while *sensu largo* they cannot be denied for the majority of Polish interwar art historians. There is no doubt about the great influence of Bołoz's personal views or Podlacha's pioneering teaching work on their immediate disciples. These two scholars, however, did not determine the uniformity of attitudes and interests of the Lviv scholars, most of whom had been educated at more than one university and had been in contact with various eminent art historians of their epoch. Conclusions like these seem inevitable when analyzing the views of the those scholars individually. As Mariusz Bryl concluded, referring to Piwocki's dissertation on the 'Lviv milieu' in an article on Bołoz:

The author [Piwocki] was absolutely right when he emphasised the formative influence of Bołoz on a whole pleiad of outstanding research individuals: Władysław Kozicki, Zygmunt Batowski, Mieczysław Gębarowicz, Mieczysław Treter, Tadeusz Mańkowski, Helena Schorrówna, Władysław Żyła, Władysław Podlacha. [...] Formative, however, does not mean strictly defined. On the contrary, Bołoz as a scholar-creator was a fullness (even before he became an 'art historian'), and it was from this fullness – by way of a natural differentiation, so to speak – that particular research individualities emerged, sometimes continuing Bołoz's interests (Italian and Polish Renaissance, 18<sup>th</sup>- and 19<sup>th</sup>-c. art, contemporary art, Armenian art) and his attitude to art and sometimes, on the contrary, choosing other areas and research approaches.<sup>47</sup>

As to the very use of the term 'scientific school', within the philosophy of science it is conditioned by criteria never met by the Lviv scholars, such as 'an awareness [among the members of a given school] of unity and a feeling of separateness from other orientations in a given discipline' or 'a common ideological core, constituting the essence of theoretical assumptions', or 'common methodological approaches'.<sup>48</sup> Another option for identifying an informal

<sup>34</sup> E. GIEYSZTOR-MIŁOBĘDZKA, 'Polska historia sztuki — jej konserwatyzm i próby jego przewyciężenia', *Problemy współczesnych nauk o kulturze*, 26, 2000, no. 4, pp. 58–76.

<sup>35</sup> Ibidem, p. 65.

<sup>36</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>37</sup> Ibidem, p. 68.

<sup>38</sup> A. MAŁKIEWICZ, *Z dziejów polskiej historii sztuki* (as in note 24).

<sup>39</sup> Idem, 'Wstęp', pp. 10–12 (as in note 24).

<sup>40</sup> Idem, "'Szkoła krakowska" i "szkoła lwowska" polskiej historii sztuki', in idem, *Z dziejów polskiej historii sztuki*, pp. 10–12 (as in note 24).

<sup>41</sup> Ibidem, p. 57.

<sup>42</sup> Ibidem, p. 57.

<sup>43</sup> Ibidem, p. 64.

<sup>44</sup> Ibidem.

<sup>45</sup> Ibidem, pp. 58–62.

<sup>46</sup> Ibidem, p. 64.

<sup>47</sup> M. BRYL, 'Jan Bołoz Antoniewicz (1858–1922)', *Rocznik Historii Sztuki*, 36, 2011, p. 17.

<sup>48</sup> Z. MUSZYŃSKI, 'Siedem cech głównych szkoły naukowej', *Filozofia Nauki*, 3, 1995, no. 1–2 (9–10), pp. 65–67.



group of academics as a scientific school, as Zbysław Muszyński proposes, is to invoke a prototype designate of the term.<sup>49</sup> For Małkiewicz the Vienna school of art history could have served as an intuitive example for such a comparison, but instead its very concept seems to have served him as an inspiration. Retrospectively it is easier, perhaps, to perceive as integral small chairs and departments, whose history usually extended for no more than two or three generations of scholars. Adam Redzik, a leading historian of Jan Kazimir University, identified in Polish academic historiography a long list of scientific schools affiliated to it. With the two most prominent of these being the Lviv mathematical school and the Lviv-Warsaw school of philosophy, one can also find mention of Lviv schools of anthropology, ethnology, history, geography, organic chemistry, zoology, one of geophysics and meteorology, surgery, internal diseases and pathology, ophthalmology, pharmacology, economic history, history of ecclesiastical, criminal, private, political, administrative and international law, economics and history of education.<sup>50</sup>

\*

However, if the concept of the 'Lviv school' proves one thing, it is that for some reason, at some point the Lviv art historians were chosen to be recalled in this way.

One of the many things history does, according to Franklin R. Ankersmit, is make myths. As he argues, a traumatic experience, when it pertains to only a part of the collective identity, can be both forgotten and remembered: 'forgotten in the sense that it is successfully expelled from conscious memory; remembered in the sense that the subject of a traumatic experience will be seriously handicapped by it'.<sup>51</sup> In this instance 'telling the right story' about the past may lead to 'a reconciliation between the traumatic experience and identity'.<sup>52</sup>

Not only the chair of art history, but the whole university and Polish Lviv itself were lost in the Second World War, Soviet occupation and post-Yalta reality and that loss could hardly be fully mourned in a socialist Poland. A 2002 conference entitled *Cracow and Lviv in European civilization*,<sup>53</sup> though demonstrating interest in the topic, drew a somber conclusion: 'such Lviv, dear Ladies and Gentlemen, no longer exists and will never exist again'.<sup>54</sup>

<sup>49</sup> Ibidem, p. 67.

<sup>50</sup> *Uniwersytet Jana Kazimierza we Lwowie*, ed. A. REDZIK, Kraków 2015, p. 28.

<sup>51</sup> F. R. ANKERSMIT, 'The Sublime Dissociation of the Past: or How to Be(come) What One is No Longer', *History and Theory*, 40, 2001, no. 3, p. 300.

<sup>52</sup> Ibidem, p. 305.

<sup>53</sup> *Kraków i Lwów w cywilizacji europejskiej. Materiały międzynarodowej konferencji zorganizowanej w dniach 15-16 listopada 2002*, ed. J. PURCHLA, Kraków 2005.

<sup>54</sup> L. UNGER, 'Kraków i Lwów w Europie jutra' [panel discussion], in ibidem, p. 20.

Who then reclaimed the Lviv art historical tradition as part of their identity? Scholars like Mieczysław Zlat and Jan Wrabec were not unwarranted to consider themselves its heirs, with both having studied under Lviv professors – Podlacha and Hornung respectively. For them Wrocław art history was a continuation of that taught in Lviv and both Małkiewicz and Miłobędzka-Gieysztor supported this optimistic notion of the 'Lviv school's' fate. Nevertheless, it does not seem to be the historical legacy that modern-day Wrocław scholars cultivate, which once again poses the question of whether there was anything other than a personal inspirational example, that these Lviv professors had passed on. No programme or set of methodological guidelines is to be found in Wrabec's recollection of Hornung, where he writes that 'Lviv about him' was the legacy of the 'Austrian monarchy court culture', manifested in professor's 'courtesy [...] to university administration, cleaning-ladies, assistants and students'.<sup>55</sup> Zlat's recollections of Podlacha paint a similarly vague picture.<sup>56</sup>

Instead the Lviv scholars' newly-created identity – 'Lviv school of art history' – was appropriated by a Cracow-centered narrative, justifying its research as traditionalistic, concrete and meticulous by choice, not limitation. The legacy of the Lviv scholars proved methodological modernity to be an innate feature of the Polish art history: 'for creating the mental roots of current Polish art history, the Lviv milieu should be awarded the highest laurel'<sup>57</sup> stated Miłobędzka-Gieysztor – and Małkiewicz agreed.<sup>58</sup>

In the end the whole concept seems more telling of the desires and fears of the art history of Małkiewicz's times, than those of Sokołowski and Bołoz. Howbeit, its instrumentality left no one to subsequently advocate against the term (unlike the 'Cracow school', challenged recently by

---

Even for the contemporary historians the city became an unwelcoming 'place of nationalized memories', whose overall Polishness was now being questioned by the Ukrainian or Jewish narratives. J. PURCHLA, 'Lwów: przestrzeń znacjonalizowanych pamięci', in *Lwów nowoczesny = Lviv and modernity* [katalog wystawy], ed. Ł. GAŁUSEK, J. PURCHLA, Kraków 2017, p. 6-13.

<sup>55</sup> J. WRABEC, 'Profesor Zbigniew Hornung – lwowski historyk sztuki we Wrocławiu', *Sobótka*, 3-4, 1997, p. 258.

<sup>56</sup> M. ZLAT, 'Wspomnienia pośmiertne. Władysław Podlacha', *Biuletyn Historii Sztuki*, 24, 1962, no. 1, p. 418-419; idem, 'O twórczości i poglądach Władysława Podlacha (1875-1951)', in *Mysł o sztuce. Materiały Sesji zorganizowanej z okazji czterdziestolecia istnienia Stowarzyszenia Historyków Sztuki Warszawa*, listopad 1974, Warszawa 1976, p. 295-311; idem, 'Pierwsze lata historii na Uniwersytecie i Politechnice we Wrocławiu' (as in note 20), p. 227-230; idem, 'Władysław Podlacha (1875-1951)', *Rocznik Historii Sztuki*, 36, 2012, p. 21-38.

<sup>57</sup> E. GIEYSZTOR-MIŁOBĘDZKA, 'Polska historia sztuki — jej konserwatyzm', p. 65 (as in note 34).

<sup>58</sup> A. MAŁKIEWICZ, "'Szkola krakowska' i "szkola lwowska'", p. 57, fn. 93 (as in note 40).

Magdalena Kunińska<sup>59</sup>), celebrate the 130th jubilee or advance research on particular Lviv scholars. For all its conjugating of *Lviv* through every possible clause, the concept of 'Lviv school of art history' left us with very little knowledge about particular persons and achievements of this milieu, forsaking Podlacha's first Polish handbook on art historical methodology, Lanckorońska's Lviv lectures or Gębarowicz's post-war theoretical reflections, to name only the most obvious gaps. Fortunately, that leaves us with a lot to discover.

## SUMMARY

Violetta Korsakova  
ON LVIV ART HISTORIANS AND A SCHOOL  
THAT NEVER WAS

The article deals with the concept of Lviv school of art history, used with regard to Polish art historians working at Lviv University from 1893 till 1939. Tracing the historical development of the term, fully formed in the works of Adam Małkiewicz, I identify and subsequently question two of its key narratives: that of the Lviv scholars' scientific consonance and their opposition to contemporary art historical practices in Cracow. This critical revision brings attention to the meaning of the 'Lviv school' concept for the historical identity of the discipline as well as for the modern-day Polish art history.

<sup>59</sup> M. KUNIŃSKA, 'Identity Built on Myth. Fact and fiction in the foundational narrative of the "Cracow School of Art History" and its relations to Vienna', *Journal of Art Historiography*, 25, 2021, p. 1-20.