In an age when schools all too often look like prisons, and suburban houses aspire to the monumentalality of palaces, such advice seems all the more timely.

Notes
1. Adolf Loos, In Leer geprügelt, 1897–1900 (Paris and Zurich: Editions Georges Cres e Cie, 1921). The second edition of the book, published the same year, contains two additional essays, "Der stadt und die kunst" (The State and Art) and "Oskar Kokoschka." The former is a shortened version of the foreword to Loos's essay in Ein Kaiser für ein Kammerspiele, published in Vienna by Richard Lanyi in 1919. The essay on Kokoschka, which Loos wrote about an exhibition of his work at the Kunstnalle in Mannheim, was not published until January 2011, when the first edition was already in press.
4. Brentner Verlag was owned and operated by Loos's friend, Ludwig von Fieker, who was also editor of Der Bronzer, among the leading progressive literary magazines of the time.
5. For a contemporary assessment of Loos's stature see, for example, Philip Lehmann, "Architektur von Menschen her," Frankfurter Zeitung, 8 February 1931, 17.
13. Loos, Ornament und Verbrechen, Frankfurter Zeitung, 24 October 1929. The essay was subsequently reprinted in the Prager Tagblatt in November of the same year.
15. Luna Loos, Das Buch ohne Titel (Rudolfs Geschichten, eds. Adolf Opel and Herbert Schimak (Frankfurt and Berlin: Ullstein, 1986), 81.

Reviewed by Alina Payne

Pioneers of the Modern Movement from William Morris to Walter Gropius
by Nikolaus Pe Slovenia

London: Faber and Faber, 1936.

1942: A historian's position in times of acute crisis is enviable. He is apt to be thought donnish, escapist, a straggler from the ranks of progress. Dr. Giedion gives me the impression of being acutely conscious of this and of having felt obliged to write his history with one hand and beat the philosophic drum with the other. The drum, I confess, bores me. But Dr. Giedion's history is the real thing.

—John Summerson, review of Space, Time and Architecture

1958: The disappearance of the idea that Modern architecture is going to redeem the world is what most strikingly differentiates Hitchcock's book from earlier treatments of the same period. Obviously Modern architecture is not going to redeem the world. But how important this proposition was.

—Colin Rowe, review of H. R. Hitchcock's Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Century

1977: Pe Slovenia's outlook is historicist in precisely the Popperian sense. It is holistic and preoccupied with the future. He believes that art is and should be a product of the economic, social, and political conditions under which it is created; he believes that there is such a thing as the essence of an age, and that the common essence is more important than its individual manifestations; he has accordingly discerned the political and social norms of the twentieth century, and insists that art and architecture must be subordinated to them. Consequently he can and does insist that he knows what will and must be the architectural expression of the age.

—David Watkin, Morality and Architecture

1987: He [Pe Slovenia] was certainly fortunate to be set on a course by Gropius almost before he knew that such a thing as a "Modern Movement" might exist; he certainly was influential in shaping the ideas of two if not three generations of architects, historians and critics, so that all were inclined to make his prophecies come true. At least one of the reasons he was so influential was that his historical generalization looked true at the time, and in many cases still look good. The relative blackness of pots and kettles is not at issue here; Pe Slovenia's performance is. He got it right. He got it more right than Giedion or Henry-Russell Hitchcock. It behooves any of us to recognize that he produced a picture of the architecture of his own time which was useful, applicable, and has had demonstrable predictive power. If it was Whiggish historicism, or the kind of moralizing that comes naturally to a self-made Lutheran, that made it possible to do that, then so much the worse for Butterfield and Poper.

—Reynner Banham, review of Morality and Architecture

2002: Morality and Architecture was thus an attempt to explain why it is unnecessary to accept the vacuous philosophy which lies behind modernism. Taking on the establishment, the book caused a considerable stir at the time, receiving passionate praise and passionate criticism. Why bring it out again twenty-four years later? The reason is simply that, though the general public is as hostile now as it was then to the damaging effects of modernist architecture in historic settings, the professional architectural establishment is still dominated by the same beliefs. Then as now, the practice of traditional and classical architecture is taught in no British school of architecture.


ARCHITECTURE AND OBJECTS:
THE POWER OF PE SLOVENIA

Théophile Gautier is said to have died of a broken heart over the destruction of Paris perpetrated by Baron Haussmann. Although not associated with loss of life, the roughly contemporary Battle of Styles in England was equally heated and personality-driven. In its turn, the polemical surrounding modernist architecture and its advocates reached no less of an emotional and intellectual pitch both between the wars and since. Each century has its architectural saucy side.

Yet, as controversies go, the one focused on modernism has lasted longer than anyone could have predicted. If the first critiques of modernism can be traced back to the 1950s (in England and Italy), and if its tenets and vocabulary seemed to receive death blow after death blow in the '60s, '70s and '80s, in the past fifteen years it has once again drawn the attention of both scholars and practicing architects. At the remove of more than a generation, modernist architecture still poses important questions.

Nevertheless, despite and perhaps because of this renewed interest, it continues to be perceived as problematic. Recent studies of the early accounts of modernism are a case in point. Treated with suspicion in the past decades, these accounts, like the architects they present, have become once more the objects of reassessment and debate. On the face of it, these histories of the birth, rise, and victory of the "modern movement" differ little in their broad strokes. All follow a trajectory that leads from the Industrial Revolution, through the American skyscraper, the British turn to the Arts and Crafts, the cleansing if ultimately stillborn intermezzo of Art Nouveau, the development of new technologies and materials, the creation of the Werkbund and demise of Expressionism, to the mature work of Gropius, Mies, and Le Corbusier. Depending on the author, the straight line rising to this climax may include additional names and movements (such as the Dutch, the Futurists, or the Russians), but the similarities in the stories they tell are striking.

This historiographic template—based on premises as fundamental an ordering principle—is a familiar one. In their own way these narratives perpetuate a tradition first castigated by Giorgio Vasari, the begetter of art history, who in his
slow awakening, the first glimmers, the early successes, and the race to the finish of the Renaissance. Yet unlike his modern colleagues, Vasari did wonder about the future and felt some qualms. Where the epigoni would go or what there was left for them to do once the collectively sought aesthetic norm was attained, he did not know; nor did he know (although he feared) if art, as he knew it, would come to an end and be reborn once again, but differently, in the cyclical way of all living things.

For all his biases and natural failings, Vasari remains a useful, indeed a unique source for scholars working on the Renaissance today. Yet, unlike him, in this respect, the early apologists of modernism—the heroic trinity of Pevsner, Sigfried Giedion, and Henry-Russell Hitchcock that strangely paralleled the trinity of Mies, Gropius, and Le Corbusier—have not all met with the same fate in the revisionist literature. Of the three, Hitchcock has had the easiest time of it. Publishing his magnum opus Architecture: Nineteenth and Twentieth Century in the late 1950s, he had far fewer barricades to scale than his two colleagues in arms. Less polemical and proselytizing, he has also been more readily accepted as a historians’ historian. But this is not to diminish the seminal importance of his 1929 Modern Architecture: Romanticism and Reintegration. Yet this work was (rightly or wrongly) eclipsed by Pevsner’s Pioneers of the Modern Movement (1936), Giedion’s Space, Time and Architecture (1941), and by Hitchcock’s own revised, much enlarged, and toned-down version of 1958. Likewise his 1932 MoMA International Style exhibition catalogue, co-authored with Philip Johnson and Alfred Barr, although influential to be sure, did not enjoy the critical fortune and the same phenomenal classroom exposure and readership over the years. As result Hitchcock did not become a bone of contention in the redefinition of modernism, and it was Pevsner and Giedion who bore the brunt of the postwar critique.

Of the two, Pevsner has kept the polemical fires burning the longest. His Pioneers, published in 1936, with new editions in 1949 and 1968, was reviewed, attacked, and defended at all these critical moments in the reception of modern architecture. So was Giedion’s Space, Time and Architecture (revised even more often and printed until 1980). Yet while the revaluation of Giedion at the hands of Spiro Kostof, Sokratis Georgiadis, and others in the past fifteen years has recovered the intellectual dimension of his achievement, Pevsner continues to be called to task and presented as an adversary. In his Morality and Architecture, reedited in 2001, David Watkin points to Pioneers as to some form of original sin when he attacks the resistance to classicism in contemporary British architecture. If indeed Pevsner has sinned, if he has “led, guided, deluded and deceived us,” as Timothy Mowl also argues, is there anything to be gained from reading Pevsner today? And if, as this present polemical testifies, his book functions like a perpetually smoldering, never quite extinct volcano on the verge of eruption, why does it? What was and what is the power of Pevsner?

Much has been imputed to Pevsner for his all-too-persuasive presentation of a reciprocal relationship between period style and Zeitgeist. Indeed, style is Pevsner’s starting point—incidentally, it is Hitchcock’s and Giedion’s too—and his endorsement of a spirit of the age is made clear from the very first lines of the book, which opens with an account of the then distant Battle of Styles. Elliptically ushering in Pevsner’s own complete with its fallacies and shortcomings, it also led him to identify aspects of modernism that would have passed otherwise unnoticed.

Unlike Hitchcock and Giedion, who address some of the arts, it is Pevsner who, methodologically, embarks on the most systematic art historical analysis of modern style. Each of his chapters is more or less neatly devoted to a different class of objects: the decorative arts (chapter 2 and most of 4 and 6); painting (chapter 3); engineering and new materials-based edifices (chapter 5); and architecture (chapter 7). All together they display (or must display in order to be perceived by Pevsner as progressive) the common features that give visible form to the

Pevsner has kept the polemical fires burning the longest. His Pioneers, published in 1936, with new editions in 1949 and 1968, was reviewed, attacked, and defended at all these critical moments in the reception of modern architecture.

Why are Renaissance ink-stands with a naked figure of Justice, why are eighteenth-century plates with Chinese temples satisfactory? Not because there are any laws demanding or forbidding a certain amount or a certain type of decoration, but because every period creates its own style according to intrinsic laws of vitality. I had to emphasize more than once that most modern architecture feels at ease as soon as they are asked to create for decoration, for adornment only (artistic metalwork, elaborate chandeliers, jewellery). Now we can give a reason for that, though one which I’m afraid will not satisfy everybody. It is the Zeitgeist of our age, the age of steel, of speed, of work, or whatever one may call it, that does not allow for much play and carefree enjoyment. One may regret living in such an age, but one cannot alter it, certainly not by imitating the outward forms of other periods.

Indeed, this premise and the role of the industrial arts in the development of a modern style are the real starting points of Pioneers. And this is precisely where Pevsner also begins to part company from his colleagues and to reveal the unique value of his text. If style led him to endorse a determinist conception of history (whether Hegelian or Göttergeschichte in origin)
Zeitgeist of modernity. How things look—
defining their formal qualities in a powerful
vocabulary that applies equally to all media—is
essential to Pevsner’s argument and allows him
to move swiftly across the arts. This visual
approach also allows the reader easy access to
the argument: pictures and words are integrated
into a persuasive narrative.

Although Pevsner gives all aspects of artistic
production equal space in tracing the birth of
a modern architectural style, it is his emphasis
on the decorative arts that sets his use of style
apart. Even the book’s title conveys this
approach. As it shifts from Pioneers of the Modern
Movement (1936) to Pioneers of Modern Design in
the 1949 MoMA edition, and despite the reference
to Walter Gropius, it is a statement of dif-
established by the Werkbund. The ultimate
synthesis, however, comes in the work of
Gropius—and this is true not only of his build-

ings but also (and especially) of his Bauhaus cur-
rriculum, which embodied the unity of the arts
and confirmed the presence of a Zeitgeist.

For more than a decade (the Bauhaus was a para-
mount center of creative energy in Europe), it
was at the same time a laboratory for handicraft
and for standardization, a school and a work-
shop.

Urbanism (a principal issue for Giedion
and not addressed by Hitchcock at all in 1929)
is hardly mentioned by Pevsner, who is con-
cerned with the formal qualities of single build-
ings and single objects, not with their
metropolitan agglomeration.11 If the mod-
ernists’ battle cry “vom Sockafissen zum Stadte-

ference (from the points of view of Giedion,
Hitchcock, Gustav Adolf Platz, and others) sug-
gest an exploration of more arts than one.
The so-called Kunststilde (Muhr’s reformers) lie
at the beginning of Pevsner’s narrative and
become the red thread weaving through the rest
of the book. After the wake-up call to the low
quality of the decorative arts provided by the
1851 Exhibition and the much needed ensuing
reforms in arts education, he argues, the in-
dustrial objects (the “small things of everyday use”) in
England in the period 1890-1914 displayed
clearness, gracefulness, refreshing simplicity,
lightness, plain surfaces. The close atmos-
phere of medievalism has vanished. Living
among such objects, we breathe a healthier
air. Of particular importance for the coming
Modern Movement was the expression of this
new spirit in cabinet-making.12 This achieve-
ment literally reifies a shift until then only
perceivable in painting: “[O]ne recognizes the
tendency towards large, unbroken surfaces,
strong colors, bold patterns—a parallel to
Cézanne or Gauguin in painting.” Indeed,
Cézanne shows that “the abstract scheme of
construction... is the real subject of the pic-
ture; constructing his pictures with cylinder,
sphere and cone.”13 For Pevsner, “the leaders
of European painting in 1890 fought for some-
thing that had never existed before. On the
whole the new style was free from tradition,
unencumbered and uncompromising... The
break was achieved by the painters earlier than
by the architects.”14

Thereafter the narrative unfolds along now
familiar lines, powerful because simple. Pevs-
nier’s leading heroes, Henry van de Velde, Otto
Wagner, Adolf Loos, and the Frank Lloyd
Wright of Art and Craft of the Machine (1901)
were decisively dissuaded in their thoughts by
England.15 But their achievements were isolat-
ed. “To have achieved a wide movement pro-
moting these new ideas is undeniable the merit
of German architects and writers.” Sachlichkeit
(objectivity, simplicity), standardization, and
machine art are the distinguishing features of the
“universally recognized style” subsequently
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Unlike Hitchcock and Giedion, who address some of the arts, It is
Pevsner who, methodologically, embarks on the most systematic art
historical analysis of modern style.
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objects of daily consumption.15 To be sure,
Herbert Read’s 1934 Art in Industry, promotes a
similar aesthetic to Pevsner’s—pro Bauhaus and
Gropius, pro abstraction and modernism—and is
moreover an acknowledged source for Pio-

ners in its attention to the decorative arts. Yet
his voice rang a familiar note to an art historian
of Pevsner’s background: Read’s own source
also seems to lie in the Riegel tradition, in this
case through the agency of German art histori-
an Wilhelm Worringor (Riegel’s most famous
follower) whose Form in Gothic is one of the
few very works that he cites.16 Yet even despite
this similarity, Read’s book remains an investi-
gation onto the decorative arts in the 19th-cen-
tury British tradition initiated by such works as
Richard Redgrave’s or Henry Cole’s (whose
joint brainchild was the 1851 Great Exhibi-
tion). Unlike Riegel and Pevsner, Read does not
claim to see a causal relationship between the
arts, and he posits no link between Kunstindus-
trie and architecture.

Instead, an even more important source for
Pevsner was Riegel’s own predecessor, Gottfried
Semper. Writing his major opus Der Stil
(1860-1863) as both architect and art historian,
he had set out the lines of inquiry upon which
much of Riegel’s work was to evolve, particularly
the strong case for Kunstindustrie as the DNA of
your culture. Despite its impact this work
remained on the periphery of art history as
Kunstgewerbe (for not being sufficiently his-
torical) and had long since been removed from
the canon upon which Pevsner’s education had
been based. Yet, for Pevsner, he offered one
fundamental insight: the mass-produced object
of daily use is the point of contact between art
and society. And, in a revolutionary move for
the time, Semper claimed that the quality of the
“high” and “monumental” arts depends on
the health of that relationship. It is thus
Semper’s admiration and education-based solution
to his own mid-19th-century crisis: he devel-
oped both an education curriculum and a phil-
osophy of museum display that was seminal in
Britain and Austria that Pevsner literally
lifts without acknowledgment for Pioneers
(there is only one fleeting reference to Semper’s
seminal essay, “Industry, Science, and Art” of
1852 in the 1968 edition) and for An Enquiry
into Industrial Art in England (1917).

Having appropriated a particular notion of
style from the Semper-cum-Riegel tradition,
Pevsner identified the period texts that
addressed the industrial arts and developed his
argument against this documentary back-
ground. Thus he drew heavily on the writings of
Herman Muthesius (by contrast Hitchcock
has only two passing mentions of Die englische
Haus) and van de Velde (particularly Die Renai-
sance im moderne Kunstgewerbe of 1903). That
these texts also allowed him to anoint his new
fatherland with a leadership role in begetting a
new modern vocabulary was not an insignifi-
cant detail. Of course he simplifies matters and obscures
some of his sources. For example, in
his Moderne Baukunst of 1908, Karl Scheffler
had argued that objects and interior design lay
at the origin of the modern architectural
vocabulary and had elevated Morris and van de Velde
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ulary and had elevated Morris and van de Velde as exemplary agents. 21 It is hard to believe that, with his education and interests, Pevsner had not read this book. Yet, intriguing though such lapses may be for today’s reader, the persuasive power of his book lies precisely in its ability to tell a powerful story with a few well-delinated characters who carry a linear plot swiftly to its climax.

Perhaps even more disturbingly for some of his readers and unlike Hitchcock and Giedion, Pevsner also had a strong leftist social message to deliver. Although Morris is again the paradigmatic figure who identified the “one essential problem, the indissoluble unity of the art of one age and its social system,” it is in Germany that a socially conscious architecture was ultimately conceived. Despite his passion for his adoptive country, Pevsner did not pull his punches, and he berates the English for resisting the social agenda of modernism: “One reason was [that] the levelling tendency of the coming mass-movement—and a true architectural style is a mass-movement—was too much against the grain of English character. A similar antipathy prevented the ruthless scrapping of traditions which was essential to the achievement of a style fitting our century.” 22

This concern to preserve the social taproot of modernism is even more evident in Pevsner’s lesser-known contemporary, and I would argue, companion volume, the 1937 An Enquiry into Industrial Art in England. Again his source was Semper, whose own work was deeply informed by that other revolutionary moment, 1848. Unlike Herbert Read, whose interest in the decorative arts never led him to posit a social role for the arts, Pevsner almost quotes from Semper when he develops a whole education program to raise the level of taste in his society and blames the deplorable state of the decorative arts on capitalism run amok: “the shape and appearance of all products were left to the uneducated manufacturer. . . . [The] consumer had no tradition, no education, and no leisure, and was, like the producer, a victim of this vicious circle.” 23

This leftist position in Pevsner’s work was not unrelated to his conception of a period style revealed in the objects of daily use. Indeed, if his advocacy of a nonaestheticized, mass-oriented modernism sets his history of the movement apart, his focus on the industrial arts is a methodological counterpart to his social concerns, as it was for Semper, the political émigré to England following the 1848 revolution. Raising the status of the modest objects of daily consumption, of the objects that reached the masses, to that of cultural icons, he also promoted a nonhierarchical, democratic conception of the arts. The tradition endured through Rieg & the association of the Vienna School of art history with the Museum für Kunst & Industrie. But ultimately the study of the decorative arts became separated from the trunk of art history, as high art, once again, took center stage for most inquiries. Both Giedion and Hitchcock followed this trend, and it is not until 1948 that Giedion seriously (if differently) addressed the issue of objects as instruments in his Mechanisation Takes Command. 24 Indeed, art historical work on the decorative arts remained a tributary to the mainstream of the discipline well into our own day, not dignified with the prestige accorded the other arts and their genius artists.

Pevsner’s commitment to the original, political impulse behind modernism made dating another very important issue for him. Aware that modernist forms were beginning to be appropriated devoid of their content, he made it his object to combat this threat. That his perception was correct was borne out by Colin Rowe forty years later: “It [modern European architecture] was introduced [in the United States] largely purged of its ideological and societal content; and it became available, not as an evident manifestation or cause of socialism, but rather as a décor de vie for Greenwich, Connecticut, or as a suitable veneer for the corporate activities of enlightened capitalism.” 25 It is for this reason that Pevsner places great emphasis on the invention of modernism, on the original modernist project and its political (rather than aesthetic) roots. For him the representative of this unadulterated modernism is Walter Gropius in 1914 and, more broadly, the Germans (particularly Peter Behrens). What comes later is development—brilliant to be sure—but emptied of content. This is why Pioneers ends with the Werkbund show of 1914, whereas Hitchcock and Johnson extend their books to 1932 (the full title of their 1932 exhibition is The International Style: Architecture Since 1922), and Hitchcock’s 1929 Modern Architecture includes Le Corbusier, J.J.P. Oud, Robert Mal- let Stevens, and Mies, and charts modernism into his very own present. Likewise, in his 1941 Space, Time and Architecture, Giedion extends his inquiry to the late 1950s, and, although Gropius is the climax of a development he traces from the Industrial Revolution onward, so is Le Corbusier, who gets equal billing.

For Pevsner’s project to be successful, however, he had to identify the “real” pioneers, and these are Wright, Loos, to a lesser extent Charles Voysey and van de Velde, but especially early Gropius. In fact, Pioneers is really an answer to Le Corbusier’s claims in his then recent Oeuvre complète, 26 which gave Pevsner a feeling of urgency to set the record straight and probably also contributed to his polemical tone: “The historian must emphasize this point, because Le Corbusier, partly owing to his magnificient artistic imagination and partly to a certain showmanship, has been taken for one of the creators of the Modern Movement. It is surprising how after so short a time of twenty or thirty years historical facts already tend to become dim and legends to grow up.” 27 This position Pevsner first made clear in his 1931 review (written in the summer of 1930) of the Oeuvre complète in Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen, where the basic framework of Pioneers—protagonists, arguments, and style-based methodology—is already fully formed. 28 This anti-Corbusier and anti-aestheticism attitude may also be the answer to the question of why Pevsner (surprisingly) never mentions Cubism (which figures heavily in Hitchcock and Giedion). Is it because he does not want to credit the Cubists with inventing the transparency he credits Gropius with? Is it because he perceived Le Corbusier’s Purism to have picked up where Cubism left off (at least in his own telling of the story in Après le cubisme of 1918)? Is it because Cubism is French from 1907 to 1914, when he wants the threads of modernism to be all in German hands?

Given his biases, all these answers are possible. Indeed, Pevsner’s negative view of Le Corbusier and post-WWII modernism never changed. In the 1968 edition of Pioneers, Pevsner ends on a rousing critique of Corb’s neo-Expressionist manner (presumably at Ronchamp) and subjectivism, which he sees in stark opposition to the socially driven aesthetics he documents and advocates.

Clearly in the 1930s historicizing modern architecture is a common project that unites Hitchcock, Pevsner, and Giedion. Yet all three are essentially moving in uncharted territory.
To be sure they are synthesizers and analysts, since the literature documenting modernism in architecture (Scheffler, Platte, Gröpilus, Le Corbusier, and early Giedion) was already in place, but they faced the same dilemma: How can one locate modernism when it does not yet reveal any clear patterns? In a historical continuum (Hitchcock)? In an "eternal present" that abolishes history (Giedion)? As a moment of fracture within history (Pevsner)? Ultimately their collective contribution is that they, in their different ways, participated in the larger yet still fragile project to open up art history to the present. There were precedents in the work of art historians at the turn of the century such as Wölflin, Josef Strzygowski, August Schmarsow, Julius Meier-Graefe, Cornelius Gurlitt, and others. But this work was either conceived by its authors as art criticism or was produced by art critics, and thus was not perceived as a legitimate component of the art-historical academic discipline. Thus the systematic approach Pevsner, Giedion, and Hitchcock adopt, as well as their common desire to embed the investigation of modernity in a historical context, is pioneering. That Pevsner's book—with all its faults and omissions—was a more manageable, readable account with a strong and convincing message that survived the ebb and flow of popularity is a testament to its value. That Pevsner also turned the spotlight on an aspect of modern visual culture—the decorative arts—which was left virtually unmentioned by Giedion and Hitchcock is an even more fascinating contribution.
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22. Pevsner finds the same to be true of urban planning. "In England it was hardly before 1925, or even 1910, that the public began to take any interest in the modern problem of the working-class environment house. About the same time, the forms of the Modern Movement began to penetrate into England, the forms which, between 1910 and 1925, had been developed by German, French, and American architects." Pioneers, 166-169.
27. Pioneers, 177.
29. "The literature of the architecture of the present seems disproportionately poised beside that of the architecture of the past. Thus the illusion is reinforced that the present is a period distinct from and opposed to the past. Historical criticism should however be able to show that as regards architecture the present is the last realized point in the dialectic of history, and that even the most advanced contemporary forms conjure no rootless phenomenon but the last phase in a long line of development." Introduction, Modern Architecture 1929.
30. See, for example, Wöflin's short essays on Adolf von Hildebrand; Josef Strzygowski's Die bildende Kunst der Gegenwart. Ein Büchlein für Jedermann (1907), August Schmarsow (a major influence upon Pevsner), who was very interested in contemporary art, Konrad Fiedler, whose aesthetics were deeply marked by his interest in German painter Hans von Marées; Julius Meier-Graefe, Die Entwicklungsgeschichte der modernen Kunst (1903), and Cornelius Gurlitt, Die deutsche Kunst des XIX Jahrhunderts (Berlin: Georg Bondz, 1899) and Zur Befreiung der Kunst: Ziele und Taten deutscher Architekten im 19. Jahrhundert (Berlin: Ulstein, 1900).

Alissa Payne is professor of art history at the University of Toronto, a recent visiting professor at Harvard Design School, and author of The Architectural Treatise in the Italian Renaissance: Architectural Invention, Ornament and Lit-
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