In the mid-19th century a certain case of artistic mobility in the early Renaissance entered the agenda of Polish, and subsequently German antiquarianism and art history. The artist in question was Hans Suess von Kulmbach (d. 1522), a peer of Albrecht Dürer and one of Nuremberg’s leading suppliers of panel paintings and designs for altarpieces and stained glass. In the 1840s Kulmbach’s name was linked to a collection of high-quality works preserved in two churches in Cracow. At the same time, a controversy erupted over the supposition that the Polish city was not only the destination of these recognized masterpieces, but also their place of creation. In the face of scarce and inconclusive evidence, answers to the question as to whether Kulmbach actually resided in Cracow have proven closely dependent on changing methodological principles developed in specific political situations. This paper aims to retrace the fashioning of the research problem conventionally referred to as the “Kulmbach and Poland” issue.

Who’s afraid of Kulturträger?

One underlying commitment of both Polish and German studies on Kulmbach was expressly articulated in an essay published in 1924 in a Cracow daily newspaper.¹ This passionate peroration aimed to convince readers that “the comic figure of Poland’s Kulturträger [italics – MS] Hans Suess from Kulmbach” had been fabricated half a century previously.² The architects of this delusion were unmasked in the very title of the article: Hans Suess von Kulmbach. Malarz złutowany z oszustwa niemieckiego i naiwności naszej [A painter soldered from German perfidy and our naivety]. The author of the piece, Ludwik Stasiak (1858-1924), was a prolific art critic specializing in “reclaiming Polish property”, such as the oeuvre of Veit Stoss.³ In Kulmbach’s case, Stasiak rectified the situation in his usual way. Thus, it was untrue, he claimed, that a Nuremberger by the name of Hans von Kulmbach had moved to Poland and worked there; the truth was that one “Jahannes Polonus” had travelled to Nuremberg.
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Fig. 1 Hans Suess von Kulmbach; Disputation of St Catherine of Alexandria with pagan philosophers: detail; 1514/1515; fat tempera with oil glazes on lime; c. 118 x 62 cm.; Krakow, Archipresbyter’s Church of Our Lady of the Assumption
in the company of numerous other Polish artists and been active as an “apostle of Polish art” there.4

The Polish advocates of the “mendacious” version of events were denigrated as “Austro-Polish”, that is, allied with the Austrian invader in the time of the partitions of Poland. Importantly, Stasiak’s research activity encompassed the years before and after his country regained independence in 1918. From 1795 until that year the former Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth had been divided between the three neighbouring powers, the other two being the Russian Empire and the Kingdom of Prussia. Cracow had fallen under Habsburg rule. Yet the Austrians were by no means the sole exponents of this “chauvinist cupidity and German plunder”.5 Stasiak explicitly associated the appropriation of Polish heritage with what he termed the “Bismarckian research model”.

The “Austro-Polish” handling of the grand narrative of a cultural gulf between Western and Eastern Europe (West-Ost Kulturgefälle) can be illustrated by an elaboration from 1903. This concerned, in particular, the only Cracow family to be justifiably counted among Kulmbach’s clients. The Boners, German newcomers who had earned a fabulous fortune and
political importance at the Polish royal court, had Kulmbach depict their coat of arms in his Disputation of St. Catherine (Fig. 1 and 3). The panel is part of one of two hagiographic cycles destined for Cracow, each of which, in all likelihood, originally spanned the closed wings of an altarpiece (Fig. 2-3). The Boners joined Cracow’s elites, along with a substantial group of other immigrants from Weissenburg and Landau in the late 15th and early 16th centuries. Recognizing their cultural role, the art historian Feliks Kopera (1871-1952) remained compliant with his predecessors’ language practice and called this movement a “colonisation.”

But he clarified right away: “Had Poles occupied German territory, and Germans that of Poles, the opposite would have been true regarding the influence of the one culture on the other.”

The whole truth about the German perfidy
Stasiak’s eponymous “German perfidy” was provoked and longingly welcomed by his “Austro-Polish” peers. “It is in Cracow, and only in Cracow, that this new German star was born, from Cracow it marched triumphantly to Germany and into the European literature.” Here Stasiak approximates the real events inasmuch as he points to the critical significance of inscriptions in two of the aforementioned paintings (Fig. 4-7). Their uniqueness lies in the fact that they combine the monogram HK with the full signature “Hans Suess.” When deciphering the monogram, Polish art writers of the 1840s had drawn on German and French handbooks and dictionaries, which had long included “Hans von Kulmbach/Kulenbach.” The respective entries provided no elucidation of the name
“Sues”, however. The baffled interpreters concentrated their endeavours on collecting material for an alternative biography to be associated with the latter name. Unlike Hans von Kulmbach, they speculated, this “other Hans” had relocated his atelier from Nuremberg to Cracow. As such, the phantom doppelgänger was listed in the 1850s among artists who either had Polish origin or had gained Polishness by working in Poland. The idea of Hans Sues the Migrant was soon adopted by Georg K. Nagler (1801–1866) and August Essenwein (1831–1892), director of the Germanisches Museum in Nuremberg (1866–1891).

In 1867 Essenwein was the contact person for Józef Łepkowski (1826–1894), nota bene a research fellow of the Germanisches Museum. Łepkowski, who had just been awarded the first professorship in archaeology at the Jagiellonian University in Cracow, was to assist in 1873 at the birth of the Commission on Art History of the Academy of Arts and Sciences (CAH AAS). By providing Łepkowski with the archive records he requested, Essenwein contributed to the milestone discovery of a note which documents the compound name “Hanns Suess von Culmbach”.

Łepkowski’s international query was mentioned by his continuators, who, however, confused Essenwein with another expert on Nuremberg sources, Rudolf Bergau (1836–1905). This mistake enabled Stasiak to libel Bergau as the forger who slipped in the “false” evidence.

But it was not Łepkowski who sealed the (re)unification of a single artistic personality identical with the monogrammist HK. He seems to have differentiated between the famous “Jan Kulmbach” and his compatriot “Jan Sues” from Kulmbach. Although the impending conclusion had been anticipated much earlier, it was not academically approved until around 1880. The final reassurance came with the publication of a monographic article by Marian Sokołowski (1839–1911). Sokołowski, reputed for having profounded “the first fully matured art history” in Poland, was the first professor of this discipline at the Jagiellonian University (1882–1911), as well as a prominent member of the CAH AAS, eventually elected its President (1892–1911). His sophisticated dissertation on Hans Suess von Kulmbach was immediately acclaimed...
as a model for cultivation of the new branch of knowledge – and promoted as such among readers of popular journals and magazines in Cracow, Warsaw and Poznań.24

Within a decade the Polish findings were communicated to and absorbed by German-speaking authors.25 Yet a symptomatic difference became clear. At the beginning of the 1890s neither Hubert Janitschek (1846–1893) nor Karl Koelitz (1852–1932) hesitated to state that Kulmbach had carried out his Cracow commissions in situ, as a resident of the city for three or four years (1514–1517/1518).26 To all appearances, the Austrian and German scholars were not disconcerted by Sokolowski’s admonitions addressed to his compatriots in 1883. The Polish mentor insisted: “Critical sanity compels us to say goodbye to such dreams, as well as to many others, which until very recently abounded in our history writing”.27

The Polish-Polish controversy

One of Sokolowski’s AAS colleagues, Leonard Lepszy (1856–1937), felt himself a victim of this kind of circumspection.28 Lepszy remarked bitterly that the prompt recognition of Koelitz’s theory might have been due to the author’s German nationality. By contrast, Lepszy complained with regard to his lectures from 1890–1891 – when he argued that Kulmbach had stayed in Poland – this hypothesis was dismissed a priori as “simply precluded, almost ludicrous”.29 Even worse, it was not recorded in the proceedings of the CAH AAS. Lepszy recapitulated his resentment in 1927, when he manoeuvred to demonstrate that Kulmbach’s supposed teacher, the great Albrecht Dürer, also had visited Cracow.30

The premature appeasement of Lepszy can be explained in the context of the self-fashioning of the newly founded academic discipline of art history in Poland.22 It was conceived as an ultra-“scientific” branch of study, which sought its legitimacy in internationally established methods.30 The missionary adherence to professionalism stiffened in response to the “unprofessional” patriotism of local romantics and enthusiasts.33 As plausibly suggested by Stefan Muthesius, the academic circle known as the “Cracow school” apparently believed that one of the tasks of a national (art) history was “also to conduct national self-criticism”.34 Tellingly, a programmatic statement by the CAH AAS, which declared the institution’s focus on investigating art in Poland, at the same time acknowledged the mediocrity of homegrown cultural goods.35

In the case of the Nuremberg master, the academic establishment was alerted by the observed “naturalization” attempts. Stasiak was by no means a pioneer. His article makes direct reference to the dilettante art historian Karol Teodor Soczyński (1781–1862), who derived the name “Culmbach” from the Polish city Chełmno (Lat. Culm).35 Similar revelations concerned a whole pantheon of German artists. Most of them nev-
er entered the mainstream scholarly exchange. It was in the daily press, necrologies, biographic and bibliographic notes that Soczyński’s findings were discredited as untruth and illusion (1862), ludicrous balderdash (1866) or historical-scientific heresy (1916). An oral tradition recorded in the 1880s linked Soczyński to the occurrence of an inscription reading “Johannes Polonus fecit” on the reverse of one of the St. Catherine panels. By all accounts, this was the very same signature that was later cited as support for the narrative by Stasiak. In spite of Stasiak’s use of the present tense, it is very unlikely that he saw the inscription with his own eyes, for in 1895–1896 the reverse sides of this entire cycle of paintings were purged of secondary washes and cradled.

Before that treatment, Sokolowski, who was not familiar with the suggestions implicating Soczyński but had examined the inscription itself, labelled it a “pia fraus”. An anonymous reviewer of Sokolowski’s dissertation called the culprit not a pious forger, but “a chauvinist who indulged in national vanity”. The more restrained Sokolowski considered this manipulation an indicator of the condition of “art criticism” in Poland some fifty years previously. This condition improved thanks to prospective professionals like Łepkowski, who as early as in 1847 had reported unauthorized signatures “Johannes Polonus” on two unspecified panels from the St. John the Evangelist cycle. Łepkowski’s dementi was then published in Polish art dictionaries and Cracow city guides, as well as by Essenwein. On the other hand, it was later remembered that at that time Kulmbach had been regarded as a Pole – such a diagnosis was noted by the student Stanisław Wyspiański (1869–1907) in 1885. One way or another, at some point these two inscriptions vanished from art writers’ sight. They might have been purposefully overpainted during attempts to restore the St. John paintings in the 1860s. This would explain why Sokolowski referred only to one of the altogether three tokens of the name “Johannes Polonus”. When one of the older signatures was exposed in 1927 (Fig. 8–9), this was announced as a discovery (see below).

Turning to the indubitably authentic inscription in the last panel of the St. Catherine legend, it shows signs of significant damage (Fig. 5). Two words are scratched out: the artist’s German name “Sues”, and “Nuremberg”, of which he was a citizen (“civis”). The results of the expurgation were probably first documented in the 1870s. In this case, however, the academics offered no clue as to the identity of the perpetrator or his motive. To find some inkling, one can read through a description of the dark ages prior to the epoch of professional art history in Poland, written by Lepszy, who at that time embraced the viewpoint of his milieu. Lepszy unhesitatingly condemned the “patriotic” practice of erasing unwelcome inscriptions in historical documents – and paintings. Not surprisingly, a simplistic explication was provided in 1940, in a peculiar publication entitled Sichergestellte Kunstwerke im Generalgouvernement. The catalogue included the artworks thus “secured” – in fact: plundered – during the Nazi occupation of Poland. The entry on Kulmbach’s St. Catherine altarpiece clarified that the “senseless destruction” had resulted from “an aversion to everything German”.

The once daring conjecture about Kulmbach’s lengthy sojourn in Cracow was eventually accepted by Sokolowski and thereby became the binding dogma. This step was substantiated by the fact that unknown pieces by Kulmbach had meanwhile surfaced among Polish proprietors. These panels were soon demonstrated by a student of Sokolowski, Konstancja Stępowska, to have stemmed from yet another altarpiece. Her teacher accordingly changed the way he perceived the physiognomies, garments and surroundings depicted in the paintings, and retracted his original judgement about their unequivocally Nurembergian character. Since then, the argument of Polish dress/types/heads/profiles in Kulmbach’s oeuvre has diffused unhindered throughout Polish academic writing. Subsequent attributions of further art objects have encouraged the unjustified belief that he held the office of court painter of King Zygmunt I Jagiellon. For the time being, it remains an open question whether Kulmbach himself, his templates, or painters from his circle were involved in multi-authored works commissioned by the Polish monarch in Nuremberg.
A messenger of the Italian Renaissance

A useful framework has been sketched out by Adam S. Labuda, who delineates different historiographic constructs in relation to Central Europe around 1500. Two of these will be of particular interest: the artist as “creator of a national art”, and the artist as “ARTcreator”. Kulmbach has predominantly been shoehorned into the second schema and compared to “universal” Renaissance standards. By the time the Polish writers joined the scholarly exchange in the mid-19th century, he had gained a reputation as a peerless colourist and Italianist, whose authentic feeling for nature outdistanced even that of his assumed master, Dürer. It is emblematic that Kulmbach never functioned in the Nazi propaganda in the same way as did his fellow citizen Veit Stoss, who was held up as an archetype of German involvement in the East. Admittedly, Ewald Behrens did not fail to place Kulmbach’s supposed eastward migration in the context of the influx from Upper Germany. Dagobert Frey, in turn, reserved the role of colonists for Kulmbach’s German-born clients, the Boners, and credited them with wilful support for German painting. In this story, the paintings commissioned were delivered to Cracow, where it was classified as Kolonialkunst. One definition of this concept had it that colonial art, prior to undergoing transformation in situ, was usually brought from the motherland in the form of portable objects. Still, the wartime narratives were marginal notes in comparison with the publication by Franz Stadler (1877–1959), probably the most quoted monograph on Kulmbach. This book came out in 1936, in the golden age of the inglorious Ostforschung. Surprisingly, for Stadler, it was Cracow rather than Nuremberg that gave Kulmbach the first opportunity to come into direct contact with the world of Renaissance forms.

In this way, Stadler agreed with the first generations of Polish art historians, who deemed Nuremberg to be burdened with medieval taste, in contrast to the more advanced Augsburg. This conviction misled Władysław Łuszczkiewicz (1828–1900), Sokolowski’s “predecessor” in terms of the use of the proper method of art history and the spiritus movens of the CAH AAS. Łuszczkiewicz considered the monogrammist HK too Italianate to be a Nuremberger. Hence he searched for a suitable rival candidate from Augsburg – and ferreted out the name “Hans Knoderer”. The Augsburg theory was superseded by the findings of Sokolowski, who ultimately even began to observe Polish features in the critical cycles of paintings. Józef Muczkowski (1860–1943) and Józef Zdanowski (1887–1977) went further still: it was only in his Cracow works that Kulmbach departed from the style of Dürer. Such an achievement would have been unthinkable in the “suffocating ambiance of Nuremberg”, and thus served as indirect proof that the altarpieces must have been completed in situ. The experience of Poland – Wanda Drecka (1904–1992) added – helped Kulmbach to achieve a delicacy unattainable to his fellow compatriots, and to free himself from the German sentimentalism. The monograph by Muczkowski and Zdanowski (1927) was compiled in the period when the reborn Polish state was being consolidated. Drecka published her booklet in 1957, when the memory of the Nazi plunder was still fresh and painful. Indeed, eight of the Kulmbach panels that were looted have never been found.

A more general tendency among Polish authors has been to look for evidence that Kulmbach transplanted the supranational ideal of the Italian Renaissance onto the “austere soil” of Poland. Since the “paradigm shift” around 1900, there have been renewed attempts to identify the natives who apprenticed at the master’s workshop in Cracow. The number of local paintings connected with Kulmbach peaked in the 1920s. The same decade also witnessed the reincarnation of Johannes Polonus, this time as a co-author of the masterpieces. In this context Muczkowski and Zdanowski quoted the opinion of Wieslaw Zarzycki (1886–1949), a painter and restorer, who had just treated two of the panels. Polonus’ signature was said to have been uncovered in the course of removing overpaintings from the Martyrdom of St. John the Evangelist (Fig. 8–9); it proved resistant to Zarzycki’s solvents. Furthermore, the restorer reportedly discerned more than one individual hand. Muczkowski and Zdanowski did not associate Zarzycki’s conclusions with the abovementioned warnings about fake inscriptions. The authors seem, moreover, to have had no knowledge of the argument presented by Stasiak in widely read magazines two years before Zarzycki’s restoration. In
any event, the unrevised news from Zarzycki’s atelier made its way into the fundamental literature on Kulmbach. The master’s Polish collaborator and namesake appeared in Drecka’s monograph and persists in the catalogue of wartime losses published in the year 2000 by the Polish Ministry of Culture and National Heritage.79

However, newer research has not confirmed the assumed transfer of Kulmbach’s style, let alone his technique and technology.80 Notwithstanding this circumstance, the established stereotype recurs even in relatively recent reference books and encyclopaedias.81 From this perspective, the “Italianized” immigrant from Nuremberg triggered an “upheaval” in Cracow painting.82 His “epoch-making” agency updated the local workshops with respect to study of nature, landscape, Italian/Venetian colouring, handling of light and harmonious composition.83 This seductive vision has been ruffled by the repeated judgement that the impact of Kulmbach’s innovativeness was compromised by unyielding incomprehension on the part of Cracow artisans.84 The latter reservation could, in a sense, even reaffirm Kulmbach’s critical role – that is, his reputed contribution to the autonomous development of a unique style in Poland. As a messenger of the Renaissance, the Nuremberger was in a position to help overcome the Gothic legacy of the German colonization. What is more, any non-German influence was suitable as a counterbalance to or neutralisation of the German influence.85 Such a strategy worked in both Polish and, for instance, Czech/Czechoslovakian research.86

While Sokolowski’s landmark dissertation was awaiting publication, the historian and antiquarian Franciszek Ksawery Martynowski (1848–1896) claimed that the lack of a Polish school of painting could not be redressed by the work of Kulmbach and other foreign artists.87 Before long, however, it had become common belief that the opposite was true. Kulmbach was being stylized as a founding figure of the hitherto absent national school even before Sokolowski attested to his stay in Poland.88

Fig. 8 Hans Suess von Kulmbach; Martyrdom of St John the Evangelist in a cauldron of a boiling oil; fat tempera with oil glazes on lime; c. 230 x 70 cm (not original); lost during the World War II. (Foto by Antoni Pawlikowski; 1927; Cracow; Jagiellonian University Museum)
As early as in 1883 one of Kulmbach’s compositions was included in a project run by the St. Luke Society in Cracow. The society’s salient task was to print cheap reproductions of excellent works of religious art that reflected the national/local genius. Kulmbach’s *Miraculous translation of St. Catherine’s body to Mount Sinai* apparently met this description (Fig. 4). Regrettably, the initiative collapsed before the prepared aquarelle was transferred to the lithographic stone, and Kulmbach was deprived of his chance to adorn the walls of peasant huts. Instead, his central role in the Renaissance in Poland was self-explanatory from the time that two major exhibitions were organized in Cracow in 1884 and 1900.

The idea of the Italian-stimulated rise of Polish art at the dawn of the 16th century was overexploited in the time of the early Polish People’s Republic. Nevertheless, Kulmbach was not intensively studied even in the “Stalinist” years 1949–1957. Drecka’s book was of a semi-popular character. In 1955 Michał Walicki (1905–1966) published a perceptive article in which he remarked that the issue required thorough reconsideration. No one undertook a comprehensive search for the missing written evidence on Kulmbach’s interactions with his Cracow clientele. Thereafter the topic dropped off the agenda. Inert repetition of the inherited hypotheses usually sufficed for the purpose of dictionaries and catalogues. Critical voices have been heard – in Poland as well as in Germany – but can hardly be said to prevail. The unceasing attractiveness of the Kulmbach-in-Poland theory has recently been reaffirmed by Agnieszka Gąsior and the authors of the dictionary *Künstler der Jagiellonen-Ära in Mitteleuropa*. A discussion with the old-new arguments would require a separate paper, however.

Reviewed by Jessica Taylor-Kucia
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