The lifework of Eduard Fuchs belongs to the recent past. A look back at this work encounters all the difficulties involved in any attempt to take account of the recent past. Moreover, it is the recent past of the Marxist theory of art which is at issue here, and this fact does not simplify matters. For unlike Marxist economics, this theory still has no history. Its originators, Marx and Engels, did little more than indicate to materialist dialectics the wide range of possibilities in this area. And the first to set about exploring it—a Plekhanov, a Mehring—absorbed the lessons of these masters only indirectly, or at least belatedly. The tradition that leads from Marx through Wilhelm Liebknecht to Bebel has benefited the political side of Marxism more than the scientific or scholarly side. Mehring traveled the path of Pan-Boulianism before passing through the school of Lassalle; and at the time of his entrance into the Social Democratic Party, according to Kautsky, more or less vulgar Lassalleanism held sway. Aside from the thought of a few isolated individuals, there was no coherent Marxist theory. It was only later, toward the end of Engels' life, that Mehring came into contact with Marxism. For his part, Fuchs got to know Mehring early on. In the context of their relationship, for the first time a tradition arose within the cultural [geistgeschichtlichen] research of historical materialism. But, both men recognized, Mehring's chosen field—the history of literature—had little in common with Fuchs's field of specialization. Even more telling was the difference in temperament. Mehring was by nature a scholar, Fuchs, a collector.

There are many kinds of collectors, and in each of them a multitude of impulses is at work. As a collector, Fuchs is primarily a pioneer. He founded the only existing archive for the history of caricature, of erotic art, and of the genre painting [Sittenbild]. More important, however, is another, complementary circumstance: because he was a pioneer, Fuchs became a collector. Fuchs is the pioneer of a materialist consideration of art. Yet what made this materialist a collector was his more or less clear feeling for his perceived historical situation. It was the situation of historical materialism itself.

This situation is expressed in a letter which Friedrich Engels sent to Mehring at a time when Fuchs, working in a Socialist editorial office, won his first victories as a political writer. The letter, dated July 14, 1893, among other things, elaborates on the following:

It is above all this semblance of an independent history of state constitutions, of legal systems, and of ideological conceptions in each specialized field of study which deceives most people. If Luther and Calvin "overcome" the official Catholic religion, if Hegel "overcomes" Fichte and Kant, and if Rousseau indirectly "overcomes" the constitutional work of Montesquieu with his [Contrat social], this is a process which remains within theology, philosophy, and political science. This process represents a stage in the history of these disciplines, and in no way goes outside the disciplines themselves. And ever since the bourgeois illusion of the eternity and finality of capitalist production entered the picture, even the overcoming of the mercantilists by the physiocrats and Adam Smith is seen as a mere victory of thought—not as the reflection in thought of changed economic facts, but as the finally achieved correct insight into actual relations existing always and everywhere.

Engels' argument is directed against two elements. First of all, he criticizes the convention in the history of ideas which represents a new dogma as a "development" of an earlier one, a new poetic school as a "reaction" to the preceding, a new style as the "overcoming" of an earlier one. At the same time, however, it is clear that he implicitly criticizes the practice of representing such new constructions [Gebilde] as completely detached from their effect on human beings and their spiritual as well as economic processes of production. Such an argument destroys the humanities' claim to forming a history of state constitutions or of the natural sciences, of religion and of art. Yet the explosive force of this thought, which Engels carried with him for half a century, goes deeper. It places the closed unity of the disciplines and their products in question. So far as art is concerned, this thought challenges the unity of art itself, as well as that of those works which purportedly come under the rubric of art. For the dialectical historian concerned with works of art, these works integrate their fore-history as well as their after-history; and it is by virtue of their after-history that their pre-history is recognizable as involved in a continuous process of change.
Works of art teach him how their function outlives their creator and how the artist's intentions are left behind. They demonstrate how the reception of a work by its contemporaries is part of the effect that the work of art has on us today. They further show that this effect depends on an encounter not just with the work of art alone but with the history which has allowed the work to come down to our own age. Goethe made this point in a characteristic manner in a conversation about Shakespeare, he said to Chancellor von Müller: "Nothing that has had a great effect can really be judged any longer." No statement better evokes that state of unease which marks the beginning of any consideration of history worthy of being called dialectical. Unease over the provocation to the researcher, who must abandon the calm, contemplative attitude toward his object in order to become conscious of the critical constellation in which precisely this fragment of the past finds itself with precisely this present. "The truth will not run away from us"—this statement by Gottfried Keller indicates exactly that point in historicism's image of history where the image is pierced by historical materialism. For it is an irretrievable image of the past which threatens to disappear in any present that does not recognize itself as intimated in that image.

The more one considers Engels' sentences, the more one appreciates his insight that every dialectical presentation of history is paid for by a renunciation of the contemplativeness which characterizes historicism. The historical materialist must abandon the epic element in history. For him, history becomes the object of a construct whose locus is not empty time but rather the specific epoch, the specific life, the specific work. The historical materialist blasts the epoch out of its reified "historical continuity," and thereby the life out of the epoch, and the work out of the lifework. Yet this construct results in the simultaneous preservation and sublation [Aufhebung] of the lifework in the work, of the epoch in the lifework, and of the course of history in the epoch.

Historicism presents the eternal image of the past, whereas historical materialism presents a given experience with the past—an experience that is unique. The replacement of the epic element by the constructive element proves to be the condition for this experience. The immense forces built up in historicism's "Once upon a time" are liberated in this experience. To put to work an experience with history—a history that is original for every present—is the task of historical materialism. The latter is directed toward the consciousness of the present which explodes the continuum of history.

Historical materialism conceives historical understanding as an afterlife of that which has been understood and whose pulse can be felt in the present. This understanding has its place in Fuchs's thinking, but not an atypical one. In his thinking, an old dogmatic and naive idea of reception exists alongside the new and critical one. The first could be summarized as follows: what determines our reception of a work must have been its reception by its contemporaries. This is precisely analogous to Ranke's "how it really was," which is what "solely and uniquely" matters. Next to this, however, we immediately find the dialectical insight which opens the widest horizons in the meaning of a history of reception. Fuchs criticizes the fact that, in the history of art, the question of the success of a work of art remains unexamined. "This neglect . . . mars our whole consideration of art. Yet it strikes me that uncovering the real reasons for the greater or lesser success of an artist—the reasons for the duration of his success or its opposite—is one of the most important problems connected to art." Furthermore understood the matter in the same way. In his Lessing-Legende, the reception of Lessing's work by Heine, Gervinus, Stahl, Danzel, and especially Erich Schmitt becomes the starting point for his analyses. And it is not just without good reason that Julian Hirsch's investigation into the "genesis of fame" appeared only shortly thereafter, though Hirsch's work is notable less for its methodology than for its content. Hirsch deals with the same problem that Fuchs does. Its solution provides criteria for the standards of historical materialism. This fact, however, does not justify suppression of another—namely, that such a solution does not yet exist. Rather, one must admit without reservation that only in isolated instances has it been possible to grasp the historical content of a work of art in such a way that it becomes more transparent to us as a work of art. All more intimate engagement with a work of art must remain a vain endeavor, so long as the work's historical content is untouched by dialectical knowledge. This, however, is only the first of the truths by which the work of the collector Eduard Fuchs is oriented. His collections are the practical man's answer to the histories of theory.

II

Fuchs was born in 1870. From the outset, he was not meant to be a scholar. Nor did he ever become a scholarly "type," despite the great learning that informs his later work. His efforts constantly extended beyond the horizon of the researcher. This is true for his accomplishments as a collector as well as for his activities as a politician. Fuchs entered the working world in the mid-1880s, during the period of the anti-socialist laws. His apprenticeship brought him together with politically concerned proletarians, who drew him into the struggle of those branded illegal at that time—a struggle which appears to us today in a rather idyllic light. Those years of apprenticeship ended in 1887. A few years later, the Münchener Post, organ of the Bavarian Social Democrats, summoned the young bookkeeper Fuchs to a printing shop in Stuttgart. Fuchs, they thought, would be able to clear up the administrative difficulties of the paper. He went to Munich, and worked closely with Richard Calver.
The publishers of the *Münchener Post* also put out the *Süddeutsche Postillon*, a Socialist magazine of political humor. It so happened that Fuchs was called to assist temporarily with the page proofs of one issue and to fill in gaps with some of his own contributions. The success of this issue was extraordinary. That year, Fuchs also edited the journal's March issue, which was brightly illustrated (color printing was then in its infancy). This issue sold 60,000 copies—when the average annual distribution was mere 2,500 copies. In this way, Fuchs became editor of a magazine devoted to political satire. In addition to his daily responsibilities, Fuchs at other times turned his attention to the history of his field. These efforts resulted in the illustrated studies—on the first 1848 as reflected in caricatures, and on the political affair of Lola Montez. In contrast to the history books illustrated by living artists (such as Wilhelm Blos's popular books on the revolution with pictures by Jentsch), these were the first historical works illustrated with documentary pictures. Encouraged by Harden, Fuchs even advertised his work on Lola Montez in *Die Zukunft*, and did not forget to say that he was merely part of a larger work he was planning to devote to the culture of the European peoples.\(^{15}\) The studies for this work profited from ten-month prison sentence he served, after being convicted of *lèse majesté* for his publications. The idea seemed clearly auspicious. A certain H. Kraemer, who had some experience in the production of illustrated housekeeping-books, introduced himself to Fuchs saying that he was already working on a history of caricature, and suggested that they combine their studies and collaborate on the work. Kraemer's contributions, however, never materialized. Soon it became evident that the entire substantial work load rested on Fuchs. The name of the presumptive collaborator was eliminated from the title page of the second edition, though it had appeared on the first. But Fuchs had given the first convincing proof of his stamina and his control of his material. The long series of his major works had begun.

Fuchs's career began at a time when, as the Neue Zeit once put it, the "trunk of the Social Democratic Party was producing ring after ring of organic growth."\(^{17}\) With this growth, new tasks in the educational work of the party came to light. The greater the masses of workers that joined the party, the less the party could afford to be content with their merely political and scientific enlightenment—that is, with a vulgarization of the theories of surplus value and the theory of evolution. The party had to direct its attention to the inclusion of historical material both in its lecture program and in the feuilleton section of the party press. Thus, the problem of the "popularization of science" arose in its full complexity. No one found a solution. Nor could a solution even be envisioned, so long as those to be educated were considered a "public" rather than a class.\(^{18}\) If the educational effort of the party had been directed toward the "class," it would not have lost its close touch with the scientific tasks of historical materialism. The historical material, turned by the plow of Marxist dialectics, would have become a soil capable of giving life to the seed which the present planted in it. But that did not occur. The Social Democrats opposed their own slogan, "Knowledge Is Power," to the slogan "Work and Education," which Stuhlitz-Delitsch's pious loyal unions made the banner for their workers' education.\(^{19}\) But the Social Democrats did not perceive the double meaning of their own slogan. They believed that the same knowledge which secured the domination of the proletariat by the bourgeoisie would enable the proletariat to free itself from this domination. In reality, a form of knowledge which had no access to practice, and which could teach the proletariat nothing about its situation as a class, posed no danger to its oppressors. This was especially the case with the humanities. The humanities represented a kind of knowledge quite unrelated to economics, and consequently untouched by the revolution in economic theory. The humanities were content "to stimulate," "to offer diversion," and "to be interesting." History was loosened up to yield "cultural history." Here Fuchs's work has its face. Its greatness lies in its reaction to this state of affairs; its problems lie in the fact that it contributes to this state. From the very beginning, Fuchs made it a principle to aim for a mass readership.\(^{20}\)

At that time, only a few people realized how much truly depended on the materialist educational effort. The hopes and (more important) the fears of these few were expressed in a debate that left traces in the *Neue Zeit*. The most important of these is an essay by Korn entitled "Proletariat und Klasse" [Proletariat and Classicism]. This essay deals with the concept of heritage [Erbe], which has again become important today. According to Korn, Lassalle saw German idealism as a heritage bequeathed to the working class. Marx and Engels understood the matter differently, however. They did not consider the social priority of the working class as ... a heritage; rather, they derived it from the pivotal position of the working class in the production process. How can one speak of possession, even spiritual possession, with respect to a parvenu class such as the modern proletariat? Every hour, every day, this proletariat demonstrates its "right" by means of its labor, which continuously reproduces the whole cultural apparatus. Thus, for Marx and Engels the showpiece of Lassalle's educational ideal—namely, speculative philosophy—was no tabernacle, ... and both felt more and more drawn toward natural science. Indeed, for a class which is essentially defined by the functions it performs, natural science may be called science per se, just as for the ruling and possessing class everything that is historical comprises the given form of their ideology. In fact, history represents, for consciousness, the category of possession in the same way that capital represents, for economics, the domination over past labor.\(^{21}\)

This critique of historicism has a certain weight. But the reference to natural science—as "science per se"—for the first time affords a clear view of
the dangerous problematic informing the educational question. Since the

time of Bebel, the prestige of natural science had dominated the de-
bate. Bebel's main work, *Die Frau und der Socialismus* (Woman and Socialism)
sold 200,000 copies in the thirty years that passed between its first pub-
lication and the appearance of Korn's essay. Bebel's high regard for natural sci-
ence rests not only on the calculable accuracy of its results, but above all
its practical usefulness. Somewhat later, the natural sciences assume a sim-
ilar position in Engels' thinking when he believes he has refuted Karl
phenomenalism by pointing to technology, which through its achieve-
ments shows that we do recognize "things in themselves." It is above all in its
capacity as the foundation of technology that natural science, which for
Karl appears as science per se, makes this possible. Technology, however, is ob-
viously not a purely scientific development. It is at the same time a histor-
ical one. As such, it forces an examination of the attempted positivistic
undialectical separation between the natural sciences and the humanities.
The questions that humanity brings to nature are in part conditioned by the
level of production. This is the point at which positivism fails. In the de-
velopment of technology, it was able to see only the progress of natural sci-
ence, not the concomitant retrogression of society. Positivism overlooks
the fact that this development was decisively conditioned by capitalism.
In the same token, the positivists among the Social Democratic theoretists fail
to understand that the increasingly urgent act which would bring the pro-
taritario into possession of this technology was rendered more and more pu-
carious because of this development. They misunderstood the destruct-
ive side of this development because they were alienated from the destroy-
ive side of dialectics.

A prognosis was due, but failed to materialize. That failure sealed a pro-
cess characteristic of the past century: the bungled reception of technol-
ology. The process has consisted of a series of energetic, constantly renewed
forts, all attempting to overcome the fact that technology serves this soci-
ety only by producing commodities. At the beginning, there were the Saar
Simonians with their industrial poetry. Then came the realism of Du Camp
who saw the locomotive as the saint of the future. Finally there was Ludwig
Pfau: "It is quite unnecessary to become an angel," he wrote, "since a lo-
comotive is worth more than the nicest pair of wings." This view of tech-
nology is straight out of the Gartenlaube. It may cause one to ask whether
complacency [*Gemütlichkeit*] of the nineteenth-century bourgeoisie did
stem from the hollow comfort of never having to experience how the pro-
ductive forces had to develop under their hands. This experience was re-
erved for the following century, which has discovered that the speed
traffic and the ability of machines to duplicate words and writing out
human needs. The energies that technology develops beyond this threshold
are destructive. First of all, they advance the technology of war and its

and dystopic preparation. One might say that this development (which was
thoroughly class conditioned) occurred behind the back of the last century,
which was not yet aware of the destructive energies of technology. This was
especially true of the Social Democrats at the turn of the century. Though
they occasionally took a stand against the illusions of positivism, they re-
mained largely in thrall to them. They saw the past as having been gathered
and stored forever in the granaries of the present. Although the future
and the prospect of work, it also held the certainty of a rich harvest.

II

This was the period in which Eduard Fuchs came of age, and which engen-
ereed decisive aspects of his work. To put it simply, his work participates in
the problematic that is inseparable from cultural history. This problematic
reduces back to the quotation from Engels. One might take this quotation to
the *locus classicus* which defines historical materialism as the history of
culture. Isn't this the real meaning of the passage? Doesn't the study of indi-
vidual disciplines (once the semblance of their unity has been removed)

ably coalesce in the study of cultural history as the inventory which hu-
manity has preserved to the present day? In truth, to pose the question in
this way is to replace the varied and problematic unites which intellectual
history embraces (as history of literature and art, of law and religion) by
merely by a new and even more problematic unity. Cultural history presents
contents by throwing them into relief, setting them off. Yet for the his-

torial materialist, this relief is illusory and is conjured up by false conscious-
ness. He thus confronts it with reservations. Such reservations would be

ified by a mere perusal of that which has existed: whatever the historical
materialist surveys in art or science has, without exception, a lineage he

not observe without horror. The products of art and science owe their
existence not merely to the effort of the great geniuses who created them,
also, in one degree or another, to the anonymous toil of their contempo-
raries. There is no document of culture which is not at the same time a doc-
ument of barbarism. No cultural history has yet done justice to this funda-
mental state of affairs, and it can hardly hope to do so.

Nevertheless, the crucial element does not lie here. If the concept of cul-

is problematic for historical materialism, it cannot conceive of the di-
sintegration of culture into goods which become objects of possession for

kind. Historical materialism sees the work of the past as still uncom-

It perceives no epoch in which that work could, even in part, drop

veniently, thing-like, into mankind's lap. The concept of culture—as the

bodiment of creations considered independent, if not of the production
process in which they originate, then of a production process in which they
continue to survive—has a fetichistic quality. Culture appears reified. The


history of culture would be nothing but the sediment formed in the consciousness of human beings by memorable events, events stirred up in memory by no genuine—that is to say, political—experience.

Apart from this, one cannot ignore the fact that thus far no work of history undertaken on a cultural-historical basis has escaped this problem. It is obvious in Lamprecht's massive Deutsche Geschichte [German History], a book which for understandable reasons has more than once been criticized by the Neue Zeit. "As we know," Mehring writes, "Lamprecht was the one bourgeois historian who came closest to historical materialism. [But] Lamprecht stopped halfway. . . . Any notion of a historical method disappears when Lamprecht treats cultural and economic developments according to a specific method and then proceeds to compile a history of simultaneous political developments from other historians." To be sure, it makes no sense to present cultural history on the basis of pragmatic history. Yet a dialectical history of culture in itself is even more devoid of sense, since the continuum of history—once blasted apart by dialectic—never dissipated so widely as it is in the realm known as culture.

In short, cultural history only seems to represent an advance in itself; actually, it does not entail even the semblance of an advance in the realm of dialectics. For cultural history lacks the destructive element which authorizes both dialectical thought and the experience of the dialectical thinker. It may augment the weight of the treasure accumulating on the back of humanity, but it does not provide the strength to shake off this burden so as to take control of it. The same is true for the socialist educational efforts at the turn of the century, which were guided by the star of cultural history.

IV

Against this background, the historical contours of Fuchs's work become apparent. Those aspects of his work which are likely to endure wrested from an intellectual constellation that could hardly have appeared less propitious. This is the point where Fuchs the collector taught Fuchs the theoretician to comprehend much that the times denied him. He was a collector who strayed into marginal areas—such as caricature and pornographic imagery—which sooner or later meant the ruin of a whole series of cliches in traditional art history. First, it should be noted that Fuchs has broken completely with the classicist conception of art, whose traces are still be seen in Marx. The concepts through which the bourgeois developed this notion of art no longer play a role in Fuchs's work; neither beautiful semblance [der schöne Schein], nor harmony, nor the unity of the material fold is to be found there. And the collector's robust self-assertion (which alienated Fuchs from classicist theories) sometimes makes itself felt—dramatically blunt—with regard to classical antiquity itself. In 1908, drawing on the work of Slevogt and Rodin, Fuchs prophesied a new beauty "which, in the end, will be infinitely greater than that of antiquity. Whereas the latter is the only rule of the highest animalistic form, the new beauty will be filled with a spiritual and emotional content." In short, the order of values which determined the consideration of art by Goethe and Winckelmann has lost all influence in the work of Fuchs. Of course, it would be a mistake to assume that the idealist view of art was entirely unhinged. That cannot happen until the dispositiva praebentia which idealism contains—as "historical representation" on the one hand and "appreciation" on the other—are merged and thereby surpassed. This, however, is left to a mode of historical science which fashions its object out of a tangle of mere facticities but out of the numbered group of threads representing the woof of a past fed into the warp of the present. It would be a mistake to equate this with mere causal connection. Rather, it is thoroughly dialectical. For centuries, threads can become lost, only to be picked up again by the present course of history in a disjointed and inconspicuous way. The historical object removed from pure facticity does not need any "appreciation." It does not offer vague analogies to actuality, but constitutes itself in the precise dialectical problem [Aufgabe] which actuality is obliged to resolve. That is indeed what Fuchs intends. If nowhere else, his intention may be felt in the pathos which often makes the text read like a lecture. This fact, however, also indicates that much of what Fuchs intended did not get beyond its mere beginnings. What is fundamentally new in his intention finds direct expression primarily where the material meets it halfway. This occurs in his interpretation of iconography, in his contemplation of mass art, in his examination of the techniques of reproduction. These are the pioneering aspects of Fuchs's work, and are elements in any future materialist consideration of art.

The three abovementioned motifs have one thing in common: they refer to forms of knowledge which could only prove destructive to traditional conceptions of art. The concern with techniques of reproduction, more than any other line of research, brings out the crucial importance of reception; it is, within certain limits, enables us to correct the process of reification which takes place in a work of art. The consideration of mass art leads to a revision of the concept of genius; it reminds us to avoid giving priority to inspiration, which contributes to the genesis of the work of art, over and against its material character [Faktur], which is what allows inspiration to come to fruition. Finally, iconographic interpretation not only proves indispensable for the study of reception and mass art; it prevents the excesses to which any formalism soon leads.

Fuchs had to come to grips with formalism. Wölfflin's doctrine was gaining acceptance at the same time that Fuchs was laying the foundations of his own work. In Das individuelle Problem [The Problem of the Individual],
Fuchs elaborates on a thesis from Wölflin's *Die klassische Kunst* [Classical Art]. The thesis runs as follows: “Quattrocento and Cinquecento as stylistic concepts cannot be characterized simply in terms of subject matter. The phenomenon . . . indicates a development of artistic vision which is essentially independent of any particular attitude of mind or any particular ideal of beauty.”30 Certainly, such a formulation can be an affront to historicist materialism. Yet it also contains useful elements. For it is precisely historical materialism that is interested in tracing the changes in artistic vision not so much to a changed ideal of beauty as to more elementary processes—processes set in motion by economic and technological transformations in production. In the above case, one would hardly fail to benefit from asking what economically conditioned changes the Renaissance brought about in housing construction. Nor would it be unprofitable to examine the role played by Renaissance painting in prefiguring the new architecture and illustrating its emergence, which Renaissance painting made possible. Wölflin, of course, touches on the question only in passing. But when Fuchs retorts that “it is precisely these formal elements that cannot be explained in any other way than by a change in the mood of the times,”31 he points directly to the dubious status of cultural-historical categories, as discussed above.

In more than one passage, it becomes clear that polemic and even discussion are not characteristic of Fuchs as a writer. As pugnacious as he may appear, his arsenal does not seem to include the eristic dialectic—the dialectic which, according to Hegel, “unites with the strength of the opponent in order to destroy him from within.” Among the scholars who followed Marx and Engels, the destructive force of thought had weakened and no longer dared to challenge the century. The multitude of struggles had already slackened the tension in Mehring's work, though his *Lessing-Legende* remains a considerable achievement. In this book, he showed what enormous political, scientific, and theoretical energies were enlisted in the creation of the great works of the classic period. He thus affirmed his distaste for the lazy routine of his belles-lettres contemporaries. Mehring came to the bold insight that art could expect its rebirth only through the economic and political victory of the proletariat. He also arrived at the unassailable conclusion that “art cannot significantly intervene in the proletariat's struggle for emancipation.”32 The subsequent development of art proved him right.

Such insights led Mehring with redoubled urgency to the study of science. Here he acquired the solidity and rigor which made him immune to reversion. He thus developed traits in his character which could be called bourgeois in the best sense of the term, though they were by no means sufficient to earn him the title of dialectical thinker. The same traits can be found in Fuchs. In him they may be even more prominent, insofar as they have been incorporated into a more expansive and sensualist talent. Be that as it may, one can easily imagine his portrait in a gallery of bourgeois scholars. One might hang his picture next to that of Georg Brandes, with whom he shares a rationalistic furor, a passion for throwing light onto vast historical expanses by means of the torch of the Ideal (whether of progress, science, or reason). On the other side, one could imagine the portrait of ethnologist Adolf Bastian.34 Fuchs resembles the latter particularly in his insatiable hunger for material. Bastian was legendary for his readiness to pack a suitcase and set off on expeditions in order to resolve an issue, even if it kept him away from home for months. Similarly, Fuchs obeyed his impulses whenever they drove him to search for new evidence. The works of both these men will remain inexhaustible lodes for research.

The following is bound to be an important question for psychologists: How can an enthusiast, a person who by nature embraces the positive, have such a passion for caricature? Psychologists may answer as they like—but there seems to be no doubt in Fuchs's case. From the beginning, his interest in art has suffered from what one might call “taking pleasure in the beautiful.” From the beginning, he has mixed truth with play. Fuchs never tires of stressing the value of caricature as a source, as authority. “Truth lies in the extreme,” he occasionally remarks. But he goes further. To him, caricature is “in a certain sense the form . . . from which all objective art arises. A single glance into ethnographic museums furnishes proof of this statement.”35 When Fuchs adduces prehistoric peoples or children's drawings, the concept of caricature is perhaps brought into a problematic context, yet his vehement interest in an artwork's more drastic aspects, whether of form or content, manifests itself all the more originally. This interest runs throughout the entire expanse of his work. In the late work *Tang-Plastik* [Tang Sculpture], we will still read the following:

The grotesque is the intense heightening of what is sensually imaginable. In this sense, grotesque figures are an expression of the robust health of an age. . . . Yet one cannot dispute the fact that the motivating forces of the grotesque have a class counterpoint. Decadent times and sick brains also incline toward grotesque representations. In such cases the grotesque is a shocking reflection of the fact that for the times and individuals in question, the problems of the world and of existence appear insoluble. One can see at a glance which of these two tendencies is the creative force behind a grotesque fantasy.37

This passage is instructive. It makes especially clear what the broad appeal and popularity of Fuchs's work rests on—notably, his gift for taking the basic concepts informing his presentation and connecting these directly with valuation. This often occurs on a massive scale.38 Moreover, these val-
In a word: he lacked the gift of exuberant wonder. There is no doubt that he felt this lack. He tried to compensate for it in a variety of ways. Thus, he

looked nothing better than to speak of the secrets he strives to uncover in the

psychology of creation, or of the riddles of history that find their solution in

materialism. Yet the impulse toward immediate mastery of the facts, an

impulse which had already determined his notion of creativity as well as his

understanding of reception, ultimately comes to dominate his analysis. The

course of the history of art appears “necessary,” the characteristics of style

appear “organic,” and even the most peculiar art forms appear “logical.”

He gets the impression that in the course of his analysis these terms occur

frequently than at first. In his work on the Tang period, he still says that

the fairy creatures in the painting of that time seem “absolutely logical” and

organic,” with their horns and their fiery wings. “Even the huge ears of the

elephant have a logical effect, and the way they stand there is likewise al-

ways logical. It is never a matter of merely contrived concepts, but always

an idea which has assumed a living, breathing form.”

Implicit here is a series of conceptualizations which are intimately con-

nected with the Social Democratic doctrines of the period. The profound ef-

fect of Darwinism on the development of the socialist understanding of his-

tory is well known. During the time of Bismarck’s persecution of the

Socialists, the Darwinian influence served to maintain the party’s faith and

determination in its struggle. Later, in the period of revisionism, the evolu-

tary view of history burdened the concept of “development” more and

more as the party became less willing to risk what it had gained in the strug-

gle against capitalism. History assumed deterministic traits: the victory of

the party was “inevitable.” Fuchs always remained aloof from revisionism;

political instincts and his militant nature inclined him to the left. As a

theoretician, however, he could not remain free from those influences. One

felt them at work everywhere. At that time, a man like Ferri traced the

principles and even the tactics of Social Democracy back to natural laws.

Ferri held that deficiencies in the knowledge of geology and biology were re-

sponsible for anarchistic deviations. Of course, leaders like Kautsky fought

against such deviations. Nevertheless, many were satisfied with theses

which divided historical processes into “physiological” and “pathological”

ones, or affirmed that the materialism of natural science “automatically”

turned into historical materialism once it came into the hands of the prole-

tariat. Similarly, Fuchs sees the progress of human society as a process that

can no more be held back than the continuous forward motion of a glacier

or an avalanche. "The whole concept of progress, to state the problem, is

false. The history of art is a saga of struggle between development and

arrested growth. Deterministic understanding is thus paired with a sta-

bilist optimism. Yet without confidence no class could, in the long run, hope

to enter the political sphere with any success. But it makes a difference

whether this optimism centers on the active strength of the class or on the

conditions under which the class operates. Social Democracy leaned toward
France is a home for Fuchs the collector as well. The figure of the collector—more attractive the longer one observes it—has up to now seldom received its due. One can imagine no figure that could be more tempting to romantic storytellers. Yet one searches in vain among the characters of a Hoffmann, a De Quincey, or a Nerval for this type, who is motivated by dangerous though domesticated passions. Romantic figures include the traveler, the flâneur, the gambler, and the virtuoso; the collector is not among them. One looks in vain for him in the "physiologies," which otherwise do not miss a single figure of the Paris waxworks under Louis Philippe, from the news vendor to the literary lion. All the more important therefore the role of the collector in the works of Balzac. Balzac raised a monument to the figure of the collector, yet he treated it quite unromantically. Balzac was never an adherent of Romanticism, anyway. There are few places in his work where his anti-Romantic stance so surprisingly claims its rights as in the portrait of Cousin Pons. One element is particularly characteristic. Though we are given a precise inventory of the collection to which this dedicates his life, we learn next to nothing about the history of the acquisition of this collection. There is no passage in Cousin Pons that can compare with the breathtaking suspense of the Goncourt brothers' description of uncovering a rare find—a description which appears in their diaries. Balzac does not portray the collector as hunter, wandering through the game park of his inventory. Every fiber of his Pons and of his Elie Magus shimmers with exultation. This exultation is the pride they feel in the incomparable treasures they protect with unflagging care. Balzac stresses exclusively his portrait of the "possessor," and the term "millionaire" seems to be a synonym for the word "collector." He says of Paris: "There, one can often meet a very shabbily dressed Pons or Elie Magus. They seem to care for nothing, to respect nothing. They notice neither women nor window displays. They walk along as if in a dream, their pockets empty, their gaze blank; and one wonders what sort of Parisian they really are. These people are millionaires. They are collectors, the most passionate people in the world." The image of the collector sketched by Balzac comes closer to the figure of Fuchs, in all its activity and abundance, than one would have expected in a Romantic. Indeed, considering the man's vital energy, one might say that as a collector Fuchs is truly Balzacian—a Balzacian figure that outgrew the novelist's own conception. What could be more in accord with this conception than a collector whose pride and expansiveness lead him to bring the productions of his prized objects onto the market solely in order to appear in public with his treasures? The fact that in doing so he becomes a milliardaire is again a Balzacian turn. Fuchs displays not only the conscientiousness of a man who knows himself to be a conservator of treasures, but the exhibitionism of the great collector, and this is what has led him to

VI

The pathos running through Fuchs's conception of history is the democratic pathos of 1830. Its echo was the orator Victor Hugo. The echo of that echo consists of the books in which the orator Hugo addresses himself to posterity. Fuchs's conception of history is the same as that which Hugo celebrated in William Shakespeare: "Progress is the stride of God himself." And universal suffrage appears as the world chronometer which measures the speed of these strides. With the statement "Qui vote rège" [He who votes rules], Hugo had erected the tablets of democratic optimism. Even more, later this optimism produced strange fancies. One of these was the illusion that "all intellectual workers, including persons with great material and social advantages, had to be considered proletarians." For it is "an undeniable fact that all persons who hire out their services for money are helpless victims of capitalism—from a privy counsellor strutting in his gold-trimmed uniform, to the most downtrodden laborer." The tablets set up by Hugo still cast their shadow over Fuchs's work. Moreover, Fuchs remains within the democratic tradition when he attaches himself to France with particular love. He admires France as the ground of three great revolutions, as the home of exiles, as the source of utopian socialism, as the fatherland of heroes of tyranny such as Michelet and Quinet, and finally as the soil in which the Communards are buried. Thus lived the image of France in Marx and Engels, and thus it was bequeathed to Mehring. Even to Fuchs, it still appeared as the land of "the avant-garde of culture and freedom." He compares the spirited mockery of the French with the low humor of the Germans. He compares Heine with those who remained at home. He compares German naturalism with the satirical novels of France. In this way he has been led, like Mehring, to sound prognoses, especially in the case of Gerhart Hauptmann.
reproduce almost exclusively unpublished illustrations in each of his works. Nearly all of these illustrations have been taken from his own collection. For the first volume of his *Karikatur der europäischen Völker* [Caricatures of the European Peoples] alone, he collated 68,000 pages of illustrations and then chose about 500. He did not permit a single page to be reproduced more than one place. The fullness of his documentation and its wide-ranging effect go hand in hand. Both attest to his descent from the race of bourgeois giants of around 1830, as Drumont characterizes them. “Almost the leaders of the school of 1830,” writes Drumont, “had the same extraordinary constitution, the same fecundity, and the same tendency toward the grandiose. Delacroix paints epics on canvas; Balzac depicts a whole society and Dumas covers a 4,000-year expanse of human history in his novels. They all have backs strong enough for any burden.”57 When the revolution came in 1848, Dumas published an appeal to the workers of Paris in which he introduced himself as one of them. In twenty years, he said, he had written 400 novels and thirty-five plays. He had created jobs for 8,160 proofreaders, typesetters, machinists, wardrobe mistresses. Nor did he forget the claque. The feeling with which the universal historian Fuchs laid his economic basis for his magnificent collections is probably not wholly unlike Dumas’ *amour-propre*. Later, this economic base made it possible for Fuchs to turn and deal on the Paris market with almost as much sovereignty in his own private demesne. Around the turn of the century, the dealers in Paris art dealers used to say of Fuchs: “C’est le monsieur qui mange Paris” [That’s the gentleman who’s consuming all of Paris]. Fuchs exemplifies the type of the *ramasseur* [parcher]: he takes a Rabelaisian delight in huge quantities—a delight manifested in the luxurious redundance of his texts.

VII

Fuchs’s family tree, on the French side, is that of a collector; on the German side, that of a historian. The moral rigor characteristic of Fuchs the historian marks him as a German. This rigor already characterized Gervinus, whose *Geschichte der poetischen Nationalliteratur* [History of Poetic National Literature] could be called one of the first attempts at a German history of ideas.58 It is typical for Gervinus, just as it is later for Fuchs, to represent the great creators as quasi-martial figures. This results in the dominance of their active, manly, and spontaneous traits over their contemplative, feminine, and receptive characteristics. Certainly, such a representation was easier for Gervinus. When he wrote his book, the bourgeoisie was the ascendant; bourgeois art was full of political energies. Fuchs wrote the age of imperialism; he presents the political energies of art polemically to an epoch whose works display less of these energies with every passing year. But Fuchs’s standards are still those of Gervinus. In fact, they can be traced back even further, to the eighteenth century. This can be done with reference to Gervinus himself, whose memorial speech for F. C. Schlosser is the magnificent expression of the militant moralism of the bourgeoisie in the revolutionary period. Schlosser had been criticized for a “peevish moralism.” Gervinus, however, defends him by saying that “Schlosser could and would have answered these criticisms as follows. Contrary to one’s experience with novels and stories, one does not learn a superficial joie de vivre by looking at life on a large scale, as history, even when one possesses great severity of spirit and of the senses. Through the contemplation of history, one develops not a misanthropic scorn but a stern outlook on the world and serious principles concerning life. The greatest judges of the world and of humanity knew how to measure external life according to their own internal life. Thus, for Shakespeare, Dante, and Machiavelli, the nature of the world made an impression that always led them to seriousness and severity.”59

The lies of the origin of Fuchs’s moralism. It is a German Jacobinism whose monument is Schlosser’s world history—a work that Fuchs came to know in his youth.60

Not surprisingly, this bourgeois moralism contains elements which conflict with Fuchs’s materialism. If Fuchs had recognized this, he might have been able to tone down this opposition. He was convinced, however, that the moralistic consideration of history and his historical materialism were in complete accord. This was an illusion, buttressed by a widespread opinion that the bourgeois revolutions, as celebrated by the bourgeoisie itself, are the immediate source of a proletarian revolution.61 As a corrective to this view, it is enough to look at the spiritualism woven into these revolutions. The golden threads of this spiritualism were spun by the bourgeoisie. Bourgeois morals function under the banner of invariance, the first signs of this were already apparent during the Reign of Terror. The keystone of this morality is conscience. Is it the conscience of Robespierre’s *citoyen* or that of the Kantian cosmopolitan?62 The bourgeoisie’s attitude was to proclaim the moral authority of conscience; this attitude favored favorable to bourgeois interests, but depended on a complementary attitude in the proletariat—one unfavorable to the interests of the latter. Conscience stands under the sign of altruism. Conscience advises the property owner to act according to concepts which are indirectly beneficial to his fellow proprietors. And conscience readily advises the same for those who possess nothing. If the latter take this advice, the advantages of their behavior for the proprietors become more obvious as this advice becomes more useful and thus for those who follow it, as well as for their class. Thus it is that the sense of virtue rests on this attitude. —Thus a class morality becomes dominant. But the process occurs on an unconscious level. The bourgeoisie did not need consciousness to establish this class morality as much as the prol-
tariat needs consciousness to overthrow that morality. Fuchs does not, in justice to this state of affairs, because he believes that his attack must be directed against the conscience of the bourgeoisie. He considers bourgeois ideology to be duplicitous. "In view of the most shameless class judgments," he says, "the fulsome babble about the subjective honesty of the judges in question merely proves the lack of character of those who write in this way. At best, one might ascribe it to their narrow-mindedness." Fuchs, however, does not think of judging the concept of bona fides (good conscience) itself. Yet this will occur to historical materialists, not only because they realize that the concept is the bearer of bourgeois class morality, but also because they will not fail to see that this concept further the solidity of moral disorder with economic anarchy. Younger Marxists at least hinted at this situation. Thus, the following was said about Lamartine's politics, which made excessive use of bona fides: "Bourgeois democracy is dependent on this value. A democrat is honest in trade. Thus, a democrat feels no need to examine the true state of affairs.

Considerations that focus more on the conscious interests of individuals than on the behavior which is imposed on their class—imposed often unconsciously and as a result of that class's position in the production process—lead to an overestimation of conscious elements in the formation of ideology. This is evident in Fuchs's work when he declares: "In all its essentials, art is the idealized disguise of a given social situation. For it is an eternal law... that every dominant political or social situation is forced to idealize itself in order to justify its existence ethically." Here we approach the crux of the misunderstanding. It rests on the notion that exploitation conditions false consciousness, at least on the part of the exploiter, because that consciousness would prove to be a moral burden. This sentence may have limited validity for the present, insofar as the class struggle has so decisively involved all of bourgeois life. But the "bad conscience" of the privileged by no means self-evident for earlier forms of exploitation. Not only differentiation cloud relations among human beings, but the real subjects to these relations also remain clouded. An apparatus of judicial and administrative bureaucracies intervenes between the rulers of economic life and the exploited. The members of these bureaucracies no longer function as full responsible moral subjects, and their "sense of duty" is nothing but the conscious expression of this deformation.

VIII

Fuchs's moralism, which has left traces in his historical materialism, was not shaken by psychoanalysis either. Concerning sexuality, he says: "All forms of sensual behavior in which the creative element of this law of life becomes visible are justified. Certain forms, however, are evil—names in which this highest of drives becomes degraded to a mere means of refined craving for pleasure." It is clear that this moralism bears the signature of the bourgeoisie. Fuchs never acquired a proper distrust of the bourgeois scorn for pure sexual pleasure and the more or less fantastic means of gratifying it. In principle, to be sure, he declares that one can speak of "morality and immorality only in relative terms." Yet in the same passage he insists on making an exception for "absolute immorality," which "entails aggressions against the social instincts of society and thus, so to speak, sin nature." According to Fuchs, this view is characterized by the historically inevitable victory of "the masses over a degenerate individuality, the masses are always capable of development." In short, it can be said Fuchs that he "does not question the justification for condemning allegedly corrupt drives, but rather casts doubt on beliefs about the history and extent of these drives." For this reason, it is difficult to clarify the sexual-psychological problem. It has never since the bourgeoisie came to power, this clarification has become particularly important. This is where taboo against more or less broad areas of sexual pleasure have their place. The repressions which are thereby engendered in the masses engender masochistic and sadistic complexes. Those rules further these complexes by delivering up to the masses those objects which prove most favorable to their own politics. Wedekind, a contemporary of Fuchs, explored these connections. Fuchs failed to produce a social critique in this regard. Thus, a passage where he compensates for this lack by means of a detour through natural history becomes all the more important. The passage in question is his brilliant defense of orgies. According to Fuchs, "the pleasure of orgiastic rites is among the most valuable aspects of culture. It is important to recognize that orgies are one of the things that distinguish us from animals. In contrast to humans, animals do not practice rites. When their hunger and thirst are satisfied, animals will turn away from the juiciest food and the clearest spring. Furthermore, the sexual drive of animals is generally restricted to specific and brief periods of the year. They are quite different with human beings, and in particular with cultural human beings. The latter simply have no knowledge of the concept of a revolution." Fuchs's sexual-psychological observations draw their strength from thought processes in which he deals critically with traditional norms. His enables him to dispel certain petit-bourgeois illusions, such as nudism, which he rightly sees as a "revolution in narrow-mindedness." "Happily, human beings are not wild animals any longer, and we... like to have fancy, even erotic fantasy, play its part in clothing. What we do not want, however, is the kind of social organization of humanity which degrades all these drives."
from fashion which better suits the author's threefold concern—namely, historical, social, and erotic concern. This becomes evident in his very definition of fashion, which, in its phrasing, reminds one of Karl Kraus, who, in his Sittenwisser, says, "how people intend to manage the business of public morality." Fuchs, on the other hand, did not make the common mistake of examining fashion only from the aesthetic and erotic viewpoints, as did, for example, Max von Boehm. He did not fail to recognize the role of fashion as a means of domination. Just as fashion brings out the subtler distinctions of social standing, it keeps a particularly close watch over the coarse distinctions of class. Fuchs devoted a long essay to fashion in the third volume of his Sittenwisser. The supplementary volume sums up the essay's train of thought by enumerating the principal elements of fashion. The first element is determined by "the interests of class separation." The second is provided by "the mode of production of private capitalism," which tries to increase its sales volume by manifold fashion changes. Finally, we must not forget the "erotically stimulating purposes of fashion."74

The cult of creativity which runs through all of Fuchs's work drew nourishment from his psychoanalytic studies. These enriched his initial, psychologically based conception of creativity, though they did not of course correct it. Fuchs enthusiastically espoused the theory that the creative impulse is erotic in origin. His notion of eroticism, however, remained tied to the unqualified, biologically determined sensuality. Fuchs avoided, as far as possible, the theory of repression and of complexes, which might have modified his moralistic understanding of social and sexual relationships. Just as his historical materialism derives things more from the conscious economic interest of the individual than from the class interest unconsciously at work within the individual, so his focus on art brings the creative impulse closer to conscious sensual intention than to the image-creating unconscious.75 The world of erotic images which Freud made accessible to the symbolic world in his Traumdeutung [Interpretation of Dreams] appears in Fuchs's work only where his own inner involvement is most pronounced.76 In such cases, this world fills his writing even where explicit mention of it is avoided. This is evident in the masterful characterization of the graphic art of the revolutionary era. "Everything is stiff, taut, military. Men do not lie down, since the drill square does not tolerate any 'at ease'... Even when people are sitting down, they look as if they want to jump up at any moment. Their bodies are full of tension, like an arrow on a bowstring... What is true of the lines is likewise true of the colors. The pictures give a cold and tinny impression... when compared to paintings of the Rococo... the coloring... had to be hard... and metallic if it was to go with the content of the pictures."77 An informative remark on the historical equivalents of fetishism is more explicit. Fuchs says that "the increase of shoe and leg fetishism indicates that the priapic cult is being superseded by the vulva cult." The increase in breast fetishism, by contrast, is evidence of a regressive development. "The cult of the covered foot or leg reflects the dominance of man over man, whereas the cult of breasts indicates the role of woman as an object of man's pleasure."78 Fuchs gained his deepest insights into the symbolic realm through study of Daumier. What he says about Daumier's trees is one of the happiest discoveries of his entire career. In those trees he perceives "a totally unique symbolic form... which expresses Daumier's sense of social responsibility as well as his conviction that it is society's duty to protect the individual... His typical manner of depicting trees... always shows them with broadly outspread branches, particularly if a person is standing or resting underneath. In such trees, the branches extend like the arms of a giant, and actually look as though they would stretch to infinity. Thus, the branches form an impenetrable roof which keeps danger away from all those who seek refuge under them."79 This beautiful reflection leads Fuchs to an insight into the dominance of the maternal in Daumier's work.

IX

For Fuchs, no figure came as vividly to life as Daumier. The figure of Daumier accompanied him throughout his career, and one might almost say that this made Fuchs into a dialectical thinker. Certainly, he conceived of Daumier in all the latter's fullness and living contradiction. If he appreciates the maternal in Daumier's art and describes it with impressive skill, he was equally conversant with the other pole—the virile and aggressive side of the figure. He was right to point out the absence of idyllic elements in Daumier's work—not only landscapes, animals, and still lifes, but also erotic motifs and self-portraits. What impressed Fuchs most was the element of strife—the agonistic dimension—in Daumier's art. Would it be too far-fetched to seek the origin of Daumier's great caricatures in a question? Daumier seems to ask himself: "What would bourgeois people of my time look like if one were to imagine their struggle for existence as taking place in a palaestra, an arena?" Daumier translated the public and private life of Parisians into the language of the agon. The athletic tension of the whole body—its muscular movements—arouse Daumier's greatest enthusiasm. This is not contradicted by the fact that probably no one has depicted bodily enervation and debility as fascinatingly as Daumier. As Fuchs remarks, Daumier's conception relates closely to sculpture. Thus, he bears away the types which his age has to offer—those distorted Olympic champions—in order to exhibit them on pedestals. His studies of judges and lawyers prove particularly amenable to this kind of analysis. The elegiac humor with which Daumier likes to surround the Greek Pantheon reveals this in-
spiration more directly. Perhaps this is the solution to the riddle which Daumier posed for Baudelaire: how Daumier's caricatures, with all their trans- chant, penetrating power, could remain so free of rancor.80

Whenever Fuchs speaks of Daumier, all his energies come to life. His subject draws such divinatory flashes from his connoisseurship. He feels that the slightest impulse becomes important. A single drawing, so casual that it would be a euphemism to call it unfinished, suffices for Fuchs to offer deep insight into Daumier's productive mania. The drawing in question represents merely the upper part of a head in which the only expressive parts are the nose and eyes. Insofar as the sketch limits itself to these features—in so far as it represents only the observer—it indicates to Fuchs that here the painter's central interest is at play. For, he assumes, every painter begins the execution of his paintings at precisely the point in which he is most compul- sively interested.81 In his work on the painter, Fuchs says: "A great many Daumier's figures are engaged in the most concentrated looking, be it a gazing into the distance, a contemplating of specific things, or even a hard look down into their own inner selves. Daumier's people look . . . almost with the tip of their noses."82

X

Daumier turned out to be the most auspicious subject matter for the scholar. He was also the collector's luckiest find. With justifiable pride, Fuchs mentions that it was his own initiative and not that of the government which led to the establishment of the first collections of Daumier (and Gavarni) in Germany. He is not the only great collector to feel an awe for museums. The brothers Goncourt preceded him in their dislike, which was even more virulent than his.83 Public collections may be less problematic from a social point of view, and can be scientifically more useful than private ones, yet they lack the great advantages of the latter. The collector's passion is a divining rod that turns him into a discoverer of new sources. This holds true for Fuchs, and it explains why he felt compelled to oppose a spirit which prevailed in the museums under Wilhelm II. These museums were intent on possessing so-called showpieces. "Certainly," says Fuchs, "today's museums tend toward such a mode of collecting simply for reasons of space. But this . . . does not change the fact that, owing to this tendency, we are left with quite fragmentary . . . notions of the culture of the past, . . . we see the past . . . in splendid holiday array, and only rarely in moral, shabby working clothes."84

The great collectors distinguish themselves largely through the originality of their choice of subject matter. There are exceptions. The Goncourts started less with objects than with the whole that had to ensure the integrity of these objects. They undertook to transfigure the interior just as it was being to be viable. As a rule, however, collectors have been guided by the objects themselves. The humanists at the threshold of modern history are a prime example of this. Their Greek acquisitions and journeys testify to the importancelessness with which they collected. Guided by Le Bruyère, the figure the collector was introduced into literature (albeit unflatteringly) with Marolles, who served as a model for Damocèle. Marolles was the first to recognize the importance of graphic art; his collection of 125,000 prints was the nucleus of the Cabinet des Estampes. The seven-volume catalogue of this collection, published by Count Caylus in the following century, is the greatest achievement of archaeology. Stosch's collection of gems was catalogued by Winckelmann on commission by the collector himself. Even More the scientific notion supposedly buttressing the collection did not manage to last, the collection itself sometimes did. This is true of the collection of Wallraf and Boisserée. Arising out of the Romantic Nazarenenes, which viewed the art of Cologne as the heir of ancient Roman art, the treasures of the collection formed the basis of Cologne's museum with their German paintings from the Middle Ages. Fuchs belongs in this line of great and systematic collectors who were resolutely intent on a single subject matter.85 It has been his goal to restore to the work of art its existence in society, from which it had been so decisively cut off that the collector could find it only in the art market; there—reduced to a commodity, far removed from its creators and from those who were able to understand the work of art enduring. The fetish of the art market is the master's theme. From a historical point of view, Fuchs's greatest achievement may be that he cleared the way for art history to be freed from the fetish of the master's signature. "That is why," says Fuchs in his essay on the Tang period, "the complete anonymity of these burial gifts means that one cannot, even in this single case, know the name of the individual creator. This is an important proof of the fact that here it is never a question of individual artistic production, but rather a matter of the way in which the world and things are grasped as a whole."86 Fuchs was one of the first to expound the specific character of mass art and thus to develop the impulses he had received from historical materialism.

Any study of mass art leads necessarily to the question of the technological reproduction of the work of art. "Every age has very specific techniques of reproduction corresponding to it. These represent the prevailing standard of technological development and are . . . the result of a specific need of that age. For this reason, it is not surprising that any historical upheaval which brings to power . . . classes other than those currently ruling . . . regularly goes hand in hand with changes in techniques of pictorial reproduc- tion. This fact calls for careful elucidation."87 Insights like this proved Fuchs a pioneer. In such remarks, he pointed to objects which would repre- sent an educational gain for historical materialism if it studied them.
The technological standard of the arts is one of the most important of historical insights. If one keeps this standard in mind, one can compensate for many lax constructions stemming from the vague way culture is conceived in the traditional history of ideas (and occasionally even in Fuchs’s own work). The fact that “thousands of simple potters were capable on the spur of the moment... of creating products that were both technically and artistically daring...” as already appears to Fuchs as a concrete authentication of old Chinese art. Occasionally his technological reflections lead him to illuminate apergus that are ahead of their time. There is no other way to view his explanation of the fact that caricature was unknown in antiquity. An ideally understanding of history would no doubt see this as evidence for the classic image of the Greeks and their “noble simplicity and quiet grandeur.” How does Fuchs explain the matter? Caricature, he says, is a mass art. There cannot be any caricature without mass distribution of its product. Mass distribution means cheap distribution. But “except for the minting of coins, antiquity has no cheap means of reproduction.” The surface area of a coin is too small to allow for caricature. This is why caricature was unknown in antiquity.

Caricature was mass art, like the genre painting. In the eyes of conventional art historians, this was enough to disgrace these already questionable forms. Fuchs sees the matter differently. His interest in the scorned as apocryphal constitutes his real strength. And as a collector, he has cleared the way to these things all by himself, for Marxism showed him merely how to start. What was needed was a passion bordering on mania; such passion has left its mark on Fuchs’s features. Whoever goes through the whole series of art lovers and dealers, of admirers of paintings and experts in sculpture, as represented in Dauwizer’s lithographs, will be able to see how true this is. All of these characters resemble Fuchs, right down to the details of his physique. They are tall, thin figures whose eyes shoot fiery glances. It has been said—not without reason—that in these characters Dauwizer conceived descendants of those gold-diggers, necromancers, and misers which populate the paintings of the old masters. As a collector, Fuchs belongs to the race. The alchemist, in his “base” desire to make gold, carries out research on the chemicals in which planets and elements come together in images of spiritual man; by the same token, in satisfying the “base” desire for possession, this collector carries out research on an art in whose creations the productive forces and the masses come together in images of historical man. Even his late works still testify to the passionate interest with which Fuchs turned toward these images. He writes: “It is not the least of the glories of Chinese turrets that they are the product of an anonymous popular art. There is no heroic lay to commemorate their creators.” Whether devoted such attention to anonymous artists and to the objects that have preserved the traces of their hands would not contribute more to the humanization...
historian and pamphleteer, joined the Social Democratic Party in 1890 and subsequently edited the Socialist "Leipziger Volkszeitung." In 1914 he joined with radical left colleagues Rosa Luxemburg and Karl Liebknecht (see note 3 below) in opposing Germany's participation in World War I, and two years later became a member of the revolutionary pacifist Spartacists. His Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie (History of German Social Democracy; 4 vols., 1897–1909) and his biography of Karl Marx (1918) remain standard works in their fields.

3. Wilhelm Liebknecht (1826–1900), German journalist and politician, a member of the Reichstag and of Karl Marx's Communist League, was cofounder, with August Bebel (see below), of the Social Democratic Party (1869), which determined the course of the German socialist movement in the twentieth century. He was editor of the leftist journals Demokratisches Wochenblatt and Vorwärts. Erich Karl (1871–1919) was a lawyer and Communist leader who (with R. Luxemburg) was murdered while under arrest by the German military. August Bebel (1840–1913), German Social Democratic leader and writer, was sentenced with Liebknecht (1872) to imprisonment of two years and nine months on charges of high treason, and subsequently (1886) on further charges. He was chief opposition leader in the Reichstag in the 1890s and early 1900s. Among his works are Die Frau und der Sozialismus (Woman under Socialism; 1883) and Christentum und Socialismus (Christianity and Socialism; 1892).

4. Karl Kautsky, "Franz Mehring," Die Neue Zeit, 22, no. 1 (Stuttgart, 1904): 103–104. [Benjamin's note. Kautsky (1854–1938) was a German Socialist writer and a champion of Marxism. He was private secretary to Friedrich Engels in London (1881) and the founder (1883) of the Socialist review Die Neue Zeit, which he edited until 1917. He favored pacifism during World War I and later opposed Bolshevism and the Russian Revolution. Ferdinand Lassalle (1825–1864) became a disciple of Karl Marx after taking part in the Revolution of 1848–1849. He was a leading spokesman for German Socialism and one of the founders of the German labor movement. He was killed in a duel near Geneva. —Trans.]

5. Cited in Gustav Marx, Friedrich Engels: Eine Biographie, vol. 2: Friedrich Engels und der Aufstieg der Arbeiterbewegung in Europa (Friedrich Engels and the Rise of the Labor Movement in Europe) (Berlin, 1933), pp. 450–456. [Benjamin's note. Martin Luther (1483–1546), father of the Reformation in Germany, in 1517 nailed to the church door at Wittenberg his ninety-five theses questioning the practice of papal indulgences. He later denied the supremacy of the pope and publicly burned the papal bull excommunicating him. After 1521 he devoted himself to biblical translation and commentary and to organizing the church he had inaugurated. John Calvin (originally Jean Chauvin; 1509–1564), French theologian and reformer, helped to establish a theocratic government in Geneva, as well as an academy where he taught theology. His Genevan government and his writings served as a focal point for the defense of Protestantism throughout Europe, unifying the scattered reformed opinions of the period in the doctrine known as Calvinism. Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel (1770–1831) was professor of philosophy at Jena, Heidelberg, and Berlin. His philosophy, the Absolute, first announced in Die Phänomenologie des Geistes (The Phenomenology of Spirit; 1807), was the leading system of metaphysics during the second quarter of the nineteenth century. Johann Gottlieb Fichte (1762–1814), director of the University of Berlin, was the exponent of a transcendental idealism emphasizing the self-activity of reason and setting forth a perfected Kantian science of knowledge, in which he synthesized practical reason and pure reason. Immanuel Kant (1724–1804), professor of logic and metaphysics at Königsberg, and author of the Kritik der Reinen Vernunft (Critique of Pure Reason; 1781) and Kritik der Praktischen Vernunft (Critique of Practical Reason; 1788), and Kritik der Urteilskraft (Critique of Judgment; 1790), developed a critical philosophy in which he sought to reconcile the laws and limits of human knowledge, avoiding both dogmatism and skepticisms. Jean Jacques Rousseau (1712–1778), Swiss-born French philosopher and writer, tried to fuse Christianity with the rationalist and materialist thought of his time. His theory of the "social contract," articulated in Le Contrat social (1762), went beyond both the economic liberalism of English thinkers and the positivism of Montesquieu (see below), while his search for a freely accepted "contract" between teachers and pupils, reflected in Emile, ou Traité de l'éducation (1762), has influenced virtually all modern pedagogical movements. Charles-Louis de Secondat, baron de Montesquieu (1689–1755), French lawyer, man of letters, and political philosopher, produced, in L'Esprit des lois (The Spirit of Laws; 1748), a partly deterministic analysis of the relationships between political and social structures that was a precursor of much nineteenth- and twentieth-century sociology. Adam Smith (1723–1790), Scottish economist, laid the foundation for the science of political economy with his Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations (1776), which propounded a system of natural liberty of trade that accorded with the arguments of the physiocrats in favor of freedom of opportunity and exchange as essential to prosperity—arguments opposed to those of the mercantilists, who viewed the economic interests of the nation as overriding the interests of individuals. —Trans.]

This thought appears in the earliest studies on Feuerbach and is expressed by Marx as follows: "There is no history of politics, of law, of science, of art, of religion, and so on." Marx-Engels Archiv, vol. 1, ed. David Riazanov (Frankfurt am Main, 1928), p. 301. [Benjamin's note. See, in English, Volume 1 of The German Ideology, in Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, Collected Works, vol. 5 (New York: International Publishers, 1976), p. 92 (trans. W. Lough). Ludwig Andreas Feuerbach (1804–1872), German philosopher, a pupil of Hegel's in Berlin, abandoned Hegelian idealism for a naturalistic materialism, subsequently attacking orthodox religion. His most important work, Das Wesen des Christentums (The Essence of Christianity; 1840), defines religion as essentially the consciousness of infinity. His thought exerted a significant influence on Karl Marx. —Trans.]

See Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, Gedankenausgabe der Werke, Briefe und Gespräche, vol. 25 (Zurich, 1950), p. 198 (letter of June 11, 1822, to F. von Müller). Goethe (1749–1832) was at work on his novel Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre (Wilhelm Meister's Years of Wandering; 1821-1829), and had established himself as the leading modern German man of letters, at the time he wrote this statement. Friedrich von Müller, known as Kanzler Müller (1777–1849), was the head of a ministry in the Duchy of Weimar and a valuable source for Goethe on literature and politics.

Gotfried Keller (1819–1890) was one of the great German-language prose styl-
ists of the nineteenth century, best known for his stories and the novel
Griine Heinrich (Green Henry; 4 vols., 1854-1855, revised version 1879-1881).
See Benjamin’s essay “Gottfried Keller” in Volume 2 of this edition.

9. It is the dialectical construction which distinguishes that which concerns
origin in historical experience from the pieced-together findings of the
original. “What is original [urspränglich]—that is, of the origin] never allows its
to be recognized in the naked, obvious existence of the factual; its rhythm is
accessible only to a dual insight. This insight, . . . concerns the fore-history and
after-history of the original.” Walter Benjamin, *Ursprung des deutschen
Tragenders* (Berlin, 1928), p. 32. [Benjamin’s note. See, in English, *The Origin
46—47.]

10. *Erotische Kunst* (Erotic Art), vol. 1, p. 70 [Benjamin’s note. For the full
title see fn. 9 below. Benjamin cites Leopold von Ranke: *Geschichte der romanischen
und germanischen Völker von 1494 bis 1514* (History of the Germanic and Romance-Language
Peoples from 1494 to 1514), 2 ed. (Leipzig, 1874), p. vii. Ranke (1795-1886) was a professor of history
in Berlin (1825-1871) and a founder of the modern school of historiography
which strove for a scientific objectivity grounded in source material rather
than legend and tradition. The ambition to describe “how it really was” in the
past apart from the consciousness of the historian in his present day, is a defining
characteristic of nineteenth-century historiography. — Trans.]

[Benjamin’s note.]

first appeared in 1891 and 1892 in *Die Neue Zeit*; the book publication
followed in 1893, with a second edition in 1906. Goethle Ephraim Lessing
(1729-1781) helped free German drama from the influence of classical
French models and wrote the first German plays of lasting importance. His
literary works made decisive contributions to philosophical aesthetics, while
focusing the principles of tolerance and humanity. Helmarich Heine (1797-1876)
and German lyric poet and critic, published his literary criticism in *Geschichte
Neueren Schönren Literatur in Deutschfrand* (History of Modern German Literature
2 vols., 1833) and *Die Romantische Schule* (The Romantic School; 1858-1871) was a German historian and politician
who held professorships at Heidelberg and Göttingen. His literary history
broke new ground in its effort to embed the discussion of literature within
a larger historical context. Adolph Wilhelm Stahr (1805-1876), a German scholar
and author of *Aristotela* (1830-1832) and *Die Preussische Revolution* (1852)
published a book on Lessing in 1858. Theodor Wilhelm Danzel (1818-1887)
was a German aesthetician and historian of literature.

Geschichte* (The Genesis of Fame: A Contribution to Historical Methodology
(Leipzig, 1914).

14. The conservative government of Chancellor Otto von Bismarck (1815-1898)
launched an anti-Socialist campaign in 1878. A repressive anti-Socialist
bill, designed as a weapon against the Social Democrats, was passed and
maintained in effect throughout the 1880s.

See Eduard Fuchs, *1848 in der Karikatur* (Berlin, 1898) and “Lola Montez in
der Karikatur,” in Zeitschrift für Bücherfreunde, 3, no. 3 (1899-1900): 105-
126; also, *Ein vormählisches Tanzidyll*; *Lola Montez in der Karikatur* [A Pre-
revolutionary Dance Idyll; Lola Montez in Caricature] (Berlin, 1902). Lola
Montez was the stage name of Marie Gilbert (1818-1861), a British dancer
and adventurer who, as mistress of Louis I of Bavaria, controlled the Bavarian
government in 1847-1848. She was ousted by Austrian and Jesuit influences,
and later performed onstage in the United States and Australia. She is the sub-
ject of Max Ophuls’ film *Lola Montes* (1955). Wilhelm Blos (1849-1927) was a
German statesman and Social Democratic journalist. Hans Gabriel von Jentsch
was a well-known German illustrator. Maximilian Harden (né Wittkowski;
1861-1927) was a German journalist, founder of the weekly political journal
Die Zukunft (1892), whose pacifist line aroused the ire of the government. He
was the author of *Theater und Literatur* (1896), Deutschland, Frankreich, Eng-
land (1893), and other works.

Fuchs’s major works (published by Albert Langen in Munich) are as follows:
Illustrierter Sittengeschichte vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart [Illustrated History
of Manners from the Middle Ages to the Present], cited hereafter as Sittengeschichte. Vol. 1: Renaissance (1909); vol. 2: Die galante Zeit [The En-
lightenment] (1910); vol. 3: Das bürgerliche Zeitalter [The Bourgeois Age;
1911-1912]; supplementary volumes 1-3 (1909; 1911; 1912); new edition of all
the European Peoples], cited hereafter as Karikatur. Vol. 1: Vom Altertum bis
zum Jahre 1848 [From Antiquity to 1848; 1st ed., 1901], 4th ed., 1921; vol. 2:
Vom Jahre 1848 bis zum Vorabend des Weltkrieges [From 1848 to the Eve of
Lithographs], cited hereafter as Daumier. Vol. 1: Holzschnitte, 1833-1870;
1918; vol. 2: Lithographien, 1828-1851, 1920; vol. 3: Lithographien, 1852-
1860, 1921; vol. 4: Lithographien, 1861-1872, 1922. Eduard Fuchs, ed., Der
Maler Daumier [The Paintings of Daumier; 1927], cited hereafter as Der Maler
Daumier. Eduard Fuchs, ed., Gauwuri Lithographien, (1925), cited hereafter as
Gauwuri. Die grosse Meister der Erotik: Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Schöpfers-
chafts in der Kunst—Malerei und Plastik [The Great Masters of the Eroticism: A Contribution to the Problem of Creativity in Art—Paintings and
Sculpture; 1931], cited hereafter as Die grosse Meister der Erotik: Tang-
Plastik. Chinesische Grabkeramik des 7. bis 10. Jahrhunderts (Kultur- und
Kunstdokumente, 1) [Tang Sculpture: Chinese Funerary Ceramics From the Sev-
enth to Tenth Centuries (Documents of Culture and Art, 1); 1924], cited here-
after as Tang-Plastik. Dachreiter und verwandte chinesische Keramik des 15. bis
18. Jahrhunderts (Kultur- und Kunstdokumente, 2) [Tong Turrets and Related
Chinese Ceramics Of the Fifteenth to Eighteenth Centuries (Documents of Cult-
ure and Art, 2); 1924], cited hereafter as Dachreiter. In addition, Fuchs dedi-
cated special works to the caricature of women, Jews, and world war.

18. Nietzsche wrote as early as 1874: “As an end... result, we have the general acclaimed ‘popularization’... of science—that is, the infamous recutting of the garment of science to fit the body of a ‘mixed public’—if we may here use the tailor’s German to describe a tailor-like activity.” Friedrich Nietzsche, Untergang der Mythologie (The Fall of the Mythology), vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1874), p. 42 (section 7). Benjamin is quoting a key work from the early period of the philosopher Nietzsche (1844–1900), one decisive for his own theory of reading. At a climactic point in section 6, Nietzsche writes, in express opposition to the historicist dogma of objectivity, that “Only from the standpoint of the highest strength of the present may I interpret the past” (p. 37).—Trans.

19. Hermann Schultz-Delitzsch (1808–1883) was a German lawyer, economist, a sociologist who worked to promote the organization of cooperative societies and people’s banks. He is regarded as the founder of workingmen’s cooperative associations in Germany.

20. “A Cultural historian who takes his task seriously must always write for the masses.” Erotische Kunst, vol. 2, part 1, preface. [Benjamin’s note]


22. See August Bebel, Die Frau und der Socialismus: Die Frau in der Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft, 10th ed. (Stuttgart, 1891), pp. 177–179, 333–336; the revolution in housekeeping brought about by technology; pp. 200–201, woman as inventor. [Benjamin’s note. On Bebel, see note 3 above.—Trans.]

23. Cited in David Bach, “John Ruskin,” Die Neue Zeit, 18, no. 1 (Stuttgart, 1900): 728. [Benjamin’s note. The Saint-Simonians, who were active in industry and government in nineteenth-century France, were the forerunners of the French socialist. He is the author of Le De La Réorganisation de la société européenne (1814), Du Système industriel (1821–1823), and Le Nouveau Christianisme (A New Christianity; 1823). Convoluto U in Benjamin’s Passagen-Werk (Arcades Project) is devoted to Saint-Simonianism. Maxime du Camp (1822–1894) was a French journalist and traveler who was on the editorial staff of some of the most important journals of his day. He composed a two-volume account of nineteenth-century Paris (1869–1875) that figures prominently in the Passagen-Werk. Ludwig Pfau (1821–1894), German poet, critic, and translator, published an eyewitness account of the first public exhibition of photography (1839), which took place in Paris. He was active in the Revolutions of 1848, and founded the first illustrated journal of political caricature in Germany, Eidenspiegel (1847). His writings on aesthetics were collected in Kunst und Kritik (Art and Criticism; 6 vols., 1888).—Trans.]

24. Die Gartenlaube (The Arbor) was a popular illustrated family magazine, in circulation between 1853 and 1937. It has lent its name to a type of sentiment novel known as the Gartenlaubenroman.

The illusory [scheinhafe] impulse found characteristic expression in Alfred Weber’s welcoming address to a sociological convention of 1912: “Culture comes into existence only... when life has risen above the level of utility and of bare necessity to form a structure.” This concept of culture contains seeds of barbarism, which have, in the meantime, germinated. Culture appears as something “which is superfluous for the continued existence of life, but is felt to be precisely... that from which life derives its purpose.” In short, culture exists after the fashion of an artwork “which perhaps confounds entire modes of life and principles of living with its potentially shattering, destructive effect, but whose existence we feel to be higher than everything healthy and vital which it destroys.” Alfred Weber, “Der soziologische Kulturbeziffert” [The Sociological Concept of Culture], in Verhandlungen des Zweiten Deutschen Soziologentages. Schriften der Deutschen Gesellschaft für Soziologie, series 1, vol. 2 (Tübingen, 1913), pp. 11–12. Twenty five years after this statement was made, culture-states [Kulturstaaten] had staked their honor on underlining, on becoming, such artworks. [Benjamin’s note. Alfred Weber (1868–1958), German liberal economist and sociologist, the younger brother of sociologist Max Weber, taught at Berlin, Prague, and Heidelberg, retiring to private life when the National Socialists came to power. He is the author of the influential study Uber den Standort der Industrien (Theory of the Location of Industries; 1908), as well as Kulturgeschichte (A Cultural History; 1950), and other works.—Trans.]


Erotische Kunst, vol. 1, p. 125. A basic impulse of Fuchs the collector is his continual allusion to contemporary art—which likewise comes to him partly through the great creations of the past. His incomparable knowledge of older art—his collection made possible his early recognition of the works of Toulouse-Lautrec, a Heartfield, and a George Grosz. His passion for Daumier led him to the work of Skovogt, whose conception of Don Quijote seemed to him the only one comparable to Daumier’s. His studies of ceramics gave him the authority to sponsor such works. Emil Pottner. Throughout his life, Fuchs had friendly relations with creative artists. Thus, it is not surprising that his approach to works of art is often more that of the artist than that of the historian. [Benjamin’s note. Henri Toulouse-Lautrec (1864–1901) was one of the great nineteenth-century French painters and illustrators; his work combines realistic and satirical tendencies. John Heartfield (pseudonym of Helmut Herzfelde; 1891–1968), German graphic artist, photographer, and designer, was one of the founders of Berlin Dada. He went on to reinvent photomontage as a political weapon. George Grosz (1893–1959) was a German painter associated with the Neue Sachlichkeit (New Objectivity); his work typically satirizes the bourgeoisie, militarism, and capitalism. He emigrated to the United States in 1932 and established
a studio near New York. Honoré Daumier (1808–1879), though largely esteemed during his lifetime, is today recognized as a master caricaturist and painter and sculptor of great sensitivity. He was on the staff of the satirical journals *La Caricature* and *Charivari*, to which he contributed drawings and lithographs that, in focusing often on the most prosaic events, mocked the middle class and the professions. See Convolte, "Daumier," in Benjamin's *Passagen*.

28. It is the values of "noble simplicity" and "quiet grandeur" that are at issue here. Such values inform the conception of classical Greek art propagated by the German archaeologist and art historian Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717–1768), whose *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums* (History of the Art of the Ancients; 1764) gave the study of art history its foundations and a scientific methodology. His works were widely read and earned him the respect of the intellectual world of his day, including, somewhat later, the poet Goethe (see note 1 above), who said that one learns nothing new when reading Winckelmann, but "becomes a new man."

29. The master of iconographic interpretation is arguably Emile Mâle. His research is limited to French cathedral sculpture from the twelfth to the fifteenth centuries and therefore does not overlap with Fuchs's studies. [Benjamin's note. Emile Mâle (1862–1954), a French art historian and specialist in medieval French iconography, held a chair in art history at the Sorbonne. He is the author of *L'Art religieux du XIIIe siècle en France* (1898; translated as *The Gothic Image: Religious Art in France of the Thirteenth Century*).—Trans.]

30. Heinrich Wölfflin, *Die klasseische Kunst: Eine Einführung in die italienische Renaissance* [The Art of the Italian Renaissance] (Munich, 1899), p. 27. [Benjamin's note. Wölfflin (1864–1945), a student of Jacob Burckhardt (see note 42 below), was the most important art historian of his period writing on German. He developed his analysis of form, based on a psychological interpretation of the creative process, in books on the Renaissance and Baroque periods and on Albrecht Dürer, and synthesized his ideas into a complete aesthetic system in his chief work, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe* (Principles of Art History; 1915).—Trans.]

31. Older panel painting showed no more than the outline of a house enclosing human figures. The painters of the early Renaissance were the first to depict an interior space in which the represented figures have room to move [Spielraum]. This is what made Uccello's invention of perspective so overpowering both to his contemporaries and for himself. From then on, the creation of paintings was increasingly devoted to people as inhabitants of dwellings (rather than as people as worshipers). Paintings presented them with models of dwellings, a never tired of setting up before them perspectives of the villa. The High Renaissance, though much more sparing in its representation of real interiors, nevertheless continued to build on this foundation. "The Cinquecento has a particularly strong feeling for the relation between human being and building—that for the resonance of a beautiful room. It can scarcely imagine an existence that is not architecturally framed and founded." Wölfflin, *Die klasseische Kunst*.

p. 227. [Benjamin's note. Paolo Uccello (né Paolo di Dono; 1397–1475), Florentine painter, mosaicist, and designer of stained-glass windows, is known especially for his experimental studies in foreshortening and linear perspective.—Trans.]


Georg Morris Brandes (né Georg Morris Cohen; 1842–1927) was a Danish literary critic and materialist historian, a professor at Berlin and Copenhagen, and the author of works on Shakespeare, Goethe, Voltaire, Kierkegaard, and Nietzsche. Adolf Bastian (1826–1905) was a German ethnologist and traveler who, after visiting every continent (1851–1866), became a professor at the University of Berlin and director of the city's ethnological museum. He is the author of *Die Völker des ostlichen Asien* (The Peoples of East Asia; 1866–1871) and other works.

3. *Karikatur*, vol. 1, p. 4. [Benjamin's note]

Note the beautiful remark about Daumier's renderings of proletarian women: "Whoever regards such material as merely an occasion for fine emotion proves that the ultimate motivating powers at work in effective art are closed book to him. . . . Precisely because these pictures have to do with something quite other than. . . . 'emotional subjects,' they will live eternally as. . . . moving monuments to the enslavement of maternal woman in the nineteenth century." Der Maler Daumier, p. 28. [Benjamin's note. On Daumier, see note 27 above.—Trans.]

4. *Tang-Plastik*, p. 44. [Benjamin's note]

Note his thesis on the erotic effects of the work of art: "The more intense the effect, the greater the artistic quality." *Erotische Kunst*, vol. 1, p. 68. [Benjamin's note]

5. *Karikatur*, vol. 1, p. 23. [Benjamin's note]


7. *Die grossen Meister der Erotik*, p. 115. [Benjamin's note. El Greco (né Kyriakos Theotokopoulos; 1541–1614), born probably in Crete and a student of Titian (see note 45 below) in Venice, became the foremost painter of the Castilian school in the sixteenth century, and a leading exponent of mysticism in painting. Bartolomé Esteban Murillo (1617–1682), a Spanish painter of the Andalusian school, was a master of color contrast. José Ribera (1588–1652), leading Spanish painter and etcher of the Neapolitan school, is likewise known as a colorist.—Trans.]

8. See Jacob Burckhardt, *Die Kultur der Renaissance in Italien* [The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy] (Basel, 1860). Burckhardt (1818–1897), a Swiss historian of art and culture, developed a general concept of a distinctively European culture in the age of the Renaissance that has been absorbed into the basic outlook of modern historiography. Paul Julius Möbius (1853–1907) was a German
neurologist known for his work relating to pathological traits in men of genius such as Rousseau, Goethe, and Nietzsche. Cesare Lombroso (1836–1909) was an Italian physician and criminologist who held that criminals represent a distinct anthropological type, characterized by atavism and degeneracy and specific physical and mental stigmata.

43. Dachreiten, p. 40. [Benjamin's note]
45. Tang-Plastik, pp. 30–31. This intuitive and immediate way of perceiving becomes problematic when it attempts to fulfill the demands of a materialist analysis. It is well known that Marx never explained in any detail how the relationships between superstructure and infrastructure should be thought of in individual cases. All we can determine is that he envisaged a series of mutations—transmissions, one might say—which interpolate between the materialist relationships of production and the more remote domains of the superstructure which includes art. Plekhov says the same: “When art, which is created by the upper classes, lacks any direct relation to the process of production, it must ultimately be explained by means of economic causes. The materialist interpretation of history...can be applied in this case as well. It is apparent, however, that the causal connections which doubtless exist between being and consciousness—between the social relations which are founded on 'labor' and the one hand and art on the other—are not readily apparent in this case. There are some intermediate stages...present here.” (See G. Plekhov, “Die französische Drama und die französische Malerei im achtzehnten Jahrhundert vom Standpunkt der materialistischen Geschichtsauffassung” [French Drama and Painting of the Eighteenth Century, from the Standpoint of Materialist Historiography], Die Neue Zeit, 24 (Stuttgart, 1911): 543–544.) This much is clear, however: Marx's classical historical dialectic regards causal contingencies as given in this relationship. In his later praxis, he became more lax and often content with analogies. This may have related to his project of replacing bourgeois histories of literature and art by materialist ones that were planned on an equally grand scale. Such projects are characteristic of the period—aspect of the Wilhelminian spirit. Marx's project demanded critique from Fuchs as well. One of the author's favorite ideas, which is expressed in various ways, is a positivist periods of artistic realism for the mercantile nations—Holland of the seventeenth century, as well as China of the eight and ninth centuries. Beginning with an analysis of Chinese garden economy, through which he explains many characteristics of the Chinese Empire, Fuchs then turns to the new sculpture which originated under Tang rule. The monumental rigidification of the Han style gave way to increasing freedom. The anonymous masons who created the pottery herebefore focused their attention on the movements of nature and animals. “Time,” comments Fuchs, “awoke from its long slumber in the centuries in China...for trade always means intensified life—life and movement. Hence, life and movement had to enter into the art of the Tang period. This is what first strikes us about it. Whereas, for example, the entire range of animals in the Han period is still heavy and monumental, those of the Tang period exhibit an overall liveliness, and every limb is in motion” (Tang-Plastik, pp. 41–42). This mode of consideration rests on mere analogy: movements parallelism in sculpture. We might almost call it nominalistic. His attempts at elucidating the reception of antiquity in the Renaissance are likewise trapped in analogy. “In both periods the economic basis was the same, but in the Renaissance this basis had reached a higher stage of development. Both were founded on trade in commodities” (Erotische Kunst, vol. 1, p. 42). Finally, trade itself appears as the subject of art of practice. And trade, Fuchs says, “has to calculate with given quantities, can work only with concrete and verifiable quantities. This is how trade must approach the world and things if it wants to control them economically. Consequently, its aesthetic consideration of things is realistic in every respect” (Tang-Plastik, p. 42). We can disregard the fact that a representation which is “realistic in every respect” cannot be found in art. In principle, we would have to say that any connection which claims equal validity for the art of ancient China and for that of early modern Holland seems problematic. Indeed, such a connection does not exist. A glance at the Republic of Venice suffices: Venice's art flourished because of its trade, yet the art of Palma Vecchio, of Titian, or of Veronese could hardly be called realistic “in every respect.” Life as we encounter it in this art wears a festive and representative aspect. On the other hand, working life in all stages of its development demands a solid sense of reality. From this consideration the materialist cannot draw any conclusions about manifestations of style. [Benjamin's note. On Plekhov and Marx, see, note 2 above. The term “Wilhelminian” refers to the reign of Wilhelm Friedrich Ludwig I (1797–1888), German emperor from 1871 to 1888; his reign was marked by absolutist policies, the suppression of insurrections, and continuous struggles with the liberals. Tang is the name of a Chinese dynasty (618–907) known for its wealth and its encouragement of literature and the arts. The Han dynasty (206 B.C.—A.D. 220) was likewise noted for promoting literature and the arts, and for expanding its national territory. Palma Vecchio (né Jacopo Palma; 1490–1528) was an Italian painter of the Venetian school. Titian (Tiziano Vecelli; 1477–1576) was chief master of the Venetian school of Italian painting and one of the greatest artists in the European tradition. Paolo Veronese (né Paolo Cagliari; 1528–1588), called the “Painter of Pageants,” succeeded Titian and Giorgione as chief master of the Venetian school.—Trans.]

Charles Darwin (1809–1882) published his account of organic evolution and its operating principle, natural selection, in the world-famous Origin of Species (1859); he then applied the idea of evolution to human behavior in The Descent of Man, and Selection in Relation to Sex (1871). The influence of Darwinism on the socialist understanding of history was already evident in Germany in the 1860s (much to the bemusement of Darwin himself); but only in the 1890s was a true "evolutionary socialism" born, with the publication of a series of articles by the political theorist Eduard Bernstein (1850–1932), who, as the "father of revisionism," envisioned a type of social democracy that combined private initiative with gradual social reform. When revisionism was incorporated into Social Democratic ideology after the turn of the century, the dogmatic Marxism of Kautsky (see note 4 above) and the eclectic Marxism of Bebel (see note 3 above) faded into the background. On Bismarck's persecution of the Socialists, see note 14 above.
47. Karl Kautsky, “Darwinismus und Marxismus,” Die Neue Zeit, 13, no. 1 (Stuttgart, 1895): 709-710. [Benjamin's note. See note 46 above. Enrico Febbraro (1856-1929) was an Italian criminologist and politician who edited the Socialist organ Avanti (first published in 1898); he was later an adherent of Fascism.—Trans.]  
48. H. Laufenberg, “Dogma und Klassenkampf” [Dogma and Class Warfare], Die Neue Zeit, 27, no. 1 (Stuttgart, 1909): 574. Here the concept of the “selecting” [Selektivität] has sunk to a sad state. The heyday of this term is the eighteenth century, when the self-regulation of the market was beginning. The concept then symbolized its triumph in Kant, in the form of “spontaneity,” as well as in technology, in the form of automated machines. [Benjamin's note. The concept of spontaneity plays an important role in the Kritik der Urteilskraft (Critique of Judgment; 1790) by the great German transcendent philosopher Immanuel Kant (1724-1804).—Trans.]  
49. Karikatur, vol. 1, p. 312. [Benjamin's note]  
50. Marie Jean Antoine de Caritat, marquis de Condorcet (1743-1794), French philosopher, mathematician, and politician, outlined the progress of the human race from barbarism to enlightenment, and argued for the indefinite perfectibility of man by 1795, in Esquisse d'un tableau historique des progrès de l'esprit humain (Sketch for a Historical Picture of the Progress of the Human Mind; 1793), the basis of the one ultimately adopted. He was arrested with other members of the Girondist group, and died in prison.  
51. Erotische Kunst, vol. 1, p. 3. [Benjamin's note]  
52. A. Max, “Zur Frage der Organisation des Proletariats der Intelligenz,” p. 62. [Benjamin's note. See note 17 above. The poet Victor Marie Hugo (1802-1885) was a key figure in the Romantic movement in French literature and, as a Republican, he provided a basis for the Constituent Assembly (1848) and the National Assembly (1871), in the French Revolution, he devised a system of state education for the benefit of the one ultimately adopted. He was arrested with other members of the Gironist group, and died in prison.  
53. Karikatur, vol. 2, p. 238. [Benjamin's note. Jules Michelet (1798-1874) was a French historian and professor at the Collège de France (1838-1851). Emotionally democratic and anticlerical, he was the author of such works as Histoire de France (1833-1867) and Le Bèbe de l'humanité (1864). Edmond de Quinet (1803-1875) was a French writer and politician, and an associate of Michelet. Among his works are the epic poems Napoleon (1836) and Peut-être (1838). The Communards were those involved in the revolutionary government established in Paris in 1871, in the aftermath of the Franco-Prussian War, the Commune of Paris was suppressed in bloody street-fighting that ended in May 1871, leaving 20,000 Communards dead.—Trans.]  
54. Mehring commented on the trial occasioned by Die Weber [The Weavers] in Die Neue Zeit. Parts of the summation for the defense have regained the local color they had in 1893. The defense attorney "had to point out that the allegedly revolutionary passages in question are counteracted by others of a soothing and appeasing character. The author by no means stands on the side of revolution, as he allows for the victory of order through the intervention of a handful of soldiers." Franz Mehring, “Entweder-Oder” [Either-Or], Die Neue Zeit, 11, no. 1 (Stuttgart, 1893): 780. [Benjamin's note. The German writer Gerhart Hauptmann (1862-1946) was a master of the naturalistic drama, as exemplified by Die Weber (1892), a dramatization of the Silesian weavers' revolt of 1844. He was awarded the Nobel Prize for literature (1912) "in special recognition of the distinctness and the wide range of his creative work in the realm of dramatic poetry."—Trans.]  
55. Ernst Theodor Amadeus Hoffmann (1776-1822) was a writer, composer, and music critic whose stories and novels are among the finest and most influential of the German Romantic movement. Thomas De Quincey (1785-1859) was an English Romantic writer, most famous for his Confessions of an English Opium Eater (1821). Gérard de Nerval (pseudonym of Gérard Labrunie, 1808-1855), celebrated French writer and eccentric, was the author of such works as Les Chimères (Chimeras; 1831) and Aurélia (1855). Physiologies were a genre of popular prose writing in early nineteenth-century France, devoted to a wide range of subjects drawn from everyday life. Louis Philippe (1773-1850), a descendant of the Bourbon-Orléans royal line of France, was declared "Citizen King" in the July Revolution of 1830; his reign was marked by the bourgeoisie's rise to power. He was overthrown by the February Revolution of 1848, which he abdicated and escaped to England. Honoré de Balzac (1799-1850), founder of the realist novel in France, conceived the plan of presenting a comprehensive picture of contemporary French society under the general title La Comédie humaine, which eventually ran to forty-seven volumes. Honoré de Balzac, Le Cousin Pons (Paris, 1925), p. 162. [Benjamin's note. See, in English, Cousin Pons, trans. Herbert J. Hunt (Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1968), p. 146 (Chapter 14, "A Character from Hoffmann's Tales"). The brothers Edmond Louis Antoine de Goncourt (1822-1896) and Jules Alfred Huot de Goncourt (1830-1870) collaborated on a series of naturalistic novels and on works of social history and art criticism. They began keeping their monumental journal in 1851, and Edmond continued it for twenty-six more years after his brother's death.—Trans.]  
56. Édouard Drumont, Les Héros et les pitres [Heroes and Foolish] (Paris, 1900), pp. 107-108. [Benjamin's note. Drumont (1844-1917) was an anti-Semitic and anti-Dreyfusard journalist who founded and edited La Libre Parole. He is the author of the influential La France juive (French Jews; 1886).—Trans.]  
58. Georg Gottfried Gervinus, Friedrich Christoph Schlosser: Ein Nekrolog [Obituary for Friedrich Christoph Schlosser] (Leipzig, 1861), pp. 30-31. [Benjamin's note. Schlosser (1776-1861) was a German historian, author of Weltgeschichte für das Deutsche Volk (World History for the German People; 19 vols., 1843-1857).—Trans.]  
59. This aspect of Fuchs's work proved useful when the imperial prosecutors began accusing him of "distributing obscene writings." His moralism was represented especially forcefully in an expert opinion submitted in the course of one of the
trials, all of which without exception ended in acquittal. This opinion was written by Fedor von Zobeltitz, and its most important passage reads: “Fuchs seriously considers himself a preacher of morals and an educator, and this deep serious understanding of life—this intimate comprehension of the fact that the work in the service of the history of humanity must be grounded on the highest morality—is in itself sufficient to protect him from any suspicion of profane hungry speculation. All those who know the man and his enlightened ideas would have to smile at such a suspicion.” [Benjamin's note. The passage by Zobeltitz is cited in the “Mitteilung des Verlag Albert Langen in München” (Publisher's Note, from Verlag Albert Langen in Munich), at the beginning of Fuchs, *Die grossen Meister der Erotik* (Munich, 1930), p. 4.— *Trans.*]


62. Maximilien François de Robespierre (1758–1794), radical Jacobin and Montagnard leader of the Revolution of 1789, known as “the Incomparable,” was elected first deputy to Paris to the National Convention in 1792; a leader of the second Committee of Public Safety (1793–1794), he was responsible for much of the Reign of Terror. He was arrested and guillotined by order of the Revolutionary Tribunal. On Immanuel Kant, see note 5 above. Kant’s concept of a cosmopolitan world federation is expounded in his essays “Ideas of a Universal History with Cosmopolitan Intent” (1784) and “Zum ewigen Frieden” (Perpetual Peace; 1795).

63. *Der Maler Daumier*, p. 30. [Benjamin's note]

Norbert Guterman and H. Lefebvre, *La Conscience mystifiée* (Paris, 1936), p. 151. [Benjamin's note. Alphonse Prat de Lamartine (1790–1869) was a popular poet and orator who helped shape the Romantic movement in French literature. He was also foreign minister in the Provisional Government of 1848, in which capacity he sought to defend the interests of the working class while maintaining lawful order. What Benjamin means by his “excessive use of bona fide” can be grasped from an entry in Benjamin’s *Fassagen-Werk* (Arcades Project), Convolute d12,2.— *Trans.*]

*Erotische Kunst*, vol. 2, part 1, p. 11. [Benjamin's note]

*Erotische Kunst*, vol. 1, p. 43. Fuchs’s moral-historical representation of the Directory has traits reminiscent of a popular ballad. “The terrible book by the Marquis de Sade, with plates as crudely executed as they are infamous, lay open in all the shopwindows.” And the figure of Barras bespeaks the “disenfranchised imagination of the shameless libertine.” *Karikatur*, vol. 1, pp. 202, 201. [Benjamin's note. The Directory (Directoire) was an executive body of five men that officiated from 1795 to 1799, during the First Republic in France; it pursued a policy of stabilization that gradually grew authoritarian. Count Donatien Alphonse François de Sade, better known as the Marquis de Sade (1740–1814), is the author of erotic writings—such as *Justine, ou Les Malheurs de la vertu* (Justine, or The Misfortunes of Virtue; 1791) and *La Philosophie dans le boudoir* (Philosophy in the Bedroom; 1795)—which affirm the liberation of instincts even to the point of crime; in the course of a life that scandalized his contemporaries, he lived out many forms of his compulsions. Paul François de Barras (1755–1829), a French revolutionist, took part in the overthrow of Robespierre in 1794 (see note 62 above) and, the following year, as a member of the Directory, secured the appointment of Napoléon Bonaparte to command the army in Italy. His power was curtailed in 1799, when Napoléon suspected him of intrigue to aid the restoration of the monarchy.— *Trans.*]

*Karikatur*, vol. 1, p. 188. [Benjamin's note]

Max Horkheimer, “Egoismus und Freiheitsbewegung,” p. 166. [Benjamin's note. See note 61 above.— *Trans.*]

The plays of Frank Wedekind (1864–1918), including the “Lulu” cycle, *Ernstgen* (Earth Spirit; 1895) and *Die Biicher der Pandora* (Pandora’s Box; 1904), form a transition from the naturalism of his own age to the Expressionism of the following generation. His work also exerted a powerful influence on Bertolt Brecht.

*Erotische Kunst*, vol. 2, p. 283. Fuchs is on the track of something important here. Would it be too rash to connect the threshold between human and animal, such as Fuchs recognizes in the orgy, with that other threshold constituted by the emergence of upright posture? The latter brings with it a phenomenon unprecedented in natural history: partners can look into each other’s eyes during orgasm. Only then does an orgy become possible. What is decisive is not the increase in visual stimuli but rather the fact that now the expression of satiety and passion of impotence can itself become an erotic stimulus. [Benjamin's note]

*Stitgensgeschichte*, vol. 3, p. 234. A few pages later, this confident judgment has faded—evidence of the force with which it had to be wrested away from convention. Instead, we now read: “The fact that thousands of people become sex—
ually excited when looking at a woman or man photographed in the nude... proves that the eye is no longer capable of perceiving the harmonious whole only the piquant detail" (ibid., p. 269). If there is anything sexually arousing here, it is more the idea that a naked body is being displayed before the camera than the sight of nakedness itself. This is probably the idea behind most of the photographs. [Benjamin's note]

72. Ibid., p. 189. [Benjamin's note. Karl Kraus (1874-1936), Austrian satirist, poet, playwright, and critic, was the founder and editor of the polemical review Die Fachze (from 1899), which took aim at middle-class circles and the liberal press. See Benjamin's 1931 essay "Kraus" in Volume 2 of this edition.—Trans.]

73. The writer Max von Boehn (1860-1932) published an eight-volume study of romantic fashion from the sixteenth through the nineteenth centuries, Die Mode (1897-1925). Among his other works are Biedermeyer (1911), Antike Mode (Fashion in Antiquity; 1927), and Puppen und Puppenspiele (Dolls and Puppets; 1929). He is cited several times in Benjamin's Passagen-Werk (Arcade Project).

74. Sittengeschichte, supplementary vol. 3, pp. 53-54. [Benjamin's note]

75. For Fuchs, art is immediate sensuousness, just as ideology is an immediate spring of interests. "The essence of art is sensuousness [Sinnlichkeit]. Art is sensuous—indeed, sensuousness is its most potent form. Art is sensuous, becomes form, becomes visible, and at the same time it is the highest and noblest form of sensuousness" (Erstliche Kunst, vol. 1, p. 61). [Benjamin's note]

76. See Sigmund Freud, Die Traumdeutung (Leipzig and Vienna, 1900). Freud (1856-1939), Austrian neurologist and founder of psychoanalysis, developed a theory that dreams are an unconscious representation of repressed desires, especially sexual desires.

77. Karikatur, vol. 1, p. 223. [Benjamin's note]


79. Der Maler Daumier, p. 30. [Benjamin's note. On Daumier, see note 27 above.—Trans.]

80. The poet and critic Charles Baudelaire (1821-1867), author of Les Fleurs du mal (The Flowers of Evil; 1857), discusses Daumier in his essay "Quelques caricaturistes français" (1857). See, in English, "Some French Caricaturists," in Baudelaire, The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays, trans. Jonathan Mayne (1964; rpt. New York: Da Capo, 1986), pp. 171-180: "The hot-hearted Achilles, the cunning Ulysses, the wise Penelope, that great booby Telemachus, and the fair Helen who ruined Troy—all of them, in fact, appear before our eyes in a farcical ugliness reminiscent of those decrepit old tragic actors whom one sometimes sees taking a pinch of snuff in the wings.... Daumier's caricature has formidable breadth, but it is quite without bile or rancor. In all his work there is a foundation of decency and simplicity" (pp. 178-179).

81. This should be compared to the following reflection: "According to my observations, it is in an artist's erotically charged pictures that the dominant elements of his palette, at any particular time, emerge most clearly. Here... the elements attain... their greatest power of illumination" (Die grosse Maler der Erotik, p. 14). [Benjamin's note]

82. Der Maler Daumier, p. 18. Daumier's famous Art Expert, a watercolor that appears in several versions, depicts one such figure. One day, Fuchs was shown a previously unknown version of this work and asked to authenticate it. He obtained a good reproduction of the picture and, focusing on the main portion of the subject, embarked on a very instructive comparison. Not the slightest deviation went unnoticed; in the case of each discrepancy, he asked whether it was the product of the master's hand or that of an impotence. Again and again Fuchs returned to the original, yet in a manner that seemed to say he could have easily dispensed with it; his gaze had a familiarity that could only have come from carrying the picture around with him in his head for years. No doubt this was the case for Fuchs. And only because of this was he able to discern the slightest uncertainties in the contour, the most inconspicuous mistakes in the coloring of the shadows, the minutest derailings in the movement of the line. As a result, he was able to identify the picture in question not as a forgery but as a good old copy, which might have been the work of an amateur. [Benjamin's note]

Paul Gavarni (pseudonym of Sulpice Chevalier; 1804-1866) was a French illustrator and caricaturist, best known for his sketches of Parisian life. On the Goncourt brothers, see note 56 above.

Dachbreiter, pp. 5-6. [Benjamin's note]

Jean de La Bruyère (1645-1696), French moralist, was the author of one of the masterpieces of French literature, Les Caractères de l'opinie, traduites du grec, avec les caractères ou les moeurs de ce siècle (Characters, or The Manners of This Age, with the Characters of Theophrastus; 1688). A series of satirical portrait sketches appended to his translation of the fourth-century B.C. character writer Theophrastus. One of La Bruyère's characters is the print-collector Démocde (not "Damocde"), who appears in Chapter 13, "De la mode" (On Fashion). He is based on Michel de Marolles (1600-1681), abbé of Villelouen and an erudite translator of Latin poetry, who amassed a collection of prints numbering 123,400 items, representing more than 6,000 artists. This collection was acquired by the government of Louis XIV in 1667 and is now in the Louvre's archive of prints, the Cabinet des Estampes. Anne Claude Philippe de Tualé, comte de Caylus (1692-1765), archaeologist, engraver, and man of letters, published his seven-volume Recueil d'antiquités égyptiennes, étrusques, grecques, romaines, et gauloises (Collection of Egyptian, Etruscan, Greek, Roman, and Gallic Antiquities) from 1752 to 1767. Baron Philipp von Stosch (1691-1767) was a Prussian-born antiquarian, diplomat, secret agent for the English, and collector of ancient art and manuscripts; his collection of antique engraved artifacts contained more than 10,000 cameos, intaglios, and antique glass gems. Winckelmann (see note 28 above) catalogued 3,444 of these intaglios in 1758, and published his catalogue in French, Description des pierres gravées du feu Baron von Stosch (Description of the Engraved Gems of the Late Baron von Stosch; 1760). Ferdinand Franz Wallraf (1748-1824), a Catholic priest and professor of philosophy and natural history at the University of Cologne, bequeathed to the city of Cologne a rich collection of works of old and Rhenish art, accumulated during the period of the French Revolution; his collection forms the basis of the Wallraf-Richartz Museum in Cologne. Sulpice Boisseré (1783-1854), a German writer and art collector, put together, with his brother Melchior (1786-1851), a collection of German and Flemish princi-
tives which, in 1827, was sold to King Ludwig I of Bavaria for the Akademische Pinakothek museum in Munich. The Nazarenes were a group of young German painters, active 1809–1830, who were intent on restoring a religious spirit to art.

86. *Tang-Plastik*, p. 44. [Benjamin’s note]


88. *Dachreiter*, p. 46. [Benjamin’s note]

89. *Karikatuur*, vol. 1, p. 19. The exception proves the rule. A mechanical process reproduction was used to produce terra cotta figures. Among these are the caricatures. [Benjamin’s note]

90. See Erich Klossowski, *Honore Daumier* (Munich, 1908), p. 113. [Benjamin’s note]

91. *Dachreiter*, p. 45. [Benjamin’s note]