

## SOME REMARKS ON RECENT AŽBÈ SCHOLARSHIP\*

Peter Morrin

"One sees here in Munich," wrote the anonymous reviewer of a private art school exhibition in 1903, "that the crucial point in art instruction has shifted more and more from the state academies to the private painting and art schools."<sup>1</sup> In a comparable vein, Paul Klee wrote to his mother from Munich in 1898 to record his first impressions as an art student. Enrolled in the private art school of Heinrich Knirr to prepare for the entrance exams to the Munich Academy, Klee reports to his mother that his fellow students advise him to remain with Knirr for not one, but two years, for "in the

---

\*The purpose of this article is to draw attention to Professor Peg Weiss' important new book, Kandinsky in Munich: The Formative Years (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978), and to point out some apparent misconceptions in the treatment of Ažbè in the exhibition catalogue Anton Ažbè in njegova šola (Ljubljana: Narodna galerija, 1962). My own interest in Ažbè stems from the dissertation I am currently preparing on Hans Hofmann.

Several people have been most generous with their time and assistance in the preparation of this article: first, Dr. Rajko Ložar, who has written me two long and very informative letters on the subject of Ažbè. I accept Professor Ložar's rebuke that my conclusions must necessarily be tentative until I have had an opportunity to study the paintings of Ažbè firsthand. Equally, Prof. Weiss has unstintingly offered bibliographical advice and shared her expert knowledge; she has not, however, directly assisted in the preparation of this article. Ms. Ann Peet, a graduate student at Columbia University, helped in obtaining reference sources, and Mr. Constantine Kustanovitch, also a graduate student at Columbia, provided me with synopses of Moleva and Beljutin's study. Prof. John Bowlt, who has studied Ažbè in conjunction with his ongoing study of the background of early Russian modernism, also assisted with Russian sources. Ing. Arch. Simon Kregar has discussed Slovene impressionism with me from the point of view of the connoisseur. Prof. Rado L. Lencek has assisted by translating from the Slovene, and has encouraged me to present my views.

Academy you would certainly take more than two years to achieve what you will achieve privately [in two]."<sup>2</sup> Klee did in fact work in Knirr's classes for two years, and after a brief period at the Academy he returned to the more stimulating environment of Knirr's private school for a third year.

The private art schools of Munich arose in response to the dilemma of the overwhelming numbers of would-be artists who flocked to the Bavarian capital to study at the Königlich Bayerische Akademie der bildenden Künste. One authority estimated that in 1900 there were over 20,000 artists and students in Munich, but the Academy always had fewer than 400 pupils.<sup>3</sup> Statutes eliminated many even before they applied: women were not admitted at all until after World War I, and then those under eighteen or over thirty-five years of age were also denied entrance.<sup>4</sup> A required autobiography in German provided a stumbling block for many foreigners. The greatest hurdle, however, was the stringent entrance examination itself. In a six-day sitting the potential academicians were required to draw a series of head and figure studies in which precision in anatomy and modelling was expected. After entrance, in classes other than those of innovators like Franz von Stuck,<sup>5</sup> one could expect more of the same: the prototypic learning exercise in the German academies was a life-size charcoal drawing of a standing male nude, in which one was expected to strive for photographic exactitude.<sup>6</sup> In the high degree of finish expected, the learning exercise was supposed to become a work of art in itself, but was more likely to degenerate into a repetition of the facile, shopworn tricks of depiction which are passed from student to student in all art schools.

Although the task of the private schools was nominally preparation for the Academy examinations, for the majority who did not gain admittance to the Academy, the private schools provided an alternative. Indeed, many talented students who were admitted to the Academy favored the private schools, which could be more responsive to the interests of the students themselves, where the drill was likely to be less tedious, and where (in the more popular schools) a broad spectrum of nationalities helped to foster a lively environment.<sup>7</sup> The most gifted of the private school teachers, and the leader of the largest school, was the Slovene artist Anton Ažbè (1862-1905). His students included not only the Slovene impressionists, Ivan Grohar, Rihard Jakopič, Matija Jama, Matej Sternen, and Roza Klein-Sternen, but also the pioneer Russian abstractionist, Wassily Kandinsky, his

compatriots, Alexei Jawlensky and Marianne van Werefkin, and even the German-American painter of the New York School, Hans Hofmann.<sup>8</sup> The distinguished accomplishments of Ažbè's students warrant special attention to his activity as a teacher.

Ažbè has been considered anew in an important study by Peg Weiss, Kandinsky in Munich: The Formative Years (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978). Weiss' evaluation of the importance of the Munich milieu in Kandinsky's breakthrough to abstraction answers a long-expressed need for a first-rate examination of avant-garde developments in that city at the turn of the century, a subject which, as Hilton Kramer has remarked, "rivals its counterparts in Paris and Vienna in excitement and consequence."<sup>9</sup> While the influence on Kandinsky of Jugendstil art and aesthetics and Symbolist poetry is the heart of Weiss' book, her discussion of the artistic and intellectual climate of the "Athens on the Isar" in the two decades prior to World War I will interest anyone who is concerned with art life in this Mecca for Slavic and Eastern European painters and sculptors in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Weiss' discussion of Ažbè should be of particular interest to Slovene scholars, for Ažbè is studied in an English publication for the first time in detail,<sup>10</sup> and is considered in an international context. The author adds new information to the descriptions of Ažbè's art and pedagogical techniques in the two major earlier studies, the exhibition catalogue Anton Ažbè in njegova šola (Ljubljana: Narodna galerija, 1962), and the Russian study of Ažbè's teaching methods by Nina M. Moleva and Elij M. Beljutin, Škola Antona Ašbe (Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo "Iskusstvo," 1958).<sup>11</sup> Weiss repeats and expands upon the stories of Ažbè's Bohemian eccentricity, personal generosity, and encouragement of his pupils, all qualities which helped build his reputation in Schwabing, the artist's quarter of Munich. She succinctly discusses Ažbè's teaching method and focuses on four issues:

. . . his emphasis on the use of pure colors applied directly to the canvas without mixing; his widely known 'principe de la sphère' or 'Kugel-System', as it was called; his advice to work with broad, sweeping lines, and with a very wide brush; and finally, his commitment to encouraging the individual development of his students.<sup>12</sup>

Weiss also discusses Kandinsky as an Ažbè student, and Ažbè's

own art, which she surveyed with the assistance of Dr. Ksenija Rozman in Ljubljana in 1972.<sup>13</sup> Thus, although her treatment of the Slovene artist is brief, Weiss effectively assesses Ažbè's influence on Kandinsky's early development, and establishes Ažbè's formative role in the evolution of the Russian's art.

Ažbè had an unlikely background for a teacher who was to nourish the talents of artistic revolutionaries. He worked first with Janez Wolf in Ljubljana and then studied at the Academy in Vienna from 1882 to 1884 with Griepenkerl, Eisenmenger, and L'Allemand; from 1884 to 1890 he worked at the Munich Academy, in the ateliers of Hackl, Müller, Löffitz, and Wagner. With the encouragement of his countrymen Rihard Jakopič and Ferdo Vesel, he opened his own school in Munich in 1891.<sup>14</sup>

The largest part of Weiss' discussion of Kandinsky's first art teacher is given over to a consideration of Ažbè's pedagogy, and indeed, it is this aspect of his work which is most in need of clarification. Moleva and Beljutin, mindful of the fact that the Soviet artists Igor Grabar and Mstislav Dobuzinski studied under Ažbè, treat him as a forefather of Russian socialist realism, and emphasize his program for the achievement of a fully three-dimensional illusionistic style.<sup>15</sup> France Stelè, in contrast, writing in the catalogue of the Ljubljana exhibition, and reflecting an interest in the Slovene impressionists, attempts to relate Ažbè's teaching to French post-impressionism, particularly the neo-impressionists, and the painting and thought of Cézanne.<sup>16</sup> Weiss, on the other hand, views Ažbè's teaching as a pragmatic set of learning techniques rather than a complete theoretical and pedagogical system, as both Moleva and Beljutin, as well as Stelè, seem to imply that it was. Instead, Weiss shows that Ažbè's inculcation of his classes in the use of the broad brush, long sweeping strokes, and unmixed pure color applied directly to the canvas, provided an auspicious and significant beginning for Kandinsky's professional development.<sup>17</sup>

Due to the lack of primary sources--Ažbè never wrote down his ideas on art education--it is impossible to be specific about the completeness of Ažbè's art theory. Certainly he emphasized the formal means at the painter's disposal, rather than the traditional study of anatomy and "correct" drawing and composition. Furthermore, he gave his

students broad freedom to develop their own individual gifts, and is said to have encouraged his students' progressive tendencies. Historically, the most important aspect of Ažbè's teaching was his insistence on the use of pure colors in painting, and his firm belief that an artist must master the laws of color interaction. Weiss notes,

Ažbè stood then in the mainstream of avant-garde artistic development, teaching painting as an art of color. He believed that the basis for the painting of the future would be a strong sense of color and that the purpose of schooling is to develop this color sense.<sup>18</sup>

At the same time, color was linked in Ažbè's mind to solutions of the problem of modelling form. What is accomplished through tone (light and shading) in drawing, Ažbè believed, could be solved in painting through the judicious application of pure color.<sup>19</sup> Ažbè called the scintillation of pure pigments juxtaposed on the canvas "the crystallization of colors," or "the diamond effect." Ažbè connected the ability to render form chromatically with the portrayal of the mutual coloristic relations between adjoining forms. Ažbè's justification for this approach, however, does not lie in adherence to the divisionist practice of following Chevreul's "law of simultaneous contrast." He seems to have grounded his advocacy of the juxtaposition of pure colors, first, on the basis of the scale reduction from the scene in nature to the easel picture, and, second, on the mutual influence of neighboring hues. Such a scale reduction made it impossible to be accurate in rendering local colors; rather, since the artist cannot imitate nature exactly, Ažbè reasoned, he must try to be true to his perceptions by reinforcing the vibrancy and interaction of nature's hues in projecting his forms volumetrically onto the canvas.

Weiss takes significant exception to Stelè's attempt to link Ažbè's belief in the use of pure pigments to French neo-impressionist theory, and Stelè's suggestion that Ažbè "actually advocated theories of 'optical mixture.'"<sup>20</sup> Referring to J. Carson Webster's reappraisal of impressionist and neo-impressionist color theory. Weiss aptly repeats Webster's finding that "optical mixture" is "'rarely if ever' the actual result achieved by neo-impressionist technique."<sup>21</sup> She notes further that Signac's influential series of articles explaining neo-impressionist theory did not appear in an

excerpted German translation until 1898, seven years after Ažbè had opened his school, and most certainly long after he had formulated his ideas on teaching.<sup>22</sup>

Professor Rajko Ložar argues pertinently that Ažbè's stress on color must be seen in the broad context of nineteenth century painting and the growing dissatisfaction with the stultifying practice of extensive preliminary studies preceding the act of painting.<sup>23</sup> Ažbè's emphasis on color, Professor Ložar suggests, must be interpreted in the light of his painterly--malerisch--gifts. Ažbè's recommendation of broad, sweeping strokes and the employment of a wide brush, so that the basic shapes of the subject could be captured quickly, seems consistent with an attitude of using the means which are appropriate to the medium, the first of these for painting being color. Professor Ložar writes,

My conclusion is: Ažbè's emphasis on color was the outgrowth of his absolutely painterly thinking, he was a painter, ein Maler, and his style was painterly, authentically malerisch.<sup>24</sup>

Another key element in Ažbè's teaching practice was the "Kugel-System," the notion that anyone who could draw a sphere with its proper shading could depict any form in nature by using this basic geometric element as a building block. The "principle of the sphere" offered a common-sense, optically based alternative to the imposition of single-point perspective, and prompted a freer, more creative interchange between the artist and his subject than would obtain in a Renaissance picture space. Ažbè thought that it was impossible for a student to solve anatomical problems until he or she had mastered the general rules and methods of shaping the human body according to the "principle of the sphere," with the proper distribution of light and shade.<sup>25</sup>

Not surprisingly, Ažbè started his students drawing heads.<sup>26</sup> Only after the shading of the rounded oval had been determined were the features of the face to be added. The planes of the face were generalized and flattened in order to stress the three-dimensionality of the skull as a whole. In drawing the figure, the first step was the shading of the large masses of the body; only subsequently were contours to be drawn in. Ažbè also paid attention to the movement or direction of a model's pose--the thrust of a hip, for instance, to one side or another--as a means of emphasizing

the plasticity of the figure.<sup>27</sup>

Stelè associates Ažbè and Cézanne, stressing the similarities of Ažbè's "principle of the sphere" to Cézanne's well-known advice to Émile Bernard to "treat nature by means of the cylinder, the sphere, the cone."<sup>28</sup> Again, attempts to link Ažbè to his French contemporaries may be challenged. The misunderstandings and misinterpretations of Cézanne's famous statement have been fully discussed in recent Cézanne scholarship. Reff has noted that as early as the first half of the nineteenth century French art students were taught to begin their course of study by drawing geometrical shapes, rather than copying engravings, as had been the practice earlier. Two of the most important nineteenth-century art theorists, Thénot and Blanc, discuss the depiction of nature's forms through geometric shapes, and as Reff points out, Thénot, writing in 1838, "specifically mentions 'the cylinder, the cone, and the sphere.'"<sup>29</sup> Cézanne was thus passing on to Émile Bernard what William Rubin goes so far as to call "an art school bromide."<sup>30</sup> In point of fact, Moleva and Beljutin demonstrated that the geometrical analysis of the artist's subject was far less a part of Ažbè's program than that of his rival, the Hungarian painter Simon Hollósy, who also led a private painting school in Munich.<sup>31</sup> Professor Ložar suggests instead that the "principle of the sphere" can be seen as part of Ažbè's more relaxed attitude towards pictorial form, and an outgrowth of his malerisch attitude.<sup>32</sup>

Despite similarities to aspects of post-impressionist doctrine, Ažbè's goals remained tied to a nineteenth-century naturalist conception of the future possibilities of painting. Ažbè's own pictures remained pre-impressionist; he would seem to have attempted to prepare his students for the evolution of a new painterly realism, based on volumetric construction realized through color. And while Ažbè was interested in the laws of color interaction and complementarism, his methods cannot be linked in any positive manner to the ideas of his French contemporaries. The crux of Ažbè's difference from the French resides in the fact that he still struggled towards a fully illusionistic style, while the French post-impressionists had understood the necessity of stressing the primacy of the picture plane in full color painting.

The context for Ažbè's innovations must be found in the late nineteenth-century impulses to throw off the authority

of Courbet, who still dominated official Central European Art. Among those who were successful in leaving Courbet behind were Ažbè's friends, Fritz von Uhde and Heinrich Zügel;<sup>33</sup> and while Ažbè did not champion their "mild" impressionism, he may well have been stimulated by their experiments. And like all great teachers, the Slovene undoubtedly learned from his students, and adopted their concerns into the framework of his more traditional understanding of the painter's task.

Was Ažbè truly a pedagogical innovator then? And if not, how can one explain the extraordinary coloristic talents of so many of his pupils, most notably Kandinsky, Jawlensky, Werefkin, Hofmann, and Jakopič? Claims for Ažbè's progressiveness must be qualified by limiting the field of comparison to Munich. Ažbè's teaching was certainly freer than that offered in the Munich Academy, which still concentrated on the fundamentals of anatomy, planar perspective, and traditional methods of technical preparation and execution of paintings. Secondly, he allowed his students an extraordinary degree of freedom and latitude. In Grabar's memory that Ažbè gave preference to the most advanced tendencies in his students' painting,<sup>34</sup> one finds an intimation that the master virtually encouraged apostasy in students whom he found to be gifted. Ažbè's neglect of specific instruction in composition and anatomy, and his concentration on problems of image making and spatial representation seem to have served his students well as they subsequently broached new formal languages. It seems possible that in the disjuncture between Ažbè's statements or goals and his practice, his students may have been prepared for an art which went beyond the possibilities offered in Ažbè's studio. With regard to Ažbè's teaching of color, it has been said that in the opposition between painting and drawing in his school, between working in color and tonal modelling in black and white, some of Ažbè's students may have been led to separate color from the description of form, as may be seen, for instance, in Kandinsky's Murnau landscapes.<sup>35</sup> More fundamentally, the fact that Ažbè encouraged a knowledge of the laws of color is noteworthy and extremely significant in itself.

Weiss' book marks the beginning of a new period in the study of Munich's contribution to the history of twentieth-century art. In the importance of Munich to the development of Eastern European art in general, one can expect the most fruitful consequences to scholarship in the further examination of the many issues Weiss raises.<sup>36</sup>

Princeton University, Princeton

## Footnotes

<sup>1</sup>"Von Ausstellungen und Sammlungen," Die Kunst 8 (May 1903), 389.

<sup>2</sup>Felix Klee, Paul Klee: His Life and Work in Documents, trans. Richard and Clara Winston (New York: George Braziller, 1962), 26.

<sup>3</sup>H. R. Wadleigh, Munich: History, Monuments, and Art (London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1910), 92: referred to in Peg Weiss, Kandinsky in Munich: The Formative Years (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1978), 4. For statistics regarding enrollment in the Academy from Summer, 1898, to Winter, 1900, see Weiss, op. cit., 162, note 23.

<sup>4</sup>Setzungen für die Studierenden der Königlich Bayerischen Akademie der bildenden Künste in München (Munich, 1911) Because the archives of the Munich Academy were substantially destroyed during World War II, earlier sets of regulations are not available, although from contemporary references it seems unlikely that there was much variation in this period.

<sup>5</sup>For a discussion of Stuck's atelier, see Weiss, op. cit., 48-53.

<sup>6</sup>Henry Nordhausen, interview in New York, February, 1979. The practice continued into the 1920's, when Nordhausen was a student at the Munich Academy. George Grosz recalled in his autobiography doing life-size drawings from plaster casts of the antique in Richard Müller's class in the Dresden Academy. These were done in pencil, not charcoal, and a mahlstick was relied upon. See Annemarie Dube-Heynig, Kirchner, His Graphic Art (Greenwich: New York Graphic Society, 1961), 19.

<sup>7</sup>Leonhard Frank recalled that gifted young students at the Academy would leave that institution to study under Ažbè. The variety of nationalities at Ažbè's school is confirmed by Frank and others: Leonhard Frank, Links Wo das Herz ist (Munich: Nymphenberger Verlagshandlung, 1952), 26.

<sup>8</sup>Karel Dobida, "Biographie Sommaire," in Anton Ažbè in njegova šola (Ljubljana: Narodna galerija, 1962), 136. Hofmann's study with Ažbè has not been recognized earlier because he misspelled his teacher's name "Aspe." See Hans

Hofmann, Search for the Real, ed. Sara T. Weeks and Bartlett H. Hayes, Jr. (Andover: Addison Gallery, 1948; reprinted Cambridge: M.I.T. Press, 1967), 4.

<sup>9</sup>Hilton Kramer, "Color Drenched Paintings of Jawlensky," The New York Times, 2 February, 1975. Kramer asked editorially in the same article, "Why, I wonder, has the Munich avant-garde of the turn of the century never attracted a first-rate writer?" Weiss' book admirably fills the need for such a study.

<sup>10</sup>Ažbè is discussed briefly in Peter Selz, German Expressionist Painting (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1957), 176. Selz translates Ažbè's obituary in Kunstchronik 16 (August 18, 1905), 505.

<sup>11</sup>The spelling of Ažbè's name varies widely: Hans Hofmann referred to him as "Aspe"; Burliuk called him "Achbe," and the Russian scholars, Moleva and Beljutin, spell his name "Ašbe." His German contemporaries referred to him as "Azbe," without any diacritical marks. On the other hand, Slovene scholarship, based on documentary biographical data, uses the form "Ažbè." Cf., K. Dobida, "Ažbè, Anton," in Enciklopedija Jugoslavije, I (Zagreb: Leksikografski zavod FNRJ, 1955), 258; and: Slovensko slikarstvo (ed. Š. Čopić et al.) (Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba, 1966), 238.

<sup>12</sup>Weiss, op. cit., 15.

<sup>13</sup>Weiss was also assisted in translations from the Slovene by Mr. Metod Milac, Assistant Director of Bird Library, Syracuse University.

<sup>14</sup>Dobida, "Biographie," op. cit., 136.

<sup>15</sup>Moleva and Beljutin, op. cit., 43, 64.

<sup>16</sup>France Stelè, "Anton Ažbè--učitelj," in Anton Ažbè in njegova šola, op. cit., 14-16; see also the French summary, "Anton Ažbè comme pédagogue," loc. cit., 134-135.

<sup>17</sup>Weiss, op. cit., 13-18.

<sup>18</sup>Ibid., 15.

<sup>19</sup>Moleva and Beljutin, op. cit., 64-72. See also Stelè, op. cit., especially 5-7.

<sup>20</sup>Weiss, op. cit., 15-16.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid., 16. See also J. Carson Webster, "The Technique of Impressionism: A Reappraisal," College Art Journal (November 1944), 3-22.

<sup>22</sup>Weiss, op. cit., 162, note 34.

<sup>23</sup>Professor Rajko Ložar to Peter Morrin, 4 December, 1978. Professor Ložar's views suggest to me that Ažbè's teachings may represent a parallel development to changes in French art education which occurred during the nineteenth century. Albert Boime has documented the shift in primary interest in France from the "executive refining stage to the generative spontaneous stage" (Albert Boime, The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century [London: Phaidon, 1971], 185. Boime's discussion of the advocacy of painting in pure tints as a preliminary stage in academic methodology raises the question of whether or not Ažbè was borrowing from the curriculum of the French private ateliers. At this point I do not think a conclusive answer is possible. On the other hand, Boime's study indicates a context for a pre-impressionist interpretation of Ažbè's pedagogy, supporting Professor Ložar's opinion.

<sup>24</sup>Ložar to Morrin, loc. cit.

<sup>25</sup>Stelè, op. cit., 7.

<sup>26</sup>Ibid.

<sup>27</sup>Moleva and Beljutin, op. cit., 52. See also Katherine S. Drier, Burliuk (New York: Société Anonyme and Color and Rhye, 1944), 36.

<sup>28</sup>Stelè, op. cit., 15-16, 134.

<sup>29</sup>Theodore Reff, "Painting and Theory in the Final Decade," in Cézanne, The Late Work, ed. William Rubin (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1977), 47. Reff refers to Jean-Pierre Thénot, Morphographie; ou l'art de représenter...des corps solides (Paris: L'Auteur, 1838), 50-56, and Charles Blanc, Grammaire des arts du dessin, 2nd ed. (Paris: Renouard, 1870), 572-576. See also Reff's discussion in his "Cézanne and Poussin," Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes 23

(1960), 150-74.

<sup>30</sup>William Rubin, "Cézannism and the Beginnings of Cubism," in Cézanne, The Late Work, op. cit., 201-202, n. 150.

<sup>31</sup>Moleva and Beljutin, op. cit., 27 ff. Differences between Ažbè and Hollossy are illustrated in the reproductions facing pp. 41, 44, 54, and 56.

<sup>32</sup>Ložar to Morrin, 23 November, 1978. In his writings on Ažbè, Ložar has emphasized that Ažbè's contribution lay in the encouragement of freer brushwork, and an improvisatory attitude, as is indicated by his famous motto, "nur fest," or "schmier nur fest". See Rajko Ložar, "Mojstri slovenskega impresionizma," Umetnost (1940), 163-177; and Rajko Ložar, "Uvodna beseda o slikarju Jožetu Petkovšku," in Marijan Marolt, Jože Petkovšek: Življenjepisna povest, ed. Tine Debeljak (Buenos Aires, 1975), 7-20. In the latter publication, Ložar equates the Kugelprinzip to the famous anecdote of an exchange between Courbet and Manet:

Courbet: But Monsieur Manet, your figures look like playing cards!

Manet: And your figures, Monsieur Courbet, look like billiard balls.

Ložar also emphasizes Ažbè's role as "the executor of the artistic legacy of Janez Wolf," a (conservative) legacy passed on principally to Matej Sternen, Ferdo Vesel, and subsequently, Gojmir A. Kos. As for the more adventurous Slovene impressionists, Rihard Jakopič, Matija Jama, and Ivan Grohar, Ložar stresses their indebtedness to Juriž Subic's example rather than Ažbè's teaching.

<sup>33</sup>Dobida, "Biographie," op. cit., 136. As is clear from the preceding note, I do not believe that Ažbè successfully overcame Courbet's authority. Zügel was known for telling his students, "You have to create form with color." See Franz Roh, German Painting in the Twentieth Century, with additions by Juliane Roy, trans. Catherine Hutter (Greenwich: New York Graphic Society, 1958), 18.

<sup>34</sup>Stelè, op. cit., 135. Ložar writes (Ložar to Morrin, 4 December, 1978),

The road must be kept open for other potential stimuli in Ažbè's teaching, which were inherent in them and germinated later in the art works of the apostatic students, such as Kandinsky or Hofmann.

<sup>35</sup>Stelè, loc. cit.

<sup>36</sup>It is not too much to expect that as an indirect result of the work of Weiss and others, before too long Slovene impressionism will become known to a far greater international audience, and will come to be understood, not merely as a national or regional movement, but as part of wider currents in the history of art whose mutual relationships can be unravelled and discerned, and whose unique contributions can be more fully appreciated in a broader field of comparison. For instance, a critical comparison of the Slovene impressionists and the Hungarian Nagybanya school would offer insights into both movements, since their origins and intentions were quite similar.