

Manuals on Historical Method: A Genre of Polemical Reflection on the Aims of Science

Herman Paul

(published in *The Making of the Humanities*, vol. 3, ed. Rens Bod, Jaap Maat, and Thijs Weststeijn, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012, pp. 171-182).

Introduction

Manuals on historical method from around 1900 are like neo-scholastic philosophy textbooks: books that are supposed to be so dull and dreary that only few scholars dare venture into them. Although methodology manuals were once a flourishing genre, especially in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, when such emerging academic disciplines as history, art history, and church history were in need of methodological signposts and boundary markers, the hundreds of pages that these manuals typically devote to the minutiae of internal and external source criticism now read like neo-scholastic meditations on the *analogia entis*. At least, that is the impression offered by the spare secondary literature on such late nineteenth-century methodology books as Ernst Bernheim's *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode* (1889) and the *Introduction aux études historiques* (1898) by Charles-Victor Langlois and Charles Seignobos. If these manuals are not openly criticized for their positivist-inspired epistemologies,¹ they are portrayed at best as dry, didactic means for codifying and conveying the methodological standards of newly established humanities disciplines.²

This, however, is to overlook that methodology books could serve as canons or swords in heated debates over the aims of historical scholarship. Virtually unnoticed in the literature so far is that manuals on historical method could serve as polemical interventions in debates on the nature and implications of a scholar's vocation. This is true for historical manuals – think of Charles De Smedt's *Principes de la critique historique* (1883), or Edward Augustus Freeman's *The Methods of Historical Study* (1886) – but especially also for manuals

¹ Hans Schleier, 'Ranke in the Manuals on Historical Methods of Droysen, Lorenz, and Bernheim', in *Leopold von Ranke and the Shaping of the Historical Discipline*, ed. Georg G. Iggers and James M. Powell (Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press, 1990), 111-123; Philippe Carrard, 'Disciplining Clio: The Rhetoric of Positivism', *Clio* 24 (1995), 189-204.

² Jeremy D. Popkin, *History, Historians, and Autobiography* (Chicago; London: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 16; Rolf Torstendahl, 'Historical Professionalism: A Changing Product of Communities Within the Discipline', *Storia della Storiografia* 56 (2009), 3-26, there 10-11.

in fields plagued by insoluble disagreement over the need for scholarly asceticism with regard to religious beliefs, aesthetic taste, or moral judgment. Reading Hans Tietze's *Die Methode der Kunstgeschichte* (1913) and Guido Adler's *Methode der Musikgeschichte* (1919), for instance, does not amount to entering a classroom where students are being initiated into the methodological foundations of their discipline; it amounts to entering a battlefield. For whatever their titles may suggest, these manuals did not merely deal with methods, that is, etymologically speaking, with a scholar's 'ways' or 'paths', but also in particular with the goals to which such roads supposedly led. The books engaged in debate over ends at least as much as over means.

If this is true, historians of the humanities may want to dust off these methodology manuals, for instance if they are interested in what Lorraine Daston calls the *persona* of the scholar,³ or what I call the 'scholarly self', that is, the habits, virtues, and character traits that were considered as distinguishing good scholars from less gifted ones.⁴ Why did late nineteenth-century humanities scholars often fail to reach agreement on the qualities of the *wissenschaftliche Persönlichkeit*? Why did they often have rather different expectations of the scholar's moral and intellectual character?⁵ Part of the answer is that these scholars did not quite agree on the aims that habits, virtues, and character traits were supposed to serve. What counted as scholarly virtues and vices depended, among other things, on the goods that scholars were supposed to pursue – that is, on the 'aims of science' (or, more broadly, the 'aims of scholarship') as debated in the pages of such methodology manuals as Tietze's *Die Methode der Kunstgeschichte* and Adler's *Methode der Musikgeschichte*.⁶

So, what I shall argue, with these two books from early twentieth-century Vienna as my case studies, is that manuals on historical method, uninspiring as they may seem, offer in fact some fascinating insight into disciplinary polemics over the most fundamental of all questions: What is the goal our discipline must serve?

³ Lorraine Daston, 'Die wissenschaftliche Persona: Arbeit und Berufung', in *Zwischen Vorderbühne und Hinterbühne: Beiträge zum Wandel der Geschlechterbeziehungen in der Wissenschaft vom 17. Jahrhundert bis zur Gegenwart*, ed. Theresa Wobbe (Bielefeld: Transcript Verlag, 2003), 110-136; Lorraine Daston and H. Otto Sibum, 'Introduction: Scientific Personae and Their Histories', *Science in Context* 16 (2003), 1-8.

⁴ Herman Paul, 'The Scholarly Self: Ideals of Intellectual Virtue in Nineteenth-Century Leiden', in *The Making of the Humanities: From Early Modern to Modern Disciplines*, ed. Rens Bot, Jaap Maat, and Thijs Weststeijn (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2012), 397-411.

⁵ Jo Tollebeek, *Men of Character: The Emergence of the Modern Humanities* (Wassenaar: Netherlands Institute for Advanced Study in the Humanities and Social Sciences, 2011).

⁶ I borrow the expression 'aims of science' from Larry Laudan, *Science and Values: The Aims of Science and Their Role in Scientific Debate* (Berkeley; London; Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984).

The Viennese context

Both Tietze (1880-1954) and Adler (1855-1941) were firmly rooted in that vibrant center of intellectual, cultural, and political life that was Vienna in the 1910s.⁷ Although both men had spent more than a decade in Prague – Tietze as a child, Adler on his first professorial chair – they had made the Austrian-Hungarian capital their home during their studies in Vienna and established themselves in Viennese upper middle class circles by marrying into local merchant families. Moreover, both Tietze and Adler belonged to one of those Viennese ‘schools’ or ‘circles’ that set their stamp on early twentieth-century art, philosophy, and scholarship. As a former student of Franz Wickhoff, Alois Riegl, and Julius von Schlosser, and as *Privatdozent* in art history at the University of Vienna, Tietze belonged to the third generation of the ‘Viennese School of Art History’. Adler, on his turn, had exchanged his professoriate in Prague for the chair of his former teacher Eduard Hanslick in Vienna in 1898. The ‘Second Viennese School’ to which Adler is often said to belong was not a historical school, but a group of avant-garde composers and musicians, the best-known members of which included Arnold Schönberg, Alban Berg, and Anton Webern. Academically, however, Adler was expected to do for music history what the Viennese School of Art History was doing for the history of the visual arts: raising the level of scholarship so as to meet the strictest demands of modern, critical, source-based historical studies. As one of the members of the search committee responsible for Adler’s appointment had put it in 1896: ‘Without question, the university, as an abode of learned research, has above all the right and the need to assure that the study of music history is undertaken by the faculty according to the same methods as those used in every other historical discipline...’⁸

One wonders, though: How easily could ‘learned research’ be reconciled with deep fascination for Schönberg? To what extent was joyous immersion in Vienna’s cultural life

⁷ For biographical details, see Ernst Lachnit, *Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte und die Kunst ihrer Zeit: Zum Verhältnis von Methode und Forschungsgegenstand am Beginn der Moderne* (Vienna; Cologne; Weimar: Böhlau, 2005), 98-110; Almut Krapf-Weiler, ‘Daten zur Biographie’, in Hans Tietze, *Lebendige Kunstwissenschaft: Texte 1910-1954*, ed. Almut Krapf-Weiler (Vienna: Schönböck, 2007), 308-315; Gabriele Johanna Eder, ‘Einleitung’, in *Alexius Meinong und Guido Adler: Eine Freundschaft in Briefen*, ed. Gabriele Johanna Eder (Amsterdam; Atlanta, GA: Rodopi, 1995), 3-52; idem, ‘Guido Adler: Grenzgänger zwischen Musikwissenschaft und Kulturleben’, in *Musikwissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft damals und heute: Internationales Symposium (1989) zum Jubiläum der Institutsgründung an der Universität Wien vor 100 Jahren*, ed. Theophil Antonicek and Gernot Gruber (Tutzing: Hans Schneider, 2005), 101-123.

⁸ Quoted in Kevin C. Karnes, *Music, Criticism, and the Challenge of History: Shaping Modern Musical Thought in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna* (New York; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008), 23.

compatible with the scholarly asceticism preached by advocates of scientific history? Both Tietze and Adler worked in academic contexts that put a premium on sharp division lines between scholarly research and aesthetic appreciation of art. Moriz Thausing, for example, one of Tietze's most influential predecessors in the Viennese School of Art History, had advocated a type of art history from which aesthetic criteria had been rigorously banned.⁹ This positivist legacy had been carried on by Tietze's teachers, Wickhoff, who had put all his cards on rigorous source criticism, and Riegl, whose was reported to have said that the best art historian is a person without personal taste.¹⁰ Tietze, however, *had* a taste for art: he greatly enjoyed expressionist art and supported such young painters as Oskar Kokoschka (whose double portrait of the Tietzes, painted in 1909, testifies to their close relationship).¹¹

Similar tensions between the historical and the aesthetic existed in the emerging field of music history, where the German Bach biographer Philipp Spitta represented that end of the spectrum most committed to positivist *Musikwissenschaft*, while Hanslick, Adler's predecessor and prolific music critic, was a specimen of the opposite style. No one doubted that after Hanslick's retirement, in 1895, the university longed for a Spitta-type of musicologist. As one Viennese observer put it, in a letter to Johannes Brahms: 'Since work in the field of music history has, under Spitta's magnificent influence, seen an upswing and an expansion that was almost unimaginable twenty-five years ago, today one expects a completely different kind of knowledge from someone who occupies a pulpit like the one on which Hanslick stood.'¹² That the university expected Adler to be a kind of second Spitta was hardly surprising. Not only did Adler know Spitta very well – they had, for example, co-founded the *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft* – but also had he aligned himself closely with Spitta's positivist program, most notably in his 1885 article, 'Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft'.¹³ One wonders, however, how carefully the Viennese search committee had read the last few pages of this manifesto, in which Adler, contrary to

⁹ M. Thausing, 'Die Stellung der Kunstgeschichte als Wissenschaft: Aus einer Antrittsvorlesung an der Wiener Universität im October 1873', in Thausing, *Wiener Kunstbriefe* (Leipzig: E. A. Seemann, 1884), 1-20.

¹⁰ Cited in Max Dvořák, 'Alois Riegl', in Dvořák, *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kunstgeschichte* (Munich: R. Piper & Co., 1929), 280-298, there 285.

¹¹ Catherine M. Soussloff, *The Subject in Art: Portraiture and the Birth of the Modern* (Durham; London: Duke University Press, 2006), 61-82.

¹² Quoted in Karnes, *Music*, 24.

¹³ Guido Adler, 'Umfang, Methode und Ziel der Musikwissenschaft', *Vierteljahrsschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 1 (1885), 5-20. Cf. Philipp Spitta, 'Kunstwissenschaft und Kunst', in Spitta, *Zur Musik: Sechzehn Aufsätze* (Berlin: Gebrüder Paetel, 1892), 1-14.

his positivist inclinations, had charged music historians with the responsibility of helping, stimulating, and encouraging composers and musicians – a task that Spitta would have rejected as truly unscientific. And what did the committee know about Adler’s fascination, not only for Schönberg, but also for Gustav Mahler and Richard Wagner, or about his life-long wrestling with Friedrich Nietzsche’s question on the use of history for life?¹⁴

All this is to suggest that Tietze and Adler lived in a world ridden with tensions: tensions between the historical and the aesthetic, between scholarship and art, as well as between Viennese cultural life and a university proud to be at the forefront of positivist science. Tietze and Adler, each in their own way, not merely encountered these tensions; they embodied them and tried to cope with them.

The aims of science

Tietze’s and Adler’s methodology books are book-length proposals for working out such tensions. This is perhaps not immediately apparent. Both manuals have lengthy chapters on auxiliary sciences. Both spend a significant number of pages on source criticism – the watchword of those committed to what Franz Schulz called a ‘philological ethos’ in the nineteenth-century humanities.¹⁵ In this respect, the books fairly closely resemble Ernst Bernheim’s *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode*, which is perhaps the prime example of a methodology book that codified a broadly shared set of methods in a more or less student-friendly format. Tietze’s *Methode* even imitated the structure of Bernheim’s *Lehrbuch* and relied on it in matters of source criticism.¹⁶

Unlike Bernheim, however, Tietze and Adler were not in a position to codify a set of widely shared methods. Although Bernheim, a historian of medieval Europe, had also risked his neck, perhaps especially by choosing sides in such methodological disputes as those revolving around Dietrich Schäfer and Karl Lamprecht,¹⁷ his book was conventional in the sense one expects a methodology manual to be. It offered a state-of-the-art description of

¹⁴ Karnes, *Music*, 133-158.

¹⁵ Franz Schultz, ‘Die Entwicklung der Literaturwissenschaft von Herder bis Wilhelm Scherer’, in *Philosophie der Literaturwissenschaft*, ed. Emil Ermatinger (Berlin: Junker & Dünnhaupt, 1930), 1-42, there 37.

¹⁶ See, e.g., Hans Tietze, *Die Methode der Kunstgeschichte: Ein Versuch* (Leipzig: E.A. Seemann, 1913), vi, 187, 240, 257, 288-289, 293, 298, 308, 316.

¹⁷ Mircea Ogrin, *Ernst Bernheim (1850-1942): Historiker und Wissenschaftspolitiker im Kaiserreich und in der Weimarer Republik* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner, 2012), 44-57; Hans Schleier, ‘Ernst Bernheims Historik in seinem “Lehrbuch der historischen Methode”’, in *Das lange 19. Jahrhundert: Personen, Ereignisse, Ideen, Umwälzungen: Ernst Engelberg zum 90. Geburtstag*, ed. Wolfgang Küttler (Berlin: Trafo, 1999), 275-292.

methods used by a majority of historians, working in the tradition of Leopold von Ranke, who consequently felt little difficulty in recognizing the patterns laid out in Bernheim's manual. Such conventions, however, did not, or not to the same degree, exist in Tietze's and Adler's fields of study. Even if they exaggerated in their complaints about an 'almost endless number of approaches', about an 'anarchy that threatens the kernel of our discipline', or, in military language, about a 'fight', a *Krieg bis aufs Messer*, with 'contending parties' that treated each other like 'enemies',¹⁸ Tietze and Adler made controversial choices with every step they took. Was it appropriate, for example, to recommend a student of Mozart's Requiem to subject the autograph manuscript to external source criticism? Or would such a technical examination of the Requiem manuscript miss the whole point of studying this sublime piece of music, as a more aesthetically inclined musicologist might argue?¹⁹

Strikingly, when Tietze and Adler spoke about methods, they presented these as conditioned by the aims of scholarship. They highlighted the indissoluble ties between the methods that Mozart scholars chose to employ and the aims their scholarship served. Adler, for instance, regularly employed topographical metaphors in arguing that methods are like 'roads' leading to a 'goal'. What kind of roads scholars have to travel, depends on the *Zweck* or *Ziel* they want to reach. Scholars must therefore be 'goal-oriented' (*zweckgemäß*) and, consequently, employ purposive (*zweckentsprechende*) methods.²⁰ For Tietze, too, methods were always means to an end. Especially in the opening pages of his book, he spoke in one and the same breath about 'goal and method' (*Zweck und Method*), 'method and tasks' (*Methode und Aufgaben*), 'task and working manner' (*Aufgabe und Arbeitsweise*), and 'method and purpose' (*Methode und Absicht*). Apparently, what it meant for scholars to work methodically was to be goal-oriented, or unfailingly dedicated to the 'distinctive knowledge aims' (*eigentümlichen Erkenntniszielen*) of their discipline.²¹

This explains why Tietze and Adler reflected at least as much on the aims, goals, and purposes of scholarship as on their methods and means. Confronted with a diversity of approaches in their respective fields, they felt this 'chaos' was not so much a lack of methodological unanimity, but rather a divergence of views on the very goals that art historians or music historians were supposed to serve. Accordingly, the key word in their

¹⁸ Guido Adler, *Methode der Musikgeschichte* (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1919), 2; Tietze, *Methode*, v, 4, 6, 3. All translations are mine.

¹⁹ Adler, *Methode*, 4-5.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 2, 110, 59, 67, 63.

²¹ Tietze, *Methode*, 2, 7, 171.

manuals was not method, but task, aim, goal (*Aufgabe, Ziel, Zweck*) or, more emphatically, ‘main task’ (*Hauptaufgabe*).²² Especially Adler continuously reminded his readers of the distinctive *Aufgabe* or *Hauptaufgabe der Musikgeschichte*, arguing that music history could grow to maturity only if its practitioners stayed focused on its proper aim (resisting the lures of such unscientific goals as aesthetic pleasure and education of the general public).²³

One might argue, of course, that the language of aims is inevitable in methodology books, especially if such manuals also practice the genre of encyclopedia by providing a map of the discipline and its constituent parts. Even Bernheim devoted a section to the ‘nature and task of historical scholarship’, while returning to the ‘goal of historical scholarship’ and the ‘fundamental tasks of our science’ whenever he dealt with such ‘temptations’ as artistic writing and romantic evocation of the past.²⁴ Likewise, Langlois and Seignobos, in France, could not do without the language of aims when they portrayed historians as traveling on a road towards the goal of their profession: establishing true facts about the past.²⁵ However, while Bernheim, Langlois, and Seignobos could more or less expect their readers to agree with what they defined as the goal of their profession, given that deviant views mostly came from *outside* the mainstream of the historical discipline, Tietze and Adler saw themselves confronted with opposition from *within* the ranks of their profession. When they set out to define ‘the office of art history’,²⁶ they were not articulating a broadly accepted position, but taking sides in a fierce debate about the scholar’s vocation.

A lead for the future

Unsurprisingly, then, both Tietze and Adler presented their views on the aims of science in *contrastive terms*, that is, in explicit dissociation from alternative views on the goods that historical scholarship was supposed to pursue. Typical is, for example, Adler’s phrase ‘that the task of music history is not the exploration of artistic beauty [*das Kunstschönen*] in music, but knowledge of the development of music’.²⁷ If this formulation already conveyed Adler’s

²² E.g., *ibid.*, 105, 107, 110, 113, 116, 123, 126, 165, 166, 176.

²³ E.g., Adler, *Methode*, 6, 9, 10, 13, 15, 192.

²⁴ Ernst Bernheim, *Lehrbuch der historischen Methode: Mit Nachweis der wichtigsten Quellen und Hilfsmittel zum Studium der Geschichte* (Leipzig: Duncker & Humblot, 1889), 90-96, 523, 528.

²⁵ Ch.-V. Langlois and Ch. Seignobos, *Introduction aux études historiques* (Paris: Hechette & Cie., 1898), 44.

²⁶ Tietze, *Methode*, 132.

²⁷ Adler, *Methode*, 13.

desire to steer away from Hanslick,²⁸ or more generally from all types of musicology in which aesthetic judgment took precedence over sober scientific analysis, it took only a couple of pages before the author had also dissociated himself from such colleagues as the Leipzig musicologist Hugo Riemann. He blamed Riemann, the editor of a multi-volume *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte* (1904-1913), for collecting facts and toying with little problems without even trying to integrate these into an evolutionary history of musical styles that, in Adler's view, would best serve the aim of music history, which he defined as 'the study and exposition of the development [*Entwicklungsganges*] of musical products'.²⁹ The historicist trope of 'development', then, provided Adler with a solution for the tensions mentioned earlier. If the aim of music history was the detection of *Entwicklung* in musical styles, then music historians could, on the one hand, engage in what Adler called 'scientific' and 'objective' analysis of patterns and trends – a task to which much of the *Methode* was devoted.³⁰ However, by doing so, music historians could also, on the other hand, provide current-day artists (composers such as Schönberg) with valuable clues as to where contemporary music came from and how it might be developed further – a role that Adler emphasized especially in his non-academic publications.³¹

Although Tietze, twenty-five years Adler's junior, presented a less articulated view on the aims of art history, his *Methode* nonetheless employed similar contrastive language. One front was Riegl's dream of the art historian as a man without qualities, which Tietze rejected as incompatible with the hermeneutic insight, derived from Wilhelm Dilthey, that art historians are always products of their times, voicing concerns and studying problems that

²⁸ On Adler's difficult relation with Hanslick, see Gabriele Johanna Eder, 'Eduard Hanslick und Guido Adler: Aspekte einer menschlichen und wissenschaftlichen Beziehung', in *Kunst, Kunsttheorie und Kunstforschung im wissenschaftlichen Diskurs: In memoriam Kurt Blaukopf (1914-1999)*, ed. Martin Seiler and Friedrich Stadler (Vienna: ÖBV & HPT, 2000), 107-142.

²⁹ Adler, *Methode*, 23, 9. Riemann, in turn, had dissociated himself from Adler in, for example, Hugo Riemann, *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte*, vol. II/2 (Leipzig: Breitkopf & Härtel, 1922), v-vi. On the relation between these two musicologists, see Barbara Boisits, 'Hugo Riemann - Guido Adler: Zwei Konzepte von Musikwissenschaft vor dem Hintergrund geisteswissenschaftlicher Methodendiskussionen um 1900', in *Hugo Riemann (1849-1919): Musikwissenschaftler mit Universalanspruch*, ed. Klaus Mehner and Tatjana Böhme-Mehner (Cologne; Weimar; Vienna: Böhlau, 2001), 17-29; Alexander Rehding, *Hugo Niemann and the Birth of Modern Musical Thought* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003), 138-149.

³⁰ Barbara Boisits, 'Historismus und Musikwissenschaft um 1900: Guido Adlers Begründung der Musikwissenschaft im Zeichen des Historismus', *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 82 (2000), 377-389; idem, 'Kulturwissenschaftliche Ansätze in Adlers Begriff von Musikwissenschaft', in Antonicek and Gruber, *Musikwissenschaft als Kulturwissenschaft*, 125-139.

³¹ Karnes, *Music*, 151-158.

inevitably reflect their own *Zeitgeist*.³² ‘Objectivity’, therefore, was a word to be used only with caution and significant qualification: history is always being written by human beings of flesh and blood.³³ Another methodological quarrel followed right out of this hermeneutical understanding of historical interpretation. Over against an art historical tradition that sought to identify law-like patterns of stylistic change, Tietze firmly defended individual human agency, which he defined as ‘the most decisive factor’ in stylistic evolution.³⁴ Given that this went right against such influential art historians as Heinrich Wölfflin, in Munich,³⁵ it was evident that Tietze did not merely summarize or codify the views of others, but staked out a position of his own.

Given the divergence of views existing among music and art historians, it comes as no surprise that Tietze and especially Adler not only used contrastive language, but also wrote *conditionally*, about the gains to be obtained *if* just everyone agreed with their proposals, and in the *future tense* about the joyous day when scholars would eventually close the ranks and devote themselves jointly to research along the lines proposed in their books. How great would be the benefits if we could just ‘unite ourselves’ in methodological respect, Adler exclaimed. ‘We would only need to agree on the way of applying style criteria and, in the first place, become fully aware of our own treatment methods.’³⁶ Near the end of his book, however, in a self-reflective passage on the possibility for this manual to ‘offer a lead for the future’, Adler admitted that this could take some time: ‘Almost all pages of this book point to new territory [*Neuland*] of music historical research, which has yet to be conquered.’³⁷ Music history, in other words, had not yet reached a stage of shared paradigms: unanimity on the aims and methods of the discipline did not yet exist.³⁸

Judging by its reception history, Adler’s volume did not suffer too much from this disagreement in the field. Even though critical voices were not lacking,³⁹ Adler’s approach resonated strongly among many of those, in Europe as well as overseas, who tried to establish

³² For Dilthey’s influence on Tietze, see Riccardo Marchi, ‘Hans Tietze e la storia dell’arte come scienza dello spirito nella Vienna del primo Novecento’, *Arte Lombarda* 110/111 (1994), 55-66.

³³ Tietze, *Methode*, 455-466.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 454.

³⁵ Marchi, ‘Hans Tietze and Art History’, 20.

³⁶ Adler, *Methode*, 21.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 193.

³⁸ These formulations reflect, of course, a progressivist narrative of disciplinary development according to which Adler’s generation stood only ‘at the threshold’ of scientific research (e.g., *ibid.*, 26, 157, 192).

³⁹ See Alfred Schnerich’s review in the *Neue Zeitschrift für Musik* 87 (1920), 40.

musicology as a scholarly discipline.⁴⁰ ‘What a university should teach the student of music has been set forth in “The Method of Musical History” (1919) by Prof. Dr. Guido Adler of Vienna, dean of European musicologists’, stated an American admirer in 1925.⁴¹ Ten years later, that same American musicologist repeated his praise by hailing Adler as ‘the first to draw a ground-plan for the structure of musical research’, which had meanwhile been ‘universally adopted’. ‘His disciples, far and wide, are teaching his theories.’⁴² One of these pupils, Wilhelm Fischer, even identified so thoroughly with Adler’s program that he could not think of ‘serious [*ernstzunehmenden*] musical historical publications’ that did not adopt the methods laid down in Adler’s book.⁴³

If the *Methode* nonetheless did not achieve a status comparable to, for instance, Bernheim’s *Lehrbuch*, this was due to at least three factors. One is the modest size of the musicological discipline, another the fact that the *Methode* was not exactly designed as an introductory textbook, and a third the circumstance that the manual quickly became overshadowed by Adler’s *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte* (1924),⁴⁴ a more than thousand page tome that came to serve as ‘the textbook for Austrian musicology students in the 1920s and 30s’.⁴⁵ This, I note in passing, is another challenge for the view that methodology manuals were primarily written for educational purposes. While Adler’s *Methode* cleared the ground, ambitiously and polemically, it was left to the *Handbuch* to survey the field in a more tranquil, encyclopedic, and student-friendly manner.⁴⁶

Whereas Adler had therefore little reason to complain, Tietze’s manual met with fierce criticism. Although it was favorably reviewed by the French art historian Louis Réau,⁴⁷ most German-language reviews were unsparingly critical. They bemoaned not only the loose organization and inconvenient structure of the book, but especially also Tietze’s alignment with Bernheim, which was perceived as repudiating the distinctiveness of the discipline and/or as testifying to an old-fashioned, source-oriented conception of art history. Tietze’s

⁴⁰ See the reviews signed by J. M. and A. W., respectively, in *Literarisches Zentralblatt für Deutschland* 73 (1922), 39-40 and *Musica Divina* 11 (1923), 22-23.

⁴¹ Carl Engel, ‘Views and Reviews’, *The Musical Quarterly* 11 (1925), 617-629, there 620.

⁴² Carl Engel, ‘Views and Reviews’, *The Musical Quarterly* 21 (1935), 484-491, there 485.

⁴³ Wilhelm Fischer, ‘Guido Adlers “Methode der Musikgeschichte”’, *Zeitschrift für Musikwissenschaft* 7 (1924), 500-503, there 503.

⁴⁴ *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte*, ed. Guido Adler (Frankfurt am Main: Frankfurter Verlags-Anstalt, 1924).

⁴⁵ John Charles Koslovsky, ‘From *Sinn und Wesen* to *Structural Hearing*: The Development of Felix Salzer’s Ideas in Interwar Vienna and Their Transmission in Postwar United States’ (Ph.D. thesis University of Rochester, 2009), 72.

⁴⁶ Fischer, ‘Guido Adlers Methode’, 501.

⁴⁷ Louis Réau, ‘Un théoricien de l’histoire de l’art: Hans Tietze’, *Revue de Synthèse Historiques* 28 (1914), 45-50, esp. 50.

progressive Viennese colleague, Joseph Strzygowski, for example, responded with dismay that Tietze seemed to want to bring the field back to pre-1890 standards.⁴⁸ Erich Rothacker was slightly more sympathetic, but deeply puzzled by Tietze's rather underdeveloped hermeneutics: how could he possibly combine a romantic notion of human individuality with a positivist conception of science?⁴⁹ Wölfflin's former student Richard Hamann explained at length why Tietze's rejection of laws in art history was fundamentally mistaken.⁵⁰ And as if this was not enough, the Heidelberg art historian Carl Neumann, committed to a more aesthetically oriented type of art history, rebuked Tietze for rejecting aesthetic quality as a relevant category of art historical interpretation.⁵¹

What these criticisms illustrate is not merely that Tietze was rather ineffective in proposing a hermeneutical conception of art history (so that it was left to another Viennese colleague, Tietze's fiend Max Dvořák, to advocate more successfully for a *Kunstgeschichte als Geisteswissenschaft*).⁵² More important, for our present purpose, is that almost all the reviewers treated the book, not as a textbook, but as a piece of polemics, as a proposal, or as a stance in a debate over the nature and tasks of art history. They commented on Tietze's 'standpoint',⁵³ assessed his 'polemics',⁵⁴ and, in Hamann's case, took the book as an occasion for a more than forty-page reply. Tietze's book figured, as it might have been intended to figure, in debates over what Tietze would later call the 'fundamental questions' and 'fundamental problems' of art history.⁵⁵ It served, not as a repository of disciplinary wisdom, but as a stimulus to debate over the aims that art history was supposed to pursue.

Conclusion

⁴⁸ Josef Strzygowski, *Die Krisis der Geisteswissenschaften, vorgeführt am Beispiele der Forschung über bildende Kunst: Ein grundsätzlicher Rahmenversuch* (Vienna: Anton Schroll & Co., 1923), 55.

⁴⁹ Erich Rothacker, 'Literatur', *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft* 41 (1919), 168-186, there 177.

⁵⁰ R. Hamann, 'Die Methode der Kunstgeschichte und die allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft', *Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft* 9 (1916), 64-78, 103-114, 141-154.

⁵¹ Carl Neumann, 'Zur Theorie der Geschichte und Kunstgeschichte', *Historische Zeitschrift* 116 (1916), 484-494, esp. 490-493.

⁵² Max Dvořák, *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte: Studien zur abendländischen Kunstentwicklung* (Munich: R. Piper & Co., 1924).

⁵³ Rothacker, 'Literatur', 176.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 179, 180; Neumann, 'Theorie', 485; Hamann, 'Methode', 64.

⁵⁵ Hans Tietze, 'Geisteswissenschaftliche Kunstgeschichte', in *Die Kunstwissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, ed. Johannes Jahn (Leipzig: Felix Meiner, 1924), 183-198, there 183.

Speaking about Bernheim's *Lehrbuch*, Peter Novick once suggested that methodology books of this kind were 'probably more cited than read.'⁵⁶ This may well have been the case, perhaps especially for those manuals, like Bernheim's, that could be prescribed in university courses because of their extensive treatment of near everything that historians could possibly wish to know about methods. It would be wrong, however, to assume that all manuals on historical method from around 1900 were encyclopedic surveys of methodological do's and don'ts, just as it would be inaccurate to assume that all manuals were primarily written for educational purposes. In this paper, I have tried to argue that Tietze's and Adler's manuals challenge even some further clichés about the genre. These books did not codify an agreed-upon body of methods. They were neither dry-as-dust nor specimen of the fact-oriented sort of positivism epitomized by Langlois and Seignobos. Instead, these manuals were designed as polemical interventions in a debate over the proper aims of science. They dwelled on the scholar's professional vocation at least as much as on details of source criticism. Moreover, they did not hesitate to do so in critical dissociation from alternative views on the aims of historical scholarship, in sometimes militantly polemical prose.

Accordingly, it is the genre of methodology manuals, as represented by Tietze and Adler, in which one may find some explicitly formulated answers to the question raised in the introduction of this paper: how to explain that late nineteenth-century humanities scholars disagreed so often about the virtues, habits, and character traits typical of a good, responsible, conscientious scholar? The gist of these answers is that scholars had different expectations of what counted as professional scholarly conduct, mainly (though not only) because they disagreed on the goals their work was supposed to serve. Perhaps especially in fields fraught with moral, religious, and/or aesthetic sensibilities – that is, throughout the late nineteenth-century humanities, even if these sensibilities were more contested in some fields than in others – the aims of science were a fundamental issue in disciplinary controversies. They were fundamental, indeed, because these aims determined so much of what scholars associated with professional academic conduct, varying from methodological sophistication to technical skill and epistemic virtuousness. This explains, finally, why the genre of methodology manuals served more than educational purposes. Judging by Tietze's and Adler's contributions, manuals on historical method could be swords or cannons in heated conflicts over the aims of historical scholarship.⁵⁷

⁵⁶ Peter Novick, *That Noble Dream: The 'Objectivity Question' and the American Historical Profession* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 38.

⁵⁷ Research for this chapter was funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO).

