

INTELLECTUAL-ARTISTS IN ROMANIA AND THE GERMAN CULTURAL MEDIUM: THE EXAMPLE OF MÜNCHEN (1808-1935)

Stelian MÂNDRUȚ

Researcher, Institute of History, Cluj

Past and present writings published in the country or abroad regarding the presence of students from the actual territory of Romania at German Academies and Universities in in the 19th and 20th centuries and studies presenting quantitative-statistic data and interpretations¹ on different temporal and spatial segments, reveal the fact that the rigorous organisation of the German higher education system, which benefited from the tradition of some

¹ See, more recently, Romanian historiography after 1989: Philippi, K, *Siebenbürgisch-sächsische Studierende an der Universität Tübingen (1977-1902)*, in: *Forschungen zur Volks- und Landeskunde*, XXXIII, 1990, nr.1-2, p.13-50; Mândruț, S, *Rumänische Studenten aus Siebenbürgen an Universitäten Österreich-Ungarns und Deutschlands im Jahre 1897-1898*, in: *Ungarn-Jahrbuch*, XX, 1992, p.171-180; Leb, I.V., *Zu den kulturellen rumänisch-deutschen Beziehungen im XVII-XIX-ten Jahrhundert*, in: *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai. Theologia Orthodoxia*, XXXVIII, 1993, nr.1-2, p.39-46; Mândruț, S, *Nae Ionescu, student și doctor în filosofie al Universității "Ludwig-Maximilian" din München (Nae Ionescu, PhD Student of the "Ludwig-Maximilian" University in München)*, in: *SUBB Philosophia*, XXXVIII, 1995, nr.1-2, p.83-100; Siupiur, E, *Intellektuelle aus Rumänien und den Südosteuropäischen Ländern an den deutschen Universitäten im XIX Jahrhundert*, in: *Revue de études sud-est européennes*, XXXIII, 1995, nr.1-2, p.83-100, nr.3-4, p.251-265; Sigmirean C., *Contribuții la studierea frecventării universităților europene de către tinerii români ardeleni în a doua jumătate a secolului al XIX-lea și în primele decenii ale secolului XX (Transylvanian Romanians at European Universities in the Second Half of the 19th Century and the First Decades of the 20th Century)*, in: *Interferențe istorice și culturale româno-europene (Romanian-European Historical and Cultural Encounters)*, Târgu Mureș, 1996, p.105-124; Tonk Sándor, *Siebenbürgische Studenten an den ausländischen Universitäten*, in: *Beiträge zur Siebenbürgische Schulgeschichte*, Wien, Köln, Graz, 1996, p.113-125; Wallner E.M., *Die Beziehungen rumänischer Persönlichkeiten zum deutschsprachige Mitteleuropa*, in: *FZVL*, XXXIX, 1996, nr.1-2, p.7-22.

genuine “schools” in various places, beneficially influenced the motivation to specialise in the field of “fine arts” with a great number of students from the centre and South-East of Europe and in particular, the three Romanian countries up to the year 1918.

Research has revealed that in the context of the evolution of modernity and, implicitly, the modernization of Romanian university education, mainly in the second half of the last century, a German “model”, in concordance with the earlier French and later on, the Austro-Hungarian one, was, from a double (methodological and organizational) perspective, a significant reference point in the activity, development and orientation of local men of art. A logical, incipient process of synchronization manifested in these conditions and presupposed the proving of the veracity of the influence of a foreign university world in the process of modelling a certain type of “intellectual-artist”. The mentality of that time showed a great preoccupation in the relationship between “form and foundation” in the structure of the Romanian higher education fine arts field. It was also concerned with the possibility of studying abroad, in another elective-selective medium with the immediate or mediated result of overlapping concepts and lines in the work of artists which normally resulted in the professional specialisation wished for. The historical period in question, mainly the middle of the 19th century, offered the possibility of human mobility and the spread of innovating ideas. However, the spontaneous or generalised tendency of “phenomenon” or “fashion” was still being questioned; there was an oscillation between the rejection or acceptance of the idea of study travel abroad as being determined or “carried on a wave”, especially when a great part of the intrinsic factors, concrete professional orientation for example, were in minority as compared to propensity which was explained in an over-simplified manner as being in the spirit of the time. However, dependance or material freedom determinant for an artist who had been working for years, was equalled to the option, impelled by either a “teacher-mentor” from the interior or the exterior, or the (state or private) scholarship, vital in a famous university centre such as the capital of Bavaria in this case.

Our paper deals mainly with presenting some estimated points of reference in the flux of specialisation through normal studies or subsequent training, with special information for the period between 1808-1935, based on those four registers kept intact in the archive of the Academy of Fine Arts (Akademie der bildenden Künste today) in München¹. We started from the supposition that the form of higher education in question meant for a representative sample of students from our country either a first contact with the results of classical art and modern German art or a necessary interlude in a similar spiritual development in other areas of artistic expression such as France and Italy. The rush towards the capital of Bavaria and entering the institution mentioned above can be correlated with the impact of two factors: a) the absence of such a training for Romanians in Transylvania b) the slowness of development in this particular field in Bucharest as well as in Iași. However, there were also a series of other premises which together led to these consequences. We think that those few parametres of the functioning and usefulness of the Academy in a time period of more than a century (1808-1935) provide the necessary basis for the interpretation and understanding of a multitude of data. We adopted a quantitative-statistic method based on the analysis of the only documentary source extant, namely, the university registers for the years 1808-1935.²

The headings in the above mentioned volumes are laconic and were not much changed during the years; they refer to the subject of research, that is, the student body which entered the academy, and have the following structure: serial number (1809-1935), surname and first name (1809-1935), place of birth and the social status of the parents, with a hiatus for the latter item in the period 1919-1935, profession (speciality) (1809-1935), the date of entering the university and the date of graduation (1809-1920, the last one actually missing) and various notes (1809-1841 and 1884-1920). Our investigation aims at quantifying the span of elements

¹ Research done in the fall of 1993 with a DAAD scholarship.

² *Grundbuch der Studierenden der Königlichen Akademie der bildenden Künste (1809-1920)* and *Matrikelbuch (1919-1935)*

revealed after their division into certain arbitrarily chosen directions, interpreting them in general terms but also particularly, according to the result of the interaction between cause and effect, all this in an acceptable form of comparison, commanded by relations and interferences generated in time and space.

1) First we estimated the global number of “student-artists” coming from the historical-geographical area in question, taken as a function of epochs and other motives with their consequences

2) The signalling and comparative analysis of the relevant data about entering a university, in connection with the age of the student, made for each time period is meant to confirm or refute hypotheses about the development of the act in itself as well as the issues linked to entering the university (formal entrance and then the legal confirmation of acceptance which proved the student’s status at the higher education art institute in question.

3) The attempt to present the data according to historical-geographical zones aims at defining the quality of different areas, natural “reservoirs” of the sample of students analysed which provided initial training in the field of art. The documents studied show whether the students came mainly from the rural or the urban area.

4) Taking into consideration the social status of parents (or tutors) allowed us to underline some forms of clear stratification in the case of certain social-professional categories which justifies the possibility of a double material effort, first in the country, prior to higher education abroad, and mainly afterwards, a financial aid required when someone spent years in the courserooms and workshops of an institution in a great European capital. The link between different segments of the research reveals at the same time the effort of laicisation and modernisation of the Romanian society in the middle of the last century as well as a shift in the power relation between different social classes and strata, which, due to various motives, were regrouped only towards the end of the last century.

5) The issue of scholarships (stipends) could not be satisfactorily addressed as we had no information about it, so that

the eclectic estimation of the amount of scholarships granted by funds or foundations is only partial, based on data gathered in function of the people and the period described.

6) The attempt to group students according to two essential characteristics, their religion and nationality, is questionable in our opinion, as they are not specified in the registers although the second issue is sporadically mentioned. We think however that our approximations, even if subjective, are a reference point in defining the basic structure of the analysed segment.

7) The presentation according to subjects (specialities) and, partially, teachers and leaders of workshops invites the reader to reflect on the understanding or apprehension shown by the students during studies abroad, towards certain direct options on a professional level mediated by professors, often improper or unintelligible for the students. This is a fact which finally led to unexpected turnarounds in their training and their choice for specialisation, which had repercussions on their career.

8) Closely connected to the above mentioned issues is the phenomenon of the "migration of artists" on different levels, horizontal and vertical, including the common movement towards places outside Germany and München, towards Paris and Rome, a fact which shows the existence and viability of such an irregular movement (university education or continuous postgraduate training) for a longer or shorter period of time.

9) The conclusions refer to the general and the particular in the research on the numeric and personal sample. The pantheon of famous personalities, painters, sculptors and architects who were trained in München (some of them found in the registers, others missing from those four volumes but were presumably in München) is significant. Our thesis based on the interpretations of the material that we found underlines the fact that the higher education institution in the capital of Bavaria was an efficient professional "laboratory" of informing and forming a multitude of artists from the present territory of our country who gradually became the nucleus of artists. It was characterised by a critical

spirit and competitive spirit, and played the role of a well-defined model.

1) The estimated number of students, as the positions in those four registers show, was 17516 in the period between 1809-1935. The number of students from Romania was 108 (0.61%), with the following chronological distribution: 1809-1841: 6 students (of a total of 3217, that is, 0.18%); 1841-1884: 35 (total: 5101; 0.68%); 1884-1920: 56 (5893; 0.95%); 1919-1935: 11 (3305; 0.33%). The fluctuations during different intervals were determined by the evolution of the system of Romanian and Transylvanian artistic education in secondary schools until 1918 as well as the state of development of the institute in München. The second half of the 19th century and the beginning of the next century was the culminating point. This is shown by the increase in the number of students in general and also the increase of the number of students from the territory of our country. Orientation towards similar institutions in Vienna and, later on, Budapest (1871) remained constant in the case of students from Transylvania, and this influenced, on account of the “academic peregrination”, the estimated total number of students studying abroad in the period delimited in function of the data retrieved from the registers in question. The small number of students as compared to the representative percentage for other nations or countries in Central and Eastern Europe¹, was undoubtedly due to the conjunction between several objective and subjective factors.

¹ Romanians were inversely proportional to the Slavs (Bulgarians, Polish, Russians, Serbs), Greeks and Hungarians in München, the latter being favoured as there were professors of Slav, Greek, etc. origin who had private schools (classes): The Slovenian H. Ašbé, the Greek N. Ghysis, the Hungarian Benczur Gyula, Alexander Liezen-Mayer, Alexander Wagner; The number of students was as follows: Polish 300 between 1850-1914 and Hungarians approx. 335, between 1809-1945. The total number for some of the years: 1872/73: 240-260, 1884/85: 428-552; 1894/95: 312-406; 1908/9: 518. See Em. Turczynski, *München und Südosteuropa*, München, 1961, p.352, 354, 356; *Tradition und Widerspruch. 175 Jahre Kunstakademie München*, München, 1985, p.112,129,136; Balogh L., *Die ungarische Facette der Münchner Schule*, München, 1988; Kahr, W., *Die Akademie der bildenden Künste München, Kreuzpunkt europäischer Kultur*, München, 1990.

There was the disparity between the obvious intervention of the Romanian state in the act of supporting the creation of the necessary layer of intellectual-artists, and the solely private interest in the case of Transylvanian students, having special conditions from all points of view. Of course, in both cases, the number of students at the Academy of Art on minimum or maximum periods until 1918, and mainly in the interwar period did not mean a factor of aspiration towards specialisation in art but often it was a part of the colour of the age, an attempt to do something else, more special, within the same uninterrupted flow, be it internal, from an institution to the other, or external, in other centres of a European cultural level. In the situation in question there are also several notable examples which confirm the rule.

2) The time period of the first sample studied, signified by the date of entering the university in case, was 3 November 1824 - 30 July 1840, in a relatively balanced hierarchy of years: 1824, 1834, 1838, 1840(2). This was the debut period of the institute, with a medium inflow of students also shown by the small number of students from the Romanian Countries, half of which were students with scholarships sent by Gh. Asachi to München for studying and specialisation. Significant is the mentioning of Gh. Panaiteanu-Bardasare, aged 20, at the Painting Section, who entered the institute on 30 July 1840 and was only registered in 2 April 1842.¹ The interval between 3 April 1844 and 26 October 1883, with increasing gaps between the years: 1844, 1846(2), 1847, 1849, 1851, 1855(3), 1858, 1860(3), 1863(3), 1869, 1871(3), 1869, 1871(3), 1872, 1874, 1875, 1877, 1878, 1879(2), 1880(4), 1881, 1883(2), motivated by the functioning of National Art Schools in Iași and București and the continuous orientation of Transylvanian students towards the capital of Bavaria after an interlude in Vienna, shows the spring-autumn variation in the practice of the entrance system (we have eight concrete cases), which gradually became general. There are two extreme cases, of maximum and minimum duration: Alexandru Orăscu entered the university on 3 April 1844, was registered on 22 November and

¹ *Akademie der bildenden Künste, Grundbuch 1809/1841, nr. 3089.*

graduated on 20 March 1847 with the identity nr.6242; Joseph Kunz from Timișoara, aged 23, Architecture, entered the university on 9 december 1846, was registered and graduated on 20 July 1847 (identity nr.6497)¹. Just like in the previous case where the favourable ages according to the rules varied between 20(2), 22(2) and 23, presupposing a maturity for being able to accept the system of higher education, those from the present segment are significant as they have the lower limit of 17 (Köllő Michael) and the highest of 35 (Sikó Nikolaus), which is a real “record” for the whole generation analysed. We must add that the higher limit could have covered years spent in the artistic profession in the country of origin or other speciality centres. This holds good for the next section with age limits between 17 and 28 years. We do not deny the impact of the financial aspect, the idea that the longer the time period the greater the material resources required during university studies. The peak of the action of entering the institution was in the penultimate time period, between 14 October 1884 and 6 May 1914, as follows: 1884(2), 1886, 1887, 1889(3), 1891(3), 1893(3), 1894(4) / O. Băncilă, P. Capidan, K. Loghi, all of them on 30 October! 1895, 1896(2), 1897(3), 1903(3), 1904, 1905(3), 1906(2), 1907, 1908(5), 1909, 1910(2), 1912, 1914, with the same unchanged procedure of most frequent days especially in the months April-May and October-November.² The period of maximum flourishing at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries which was due to the swing of schools of arts all over Europe, was stopped by the outbreak of the First World War and the events which led to geopolitical-strategic reorganisations in Europe. There was a total number of 11 students in the following segment, between the years 1920/21 and 1935/36, with Alice Goldstein (1927/1928) and Tempeanu Despina³ at the head, as follows: 1920/21(2), 1922(3), 1922/23(2), 1926/27(1), 1927/28(1), 1935(1), 1935/1936(1). These data show in fact the

¹ *Idem*, 1841/1884, nr.227 and 440.

² *Idem*, 1884/1920, nr.118: the only case when we have precise data about entrance is that of Traian Mureșian, who entered the academy on 14 October 1884 and was registered on 13 April 1885.

³ *Idem*, Matrikelbuch, 1919/1931, p.109, nr.42; 1931/1935, nr. 365.

beginning of a decline in the presence of students at the institute in München, a decline in their number and their intrinsic value. Naturally, a series of internal and external factors contributed to the creation of this image; we mention only the evolution of art schools in Romania after the union as well as the increasing number of obstacles in the interwar period due to the worsening of the general international situation.

3) The statistical research completed in order to select the provenance of those 108 students who studied in München between 1824-1935, presented some lines specific of those two great historical-geographical zones until 1918. Journeys from Old Romania and Transylvania proved – through significant data referring to temporal and spatial segments, assembled subsequently for the whole period and the present territory of the country – an urban ascendance in comparison with the rural one mainly characteristic to Transylvania. The network of towns in the first category, encompassing big, middle and small places (București 23, Iași 8, Botoșani, Galați 4, Buzău 3, Brăila, Fălticeni, Focșani 2, Bacău, Bârlad, Caracal, Ploiești, Roman, Tecuci, Târgu Jiu, Suceava 1) included the capital (București), old historical centres, centres with commercial-handicraft tradition, some with advanced industry and a more stable local financial system. The proportions seemed evident with those only 6 rural settlements which were added two others from Macedonia, namely, Perlepe and Serres, the birthplace of P. Capidan and K. Loghi. In Transylvania there was a balanced combination of the urban and rural, with a slight ascendance of small places, economic centres not always sufficiently strong from a financial point of view, situated therefore on the ante-penultimate place in the geographical network described: Brașov 6, Cluj, Oravița, Timișoara 3, Arad, Sighet 2, Beclean, Bistrița, Brad, Deva, Gheorghieni, Nășăud, Oradea, Orăștie, Orșova, Sfântu Gheorghe, besides 11 villages and communes from the comitats in Banat, Bihor and Transylvania. All of them were mixed from an ethnic and religious point of view, had a relatively prosperous economy but also parts with slight changes for the better from many points of view. We repeat the fact that it was the whole network of towns and other localities that

financially supported the spiritual and artistic efforts, mainly in the case of the majority population which was nevertheless discriminated politically, economically and socially.

4) The examination of the social and professional situation was helped by the permanent and separate column in the registers revealing accurate data about the parents or guardians. There were also cases of vague or generalised indications which made typology difficult, or deliberately minimising and omitting vital details especially in the case of parents who had passed away or mature students who were relatively independent from a financial point of view.

We think that the rule of these “blank spots” functioned on account of the span of existing prejudices, mainly to hide the ridiculous social status in the cases of those who came from the lower classes of society without the possibility of supporting themselves during longer periods of study. There was a different situation in the case of members of the middle class who desired to attain a higher social level on account of their status of would-be artists. This was in fact an important general phenomenon in the modern society, marked by the attempt of power transfer on the cultural-spiritual level from the old economic and political intellectuals to intellectual-artists, technical intellectuals and those with a thorough university education abroad. The obvious deficiencies on the social-economic level until the beginning of the 20th century affected to a certain extent the family microcosm which contributed to the grounding of the effort of students in München. The inequality between urban and rural representation, together with the loading of the preponderantly lower-middle class and intellectual occupations with the traditional-agrarian occupations and other, industrial-commercial activities which were getting under way, can be shown from a statistic and quantitative point of view. Dependence on the rural way of life and the limited financial possibilities contrasted the social perception of ethnic groups in Transylvania, for example: real-estate owners, officials, free professionals, etc. In this context, the stratification of Romanians had repercussions on the career of artists. Consequently, a sort of intellectual “elite” was formed more slowly, and

there were dysfunctions and differentiations in their role in social life. The picture of the social background of students from the old Romania shows different gradations which cover all the social classes and strata. A minimum primacy has the commercial, financial and industrial bourgeoisie, together with the influence of other categories, foreseeable in the case of Transylvania, too: officials, the professional military, professors, lawyers, doctors, free professionals, etc, according to the following statistics: farmers (11), shopkeepers (15), officials (11), handicraftsmen, landlords (10), deceased (6), priests, professors (5), officers, painters (4), architects, fund holders (4), no specification (4), teachers (3), chemists, manufacturers, engineers, sculptors (2) and a doctor, forester, senator, etc. We can observe that on the superior level of this hierarchy are those who come from certain social classes and strata which could financially support studies in the country and abroad. The decreasing percentage at the middle and terminal part of the hierarchy proves the limited possibilities of those enumerated, with the observation that this is where the system of state or private scholarships worked beneficially. The distances on the social hierarchy drawn are nevertheless minor and not too significant; all this is relative and gains relevance in a comparison with student segments from other historical-geographical areas in Central and Eastern Europe. We think that only this way can we reject or support the often quoted thesis that a certain social-economic context which is identical on a spatial scale, is strictly circumscribed temporally and characteristic to a majority population, automatically creates similitudes and overlappings on the level of social typology. The stability and progress in this area, especially in the second half of the last century, decisively determined the qualitative parameters of the existence and action of students in the fine arts university life in the capital of Bavaria.

5) In connection with the above mentioned issues we can also present the system of stipends offered by the state or various private institutions meant to help the students and young people with good professional results who could not support themselves, mainly artists, who were sometimes compelled to give up their

profession or migrate towards other institutions of education that were financially more accessible. According to a first, provisional estimation based mainly on the material that we had at our disposal, the majority of those in question benefited from these scholarships obtained by competition or in other legal ways. The duration of the stipends varied from case to case, and the chances for obtaining them were not always uniform; personal relationships often acted at different levels, so that the confidence granted should be subsequently and gradually validated by the activity and results of the students in question. Even if the Royal Academy of Fine Arts in München did not perceive taxes in the first phase of its functioning (they were introduced only at the end of the 19th century), the minimum expenses for a couple of years and the cost of study materials made applications for scholarship inevitable, and the increase of the amount of scholarships necessary; there were also other ways of gaining financial support, e.g. making copies in the Pinakothek, an activity which allowed for a relatively high monthly payment.¹ The reconstructed data highlight the contribution of the Romanian state and of various local (county or town) authorities in the constant and equal support of those from the urban and rural medium, together with a minimum of private contribution mainly on the part of well-to-do families. In the case of Transylvania the relation is reverse: financial support came from private foundations, lay or religious, and it was mainly the Romanian students from villages who benefited from it.

6) The attempt to group students according to their mother tongue (nationality) is questionable because we had no guidelines in this respect. Nevertheless we tried to deduce figures on account of the names registered for the years 1809-1841 and 1919-1945

¹Tonitza, N.N., *Correspondență. 1906-1939 (Correspondance. 1906-1939)*, București, 1978, p.23: to Ștefan Dimitrescu, München, 1 November 1907, about the copies made in the Pinakothek and the money earned; *Idem*, p. 363; to Gh. Leon, München, 29 December 1907, about the “tariffs” necessary for studies an everyday life; see also Cipariu T, *Correspondență primită (Received Correspondance)*, București, 1992, p.575-577: letters sent by G. Vlădereanu, January-February 1865 about the costs of the “school of composition”.

(religion is not mentioned in these cases). As to the middle periods (1841-1884 and 1884-1920), the record of every person's religion made our work easier. The figures are as follows: 1809/1841: Romanian (4), German, Hungarian (1); 1841/1884: Hungarian, Romanian (12), German (9), Jew (2); Catholic (11), Orthodox (10), undeclared, Protestant (6), Israelite, Reformed Church (1); 1884/1920: Romanian (3) and 2 Macedo-Romanian (T. Capidan, K. Loghi), Jewish (8), German (7), Serb (3), Hungarian (1), Orthodox (35), Catholic, Protestant (5), Greek-Catholic (4), Israelites, Mozaic (3), without a religion (1); 1919/1935: German (5), Romanian (4), Hungarian (2). Summing up nationality (mother tongue) in the period 1809-1935 and religion (1841-1920): Romanian 55 (52.77%) and two Macedo-Romanians; German 22 (29.37%), Hungarian 16 (14.81%), Jewish 10 (9.25%), Serb 3 (2.77%), Orthodox 45 (49.45%), Catholic 16 (17.58%), Protestant 11 (12.08%), undeclared 7 (7.69%), Greek-Catholic, Israelite 4 (4.39%), Mozaic 3 (3.29%), Reformed Church 1 (1.09%). We can conclude that there was an ethnic and religious pluralism in the student body studying abroad, its structure being defined by the Romanian and Transylvanian reality in the period in question, up to 1918, indifferent of the political situation and the evolution of the geo-political configuration. The significant segment of Germans and Hungarians was not originating in Transylvania only, as it would appear, but also in Wallachia and Moldavia, differing from case to case, in function of different motivations on a temporal and spatial level. The small number of Serbs as well as those four Greek-Catholics came from the Banat, not to mention those two Macedo-Romanians from over the Carpathians who became important personalities of Romanian fine arts.

7) We were in a dilemma whether to accept the terminology in designating the basic material studied, indicated as such at entering the academy. Otherwise we could not have understood in translation the term *Kunstfach*, 'speciality', especially as it referred mainly to those who went through a whole cycle prescribed for obtaining the diploma but who took optional turns in the meantime. We will not give details about those with an irregular presence, who chose the main material in an aleatory

way, in function of a series of direct or indirect motives, under others' influence or merely by chance. Beyond this number and percentage the question concerning the number of graduates remains unanswered and, consequently, the number of those who became free-professionals or gained teaching positions also remains unclear. All the estimations were done "post festum" as the necessary data for analysis was missing from the registers. There is a span of explanations for professional orientation from the beginning or on the way, in function of a) theoretical background and the influence gained, besides a personal wish by those who began their studies at München and then at the fine arts schools in Iași and București, especially in the second half of the 19th century and towards the turn of the century; b) the renown and professional experience of professors-masters from the Academy of Art in München c) the exercises during the effective period of practice in those workshops (classes) led by local professors which allowed students to approach a possible well-known "mentor" such as S. Hollósy in Transylvania and N. Gysis for those in Romania; d) interconditionings during the studies which favoured mutations and changes on an individual level which finally led to graduating from a section (speciality) other than the one chosen at entering the academy. The table according to subject-matters (specialities) in the period that we are dealing with also includes professors for the middle period (1841-1884-1920) which is in fact qualitatively and quantitatively the most consistent. It contains the following data: 1809/1841: painting (4), architecture (2); 1841/1884: painting (22) with sporadically mentioned masters such as Karl v. Piloty (1860)¹, Hermann Anschütz (1863), Ludwig Lange (1855, 1860, 1863) and Friedrich Ziebland (1855); architecture (10), sculpture (3); 1884/1920: painting (47), with professors constantly mentioned in the following hierarchy: Gabriel v. Hackl (12), Nikolaus Gysis (11), Karl Raupp (6), Angelo Jank (4), Johan Caspar Herterich, Hugo v. Habermann, Karl v. Marr (?), Otto v. Seitz (2) and other two

¹ Details in the Appendix to the jubilee volume entitled *Tradition und Widerspruch...* München, 1985, p.317-319.

incomplete columns; Martin Feuerstein, Hermann Graeber, Ludwig v. Löffitz (1); sculpture (9) with representatives such as Wilhelm v. Rümman (5), Syrius Eberle (2), Baltasar Schmitt (1) and an empty column; 1919/1935: painting (9), sculpture (3). A summarising statistics reveals the primacy of painting (1838-1935: 81, 75%) followed distantly by sculpture (1860-1927/28: 15, 13, 88%) and architecture (1824-1883: 12,11,11%). Naturally, besides the objective reasons for choosing the materials at entering the academy there were many other subjective ones rooted in the financial means necessary for the study years. The requisites for a painter's studio, for example, could not be compared to requisites for the other two specialities, as painting is an activity which can be practised regardless of everyday conditions, whereas in case of sculpture and architecture materials are not always easy to find, not to mention strength and an appropriate physical condition. There was also students' need of learning certain trends and techniques in German painting (historical painting or etching), without neglecting certain romantic ways, searches in the attempt to find the best way in the formation and use of the native talent within the given circumstances.

8) Another important factor derives from the above mentioned issues and this is permanent migration, differing from period to period, beneficially accentuated at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, in the context of the flow of ideas and the manifestation of artistic trends determinant for the form and foundation in Romanian culture. Not knowing the language of a given place often determined the choice of another town, especially from the Latin medium, which became the next spiritual station on the professional trajectory.¹ There is also the financial aspect, the difficulty of providing for living costs especially in the last years of study. Many talented students who came from a rural medium did not have the necessary financial support and were compelled to interrupt their studies, either returning home or

¹Examples given by famous men of art in the country: Marius Bunescu mentions precarious language skills; Ștefan Luchian complains of lack of language skills; Nicolae Vermont speaks about easy access to language, inherited from the family.

looking for other possibilities of continuing their training in financially more advantageous circumstances. Let us take the example of students coming from Transylvania who were also constrained by the encroachment of a legal system which restricted the possibilities of studying abroad and the recognition of diplomas, students who had viable study experiences at Vienna (its famous Academy founded in 1692) or Budapest (its new institution founded in 1871), either before or after their studies in München. As the registers of those two series of students who studied in München in the period in question demonstrate, there were many cases of interrupting studies, for personal reasons or compelled by circumstances; there was a pendulation, returns home and orientation towards other higher education art institutions, sometimes also in Germany but more often outside it, in France (Paris) and Italy (Rome). The change of place and the orientation towards the Latin world had a strong ideatic and thematic reason, mainly at the beginning of the 20th century when the forms of obvious opposition to “academism”, born in the 1890s and expressed by “Jugendstil”, “Secession” and the “isms” had a great impact on the young generation coming from Romania. This generation brought with them a historicist-symbolist idyllism and romanticism, but needed a tendency of de-historicising feeling, of freeing and identifying existence in communion with nature.¹ At the beginning of the 20th century Paris and Rome became a necessary alternative, a counterpart claimed for Vienna and München in order to annul the uniqueness of influence which did not allow for comparison and other choices therefore. There was the thesis in the artistic thought of the period according to which every contact, sporadic or repeated, involved selective assimilations, in function of various interests, creating the necessary technical resources which were viable only in a given situation. On a psychological level, it was held that the Latin world was the appropriate point of encounter with spirituality, freed from all sorts of constraints, especially after the German “academic”

¹ Deac M., *50 de ani de pictură. 1890-1940 (Fifty Years of Painting. 1890-1940)*, București, 1996, p.5-7, 13, 20, 53, 56.

experience. This was in fact convenient for the emotional structure of Romanians. French or Italian language were considered as expressions of the top culture of the epoch. Even if art in that period was still strongly pervaded by conventions of respectability and the lies of bourgeois life in appreciating the hierarchy of values. The capital of France had a special charm on account of its cosmopolitan colour and the high level of the fine arts academy where Romanian students were “initiated in colour”: this was the act of accomplishment and attaining maturity in contact with the professors and under the impact of trends at the beginning of this century. The activity of rounding up studies or speciality knowledge was ensured either in parallel with the training in Germany or afterwards in Rome, the metropolis famous for classical art which became more understandable for students after studying in the country or abroad (in Budapest, Vienna or München). Mental training entwined with spiritual opening in the act of artistic creation. The selection compiled by us attempts an answer to some of the issues regarding academic peregrination and the choice of other European towns during professional training.¹

¹ Relations of friendship between artists during their studies in the country (București, Iași) or abroad (Budapest, Vienna, München, Paris, Rome): a) Ștefan Luchian, between 1885-1889, with C. Artachino, P. Capidan, K. Loghi, D. Mirea, O. Obedeaneu, D. Serafim, F. Storck, N. Vermont; Johann Teutsch, between 1901-1902, with: A. Coulin, Fr. Miess; Nicolae Vermont, between 1881-1886, with: Ștefan Luchian, O. Späthe, F. Storck; b) examples of channels of impulse for studying at the Royal Academy of Art in the capital of Bavaria: Emanuel Bardasare, through his uncle, Gh. Panaiteanu-Bardasare; Bassarab Ludovic, through Idem; Octav Băncilă through Idem and C.D. Stahi; Marius Bunescu, through D. Hârlescu; Paul Focșeneanu, through K. Storck; Traian Mureșianu, through S. Mureșianu; C.D. Stahi through his father-in-law, Gh. Panaiteanu-Bardasare; D. Stoica through Ipolit Strâmbulescu; Nicolae Tonitza through E. Bardasare. c) cases of artists' camaraderie who worked in the same place: Marius Bunescu, between 1906-1912 with N. Mantu, G. Russu, D. Stoica, N. Tonitza, L. Vorel; Ștefan Luchian between 1889-1891 with O. Dolinschi, O. Obedeaneu; Nicolae Tonitza between 1908-1909 with Gr. Negoșeanu, C. Bacalu, D. Pavlu, S. Tarasov; P. Capidan between 1893-1898 with K. Loghi, Șt. Popescu, I. Strâmbulescu; A. Coulin, 1899-1891: Fr. Miess, K. Schvullerus, R. Wellmann; I. Iser, 1899-1900-1903/4: P. Ioanid, A. Murnu, Șt. Popescu; Gh. Panaiteanu-Bardasare, 1840-1842: D. Asachi, Gh. Lemeni; V. Simionescu, 1902-1906: L.

One thing is certain: the Royal Academy of Art in München had an important role in broadening the span of theoretical and practical knowledge, guiding the development of an array of artists, either at the beginning or the end of the “circulating academic dialogue” developed in the spirit of the age. These artists distinguished themselves during their studies or afterwards, on their return to the country, through exhibitions and valuable works of art which became parts of the national and universal heritage. Even if our source, the only archive material extant contains a small number of wandering students as compared to students from neighbouring countries, it reveals a constant interest and a great effort put forth in learning modern techniques of fine arts and establishing the most distinct and innovating trends and styles in the epoch.

We tried to support the thesis regarding the role of “defined model” of the München Academy, a model built on a modern conception which encompassed practical as well as theoretical training. The academy was pervaded by an atmosphere of emulation in the training of would-be men of arts, mainly in the case of the student body coming from Romania where higher education in the field of fine arts gradually became a factor of modernisation and Europeanisation, together with the institutionalisation of spirituality and the activity of the artist elite. The process of synchronisation at the end of the 19th century meant the contact with the advanced cultural medium, influences sent in various forms and different fields creatively assimilated. Therefore the recourse to the “science of fine arts” learnt in the German world, and in München, was gradual and continuous, in spite of the small number of students shown in the registers. Important was the succession of generations of graduates returning from abroad (Budapest, Vienna, München, Paris, Rome) with an amount of

Vorel; D. Stoica, 1909-1914: C. Bacalu, Gh. Ionescu, Gr. Manea, N. Mantu, Gr. Negoșeanu; Fr. Storck, 1893-1897: K. Loghi, Șt. Popescu, O. Späthe, I. Strâmbulescu; G. Vlădăreanu, 1865-1866: Tr. Iliescu; L. Vorel, 1907-1908: Gr. Negoșeanu, N. Tonitza, see also C. Bacalu, M. Bunescu, Gr. Negoșeanu, D. Pavlu, N. Tonitza, L. Vorel in the “Patria” Association of Romanian Students.

knowledge, an artistic “load” manifested in singular or collective works in the country or abroad.

Instead of conclusions we are going to formulate some question which could be starting points for further analyses. Was there an elite of artists?¹ Did the “imitatio occidentae” with all its characteristics have a major role in its formation? Was the elite selected according to the criteria of competence? Was this a creative minority of liberal profession with an ideatic-thematic weight in culture? Did they have a role in the dominant (superior) syntagm and the value-structure (quantitatively), with a potentiality only legitimised by the aesthetic criteria? What was their function and their relation to society and the state? What was their career like after completing their studies and what was the social background of this career? Was there an integration in the European context?

¹ Also compare with Gyémánt L., *Elita intelectuală românească din Transilvania. Evoluție comparativă. 1848-1918 (The Romanian Intellectuals in Transylvania. Comparative evolution. 1848-1918)*, in: *Anuarul Institutului de Istorie din Cluj*, XXXII, 1993, p.141-147; Siupiur E., *Les intellectuels roumains du 19-ème siècle et la réorganisation de la classe politique et du système institutionnel*, in *Revue Roumaine d'Histoire*, XXXIV, 1995, nr.1-2, p.75-95; *Elitele. Repere. Secvențe. Controverse (The Elite. Reference Points. Sequences. Controversies)*, in: *Xenopoliana*, IV, 1996, nr.1-4.