An Artist, a Glass Painter, a Craftsman, and a Debate on their Role in the Design and Execution of Stained Glass*

Wojciech BAŁUS
Uniwersytet Jagielloński
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7108-2184

ABSTRACT According to a discussion which took place in Germany in 1912, the fundamental environment for stained-glass making were workshops. It was within various workshops that simple ornamental glazing was put together. Designs were either produced by artists employed at workshops, which allowed them to sign their work with their names, or the effort was done collectively, with no singling out of the individual designers of the cartoons; in this case, the latter were treated as common property intended for multiple use. Thus, it was only in this environment that the agents emerged as "compilers" of simple glazing patterns and someone else's models, as "salaried designers", as artists associated with the workshop, or else as independent artists, often acclaimed ones. The authorship of the stained glass windows has always been entangled in a *sui generis* discourse involving the organisation, selection, control and redistribution by a certain number of procedures resulting from the nature of "workshop work".

KEYWORDS stained glass; artist; craftsman; stained-glass designing process

ABSTRAKT *Artysta, malarz na szkle, rzemieślnik i debata o ich roli w projektowaniu i wykonywaniu witraży*. W dyskusji toczącej się w Niemczech w 1912 r. uznano, że zasadniczym miejscem powstawania witraży jest warszat. To właśnie w różnego rodzaju warsztatach tworzone były proste dekoracyjne przeszklenia. Projekty witraży były albo dziełem artystów zatrudnionych w warsztatach, co pozwalało im podpisywać prace własnym imieniem i nazwiskiem, albo efektem wysiłku grupowego, w którym nie wyróżniano któregokolwiek z autorów kartonu, co z kolei prowadziło do traktowania projektu jako dzieła wspólnego, przeznaczonego do wielokrotnego powielania. Dopiero w tym środowisku pojawiały się „podmioty sprawcze" – agenci, będący albo „kompilatorami" prostych witrażowych wzorów i cudzych modeli, albo „projektantami najemni", albo artystami związani z warsztatem lub też artystami niezależnymi, często uznanymi. Autorstwo witraży było zawsze uwikłane w *sui generis* dyskurs organizowany, wybierany, kontrolowany i przekazywany poprzez określone procedury wynikające z charakteru „pracy warsztatowej".

SŁOWA-KLUCZE witraż; artysta; rzemieślnik; projektowanie witraży

I

In 1912, a debate concerning the possibility of improving the poor reputation of German stained-glass making took place on the pages of the *Zeitschrift für alte und neue Glasmalerei und verwandte Gebiete*. Delegates of the Verband deutscher Kunstgewerbevereine passed a motion that unqualified entrepreneurs (i.e. those who were not skilled in the production of stained glass) should be prohibited from running stained-glass workshops, since all they cared for were the cheapest products. Furthermore, it was decided that designs made by independent artists should be dispensed with, since such designers demanded inflated remuneration for work that, executed in a minimum amount of time and with the slightest effort, was unprofessional in any case. As a remedy for the bad state of stained-glass production, it was suggested to have a single hand design the cartoons and execute them in glass.[1]

Gottfried Heinersdorff disagreed. He believed that the level of stained-glass production could be improved only through the separation of the designing process from its execution in glass. He noted that stained-glass workshops operated usually under the name of their owners, who may themselves have been qualified painters but commissioned designs from other artists employed in their company. Yet the names of the latter were not made visible by signatures in the colourful windows, a fact that, in turn, had led to lowering the artistic quality of designs, since their makers did not feel personal responsibility for their works. Heinersdorff thought that artistic standards of designs could only be raised by entrusting their execution to accomplished external artists, who would care for the quality of their conceptions, and that at the same time this would lead to improved quality of the work, because the artists would not allow their designs to be spoilt by being poorly executed in glass.[2] This very procedure was adopted by Heinersdorff in his own Berlin studio, the Kunstanstalt für Glasmalerei, Bleiverglasungen und Glasmosaik, which collaborated with, among other artists, Jan Thorn-Prikker.[3]

The last of the discussants, Rudolf Linnemann, who himself ran a studio in Frankfurt am Main, in which he collaborated with his brother, the painter Otto Linnemann,[4] warned against engaging external artists for designing stained glass. In his opinion, the majority of contemporary painters lacked awareness of the technical requirements of stained-glass production, which might lead to their creating designs impossible to execute in glass. Furthermore, he stated that contemporary painters, unlike those of the 15th and 16th century, did not have the understanding of decorative qualities that is indispensable for properly devised stained glass designs.[5]

Two main problems related to the authorship of stained glass converge in these attitudes: firstly, they demonstrate the vagueness of the definition of the very category of designing and the fluidity of its borders; and secondly, they compel us to examine the question of authorship and the extent of its meaning. Although both issues have been explicated on examples from

1. "Zur Frage des Submissionswesens", *Zeitschrift für alte und neue Glasmalerei und verwandte Gebiete* 8, 1912, 92.

2. Gottfried Heinersdorff, "Die Trennung zwischen Kartonzeichner und Glasmaler. Eine Entgegung", *Zeitschrift für alte und neue Glasmalerei und verwandte Gebiete* 11, 1912, 126–129.

3. Ulrike Looft-Gaude, *Glasmalerei um 1900: Musivische Verglasungen im deutschsprachigen Raum zwischen 1895 und 1918* (Munich: scaneg, 1987), 61–62.

4. Ibid., 62–63.

5. Rudolf Linnemann, "Nochmals 'Die Trennung zwischen Kartonzeichner und Glasmaler'", *Zeitschrift für alte und neue Glasmalerei und verwandte Gebiete* 12, 1912, 138–141.

the beginning of the 20th century, in fact this case is universal, because the production of stained glass since the Middle Ages was divided between artist-designers and workshops of glaziers. Therefore, in the final part of the article, a general question about the authorship of stained glass will be considered.

II

The first of these problems may be otherwise expressed as the question whether drawing a design for stained glass was limited to merely outlining the entire composition of the window as in a preparatory drawing for an easel painting, that is, without taking into consideration the specific qualities of the medium, i.e. glass and lead, because in an "ordinary" painting a drawn sketch could be easily transferred onto canvas; or whether a design was drawn with full awareness of the demands imposed by the materials of which stained glass was made. In the first case, design would have been closer to the 16th-century *disegno*, that is, a roughly sketched idea, previously conceived in the mind of the artist,[6] and in the second instance, it would have been produced by a craftsman skilled in drawing and at the same time experienced in working with glass.

Authors who wrote about stained glass in the late 19th and the first half of the 20th century often pointed out problems resulting from the lack of the artists' familiarity with the specific technical requirements of this art. As noted by Józef Mehoffer (1869–1946), who was an experienced stained-glass designer (his greatest work was windows in a collegiate church, now a cathedral, in Fribourg, Switzerland):[7]

A design for stained glass painted on paper gives the impatient hand much more latitude than a solid piece of glass that has to be laboriously trimmed, as was the case in the Middle Ages, or, in the best case, be cut using a diamond […]. I have seen glaziers striving to cut a piece of glass using methods that were quite contradictory to the its natural qualities, such as trying to cut some incredibly intricate shapes from this rigid and easily cracking material. Let us not forget that such an aberrant shape, imposed against the natural qualities of the material, is additionally emphasized by the line formed by lead cames which, when joined with the other such lines, are also governed by some norms of rhythm characteristic of a stained-glass composition, and dictated by technical requirements of this medium.[8]

Yet, a return to the once close relationship between the fine art of painting and the craft of stained-glass execution, was still opposed at that time. It was well remembered that painting had broken free from the restrictions of the guild system, a process initiated in the Renaissance and completed in the 19th century.[9] As a consequence of these developments, the

6. Looft-Gaude, *Glasmalerei um 1900*, 58–59.

7. Hortensia von Roda, *Glasmalereien von Józef Mehoffer in der Kathedrale St. Nikolaus in Freiburg i. Ue* (Wabern and Bern: Benteli, 1995).

8. Józef Mehoffer, "Witraż jako kompozycja dekoracyjna", *Przegląd Współczesny* 18, 1939, 169–170: "Projekt witrażu malowany na papierze daje rozbieganej ręce większą swobodę niż kawał szkła, który trzeba pracowicie i z trudem łupać, jak w wiekach średnich, a choćby tylko krajać diamentem. […] Widziałem szklarzy czyniących wysiłki, aby wykrajać kawał szkła w sposób zupełnie sprzeczny z jego naturą, wyrobić w tym materiale opornym i łatwo pękającym jakieś nieprawdopodobne wrzynanie się w głąb. Nie zapominajmy, że taka fałszywa wbrew naturze materiału nadana forma akcentuje się jeszcze linią ołowiu, która przecież zbiegając się z innymi liniami podlega pewnym prawom rytmu witrażowego, dyktowanego potrzebą techniczną".

9. Rudolf and Margot Wittkower, *Born under Saturn. The Character and Conduct of Artists: A Documented History from Antiquity to the French Revolution* (London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963), 1–16.

early modern painters strove to produce masterworks which ceased to have anything in common with the guild-system "masterpieces", being instead products of the fine arts, perfect creations of a free genius – a *Divino Artista*.[10] Great artists did not have to be bothered with whatever difficulties a glazier might encounter while executing their designs in intractable material. Their *disegno* recorded a pure, perfect conception, whose realization inevitably led to disfigurations resulting from limitations of material. Therefore, in keeping with this concept, an ideal artist would be a "Raphael without hands",[11] the direct opposite of a manual labourer, representative of the mechanical arts, toiling physically to overcome the intractable nature of glass.

The opposing ways of understanding the nature of design, described above, resulted from a dualism in understanding art at the beginning of the 20th century. On the one hand, according to the conception of *disegno*, art was understood idealistically as the fine arts. According to Benedetto Croce, author of one of the most influential aesthetic theories that goes in this direction, it is intuition that is the essence of creation, as it brings into being the works of art or poetry by means of fantasy, set in motion by emotions. From the very beginning, these works of art are something more than a mere thought or emotion, because they assume particular forms of expression – words, rhythms, colours or compositional schemes – conceived already in the mind of the artist. Thus, they are already complete and perfected in their subjective, "mental" form. Therefore, their realization in the external world was to Croce of secondary importance and was in his opinion an activity conditioned exclusively by practical requirements. Croce wrote:

The artist, whom we have left vibrating with expressed images which break forth through infinite channels from his whole being, is a whole man, and therefore also a practical man, and as such takes measures against losing the result of his spiritual labor and in favor of rendering possible or easy, for himself and for others, the reproduction of his images; hence he engages in practical acts which assist that work of reproduction. These practical acts are guided, as are all practical acts, by knowledge, and for this reason are called technical and, since they are practical, they are distinguished from contemplation, which is theoretical, and seem to be external to it, and are therefore called physical [...]. Thus writing and phonography are connected with words and music, canvas and wood and walls covered with colors, with painting, and stone cut and incised iron and bronze and other metals, melted and molded to certain shapes, with sculpture and architecture.[12]

The secondary importance of executing works of art in a material form resulted, according to Croce, in the fact that an artist did not have to master any practical skills. Shortcomings in the execution did not influence the artist's position in the art world in any way; in fact, they were of no importance to his greatness:

it is possible to be a great artist with a faulty technique, a poet who corrects the proofs of his verses badly, an architect who makes use of unsuitable material or does not attend to statics, a painter who uses colors that deteriorate rapidly: examples of these weaknesses are so frequent that it is

10. Walter Cahn, *Masterpieces: Chapters on the History of an Idea* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979); Ernst Kris and Otto Kurz, *Die Legende vom Künstler: Ein geschichtlicher Versuch* (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1980), 64–86.

11. Anne Bloemacher, "Raphael's Hands", *Predella. Rivista semestrale di arti visive* 29, 2011, http://www.predella.it/archivio/index8882.html?option=com_content&view=article&id=171&catid=65&Itemid=94, accessed May 11, 2022.

12. Benedetto Croce, *The Essence of Aesthetic*, transl. Douglas Ainslie (London: W. Heinemann, 1921), 45–46.

not worth while citing any of them. But what is impossible is to be a great poet who writes verses badly, a great painter who does not give tone to his colors, a great architect who does not harmonize his lines, a great composer who does not harmonize his notes; and, in short, a great artist who cannot express himself. It has been said of Raphael that he would have been a great painter even if he had not possessed hands; but certainly not that he would have been a great painter if the sense of design and color had been wanting in him.[13]

Croce's idealistic theory thus assumed that the essence of art was indifferent to technical deficiencies of execution. If we transpose this conception to the field of stained-glass making, it can be said that a designer completely fulfilled his task by producing a colourful stained-glass design. Execution in glass would not add anything to the artwork in itself; therefore this task could be entrusted to an external person who would be able to realize it in physical form more skilfully. Heinersdorff was of similar opinion in that he substantiated his recommendation to separate the role of the designer from that of the executant as follows: "Stained glass has much in common with music. It is very nice to be able to listen to the composer playing himself. Often, however, a different skilled and cultivated performer can render his works far better".[14]

On the other hand, at the beginning of the last century, the principle of *Materialgerechtigkeit* started to gain importance, along with the conception of art which emphasized the importance of technology and material as significant, even essential, constituents of every work of art.[15] This immediately found expression in the understanding of stained glass.[16] Otto Freundlich declared that "the production of [stained-glass] windows itself is a creative act in its own right",[17] and Mehoffer wrote that the distinctiveness of this genre of art "consists primarily in the difficulty that it presents to the artist in achieving a true glass form, organically related to the material from which it is made and the purpose for which it is to be used. These two factors, the material and the practical purpose, leave their mark on it, and perhaps in no other type of decorative art do they play such a decisive role or give the work such a characteristic appearance, as in the stained glass window."[18]

13. Ibid., 46.

14. Heinersdorff, "Die Trennung zwischen Kartonzeichner und Glasmaler. Eine Entgegung", 129: "Die Glasmalerei hat viel Verwandtes mit der Musik. Sehr schön, wenn man einen Komponisten selbst hören kann. Oft aber gibt ein geübter und bestellter andrer Spieler seine Werke noch weit bessser wieder".

15. Günter Bandmann, "Der Wandel der Materialbewertung in der Kunsttheorie des 19. Jahrhunderts", in *Beiträge zur Theorie der Künste im 19. Jahrhundert*, ed. Helmut Koopmann and J. Adolf Schmoll gen. Eisenwerth, vol. 1 (Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1971), 152–153.

16. Christine Hediger and Angela Schiffhauer, "Werkstoff Glas. Überlegungen zur Materialität von Glasmalerei in Moderne und Mittelalter", *Kunst + Architektur in der Schweiz = Art + architecture en Suisse = Arte + architettura in Svizzera* 58, 2007, 15–18.

17. Quoted after: ibid., 17: "die Herstellung des Fensters selbst ist der eigentliche schöpferische Akt".

18. Mehoffer, "Witraż jako kompozycja dekoracyjna", 161: "polega przede wszystkim na trudności, jaką przedstawia dla artysty w osiągnięciu prawdziwej formy szklarskiej, organicznie związanej z materiałem, z którego jest zrobiony, i z celem, do którego ma służyć. Dwa te czynniki, materiał i cel praktyczny, wyciskają na nim właściwe piętno i w żadnym może rodzaju sztuki dekoracyjnej nie odgrywają tak rozstrzygającej roli i nie nadają dziełu tak charakterystycznego wyglądu, jak w witrażu".

Therefore, on the one hand – according to the idealistic aesthetic – an artist was allowed to limit himself to drawing, on the other hand, the principle of *Materialgerechtigkeit* compelled him to investigate the material and technique of production until he was able to master all production stages, from the initial idea up to the execution of a window – the latter attitude, however, having been a rare and extreme case in the practice of stained-glass making.[19] In any case, at the beginning of the 20th century the dilemma remained unresolved (and still remains unresolved today), and the scope of the designer's responsibilities had not been finally defined.

III

Ambiguities caused by the unspecified extent of the designers' competences had led to another problem that emerged in the forgoing discussion, namely, who, and on what grounds, should be named as the originator of a stained-glass window.

Forty-five years ago, Michel Foucault published a paper *What is an Author?*, which, according to Donald Preziosi, "has important implications for notions of art, artist, and artistry".[20] In it, Foucault demonstrated that the category of authorship is not immovable and unequivocal, and is not encountered in every civilisation, but rather that it is a historical construct responding to particular needs and cultural circumstances, associated above all with Europe. First of all, in his opinion, we do not always search for an author of every single statement: "a private letter may have a signatory, but it does not have an author; a contract can have an underwriter, but not an author; and,

similarly, an anonymous poster attached to a wall may have a writer, but he cannot be an author".[21] Then, an author or creator is someone who may be brought to account for a thought expressed in writing or in an image, but also someone who can be admired for his talent.[22] And finally, "[w]e can conclude that, unlike a proper name, which moves from the interior of a discourse to the real person outside who produced it, the name of the author remains at the contours of texts – separating one from the other, defining their form, and characterizing their mode of existence. It points to the existence of certain groups of discourse and refers to the status of this discourse within a society and culture. The author's name is not a function of a man's civil status, nor is it fictional; it is situated in the breach, among the discontinuities, which gives rise to new groups of discourse and their singular mode of existence."[23]

Thus, according to Foucault, an author is not as much an individual as a product of a given discourse, understood as a set of principles and practices regulating the functioning of a social group or an institution.[24] As he wrote, "in every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed by a certain number of procedures whose role is to ward off its powers and dangers, to gain mastery over its chance events, to evade its ponderous, formidable materiality."[25]

The purpose of the category of the author is therefore to enable a grouping and classification of works, and, by the same token, to separate some pieces from others executed at the same time and in the same milieu (hence, a text written on a wall is not assigned

---

19. Looft-Gaude, *Glasmalerei um 1900*, 55–57.

20. Donald Preziosi, "Modernity and its Discontents. Introduction", in: *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, ed. Donald Preziosi (Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), 279.

21. Michel Foucault, "What is an Author?", in *The Art of Art History*, 305.

22. Ibid., 305–307.

23. Ibid., 305.

24. David Howarth, *Discourse* (Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2000), 48–66.

25. Michel Foucault, "The Order of Discourse", transl. Ian MacLeod, in *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, ed. Robert Young (Boston, London and Henley: Routledge, 1981), 52.

an author). This is why the authorship may be a construct devised by scholars, as for instance numerous anonymous artists determined on the grounds of the "similarity of style" within a given set of works (e.g. the Master of the Female Half-Lengths, the Naumburg Master etc.). It does not disagree with a tendency to apotheosise a genius, since while admiring a painting or a sculpture one wants to praise its maker, even if his true name is unknown. The above, however, indicates an impossibility of fully identifying an author with a particular person. For instance, if someone succeeded in demonstrating – as has already been suggested – that the works of Shakespeare had been written by Francis Bacon, it would not change a thing in the contents of the plays and sonnets, nor in the characteristics of their style and the place they hold in the history of literature (i.e. in the qualities ascribed to the author of this corpus of these texts); they would have been only signed by a different name.

When Foucault's conclusions are applied to the area of stained-glass making, it is possible to state, firstly, that a distinct authorship does not necessarily have to be ascribed to every piece of stained glass. Simple ornamental glazing would have been compiled in a workshop on the basis of pattern-book designs, which were common property, since nobody has ever ascribed to himself the invention of the fish-scale pattern, lozenges, interlace patterns or, for that matter, of the pomegranate motif.

Secondly, the authorship did not necessarily have to be associated with emphasis on the creative genius of a given painter, expressed in a unique design made by him. Heinersdorff, as already mentioned, recommended signing the finished stained-glass panels with the names of their designers for purely practical, and not aesthetic reasons. He wrote: "An artist who marks his work with his name will always take great pains to have his drawings executed in the best possible way".[26] Thanks to a signature, the painter was no longer anonymous to viewers, and it was precisely the fear lest his name be put to shame or mocked, and not the pride upon the work done, that were supposed to stimulate the artist's efforts to achieve the highest quality of his designs. Thus, for Heinersdorff, publicizing the authorship was a sort of invoking social authority that prevented the production of rubbish. For the Verband deutscher Kunstgewerbevereine, however, an acknowledged authorship involved elevated production cost of stained glass resulting from the disproportionately high fees demanded by self-confident artists, too sure of their own greatness.[27] Finally, in some cases, showing the names of famous artists in the finished stained glass windows could be treated as a kind of advertising, emphasizing the prestige of the workshop cooperating with the great painter; this was the case of Kirsch & Fleckner from Fribourg in Switzerland, who clearly boasted of their cooperation with Józef Mehoffer.[28]

And, thirdly, ascribing an authorship to a piece of work encountered difficulties because of the discrepancy between a conviction about the singularity of the design drawing, understood as *disegno*, and the workshop practice typical of artisanal production. As described by Heinersdorff, numerous stained-glass windows were signed only with the name of the studio, since the cartoons used in the production of stained glass would have been drawn by painters employed in that studio.[29] The victims of such practices were not only young artists (such as Raymond Buchs, whose name – unlike Mehoffer – did not appear on his early

---

26. Heinersdorff, "Die Trennung zwischen Kartonzeichner und Glasmaler. Eine Entgegung", 128: "Ein Künstler, der seine Arbeit mit seinem Namen mitdeckt, wird immer auf das äußerste bemüht sein, die denkbar beste Ausführung seiner Zeichnungen zu erreichen".

27. "Zur Frage des Submissionswesens", 92.

28. Valérie Sauterel and Camille Noverraz, "The Functioning and Development of Kirsch & Fleckner's Workshop in Fribourg During the First Half of the Twentieth Century", *Folia Historiae Artium* 17, 2019, 63.

29. Heinersdorff, "Die Trennung zwischen Kartonzeichner und Glasmaler. Eine Entgegung", 127.

works for the Kirsch & Fleckner atelier[30]), but also the experienced ones, because the designs that they prepared were treated as the property of the studio and freely reproduced in subsequent commissions, either as a whole or in fragments (e.g. certain figures or faces were repeated).[31] The post-Renaissance discourse of the creative genius and inspired individuality of an artist clashed with the principles of artisanal workshop practice. On the one hand, there was the singularity and uniqueness of a creative act by a talented individual, from the second half of the 19th century additionally supported by the regulations of copyright law that gave increasing protection against plagiarism.[32] On the other hand, there was the still valid medieval "workshop work" principle, regulating the production of a given artwork,[33] which consisted in the freedom to re-use patterns and cartoons gathered in the workshop. For instance Morris, Marshall, Faulkner & Co. used Edward Burne-Jones's *St George* and *St Martin*, originally designed in 1880, more than forty times.[34]

To whom, then – in light of the discussion published in the *Zeitschrift für alte und neue Glasmalerei und verwandte Gebiete* – should the authorship of stained glass be ascribed? At the end of his paper, Foucault proposed that such a question be replaced by a different one, namely, "under what conditions and through what forms can an entity like the subject appear in the order of discourse; what position does it occupy; what functions does it exhibit; and what rules does it follow in each type of discourse?".[35]

At the beginning of the 20th century, and also in earlier centuries, the discursive reality of stained-glass making were workshops producing coloured windows, and not the individual, more or less talented artists. It was within various studios or workshops that, (1) simple ornamental glazing was "compiled", or (2) designs were produced by artists employed in a workshop that allowed them to sign their work with their names, or (3) the work was done collectively, with no singling out of the individual designers of the cartoons, while the latter were treated as common property intended for multiple re-use, or, finally, the workshop carried out the ideas of "external" artists who (4.1), either provided sketches, often difficult to execute in glass, or (4.2) drew professional cartoons, in which they employed all their practical knowledge of the technique of stained-glass making. Thus, it was only in this reality that the causative subjects, or agents, emerged – (I) as "compilers" of simple glazing patterns and someone else's models (including designs from the workshop's archives), (II) as "salaried designers", or, finally, (III.1) as artists associated with the workshop, or still (III.2) as independent artists, often acclaimed, but not always aware of the technical requirements of the *ars vitrea*. Be that as it may, the authorship of windows made of coloured glass has always – that is, from the Middle Ages to the present day – been entangled in some kind of "discourse organized, selected, controlled and redistributed by a certain number of procedures"[36] resulting from the nature of "workshop work".

30. Sauterel and Noverraz, "The Functioning and Development of Kirsch & Fleckner's Workshop", 63.

31. Looft-Gaude, *Glasmalerei um 1900*, 60–61.

32. Leonard Górnicki, *Rozwój idei praw autorskich: od starożytności do II wojny światowej* (Wrocław: Prawnicza i Ekonomiczna Biblioteka Cyfrowa, 2013), 137–142.

33. For "workshop work" see Lech Kalinowski, [Voice in the discussion], in *Niedzica Seminars III: Serial and Individual Production in the Representative Arts of the 14th and 15th Century*, ed. Ewa Śnieżyńska-Stolot (Kraków: SHS, 1988), 130.

34. Martin Harrison, "Stained Glass and Church Decoration", in *William Morris*, ed. Anna Mason (London: Thames and Hudson, 2021), 126.

35. Foucault, "What is an Author?", 314.

36. Foucault, "The Order of Discourse", 52.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bandmann, Günter. "Der Wandel der Materialbewertung in der Kunsttheorie des 19. Jahrhunderts." In *Beiträge zur Theorie der Künste im 19. Jahrhundert*, edited by Helmut Koopmann, J. Adolf Schmoll gen. Eisenwerth, vol. 1, 129–157. Frankfurt am Main: Klostermann, 1971.

Bloemacher, Anne. "Raphael's Hands." *Predella. Rivista semestrale di arti visive* 29, 2011. http://www.predella.it/archivio/index8882.html?option=com_content&view=article&id=171&catid=65&Itemid=94.

Cahn, Walter. *Masterpieces: Chapters on the History of an Idea*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1979.

Croce, Benedetto. *The Essence of Aesthetic*. Translated by Douglas Ainslie. London: W. Heinemann, 1921.

Foucault, Michel. "The Order of Discourse." Translated by Ian MacLeod. In *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, edited by Robert Young, 48–78. Boston, London and Henley: Routledge, 1981.

Foucault, Michel. "What is an Author?" Translated by Bouchard and Sherry Simon. In *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, edited by Donald Preziosi, 299–314. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Górnicki, Leonard. *Rozwój idei praw autorskich: od starożytności do II wojny światowej*. Wrocław: Prawnicza i Ekonomiczna Biblioteka Cyfrowa, 2013.

Harrison, Martin. "Stained Glass and Church Decoration." In *William Morris*, edited by Anna Mason, 134–159. London: Thames and Hudson, 2021.

Hediger, Christine, and Angela Schiffhauer. "Werkstoff Glas. Überlegungen zur Materialität von Glasmalerei in Moderne und Mittelalter." *Kunst + Architektur in der Schweiz = Art + architecture en Suisse = Arte + architettura in Svizzera* 58 (2007): 15–18.

Howarth, David. *Discourse*. Buckingham and Philadelphia: Open University Press, 2000.

Kalinowski, Lech. [Voice in the discussion]. In *Niedzica Seminars III: Serial and Individual Production in the Representative Arts of the 14th and 15th Century*, edited by Ewa Śnieżyńska-Stolot, 130. Kraków: SHS, 1988.

Kris, Ernst, and Otto Kurz. *Die Legende vom Künstler: Ein geschichtlicher Versuch*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1980.

Looft-Gaude, Ulrike. *Glasmalerei um 1900: Musivische Verglasungen im deutschsprachigen Raum zwischen 1895 und 1918*. Munich: scaneg, 1987.

Preziosi, Donald. "Modernity and its Discontents." In *The Art of Art History: A Critical Anthology*, edited by Donald Preziosi, 277–280. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

von Roda, Hortensia. *Glasmalereien von Józef Mehoffer in der Kathedrale St. Nikolaus in Freiburg i. Ue.* Wabern and Bern: Benteli, 1995.

Sauterel, Valérie, and Camille Noverraz. "The Functioning and Development of Kirsch & Fleckner's Workshop in Fribourg During the First Half of the Twentieth Century." *Folia Historiae Artium* 17 (2019): 59–71.

Wittkower, Rudolf and Margot. *Born under Saturn. The Character and Conduct of Artists: A Documented History from Antiquity to the French Revolution*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1963.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Wojciech Bałus (b. 1961) is an art historian, a professor at the Institute of Art History of the Jagiellonian University. His research interests focus on the theory and history of art between the nineteenth and twenty first centuries, as well as on the

relationship between art and philosophy, cultural anthropology, and literary studies. Within the Corpus Vitrearum International he conducts research on Polish stained glass art of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries; he serves as the Chairman of the Polish National Committee of Corpus Vitrearum. He is a regular member of Polish Academy of Arts and Sciences, and member of the AICA.

NOTA BIOGRAFICZNA

Wojciech Bałus (ur. 1961) jest historykiem sztuki, profesorem w Instytucie Historii Sztuki UJ. Jego zainteresowania badawcze koncentrują się wokół teorii i historii sztuki XIX–XXI w., związków sztuki i filozofii, antropologii kulturowej i literaturoznawstwa. W ramach Corpus Vitrearum International prowadzi badania nad polskim witrażem XIX i XX w.; pełni funkcję przewodniczącego Polskiego Komitetu Narodowego Corpus Vitrearum. Jest członkiem czynnym Polskiej Akademii Umiejętności oraz członkiem AICA.

Wojciech Bałus