

An interview with Ernst H. Gombrich

Elizabeth J. Sacca

Reproduced by kind permission of the The Canadian Society for Education through Art/ La Société Canadienne d'Éducation par l'Art

E - Reviews of Gombrich's major publications

135. *ABY WARBURG*

- 135a. Burke, P. *Listener* (21 October 1971): 546.
- 135b. Gilbert, F. *Journal of Modern History* 44 (September 1972):381-91.
- 135c. Karling, S. *Konsthistorisk Tidskrift* 41 (December 1972): 127-29.
- 135d. *Times Literary Supplement* (25 June 1971): 735.
- 135e. Watkin, D. *Encounter* 38 (April 1972): 78-80.
- 135f. Weitz, M. *Art Bulletin* 54 (March 1972): 107-10.

136. *ART AND ILLUSION*

- 136a. Arnheim, R. *Art Bulletin* 44 (March 1962): 75-79.
- 136b. Betram, A. *Tablet* 215 (21 July 1962): 689.
- 136c. Boas, G. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 19 (Winter 1960): 229.
- 136d. Brain, R. *Speculum* (8 April 1960): 514. 1:
- 136e. *Domus* 371 (October 1960): 11-12.
- 136f. F.,J. *Connoisseur* 149 (January 1962): 46.
- 136g. Fell, A. *Queen's Quarterly* 68 (Autumn 1961): 528-9.
- 136h. Frankenstein, A. *New York Times Book Review* (3 April 1960): 7.
- 136i. Gaertner, J. *Books Abroad* (Autumn 1960): 364.
- 136j. Getlein, F. *New Republic* 142 (9 May 1960): 28.
- 136k. Gibson, J. *American Journal of Psychology* 73 (December 1960):653.
- 136l. Gowing, L. *New Statesman* 60 (29 October 1960): 654.
- 136m. H.J. *Personalist* 42 (Winter 1961): 111.
- 136n. Held, R. *Yale Review* 49 (June 1960): 607.
- 136o. Kelder, D. *Liturgical Arts* 29 (November 1960): 27-8.
- 136p. *Kunstwerk* 21 (April 1968): 89.
- 136q. Morris, R. *America* 104 (7 January 1961): 448
- 136r. *New Yorker* 36 (1 October 1960): 183.
- 136s. *Oeil* 72 (December 1960): 112.
- 136t. Piers, M. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* (July 1962): 393.
- 136u. Reynolds, C. *Apollo* 71 (June 1960): 202.
- 136v. *Saturday Review* 52 (21 June 1969): 62.
- 136w. Steefel, L. *Art Journal* 20. (Summer 1961): 252.
- 136x. *Times Literary Supplement* (8 April 1960): 217.
- 136y. *Times Literary Supplement* (27 July 1962): 533.
- 136z. *Umeni* 17 (1969): 294-97.
- 136aa. Wallis, N. *Connoisseur* 151 (December 1962): 257-58.
- 136bb. White, H.C. *American Journal of Sociology* 3 (November 1961): 347.
- 136cc. White, J. *Burlington Magazine* 104 (March 1962): 127.

137. ART HISTORY AND THE SOCIAL SCIENCES

- 137a. Bornstein, M. *Art Journal* 38 (Spring 1979): 220.
- 137b. Nordenstam, T. *Journal of Aesthetic and Art Criticism* 37 (Spring 1979): 360.

138. THE HERITAGE OF APELLES

- 138a. Bazarov, K. *Art and Artists II* (February 1977): 46-48.
- 138b. *Book Forum* 2 (Fall 1976): 529.
- 138c. *Choice* 13 (February 1977): 1582-83.
- 138d. Clark, K. *New York Review of Books* (24 November 1977): 36-38.
- 138e. Fehl, P. *Burlington Magazine* 121 (March 1979): 179-81.
- 138f. Gilbert, C. *Art News* 76 (October 1977): 120.
- 138g. Larsen, E. *Western Humanities Review* 31 (Winter 1977): 81-83.
- 138h. Martin, F. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 35 (Spring 1977): 378-79.
- 138i. *Nation* 223 (18 December 1976): 666.
- 138j. Olds, C. *Art Journal* 37 (Winter 1977-78): 180.
- 138k. Podro, M. *Encounter* 48 (April 1977): 50-55.
- 138l. Pope-Hennessy, J. *New York Times Book Review* (8 May 1977): 36-37.
- 138m. *Spectator* 237 (6 November 1976): 32.
- 138n. Steiner, G. *New Yorker* 53 (4 April 1977): 132.
- 138o. Weller, B. *MLN* 92 (December 1977): 1067-80.

139. IN SEARCH OF CULTURAL HISTORY

- 139a. *English Historical Review* 86 (January 1971): 222.
- 139b. *Guardian Weekly* 100 (15 May 1969): 15.
- 139c. Sutton, D. *Apollo* 91 (April 1970): 32.

140. MEANS AND ENDS

- 140a. *Apollo* 106 (October 1977): 324.
- 140b. *Choice* 15 (May 1978): 386.
- 140c. DeCandido, G. *Library Journal* 102 (15 November 1977): 2336.

141. MEDITATIONS ON A HOBBY HORSE

- 141a. Chapin, L. *Christian Science Monitor* (20 February 1964): 7.
- 141b. *Economist* 209 (7 December 1963): 1028.
- 141c. Edwards, R. *Connoisseur* 156 (May 1964): 65-6.
- 141d. Kermode, F. *New York Review of Books* 2 (20 February 1964): 1.
- 141e. Kitson, M. *Encounter* 22 (May 1964): 65.
- 141f. Lucie-Smith, E. *The Listener* 70 (5 December 1963): 949.
- 141g. Neumeyer, A. *Art Journal* 24 (Winter 1964/65): 214.
- 141h. *New Yorker* 39 (15 February 1964): 140.
- 141i. Ramsden, E. *Apollo* 80 (August 1964): 164.
- 141j. Rosenberg, H. *Saturday Review* 47 (25 April 1964): 33.
- 141k. Taylor, H. *Herald Tribune Book Week* (16 August 1964): 3.
- 141l. *Times Literary Supplement* (30 July 1964): 660.

- 141m. *Virginia Quarterly Review* 40 (Spring 1964): lxxxi.
141n. Wollheim, R. *New Statesman* 67 (3 January 1964): 18-19.

142. NORM AND FORM

- 142a. Bell, O. *Listener* 77 (5 January 1967): 31.
142b. Clark, K. *New York Review of Books* 24 (24 November 1977): 36- 38.
142c. *Connoisseur* 165 (May 1967): 50-51.
142d. *Economist* (4 March 1967): 834.
142e. Greenberg, C. *New York Times* (23 April 1967): 6.
142f. Hale, J. *Observer* (27 November 1966): 26.
142g. Hampshire, S. *New York Review of Books* 8 (9 March 1967): 6.
142h. Howard, S. *Art Bulletin* 51 (June 1969): 184-86.-
142i. Johnson, W. *Art Quarterly* 31 (Winter 1968): 459.
142j. Levey, M. *Apollo* 85 (April 1967): 304.
142k. Neumeyer, A. *Art Journal* 26 (Summer 1967): 422.
142l. Podro, M. *Spectator* 218 (6 January 1967): 19.
142m. Stechow, W. *Renaissance Quarterly* 20 (Autumn 1967): 361-63.
142n. Steiner, G. *Encounter* 28 (May 1967): 61-64.
142o. *Times Literary Supplement* (31 August 1967): 776.
142p. *Yale Review* 56 (June 1967): xxii-xxiii.

143. THE SENSE OF ORDER

- 143a. Arnhem, R. *New Republic* 10 (March 1979): 36-38.
143b. Gablik, S. *New York Times Book Review* 84 (27 May 1979): 7.
143c. *Kirkus Review* 47 (15 January 1979): 98-99.
143d. *Library Journal* 104 (15 February 1979): 474.
143e. Wollheim, R. *Burlington Magazine* 121 (May 1979): 322-23.
143f. Zerner, H. *New York Review of Books* 26 (28 June 1979): 18-21.

144. THE STORY OF ART

- 144a. *Architectural Review* 108 (November 1950): 325.
144b. *Booklist* 46 (15 April 1950): 258.
144c. *British Journal of Aesthetics* 6 (July 1966): 300.
144d. *Burlington Magazine* 92 (April 1950): 118.
144e. *Choice* 10 (April 1973): 278.
144f. *Christian Science Monitor* (21 October 1950): 14.
144g. *College Art Journal* 9 No. 4 (1950): 429-30.
144h. *Connoisseur* 126 (December 1950): 216.
144i. Hirsch, *Leonardo* 9 (Winter 1976): 76.
144j. *Instructor* 82 (February 1973): 207.
144k. Ironside, R. *New Statesman and Nation* 38 (10 December 1949): 706.
144l. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 9 (June 1951): 339-40.
144m. Lask, T. *Art News* 72 (April 1973): 50.
144n. *Liturgical Arts* 18 (August 1950): 107.
144o. Plaut, A. *Library Journal* 75 (1 June 1950): 983.
144p. Sweet, F. *Chicago Sunday Tribune* (2 April 1950): 18.

- 144q. Thompson, J.W. *Magazine of Art* 44 (January 1951): 35-36.
144r. Werner, A. *Chicago Jewish Forum* 27 (Spring 1968): 221.

145. *SYMBOLIC IMAGES*

- 145a. Beres, D. *Psychoanalytic Quarterly* 42 No. 4 (1973): 629-37.
145b. *Books and Bookmen* 19 (October 1973): 45.
145c. Broyard, A. *New York Times* (1 June 1972): 45.
145d. *Choice* 9 (October 1972): 958.
145e. Clark, K. *New York Review of Books* 24 (24 November 1977): 3638.
145f. Clough, C. *Apollo* 97 (May 1973): 533.
145g. Denvir, B. *Art International* 16 (Summer 1972): 138.
145h. Forge, A. *Listener* 87 (27 April 1972): 561.
145i. Langedijk, K. *Renaissance Quarterly* 27 (Autumn 1974): 336-37.
145j. Muller, P. *Library Journal* 97 (August 1972): 2564.
145k. *Nation* 215 (11 December 1972): 599.
145l. Paulson, R. *MLN* 92 (December 1977): 1052-66.
145m. *Spectator* 228 (13 May 1972): 734.
145n. Tarr, R. *Studio International* 184 (July 1972): 58-59.
145o. *Times Literary Supplement* (20 October 1972): 1248.

146. *ART, PERCEPTION AND REALITY.*

- 146a. Bornstein, M. *Art Journal* 33 (Summer 1974): 378, 380.
146b. Brockleb, R. *Leonardo* 7 (Winter 1974): 75-76.
146c. *Burlington Magazine* 115 (April 1973): 267.
146d. *Choice* 10 (February 1974): 1856.
146e. Longueth, C. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 26 (February 1974): 173-74.
146f. Maher, B. *Contemporary Psychology* 19 (April 1974): 333.
146g. *Nation* 215 (11 December 1972): 599.
146h. Rosenthal, M. *Connoisseur* 184 (September 1974): 67.
146i. Sagoff, M. *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 32 (Fall 1973): 128.
146j. Schaper, E. *British Journal of Aesthetics* 14 (Spring 1974): 179-181.
146k. Somville, P. *Revue Philosophique de la France et de l'Étranger* (October- December 1975): 487.
146l. Stalker, D. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 34 (March 1974): 450-51.
146m. *Times Literary Supplement* (13 July 1973): 814.

147. *ILLUSION IN NATURE AND ART*

- 147a. Bailey, E. *Library Journal* 100 (1 January 1975): 56.
147b. *Choice* 12 (May 1975): 376.
147c. Morrison, P. *Scientific American* 232 (June 1975): 123.
147d. Rice, C. *Psychological Record* 25 No. 2 (1975): 301-2.
147e. Sutherland, N. *Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology* 26 (November 1974): 658.
147f. *Times Literary Supplement* (22 March 1974): 302.
147g. Willson, J. *Leonardo* 8 No. 4 (1975): 347-48.
147h. Wollheim, R. *Perception* 2 No. 2 (1973): 261-62.

F - Appraisals, criticisms and applications of Gombrich's theories

148. Aldrich, Virgil. "Mothersill and Gombrich - 'The Language of Art'." *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (October 1965): 572-573.

Mothersill is successful in arguing that Gombrich does not show how art is a language but she mistakes the thesis that Gombrich is defending. Gombrich's point is that the language of art is like the language of words or of concepts not in propositional or statement combination and therefore neither true nor false. For Gombrich the work of art is informative but as an expressive instead of a descriptive portrayal. It exhibits something under a conceptual schema, without saying anything true or false about it.

149. Aldrich, Virgil. "Mothersill and Gombrich on 'The Language of Art'." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 8 (October 1968): 359-364

Aldrich expands the arguments he made in the *Journal of Philosophy* (see above) and concludes that "it is a mistake to suppose, as I think Mothersill does, that language, as what one learns first, has a kind of standing priority over visual art. Rather, if there is to be any kind of justifiable talk about one being parasitic on the other, this should be thought of as a reciprocal relation. Thus we as naturally - or unnaturally say 'the art of language' as we say 'the language of art'."

150. Colas, Nicolas. "Truth and E.H. Gombrich." *The Village Voice* September 23, 1965. Reprinted in *Art in the Age of Risk*, pp. 115-20, New York: Dutton, 1968.

For Gombrich "art lies between two extremes, between the traditional symbols and emblems of religious paintings and those symptoms of emotions we detect in an artist's brushstrokes." For him the language of art serves not to imitate reality but to substitute for reality.

151. Carrier, D.S. "Representation and Expression in Visual Art." Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1972.

This thesis discusses the relationship between expression and representation in visual art as presented by Goodman, Gombrich, Wollheim and Stokes, and attempts to clarify the concepts of 'representation' and 'expression'. The defect of Goodman's convention theory of representation is seen to lie in its inability to explain the activity of artists or the nature of art history. Gombrich's defence of an illusion theory of representation is important, if incomplete, but his account of expression founders on too great a tendency to identify it with the use of a code. Wollheim's account of expression is examined and also found wanting. Stoke's psychoanalytical approach overcomes both the usual limitations of such approaches and the defects of Goodman's and Gombrich's accounts. All these theories represent responses to the condition of modern art.

152. Channin, R.J. "The Western Factual Tradition of Painting and the Rise of Factual Autonomy." Ph.D. dissertation, New York University, 1972.

In this study of factual painting from Titian to the present day, the author establishes a continuum of attitudes towards painting materials and techniques, and outlines his own concept of factual painting, which he contrasts with Wofflin and Greenberg's concepts of 'painterly', while those of Vasari and Gombrich are criticized. Factual painting is examined for its contribution to the depiction of natural forms, and a theory of factual autonomy is advanced.

153. Child, Irvin, Cooperman, Marc, and Wolowitz, Howard. "Esthetic Preference and Other Correlates of Active Versus Passive Food Preference." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* II No. 1 (1969): 75-84.

Gombrich has suggested that esthetic sophistication may be correlated with the psychoanalytic dimension of active versus passive orality. This prediction is confirmed in a study of 105 college men, using H.M. Wolowitz's measure of food preferences and I.L. Child's measure of esthetic sensitivity. Each of these two measures is found to be related to active versus passive preferences in several other spheres of life, and to several measures of independence versus dependence. Neither oral nor esthetic preference appears to be related to measures of achievement, dominance, and aggression. Findings have no clear implication for the causal priority of one or another of the variables found to be interrelated.

154. "Ernst Gombrich and the Warburg Institute: 1936-1976." *Burlington Magazine* 118 (July 1976): 46.

This article gives an appreciation of Gombrich's work as Director of the Warburg Institute. Gombrich was able to build bridges between the 'Fine Arts' and other disciplines. "No one knows better than he how to shake up the kaleidoscope of the past, not once, not twice, but a dozen times, on each occasion revealing some new insight won through a fresh angle of vision. Gombrich is, quite simply, our most stimulating guide - not to art history as a cut and dried academic subject, nor to the unlocking of riddles - but to that hardest of all themes, our relationship to the past... What interests Gombrich almost more than the answer, is the question, the line of approach to the historical problem - it is partly what makes him such a good teacher and university lecturer - and no one is less doctrinaire."

155. Finch, M. *Style in Art History: An Introduction to Theories of Style and Sequence*. Metuchen, New Jersey: Scarecrow Press, 1974.

Finch attempts to reformulate some traditional and current ideas about style and sequence, putting into context portions of the thinking of pioneers in the theory of styles, - Bernard Berenson, Alois Riegl, Heinrich Alfflin and Wilhelm Worringer. Ideas that have withstood "the eruptions of new-found information about the past and the bombardment of twentieth century styles" are singled out and revised. The text brings the topic up to date by including contributions made towards mid-century by Sir Herbert Read, Henri Focillon, Erwin Panofsky, Meyer Schapiro, and others, and turns to recent ideas of James Ackerman, George Kubler, and especially Sir Ernst Gombrich. This volume makes accessible "the recent philosophical trend in scholarly thought", and the text tries to strike a balance between iconology and morphology. Considerable attention is given to the matter of representational art versus abstraction. The whole subject is considered within the framework of five main chapters entitled 'Form', 'Subject', 'Meaning', 'Predilection and Meaning'.

156. Gablik, Suzi. "On the Logic of Artistic Discovery: Art as Mimetic Conjecture." *Studio International* 186 (September 1973) 65-67.

Gombrich like Popper suggests that progress is the elimination of error by way of systematic rational criticism. "To accept this model of artistic progress, I shall argue, is to place representational art within a closed system (rather like a system in thermodynamics where the process eventually comes to a stop at a state of equilibrium); it does nothing towards explaining

the way in which art has progressed since then. All modernist, non-representational and post-object art (since it is independent of the demands of external reality) is doomed by this formulation to remain a tantalizing loose end, a conspicuous aberration which can only be explained by ad hoc causes and a separate interpretative framework."

157. Ginzburg, Carlo. "Da A. Warburg a E.H. Gombrich (Note su un problema di metodo)." *Studi Medievali* 7 No. 2 Third Series (1966): 1015-1065.

158. Hansen, Robert. "This Curving World: Hyperbolic Linear Perspective." *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 32 (Winter 1973): 147-61.

We see curves whenever we look at straight lines and all straight lines except those that pass through a line projected straight ahead from a point between our eyes appear curved, not as arcs but as hyperbolas. A brief history of linear perspective and comments on the views of Fouquet, Leonardo, Gombrich and Gibson accompany a presentation of a five-point system of hyperbolic linear perspective.

159. Kjørup, Soren. "George Inness and the Battle at Hastings, or Doing Things with Pictures." *Monist* 58 (April 1974): 216-235.

"E.H. Gombrich's *Art and Illusion* is one of the best books in the world. If you are in any way concerned with pictures - as an art historian, a philosopher, an educator, a painter, or an illustrator - you cannot open it randomly without finding a passage rich in valuable observations and thoughtful considerations, and yet capable of giving you stuff for your own further work." Gombrich's book demonstrates that the artist may use pictures as vehicles for pictorial speech acts by depicting something in the picture and the observer may see a picture for its properties or its exemplification.

160. Lycan, William G. "Gombrich, Wittgenstein and the Duck-Rabbit" *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 30 (Winter 1971):229-37.

Gombrich's use of the notion of seeing is surveyed and traced in some detail to its Wittgensteinian origins. Gombrich's *Art and Illusion* is viewed as a laudable working out of the implications of some Wittgensteinian doctrines for aesthetics.

161. Mothersill, Mary. "Is Art a Language?" *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (October 1965): 559-571.

Gombrich's thesis that "everything points to the conclusion that the phrase the language of art is more than a loose metaphor" is investigated in this article. Mothersill summarizes the various attempts made by Dewey, Hanslick, and Gombrich to treat art as a language and concludes that the phrase, the "language of art" is a mere metaphor and not much is to be gained by pursuing analogies between art and language. "That it is a metaphor seems certain, and I doubt that much is to be gained by following out the analogies between art and language: to the extent that they are obvious, they are instructive. What is genuinely puzzling is the persistence of the metaphor and the - as it seems to me -mysterious fascination it continues to exert."

162. Mundt, Ernest. "Kunstwollen and Artistic Purpose." *College Art Journal* 18 (Fall 1958): 63.

Gombrich in his article "Art and Scholarship" *College Art Journal* 17 (Summer 1958): 342-56) warns against a simulacrum of an explanation which puts an end to further search. Kunstwollen has been similarly seminal but there is no alternative - Gombrich must accept words as symbols of knowledge. To creative minds such conceptualizations are necessary and it is not their fault if such concepts are turned into cornerstones by lesser minds who crave finite structures of meaning.

163. Novitz, David. "Conventions and the Growth of Pictorial Style." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 16 (Autumn 1972): 324-37.

Novitz questions the claim that pictures depend heavily on conventions and argues that Gombrich is mistaken in his belief that one can explain the structure and dynamics of style in terms of conventional schemata.

164. Novitz, David. "The Gombrich Problem." In *Pictures and Their Use in Communication*, pp. 50-54. Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1977.

The view proposed by Gombrich in his book *Art and Illusion*, that depicting is essentially schematic and that schematic images influence the act of depicting, does not provide an adequate analysis of this activity. Gombrich's view of the central role which conventional schemata play in depicting reveals one startling deficiency - "he never argues in support of the view that schemata, conventional or otherwise, are logically required for depicting." Gombrich is mistaken in his belief that schemata, conventional or otherwise, are integral to depicting and he does not take into account that the depicter can devise entirely new formulae for depicting individual objects.

165. Perkins, David. "Compensating for Distortion in Viewing Pictures Obliquely." *Perception and Psychophysics* 14 (August 1973): 13-18.

Perkins discusses Gombrich's suggestion that the interpretation of obliquely viewed pictures depends largely on the foreshortened image projected to the eye, the attendant distortion rarely being important. In this study the subjects differed in their predictions for normal and oblique viewing and demonstrated substantial capacity to compensate for oblique viewing and small tendency to judge according to the foreshortened image.

166. Richmond, Sheldon. "An Evaluation of Gombrich's Critique of Aesthetics." Ph.D. dissertation. Boston University, 1976.

Gombrich is an historian of art who adopts the approach of Karl Popper, a philosopher of science, to his studies in the history, psychology and sociology of art. Gombrich's critique of aesthetics is analogous to the critique of methodology used by Michael Polanyi, and is inconsistent with Gombrich's Popperian background. There is a mistake in Gombrich's critique of aesthetics similar to the errors of the Polanyian approach to criticism.

167. Richter, Paul. "On Professor Gombrich's Model of Schema and Correction." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 16 (Autumn 1976): 338-346.

In *Art and Illusion* Gombrich explains how each historical period has a predominant representational art arrived at by a progressive realization of schema and correction, that is the posing, testing, correction and revision of hypotheses. "I have tried to make sense of Professor Gombrich's model of schema and correction by describing change and development in the art of depiction based upon

schematic invention, testing, and modification taking place against increasing refinement of discrimination of relevant elements within our perceptual field taken as a whole. I have tried by this account to avoid the problems which arise with respect to the notion of correction when this model is thought of as one process of change evolving against another."

168. Ross, Stephanie. "Caricature." *Monist* 48 (April 1974): 285-293.

Gombrich's negative comments about caricature are valid but "his positive theory is not so airtight. First, he grounds the equivalence between a caricature and its subject in audience response but that is not what counts since a caricature seen by no one but its artist would still be a caricature. Second, Gombrich's formulae fail to distinguish caricature from other forms of representation. Third, when Gombrich attempts to explain how caricature captures its subject he reverts to the notion of "concentrating all required information into one arrested image." The explanations of caricature in terms of essential features, relevant information and parametric exaggerations, postulated by Gombrich, should be rejected in favour of an interpretation that views caricature as those representations of people which are judged to be less realistic and which demand that we see reality in terms of them.

169. Stezaker, John. "Towards Nihilism." *Studio International* 186 (November 1973): 169-70.

In this reply to Suzi Gablik's article "On the Logic of Artistic Discovery: Art as Mimetic Conjecture" *Studio International* 186 (September 1973): 65-67), Stezaker suggests that Gombrich's thesis of art theory and practice is inadequate because of its commitment to Popperian positivism but so is Gablik's conceptual framework inoperative in its embracing the fashionable Kuhnian revision of positivism.

170. Tomas, Vincent. "On 'Is Art a Language'." *Journal of Philosophy* 62 (October 1965): 573-74.

The main shortcoming in Gombrich's book, *Art and Illusion*, is that he never considers the possibility that the language of art is not really being used to assert or to deny anything. "I agree with Mothersill that Gombrich's book provides a good starting place for the discussion of the language of art. But I suggest that the first step in such a discussion is to distinguish between pictures as aesthetic objects and pictures as illustrations, which Gombrich does not do. The next step is to compare pictures qua aesthetic objects with poems, and novels, with what Thomas de Quincey called the 'literature of power' as opposed to the 'literature of knowledge,' in which language is used to express information. One would find, I am confident, that the analogies are rather impressive."

171. Tonelli, Giorgio. *E.H. Gombrich e l'Estetica delle Arti Figurative*. Torino: Edizioni di Filosofia, 1962.

172. White, Hayden. "The Tasks of Intellectual History." *Monist* 58 (October 1969): 606-630. The achievements of E.H. Gombrich, Thomas S. Kuhn and Lucien Goldmann in history of art, history of science and history of literature respectively, are examples of specialists who have availed themselves of the latest developments in experimental psychology and the learning theory of the Gestalt school. Both Gombrich and Kuhn have studied the attempt to represent reality realistically and make appeal to the model of the binary computer with the feedback mechanism which requires each successive matching of a picture of the world-reality be followed by another "making" of the picture. Gombrich and Kuhn's approach leads into the subject, to concentration on the relations

between procedures and theories within specific disciplines and stylistic conventions and to the dynamic interaction and mutual influences of conflicting thought-styles.

173. Wilkerson, Terence. "Representation, Illusion and Aspects." *British Journal of Aesthetics* 18 (Winter 1978): 45-58.

Wilkerson discusses Gombrich's arguments in *Art and Illusion* concerning the connection between representation and illusion and rejects an information-flow model of perception and pursues the "idea of appearances."

174. Wilson, Judith. "E.H. Gombrich and Beyond: A Study of Ernst Hans Gombrich's View on Pictorial Imagery and of Their Implications for Identification of the Distinctive Features of Pictorial Works of Art." Ph.D. dissertation. University of Wisconsin, 1974.

"I ask whether there are any reasons relating to art pictures themselves, which would explain our special treatment of them. I preface my discussion about art with the selection of a set of theses about perception on the basis of their general reasonableness and their promise for dealing with the special problem about pictorial art which concerns me here. In this connection, E.H. Gombrich's work on perception in *Art and Illusion* serves as a useful starting point since he has focused attention on the special problems of image-seeing and has based his views on a thorough review of experimental results in perceptual psychology and information theory."

175. Yoos, George. "An Analysis of Three Studies of Pictorial Representation: M.C. Beardsley, E.H. Gombrich, and L. Wittgenstein." Ph.D. dissertation. Columbia:University of Missouri, 1971.

The purpose of the three studies is to determine to what degree resemblance, language, and intent are factors in pictorial representation. The study of Gombrich consists of an exposition, interpretation, and critique of his major hypothesis as to why pictorial art has had a history and attempts to show that his lack of clarity in defining "seeing a likeness" and "illusion" in pictorial representation undermines his argument. The conclusion is that both Beardsley's and Gombrich's theory of pictorial representation fail to account for the features of seeing and regarding pictorial representations as they are presented. in Wittgenstein's formal analysis of these concepts.