As both an artist and teacher, Josef Albers is a singularly important figure in the history of twentieth-century art. He is best known for his *Homage to the Square*, an expansive suite of paintings and prints that explores the nuances of color and tonal relationships and the relative nature of perception. Albers made his first *Homage to the Square* in 1950, and during the next quarter-century he produced more than two thousand paintings and 160 distinct prints that adhere to a fixed set of formal parameters—a square with three or four concentric but unequal margins (page 10, for example)—through which the artist explored a seemingly infinite variety of combinations. Yet as much as Albers is identified with this body of work, it is important to remember that by the time he painted his first such square, at age sixty-two, he was already an accomplished artist and, no less, a respected teacher, first at the Bauhaus in Germany, then at Black Mountain College in North Carolina; in 1950, he was just assuming the chairmanship of the Department of Design at Yale. Celebrated for his furniture and typographic designs, glassworks, drawings, and prints, in 1963 he published the first edition of *Interaction of Color*, which revolutionized the discourse surrounding perception and pedagogy. In 1971, he became the first living artist to be honored with a major retrospective at The Metropolitan Museum of Art. One field in which Albers was not known, however, was photography, and his engagement with the medium was only fully discovered after his death.

Since a modest exhibition of his photographs at The Museum of Modern Art in 1988, organized by John Szarkowski, then Director of the Department of Photography, this achievement has developed a small but ardent following, and every serious consideration of Albers as an artist includes at least a few of his extraordinary photocollages. Beginning at the Bauhaus in 1928, Albers made hundreds, perhaps thousands, of photographs with his handheld Leica camera, and he made thousands more, mostly while traveling, in the decades following his emigration to the United States in 1933. But we concern ourselves here with a group of seventy photocollages mounted to A3 boards, established as a standard size in Germany in 1922 at 29.7 by 42 centimeters (11 3/4 by 16 1/2 inches). No record exists of Albers ever having exhibited these collages in his lifetime, nor does he appear to have spoken of them. Yet in their rigorous construction and allusive potential, they represent a singularly creative body of work. The images Albers used to make these collages fall rather neatly into four categories—portraits, mannequins, the natural world, and the built environment—and Albers attends to a remarkably narrow subsection within each of these:…
The portraits feature only people Albers knew well—fellow Bauhausler, family, and friends. The primary urban motif is the mannequin, which was also featured in the photographs of contemporaries such as Eugène Atget, Bill Brandt, Manuel Álvarez Bravo, Horacio Coppola, and scores of others who were attentive to the figures’ Surrealist echoes. His images of nature consist of mostly waves, some trees, and a few mountains, and there are only a handful of man-made structures. Albers’s limited range of subjects achieves new significance in his collages, where their selection and pairings take on questions of duality, time, and narrative, topics that resist being infused into single images of similar subjects. The creativity and originality of Albers’s Bauhaus-era photocollages have been subsumed within other considerations of the artist’s work with a camera, although the fixed parameters of the cream-colored boards and the black-and-white gelatin silver prints anticipate in important ways the central concerns of his career. Never before has the entirety of this body of work been gathered or studied as a unique achievement.

The type of camera Albers used to create the source material for his photocollages was itself a landmark in the history of photography: the Leica, which in 1925 debuted as the first handheld camera that could accommodate rolls of 35mm film.6 By freeing the camera from its tripod but preserving the quality of the lens, the Leica enabled a whole new way of approaching the world photographically; the act of holding a camera before one’s face, looking through its viewfinder, also led naturally to the almost in profile, looking toward his other likeness. This time the asymmetry of his placement within the frame is even more pronounced: László Moholy-Nagy may not have been the first to remark how photography constituted a uniquely modern visual language in the wake of World War I, but he did so memorably, coining the phrase Neue Sicht (“New Vision”) to capture the novelty of seeing the world through the camera lens.6 In 1925, while teaching at the Bauhaus, Moholy-Nagy articulated his radical ambition for the medium in the eighth Bauhausbühner (Bauhaus Book), titled Malerski Fotografie Film (Painting Photography Film), and even more memorably through the example of his own practice. At the time, Albers was encouraging his students at the Bauhaus to use photography to document their work (figs. 1–3), yet it is likely not a coincidence that it was not until Moholy left the Bauhaus in 1928 that Albers began making photographs in earnest. And when he did, given the sweeping scope of Moholy’s photographic interest—incorporating camerless and scientific imagery, negative prints and film—it is not all that surprising that Albers, an artist of natural restraint, would pursue a photographic path within a much narrower set of parameters. Albers used his camera to capture many dynamic points of view, but there is no record of his ever having made a photogram or an optical distortion of any sort. Even when flirting with that illusion, as he does with some of the last photographs he incorporates into his collages (page 91), we soon realize that what seems like a positive/negative pair are in fact two distinct views from his window in Dessau: one where the fence and flora are silhouetted against the snow, and the other where the frost on these same forms renders them light against the bare ground. The dark tree trunks are a visual constant, a reminder of optical fidelity.

There is some variety to Albers’s choice of photographic papers and print sizes, but there are no solarizations or attempts to manipulate basic printing processes. Even in the assemblage of his collages—arguably the most innovative aspect of his photographic practice—Albers used square or rectangular prints exclusively, mounted according to a grid with virtually no overlap. Yet in the same way that Albers’s radical reimagining of the potential of painting would unfold within the strict confines of a nested square, so, too, does his series of photocollages open up a universe of possibility within a willfully limited range of variables.

Take, for instance, one of Albers’s collages of El Lissitzky (page 29), comprised of just two photographs made when Lissitzky visited the Bauhaus in June 1930. The image on the left shows Lissitzky smiling warmly, almost conspiratorially, at Albers. The background divides neatly into three tones—black, white, and gray—each of which corresponds loosely to Lissitzky’s (black) tie, (white) shirt, and the middle shades of the photographic spectrum that echo Lissitzky’s tanned complexion and balding pate. The horizontal image on the right is the same width but half the height of the vertical image, and in it we see Lissitzky almost in profile, looking toward his other likeness. This time the asymmetry of his placement within the frame is even more pronounced: his nose is cropped by the left edge, his forehead by the top, but the right half of the image is virtually empty. While we feel confident that these photographs were captured at the same meeting, the darker background in the right-hand image and the differentiation between Lissitzky’s shirt and collar (which, on the left, seem identical) remind the viewer of the variability of photographic representation. Albers mounted these prints with their top edges roughly aligned and with nearly equivalent space between their outside edges and the sides of the board: there is no evident thyme or reason in the interstices. This irregularity draws the viewer’s attention to the geometric forms within each image and to the prints themselves, which might
be construed as Albers's nod to the dynamic geometric vocabulary that Lissitzky employed in his own art and design.

Of the seventy photocollages Albers made at this time, more than half feature but two photographic prints: their placement reveals both formal innovation and a sensitivity to the unique characteristics of the individual photographs. Albers's photographs of the Eiffel Tower, made during a summer break from teaching, suggest his attentiveness to the range of possibilities offered by his Leica, and the close relationship between his work and that of his contemporaries (page 93 and fig. 4). Both images in his collage feature plunging perspectives; the sunlight and shadow in the image on the left draw our attention to the diminutive figures below. Albers was not a particularly fastidious printer, yet he was surely attuned to the fact that every tone in the photograph on the right exists on the continuum of tones between the highlights and shadows on the left.I Last the viewer suspect that these are purely mechanical byproducts of the process, Albers tears each image with a subtly but noticeably irregular hand, underscoring the artist's creative agency. This marriage of industry and craft was a hallmark of the Bauhaus. To further emphasize the aesthetic, non-documentary function of these photographs, Albers anchors them at the top left of his board, pointedly shifting the viewer's perspective.

One might forgive overlooking this degree of invention and intervention in Albers's collages, particularly if denied the opportunity to make comparisons among them. But with each collage, the intentionality of the selection and placement of the images becomes clearer, and with each added photograph, the complexity of the relationships between images multiplies exponentially.6 At first glance, a collage of Erdmannsdorfer mannequins (page 47) appears composed of two photographs, each the same image but with variant cropping and printed in different sizes, but closer inspection reveals that the mannequins at top are actually two separate images placed adjacent by Albers to form a single rectangle: the dialogue between them is an imagined one, and the space they inhabit takes on a different character. That skepticism is rewarded when taking into consideration the bottom photograph, where we realize that these mannequins are, in fact, in the same shop window after all: the space below the mannequin's arm in the top left image suggests that Albers stepped to the left to make that picture, whereas the overlap of the mannequin's hand in the top right image indicates that he shifted to his right. Albers provides just enough clues to confirm that we are looking at the same figures, and just enough discrepancy to confound our initial assumptions.

Nowhere does Albers change the rules of the game more profoundly than in his collages that feature a multitude of photographs. His collage of a bullfight in San Sebastian (page 35) can be read as a short story or experimental film, where we as viewers recognize that we are being transported to a distant time and place, no less enchanting for its impossibility.8 At the center we find the nominal subject: a procession of banderilleros, picadors, and matadors. Surrounding this are three views of the arena filled with crowds, whose choreographed disjunction evokes the rhythm of the event they are gathered to see. The sweep of the arcade is plainly elevated in the central view; with a nearly symmetrical relationship to those architectural forms on the left and right, whereas the cropped edge of the ring awkwardly intersects its corresponding form, an oblique allusion, perhaps, to the impossibility of predicting the outcome of this highly ritualized event. The two images that anchor the bottom of the collage show more dramatic vantage points. A plethora of hatters, caps, and a scattering of bare heads, each precisely described, is juxtaposed against a mass of automobiles presumably parked outside. These horizonless forms of repeated forms were common motifs for avant-garde photographers of the period. It is the tightly woven—but not flawless—relationships between these individual components, akin to cuts in a film, that reward our reconsideration of these elements with respect to the whole.

The abstract language that Albers adopted for the great majority of his oeuvre precludes temporal specificity, which makes the close study of a number of his photocollages all the more compelling, specifically in Albers’s attentiveness to the complexity engendered by incorporating multiple photographs—each captured in a fraction of a second, but inevitably across time—into a single work.9 One solution employs images made across several years, in his portrait of fellow Bauhaus master Oskar Schlemmer (page 67). The eleven photographs were made on at least four occasions, evidenced by the inscriptions, Schlemmer’s clothes, and his choice of what to smoke.10 One image repeats, as a contact print toward the lower left and as an enlargement toward the upper right. The two largest images appear to be from the same encounter, but Schlemmer is wearing a bow tie and striped shirt, in bright sunlight and with a cigarette between his lips. Yet one is dated April 1929 and the other, April 1930. To state, “Consistency is the hobgoblin of small minds,” seems appropriate here.11 In this intimate and affectionate portrait, the apparently willful misdating evidences a sustained friendship. As with all of Albers’s photocollages, these temporal and spatial leaps, the small gaps and miscalculated edges, all serve to remind the viewer of the artist’s role in the creative process.

Albers’s portrait of Marli Heimann (page 65), a student in the weaving workshop, might be considered a counterpoint to his portrait of Schlemmer. Albers reminds us in his inscription that the twelve photographs were made “all in an hour” in March or April 1933. And he keeps some elements constant: the framing founders from just below Heimann’s shoulders to just above her head, and her distinctive collar is visible in most images. But expressions and shadows jet across her face, in a sequence that reminds us of the passage of time and the instantaneous
of the photographic process. Albers chose four images to enlarge atop eight contact prints with significantly warmer tonality, again drawing subtle attention to the tools he had at hand. These portraits (and those of Amédée Ozanfant, page 73) are among the last Albers made before leaving Germany: the number and coarseness of the images hint at his disposal hint at a systematic approach, perhaps with these collages in mind.9

By the time Josef Albers arrived at the Bauhaus he was thirty-two years old, older than several of his teachers and the same age as Johannes Itten, who taught the required Vorkurs (preliminary course) during his first semester. A native of the mining town ofcottrop in western Germany and son of a skilled craftsman, Albers had spent his twenties teaching elementary school as well as studying art and the teaching of art. His position as a teacher exempted him from military service, and at the conclusion of World War I, he went to Munich to study at the Koeniglich Bayerische Akademie der Bildenden Kunst (Royal Bavarian Academy of Pictorial Art).10 It was there that he happened upon a leaflet describing the newly founded Bauhaus; the commitment of its founder, Walter Gropius, to art and craft was a siren’s call he could not refuse.

The Bauhaus has been profoundly influential not only in the conception of modern art and education but also as a model for modern art museums, like MoMA, that attend to a range of disciplines, from architecture to industrial design, painting to photography.11 Albers’s tenure at the Bauhaus would stretch across a greater swath of the institution’s history than that of any other individual. He arrived in April 1920, and after successfully completing the Vorkurs, he had wanted to enter the school’s glass workshop but was advised to study wall painting instead. As he would wryly recall later:

As I did not agree that, for me, wall painting was the necessary preparation for glass painting, I worked independently of a workshop. With rucksack and hammer, I went to the garbage dumps where all kinds of bottles preceded the glass I needed for my studies of glass painting.

During my second semester, Gropius, warmly concerned, warned me dutifully and repeatedly that I could not remain at the Bauhaus if I would not comply with the advice of the masters, namely, to study first wall painting. In the meantime, the glass workshop had been dismantled [. . .]

At the obligatory exhibition at the semester’s end, I hung several of my glass painting studies. They were combinations of bottle shards mounted, because of lack of tools and better materials, in the most unprofessional way on old tin, screen, and lattice. I thought this would be my swan song at the Bauhaus . . .

Then, I got a letter from the conference of the masters informing me first that I was accepted for further studies and then asking me to organize—a new glass workshop.12

Gropius’s approach was to pair teachers who would instruct in tandem, pursuing aesthetic exercises alongside technical training. At first, Albers was the technical instructor (perhaps owing to his experience designing a stained-glass window in his native Bittrop in 1917), paired with painter Paul Klee. As Leah DiCerman has noted, Klee had a keen interest in the organizing structure of the grid, and this played a significant role in both his teaching and his art.13 One detects Klee’s influence in Albers’s Gitterbild (Lattice Picture, also known as Grid Mounted, fig. 5), his first foray into the type of regular geometric framework that would become a hallmark of his future achievements but which also presages the artist’s photocollages: rectangular forms (derived from translucent materials that appear surrounded by black frames) in a lively marriage of handcraft and mechanical production.14

The tension between expressive/creative forces and industrial ones was a defining polarity in the early years of the Bauhaus. Its most public expression occurred in 1923 with the departure of Itten, who objected to what he felt were Gropius’s overly practical concerns and the school’s emphasis on production. In August, Gropius declared a new era he called “Art and Technology: A New Unity.” Responsibility for teaching the Vorkurs was handed over to Albers and the newly appointed Moholy-Nagy, seven years his junior. Moholy also assumed responsibility for leading the metal workshop: at the time, photography was arguably a tangential aspect of his embrace of the new and of mechanical means of expression. His success with photograms as well as the example and collaboration of his talented wife, Lucia Moholy, helped cement the centrality of photography in his aesthetic worldview. All this was long before photography was explicitly incorporated into the Bauhaus’s curriculum.15

For as long as Moholy-Nagy remained at the school, Albers’s engagement with photography was an oblique one at best. In 1925, while teaching the Vorkurs, Albers began making an extensive series of works with sandblasted glass. In these, the artist’s hand is eliminated, and Albers dramatically reduced his palette to incorporate, typically, only black and white, sometimes joined by a single primary color.16 The arrangements of stacked and staggered rectangles might be seen as purely abstract were it not for the works’ titles, such as Fabrik (Factory; fig. 6), Hochbauten (Skyscrapers), or Stadt (City). Almost half of the sandblasted-glass works employ but black and white, the building blocks of photographic description at the time, and most of these were made between 1929 and 1932, when Albers was most deeply engaged with photography.

Even before acquiring his Leica in 1928, Albers was encouraging his Vorkurs students to document their work photographically.17 This was,
in part, because the administration had recognized the value of having a visual record of the school’s activities, but the quality and variety of images from Albers’s students suggest that this was conceived as an integral element of a given exercise.14 Andreas Haus has noted that Erich Consemüller’s photographs of works from Albers’s Vorkurs “probably made a greater effect than the object-character of the photographed objects themselves,” and the precise attention to composition, light, and shadow in the images of Consemüller and others transcends a purely documentary function.15 For Albers, the process of recording an exercise as a two-dimensional photograph had an added benefit of rendering it unfamiliar, or giving it new life in shades of gray, a transformative effect he would explore in his own photographic practice as well. The angular highlights that extend across the two images of hotel staircases in Geneva (page 87), for example, are purposefully discontinuous, yet their similar tonality allows them to function as a single graphic entity. Albers orchestrates images made in noticeably distinct stairwells, and from opposite angles, into a coherent whole by harnessing their photographic transformation just as surely as he wanted his students to see their projects anew within a specific pictorial space.

Even closer to home, for Albers, was the example of a fellow student whom he married in May 1925. Anneliese (Anni) Fleischmann had trained as a painter before enrolling at the Bauhaus in 1922, and, like many female students there, she joined the weaving workshop after completing the Vorkurs. Within the confines of the strict vertical and horizontal format of the loom, she produced her own enduring visual language, often in monochrome hues that prefigure her husband’s photographs (fig. 7). In February 1928, Gropius announced that he would leave the Bauhaus, recommending architect Hannes Meyer to lead the school. It wasn’t long before Moholy-Nagy, Herbert Bayer, and Marcel Breuer followed suit. Albers took full responsibility for the Vorkurs upon Moholy’s departure, as well as for Breuer’s cabinetry workshop. But arguably more significant for his own development as an artist, he and Anni moved into the Gropius-designed Masters’ House, complete with a darkroom in the basement, that had been previously occupied by the Moholy. The Alberses’ new neighbors were Lyonel and Julia Feininger, who had a darkroom of their own and three sons who were intensely interested in the medium.16

The parallels between Lyonel Feininger’s and Josef Albers’s early forays into photography are striking, with each responding in his own way to the legacy of Moholy-Nagy.17 Laura Muir posits that Feininger’s photographs of “Moholy-Nagy’s studio window” (Bauhaus, Dessau, 1922, p. 109),3519 (converted from gelatin dry plate glass negative), an international exhibition organized in Munich the
following year by the Münchner Bund and the Verein Ausstellungs park in Munich. Less frequently mentioned is Fotomontage (Photomontage), held in the courtyard of the former Kunstgewerbemuseum (Museum of Decorative Arts) at the Staatliche Museen in Berlin in 1931. Organized by César Domela-Nieuwenhuis, it included historical precedents alongside work by more than fifty contemporary artists. The exhibition was arranged around the two dominant uses of photomontage at the time—advertising and political propaganda—but there was a small section dedicated to experimental works. We know from Albers’s correspondence that he saw this exhibition in Berlin; the dramatic differences between his photocollages and those of Moholy-Nagy and Hannah Hinch (whose work was featured there) underscore the confidence with which he pursued his own experiments in the medium.

What it was exactly, however, that prompted Albers to gather his photographs and adhere them in such inventive ways to a group of large mounts remains a tantalizing mystery. While there is some variety in the prints, the collages are too consistent in their assembly to entertain the possibility that they were made over the course of several years. That the boards are a standard European size and the inscriptions in German strongly suggest that they were put together before the Alberses left for the United States in November 1933. It seems conceivable that they could have been mounted to protect the prints (either when the Bauhaus moved from Dessau to Berlin in 1932, or in anticipation of the transatlantic voyage), but then how to explain the wide variation in the quality of the prints, the repetition of certain images, or the finely tuned associations between them? It would have been common to mount photographs for instructive purposes, but the expense of such large, high-quality boards and the effort involved, evidenced by the subtle intentionality of the collages’ construction, seem miscaligned with that function. The most common reason to mount photographs would have been for display, yet no specific evidence exists today to indicate that Albers exhibited these collages or intended to do so.

However, what we do know is that when Ludwig Mies van der Rohe assumed the directorship of the Bauhaus in 1930, he faced constant political pressure to defend the school against the rising Nazi tide and accusations of communism, and one tactic he adopted was to highlight the school’s practical and artistic achievements. Abstraction was deemed a political, either alongside or in lieu of the glassworks, or that he assembled them at this time to give van der Rohe another selection of work that could be installed at a moment’s notice. Albers also mounted to identi-...
graphs according to an evolving set of formal guidelines. “Nearer” is a fair description of most photographs of this era—objects placed on a sheet of photosensitive paper (photograms) or within range of a camera’s lens—yet Albers imbued his selection of what to photograph with a less literal, more personal meaning: his back yard, summer vacations, family members, or Bauhaus colleagues. His photographs are not simply physically proximate to their subjects; they are nearer to him than still lifes, abstractions, or portraits of strangers could ever be. Through the exercise of photographing, printing, selecting, and mounting his collages, Albers created works so “forward-looking” that they speak to the photographically based amalgamations of his student Robert Rauschenberg, or to the cut-and-paste practices of contemporary artists as diverse as John Stezaker, John Houck, John O’Reilly, Sara VanDerBeek, or Katharina Gaenssler.

The material and historical evidence strongly supports that Albers’s exceptional series of Bauhaus-era photocollages was complete by the time the school moved to Berlin, where it appears that the artist no longer had access to a darkroom. A small number of loose prints bear Albers’s Berlin stamp in black ink on their verso, and an even smaller number are marked with the red stamp of the German Novofot agency (crossed out in pencil), indicating Albers’s efforts to circulate his prints from Berlin.\(^\text{38}\) These minor efforts notwithstanding, the most significant, remarkable chapter of Albers’s work with the medium had concluded by the time the Bauhaus officially closed in August 1933. Photography was an important element of the curriculum at Black Mountain, but it was not until a decade after his arrival that Albers shared his only formal thoughts on the medium. In his slide lecture titled “Photos as Photography and Photos as Art,” he charts a rather uneasy path for the medium between the stuff of amateur dalliance and craft, and photography’s potential for original artistic expression. The only known extant illustration presents photographs Albers made in 1931 to underscore the essential flatness of the medium, and the distinction between human vision and camera vision (page 131). The lecture represents Albers’s clearest conception of the perils and promise of the medium, and his position that it is the responsibility of the viewer to learn how to “read” photographs: “Only a sensitive and trained eye gives us the right to judge . . .” Albers would continue to take photographs and even mount them, but these subsequent efforts, most featuring images of his and Anni’s travels (fig. 11, for example), often signal “scrapbook” more than a gesture of aesthetic intent comparable to his Bauhaus collages.\(^\text{39}\) No matter. Albers’s Bauhaus-era photocollages stand not only as remarkable artworks on their own right, they are all the more significant for the ways in which they connect with so many aspects of the artist’s subsequent achievement. Albers’s inclination to work in series extends throughout his career, and his fascination with perception and the interactions between positive and negative space both precedes and postdates this moment of extraordinary originality in the photographic medium. As a teacher and an artist, Albers used restraint of means to ignite the creative process, always espousing the principle of learning by doing. With the publication of Interaction of Color, he cemented his legacy as a color theorist, but his interest in optics as they relate to photography merits attention as well (fig. 12). Albers is a rare artist whose insatiable visual curiosity is matched only by a profound dedication to tactile exploration. That this statement is equally true as true of his Homages to the Square as his photocollages from the Bauhaus expands our appreciation of both.
11. This collage contains the only Albers image inscribed "72/28". Grant and Albers were married on January 7, 1928, and that the ten or so activities for Albers's 1928-1930 work would be found in place (in March 1928). It was more likely a reference to the dates of the less than a reflection of Albers's uncertain memory. We must thank to Astrid Gaylard for suggesting this interpretation.


14. The serial number on Albers's Leica I (7643) dates the camera to early or mid-1928. Michael Beggs has observed that Albers had been in Germany for two months early that year with photography by Heinrich (page 193), whose location is unknown.

15. The serial number of Albers's Leica II (7547) dates the camera to early or mid-1928. Michael Beggs has observed that Albers had been in Germany for two months early that year with photography by Heinrich (page 193), whose location is unknown.

16. Verwey states that Albers bought his Leica 1928 (page 110). We know of one additional collage, sixty-eight collages with his own photographs, and collages in his master's thesis submitted to the Institute of Technology in 1929, and Italy and Switzerland in the summer of 1930, when he purchased a Leica IIIf while visiting Germany. It could have been a birthday present, as Albers turned sixty-eight on October 10, 1929.

17. Dickerman further argues: “If we can discern the dominant imperatives of other forms of modernism— the way Surrealism transformed the Russian avant-garde, for example, or the way the German Expressionists defined the modern— then we might also understand the way the spatial possibilities of the Bauhaus 1919–1933: Workshops for Modernity, 18.

18. Of Gilioli, Peter Nadel’s obituary. "With ten cameras and a dozen ways to work, he was essentially an experimentalist, combining new and known photographic techniques in his own personal way. He died of a heart attack on April 14, 1946, at the age of 63."

19. Michael Beggs has observed that Albers had been in Germany for two months early that year with photography by Heinrich (page 193), whose location is unknown.


21. Note 19 for a corollary of 1928 as a starting date for these collages. There is only one photographic composition dated 1928 (page 95). The fact that this image suggests the work was made in the month of April that year by October, the Museum of Modern Art had moved to its current address.

22. Although this collage was made from materials regularly used by Albers's students—materials with which Albers himself would have been intimately familiar—the collage was completed at the end of the 1980s, after Albers's death. The Museum of Modern Art in New York, where Albers had moved in 1949 and died on October 1976, a number of photographic postcards of similar subjects accompanied the essay.

24. Notes


26. Albers's late known successor in this era was April 1956, when his photographs of 1957 (Barkenburg 1971, 171) appeared.
Klee / Dessau XI 29

Paul Klee, Dessau, November 1929
Paul Klee in his studio, Dessau, November 1929
Bullfight, San Sebastian, 1929
On Kurfürstendamm, Berlin, summer 1929

Am Kurfürstendamm / Sommer 1929
38. Dessau Winter ende 31
Dessau, end of winter, 1931

39. Bauhaus, Metallisches Fest / III. 29
Bauhaus, Metal Party, [February] 1929
Brackwasser / Biarritz VIII 29
Brackish water, Biarritz, August 1929

Miramar and Grande plage / VIII 29
Miramar and Grande Plage, Biarritz, August 1929
Barbara Ludeke, Lake Stössen, Berlin, summer 1929
Mannequins, c. 1930

Mannequins, 1930
Biarritz, August 1929; Ascona, August 1930
Walter Gropius and Schifra Canavesi, Ascona, August 1930

Anja Schawinsky, Ascona beach, August 1930
Bruno + Schifra Caneves / Ascona VIII 30
Bruno and Schifra Canevesi, Ascona, August 1930

Herbert Bayer + Muzi / Ascona Ronco VIII 30
als Mona Lisa
Herbert Bayer and Muzi, Ascona Ronco, August 1930; Bayer as Mona Lisa
Andreas Grote and his mother, spring 1930
Alle während 1 Stunde
Marli Heimann, March or April 1931, all during an hour
Oskar Schlemmer / IV. 29
im Meisterrat / 28
+ Wittwer + Kallai + Marianne Brandt, Vorkurs-Ausstellung / 27/28
+ Tut/Sommer 28

Oskar Schlemmer, April 1929; Schlemmer in the Bauhaus Masters' Council, 1928; Schlemmer with Hans Wittwer, Ernst Kallai, and Marianne Brandt, Preliminary Course Exhibition, 1927/28; Schlemmer and Tut, summer 1928; Schlemmer, April 1930; Schlemmer, 1928
El Lissitzky / V.I. 30

El Lissitzky, June 1930
Kandinsky / frühjahr 1929 Meister auf der Terrasse bei Hannes Meyer.

Vasily Kandinsky, master on the terrace at Hannes Meyer's, spring 1929; May 1930

El Lissitzky / Dessau VI. 30

El Lissitzky, Dessau, June 1930

El Lissitzky, master on the terrace at Hannes Meyer's, spring 1929; May 1930
Walter Gropius, Ascona, summer 1930

Amédée Ozenfant, summer 1931
Hanne: Hith-Hesis / Stössensee Sommer ’28


beim Segeln

Hanne: May/June 1930; Farman sailing
Frau u. Herr Heimann / Dessau Sommer 30

Mrs. and Mr. Heimann, Dessau, summer 1930

Paul Klee and Mrs. Lily Stumpf Klee, Guéthary (Biarritz), August 1929
Anni Albers, summer 1928

Anni Albers's father, Siegfried Fleischmann, Pentecost 1930
Lasst Hände Sprechen / Sommer 30

Let hands speak, summer 1930

Mannequins, c. 1930
Barcelona, Intern. Ausstell. / VIII. 29
Barcelona International Exposition, August 1929

Paris, Tour d’Eiffel / VIII. 29
Eiffel Tower, Paris, August 1929
Flooded trees and forest, c. 1931

Flooded streets during construction, Dessau, spring 1931