

Julius von Schlosser, The Vienna school of the history of art - review of a century of Austrian scholarship in German¹

Translated and edited by Karl Johns

Members of the profession are immediately aware of what is meant with the expression 'Vienna School:' the center for art historical teaching, closely related to the Austrian 'école des chartes', organized by Theodor von Sickel, and today called the 'II. Kunsthistorisches Institut der Universität Wien' ('second department of the history of art in the University of Vienna') – a designation only ten years old and in no way expressive of chronology or quality, as only those completely ignorant of academic customs might require reminding. Austrian daily newspapers have especially recently published repeated reports that might lead to a complete misunderstanding of the situation. For this reason, and since many specialists are barely aware of the history of this respected 'school' which has produced so many distinguished scholars, we offer a brief sketch of its origins and development. It has been almost completely forgotten that it originated in the period of German Romanticism and that its nearly century-old history represents a considerable chapter in the history of German language scholarship and intellectual history in Austria.

Josef Daniel Böhm and his Circle

Its 'prehistory' in fact began with a very remarkable figure of the period before the Revolution of 1848: the medalist Josef Daniel Böhm († 1865), born 1794 in an old German language colony in the eastern Slovak Zips region, and a pupil of the well-known classicistic sculptor Franz Zauner, who is known so well to all Viennese by his equestrian portrait of the Emperor Joseph II that still stands in one of the unscathed beautiful city squares before the former Imperial Library. The young medalist had the good fortune of emphatic patronage from the Viennese nobles of

¹ Julius v. Schlosser, *The Vienna School of the History of Art - Review of a Century of Austrian Scholarship in German* Including a list of members edited by Hans Hahnloser
Dedicated to the spirit of Theodor von Sickel and Franz Wickhoff on the 25th anniversary of their deaths and the occasion of the 80th anniversary of the Österreichisches Institut für Geschichtsforschung
A translation of 'Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte', *Mitteilungen des österreichischen Institut für Geschichtsforschung* Ergänzungs-Band 13, Heft 2, Innsbruck: Wagner 1934

the period of Beethoven and Schubert - especially Count Moritz Fries, who is remembered not merely as a wealthy banker, but who played an important role in the history of early Viennese art collecting, and also provided the means by which the young artist was able to visit Italy in 1821. Having converted to Catholicism in Rome like so many of his fellow German-speaking artists, Böhm joined the circle of the German Nazarenes, and especially that of Johann Friedrich Overbeck, who became his close friend, and who had also converted. From 1825 to 1829, Böhm was again in Rome on a fellowship as medalist, living in the tower of the Palazzo Venezia, which until the First World War became the home of so many Austrian artists. One should mention his friendship with Bertel Thorvaldsen and with Eduard Jakob von Steinle, which were formed here during this time. After returning to Vienna, he soon achieved a distinguished position as director of the old and prestigious 'Academy of Engraving at the Imperial and Royal Central Mint', which he held until his death. He occupies a venerable place in the history of the Austrian medal. His works are characterized by technical and artistic ability. He was as excellent a teacher and as memorable an artist as was our own Anton Scharff († 1903), who was still inspired by his example.

With the meager means at his disposal, Böhm had already begun collecting art during his years in Rome. In Vienna he rose to become one of the greatest middle class collectors. His holdings, which were auctioned by the Vienna art dealer Alexander Posonyi after his death in 1865, are listed in a catalogue with 2261 entries. They covered a wide range, including a large number of prints and drawings, as well as paintings and ancient and Near Eastern decorative arts (particularly cameos). 'German primitives' received a special emphasis, as could only be expected with a man trained in the period of classicism who found his artist friends among the Nazarenes in Rome. The most valuable elements were the small German sculptures of the 15th and 16th centuries, particularly relevant to Böhm for his own artistic activity – since he had begun as a sculptor in wood. Some of these are still today among the proudest holdings of public collections: a statue of 'Adam' by Tilman Riemenschneider and a proportion figure derived from Albrecht Dürer in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, also the 'Adam' by Konrad Meit in the Österreichische Galerie, and above all Böhm's favorite items, which he refused to part with throughout his life in spite of repeated lucrative offers - the two portrait busts identified as Charles the Bold and his wife, now in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London. At the sale, these were also appraised most highly, which strikes us today as naïve, but in fact they brought the highest prices, the portrait busts being knocked down for 12400 Guilders – unique at the time.

In our context it appears most significant that the entire collection was conceived from the didactic point of view, and 'art historically' in the strict sense. Böhm, was by nature a teacher, had sought to broaden his narrow literary training by studying the writings of Goethe about art, and according to his pupil, Robert von Eitelberger, these informed the simple and informal lectures which he liked to give in his welcoming house in the suburb on the Wieden. He was consulted by Count

Leo von Thun in the remarkable reform of Austrian education at the beginning of the 1850's, and stressed the history of art with particular emphasis. In keeping with his intellectual origins and training, he remained devoted to the true Greek antiquity – he had studied the sculptures from Aegina which Thorvaldsen was restoring in Rome, and the casts of the Elgin marbles that belonged to the pope - as well as the art of the medieval period, especially the German late Gothic and early Renaissance.

His humble abode outside the walls of the city became the center for those Viennese interested in the history of art in the period before the revolution of 1848, and this in fact laid the foundation stone for the 'Vienna school'. It was here that the people met who became its ancestors through the direct study of original objects under the tutelage of their host. This is the reason that we have dwelt on this old Viennese 'salon'. On the basis of long years of experience and with an exaggerated systematization, a Hungarian archaeologist, Emmerich Henszlmann (born 1813 in Kaschau - Košice in the present Slovakia) published a characterization of Böhm's didactic methods after his death (*Österreichische Revue*, January 1866). It was characterized by an inductive approach, based on the direct examination of individual works of art. This alone was to provide the point of departure for general rules of historical development or the psychological analysis of artists. Böhm strongly opposed the abstract and dogmatic artistic theories that still predominated in the academies of that time. This affected his attitude to the medieval period as well as to Greek antiquity, which he had discovered so early in his development. As a practicing artist, he placed the greatest emphasis on the technical aspect, deriving 'style' from the basic material. Böhm became a staunch defender of that thesis which was first expressed by his contemporary Karl Friedrich von Rumohr – although it is doubtful whether he knew of Rumohr – and which found its greatest expression in the positivism of the famous publication of Gottfried Semper, before it was successfully refuted by Alois Riegl. It is also important that, together with Rudolf Eitelberger and Dominik Artaria, Böhm in 1846 organized the first exhibition of older art to be held in Vienna.

At this point we should briefly recall the development of early modern art history during the first half of the 19th century. It is important to realize the situation of this field at the time when these men met in the house of Böhm, and began to make their Austrian home, and particularly Vienna, a prominent center of scholarship in the German tradition. Before this, there had been very little such activity here. Aside from the work of local antiquarians, among them Alois Primisser, who became the first to publicize the 'Ambras collection' in 1819 – removed by the French – almost nothing of importance had been achieved. He was the son of that doughty keeper of Ambras castle, who discovered the Salt Cellar by Benvenuto Cellini, the fame of which was then spread by the Cellini translation made by Goethe. The manifold of diverse secondary literature which set in at the beginning of the 19th century was eagerly assembled and employed in the earliest Austrian artistic topography published by the good Franz Tschischka: *Kunst und Altertum im österreichischen Kaiserstaate*, Vienna 1836 - and including the occupied

provinces of Italy. This inwardly and outwardly unprepossessing book is the first of its kind, and placed Austria in the vanguard of such scholarship. It was to be another two decades until the appearance of the *Mittelalterliche Kunstdenkmale des Österreichischen Kaiserstaates*, by Gustav von Heider and Rudolf Eitelberger, which was already conceived art historically and richly illustrated. It was not until 1907 that Max Dvořák vigorously began the systematic inventory of Austrian artistic holdings along the lines of German models. Austria assumed a far greater place in another given field, the study of engravings and drawings, in which Vienna, by its superb collections, was destined to play a prominent part. This is a subject that assumed a prominent place during the days of Moriz Thausing and Franz Wickhoff, and will be discussed further on. One should note that a connection to the French culture of amateurs and connoisseurship existed at this early time.

Since the Napoleonic period, Italy, the traditional center for theoretical and historical study of art, lost its hegemony, which had already been shattered by the 18th century – partially due to the political situation of the peninsula. Certainly fundamental works still appeared there, such as the two pylons of the older and more recent period, the *History of Italian Painting* first published in 1789 by Abate Lanzi and often reprinted, as well as the valuable 1815 catalogue of the mighty art library of Count Cicognara († 1834), now belonging to the Vatican, and his history of sculpture until Canova, written in a classicist spirit and published in 1823. The earliest history of European art since Christian antiquity ‘on the basis of the monuments’ and as richly illustrated with line engravings as the folios of Cicognara, was also written in Italy by the Frenchman d’Agincourt († 1814 in Rome) but published only posthumously in Paris in 1823. These were fundamental books for the period of Böhm and German Romanticism, and they remained so until the end of the 19th century.

Romanticism brought a new historical and critical spirit to the history of art. It was Germany that assumed a guiding and still unbroken role in the historical-philological ‘humanities’, that was supported by the European predominance of its grand idealist philosophy from Kant, through Fichte, Schelling and Hegel down to Herbart. It was not until the beginning of the 20th century that again in Italy the idealist philosophy of Benedetto Croce – *Aesthetic as Science of Expression and General Linguistic* of 1903 - brought a turn of events nurtured in the soil of Naples, that had remained faithful to Hegelianism, just as our Vienna had been the final fortress of Herbartianism into the final third of the 19th century. This was not a trivial fact for the development of the Viennese school of art history, since, completely aside from the widespread little book by the musicologist Hanslick, the Herbart influence can still be felt in the thinking of Alois Riegl.

Carl Friedrich von Rumohr was nurtured in the spirit of romantic philosophy and became the founder of the modern German art history, but also anticipated the positivism and empirical bent of the later century (I might refer to the introduction of his main work, which I republished in 1920). In spite of, and alongside the enthusiasm for local national traditions on the part of Wackenroder, Tieck, and the

activities of the Boissérée brothers, the relation to Italy remained central to German Romanticism, and was typical of Rumohr. It had a source in the remarkable German scholar of Italian descent, Dominik Fiorillo (+ 1821) who had been born in Hamburg as early as 1748, and as a painter had traversed the final baroque workshops of Italy before becoming the first academic instructor of art history, still involving practical drawing instruction, at the University of Göttingen – where he was a colleague of the great Lichtenberg. His diligent *Geschichte der zeichnenden Künste* ('History of the graphic arts'), which began to appear in 1798, is largely based on written sources, devoid of opinions as Goethe remarked critically, and has still not completely lost its value today. It has the character of 18th century Italian polyhistory. The aforementioned opus magnum of Karl Friedrich Rumohr consists in the *Italienische Forschungen*, 1827-1831, also largely based on secondary sources and particularly on documents that had been assembled by earlier Italian historiography. This was done in a new exemplary critical spirit, and combined with fundamental epistemological reflection of contemporary Romantic philosophy, both of which had remained remote to the good Fiorillo.

Rumohr was a nobleman from the same north German hinterlands along the Baltic Sea that had already spawned Johann Joachim Winckelmann, the great genius of the 18th century. Like so many of the northern German Pre-Raphaelites, and we might add our own Josef Daniel Böhm, he had converted to Catholicism. In fact, the entire generation of great art historians of the early 19th century were of northern German origins, with Berlin at the center of German Romanticism - which also benefited from the Jewish converts to Catholicism. This Romantic Berlin of the Hohenzollern, which also produced the first picture gallery organized along art historical principles, was colorfully described by Immermann, another northern German from Magdeburg, in his unduly neglected novel *Die Epigonen*. This entire generation was deeply indebted, reinforced and invigorated by the critical philosophy that, in spite of Schelling and especially Hegel from Swabia, remained typical of northern Germany and particularly Berlin. It was not merely Rumohr from Holstein, but his later collaborators on the work were also from northern Germany. Gustav Friedrich Waagen (1794-1868) from Hamburg was director of the Berlin picture gallery beginning in 1823, the most versatile connoisseur of that time, in 1866 produced his survey *Wiener Kunstschatze*, and remains remarkable in our present context by the fact that in 1844 he almost reluctantly assumed the first purely art historical teaching chair at a German university. Then there was Franz Kugler (1808-1858) from Pomerania, who assumed particular prominence, among other reasons for being the art specialist in the Berlin ministry. It is well known that the young Swiss Jacob Burckhardt and the Westfalian Wilhelm Lübke proceeded from his convivial home. They revised his somewhat dry *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte* in renewed editions and guaranteed its great popularity. His *Geschichte der Malerei* first appeared in 1837 and, with the *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte* of 1842, represented the first attempt to place the history of art from the earliest times to what was then the present in the context of a philosophy of history. In his (uncompleted) *Geschichte der*

bildenden Künste of 1848-1864, Carl Schnaase of Danzig expanded this very broadly into a standard work of German art historical writing that has still not been surpassed, and remains unrivalled outside of Germany. A 'northern' citizen of the old Austria and native of Prague, Anton Springer (1825-1891) in 1853 first published his *Handbuch der Kunstgeschichte* which remains in print today. He also began from Hegelianism, having defended a dissertation about Hegel's conception of history before Friedrich Theodor von Vischer in 1847, but first worked as an historian, primarily in Austria. He was forced to flee to Germany before the concordat, where he produced his 'Habilitation' in Bonn in 1852. His teaching at the newly instituted chair for modern art history at the University of Leipzig made that the most prestigious in Germany for that time. It was most notably his studies of medieval iconography that brought him close to the circle of Böhm, Eitelberger and Heider.

In France, the other country of relevance beside Germany, the development of art history had taken a completely different course. National 'gauloise' history was already being researched during the 17th century with a strongly antiquarian cast. This is the world of the grand Thesauri and philological-historical corpus editions of Montfaucon, Ducange, the Maurins and Bollandists, on to the Patrology of Migne. It is significant that the foundation of Theodor von Sickel which became so fundamental to Viennese art history was conceived as following the model of these paleographers and diplomaticists of the *École des chartes*, although naturally in a more German philologically historical spirit. We have seen that the first universal history of art was not conceived as an intellectual scheme in the sense of Winckelmann, but had instead proceeded from the individual monuments, and was the work of a Frenchman, Séroux d'Agincourt, even if it originated in the ancient seat of all history of art, in Italy. However different the intentions of d'Agincourt, Clarac and the short-lived Napoleonic central museum in Paris, a strong impulse began with the Empire, and flourished remarkably in the work of 'archéologie' in the French sense. This was not limited to antiquity as in German usage, but applied also to the aforementioned national past of one's own 'Gallo-Roman' period as a preface to the 'Middle Ages' - where the imperial spirit of the French, unlike the Holy Roman Empire of the Germans, was linked most recently by Napoleon to the practical memory of the Roman Empire - just as it also raised its 'Gothic' to an international status. We can only mention the names of a few of the relevant authors and the titles of their works. A. de Caumont (1801-1872) appears as a patriarch of French 'archéologie', gifted with a typically French talent for organization, in some ways recalling Eitelberger in Austria. It was he who originated the most felicitous stylistic term for post-antique art history, that of the 'Romanesque style' which was gleaned from an insight into the development of the Romance languages, as it is so apparent to the Gallo-Latin-Germanic traditions of France, and was later taken over by Germany. It is characteristic that the historical phenomenon referred to in the time of Goethe as 'Wiedergeburt' has survived in its French translation since the work of Jacob Burckhardt from Switzerland. Caumont's *Cours d'antiquité* appeared in 1836, his *Bulletin monumental* has been appearing since 1843. The 'Société nationale

des antiquaires de France', that excellent institution of historical research and model for countless smaller local organizations, providing valuable information to the present day, has been in existence since 1817. The *Annales archéologiques* were published by Didron beginning in 1844, and include illustrations many of which have artistic value in and of themselves, and continue to provide a boundless source of knowledge. All of these revolve around 'archéologie du moyen-âge', particularly medieval symbolism – the research of which began in France and continues there unabated. In spite of numerous errors, the study by Charles Cahiers and Arthur Martin of the typological glass painting at Bourges (1841-1844) retains its value. As we shall see further on, this is connected to the Austrian school in many ways, as is so much of the other French work. Numerous examples, such as the brilliant work of Brutails, show that the character of French 'archéologie' is still very much intact. It provides a supplement to the Romantic philosophical-historical spirit of historical thinking of the northern German art historians of the earlier 19th century. In France by contrast, the pragmatic 18th century approach to history survives in many ways, as embodied in the Enlightenment, and remains apparent in the artist-'archeologists' of the Viollet-le-Duc following.

Albert von Camesina

We return to the circle of Josef Daniel Böhm. We are primarily concerned with four men. The oldest among them was Albert von Camesina (1806-1881), from a family of stucco artists from Bünden [the Swiss Kanton of Grabünden], resident in Vienna since the 18th century, a typical Viennese, but never oblivious to the ancestral home – much as the surviving Artaria family of art dealers remain devoted to their ancestry on the bank of Lake Como. Dominik Artaria († 1842) and his son and heir August were also close friends of Böhm. Camesina was primarily an archaeological draftsman, active in *the Mitteilungen der k. k. Zentralkommission*, to which we shall return, and the 'Wiener Altertumsverein', but also author of many an historical notice. The publications of the Verdun Altar in Klosterneuburg, made in collaboration with Josef Calasanz von Arneth (for many years director of the Cabinet of Coins and Antiquities), and of the important manuscript of the Biblia Pauperum at St. Florian (in collaboration with Gustav Adolf von Heider on whom cf. below), had their origins with him.

Eduard von Sacken

The youngest man in the circle was Eduard Freiherr von Sacken (1825-1883) of an old noble family of Courland, but also completely acclimatized to Vienna, a splendid example of an archaeologist in the French sense of the word, equally versed in local pre-history, classical archaeology and art of the medieval period. His life as a scholar occurred in the service of the Imperial collections to which he made great contributions (to mention only one - the discoveries of the culture at Hallstatt). He

was the author of the exhaustive catalogue of the collection at Ambras which he already arranged as a young man (1849-1852), as he also did with the Cabinet of Coins and Antiquities, which was under his direction from 1871 until his death. His *Katechismus der Baustile* ('catechism of architectural styles') had a wide circulation.

Gustav Adolf von Heider

The figure of Gustav Adolf Freiherr von Heider arouses our particular interest – born 1819 in Vienna, retired already in 1880 as Sektionschef, dying at a great age almost forgotten in 1897 - the same year as his Berlin contemporary Franz Mertens, who contributed to the history of the Gothic and experienced a similar fate. Like Kugler and Schnaase, Heider had also not been trained in the field, but rather in law. He had begun as secretary of the academy of art in Vienna, but transferred already in 1850 to the Ministry of Education, just as it was entering a prosperous period under the direction of Count Leo von Thun. Heider embodied that type of high official sensitive to art and history, as it flourished then as now in the Ministry of Education. He was of a definitely scholarly disposition. His studies of medieval iconography ('Über die Typologie der mittelalterlichen Bilderhandschriften' 1861, 'Die Kirche von Schöngrabern bei Wien' 1855 among others) run parallel to those in France particularly of Didron – which was not trivial considering the factors discussed just above - and provided a valuable basis for subsequent work (including that of Anton Springer). Most of Heider's essays appeared in the *Mitteilungen (and Jahrbuch) der k. k. Zentralkommission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst- und historischen Denkmale*, published since 1856, and which he himself edited since 1861. He provided the actual soul of this remarkable periodical, as it rose to become the virtual focal point and central medium for all research in the history of art written in German during the 1850's and 1860's. One should recall that Schnaase, Lübke, Springer and many others made contributions, not least since it is easily forgotten that Austria assumed the leading position in such things at this time. This was the earliest and most prominent publication of this kind in the German language, comparable only to the slightly older *Anzeiger für Kunde der deutschen Vorzeit* (from the Germanisches Museum in Nuremberg) or the *Kunstblatt*, edited by Kugler, Schorn, Förster and later Egger, but which folded already in 1858. Only England and France could boast similar publications, *Archaeologia* founded in 1770, and the aforementioned *Annales archéologiques* founded by Didron, and appearing since 1844.

Heider was by nature more of a scholar than Rudolf Eitelberger, whose practical and organizational panache was directed more toward covering broad expanses. The two men collaborated for many years, but there can be no doubt that Heider, although a few years younger, was an important scholarly influence on Eitelberger.

Rudolf von Eitelberger

Rudolf Eitelberger (von Edelberg 1819-1885) was born in Olmütz (Olomouc) and must be considered as the actual father of the 'Vienna school', having anticipated many of its salient qualities, in spite of the fact that his scholarly aspirations were overshadowed by Heider. It was typical of his own personal attitude, and that of the time, that Eitelberger began as a jurist, but very soon transferred to philosophy and ancient literature. As a young man, he was already holding private lectures about the philosophy of Hegel, then active as Assistant in the field of ancient literature under [Franz] Ficker, and offering courses in his own right. This interest in teaching brought him into the circle of Böhm, to whom he was introduced by Heider. This became the decisive step in his life: here he was exposed to the history, theory, and technical aspects of the visual arts in their classical and romantic cast, with exactly the practical connection to collecting, artists and related types as would later become so important for the future founder of the Österreichisches Museum [Museum für angewandte Kunst]. The following is generally based on the obituary by Jacob von Falke, his northern German successor as director of that museum, which appeared in the *Wiener Zeitung* of 1885. After wide reaching travels in Italy, France and England, he was characteristically focused in a western direction, when in 1852, Count Thun appointed him 'außerordentlicher Professor' (assistant professor) for the history of art at the university of Vienna, a position which he held and practiced - later as 'Ordinarius' (full professor), and in spite of other momentous duties assumed in 1864 – continuously until his death. This was the second chair that was founded to specifically teach the history of art at a German language university – we have seen that that held by Gustav Friedrich Waagen in Berlin since 1844 was only a few years older. As we can read in the excellent study by Wilhelm Waetzoldt, Waagen, quite unlike Eitelberger, never performed his teaching duties with a particular interest. As one can see from the development of Jacob Burckhardt and Carl Justi, academic art history long remained intimately related to the subject's history and especially cultural history (though not to its disadvantage). Springer, and more recently Riegl and Dvořák, also began their careers with publications in the field of history. Eitelberger's entire academic career was determined by his background in classical philology with its tools of hermeneutics and criticism as they had been refined through the centuries, and also by the experiences which this natural teacher gained among the collections in the house of Böhm. In a devoted obituary which he later wrote, Eitelberger himself characterized Josef Daniel Böhm as his first and only mentor (reprinted in Rudolf Eitelberger, *Gesammelte kunsthistorische Schriften*, Vienna: W. Braumüller 1879, Volume 1, pp. 180 f.)

We can only refer in passing to his greatest achievement, founding the Österreichisches Museum für Kunst und Industrie [the present Museum für angewandte Kunst] in 1864 - inspired by Archduke Rainer, who remained a central figure in Austrian intellectual life for some time to come. In 1862, Eitelberger returned from a visit to the world exhibition in London, and bringing with him an important idea that had been born there, he created the first museum for applied arts on the European continent, and with the assistance of Jacob von Falke who had

already come to Vienna in 1858, served as its director until his death. At first, this was limited to humble holdings, largely loans from the collections of local nobles and abbeys, but it then long remained a leading institution of its kind. The thought of assembling a collection on the basis of the previously disdained applied arts that might serve with models for living artists, quite clearly recalls the example of Böhm. The 'archaeological' exhibition of 1846 in which Eitelberger had already participated, and to which we have already referred, became the precedent for that remarkable exhibition of loans and galvanized copies of sculpture in the old 'Ballhaus', which then later developed into the Österreichisches Museum.

It is striking how Eitelberger was able to combine the activities of this his primary preoccupation with the stressed functions of his academic duties, as well as his prodigious work in publications as scholar and publicist. He was well organized and practical. We have already mentioned that he founded the 'Zentralkommission', the predecessor of the 'Bundesdenkmalamt' together with Heider, who in spite of his slightly younger age was a teacher to him. It was in collaboration with Heider that he published the large two volume work *Kunstdenkmäler des österreichischen Kaiserstaates*, Stuttgart 1858-1860, which became the first monumental achievement in the field of artistic topography. One must not forget his work as a journalist. For years, he supplied the *Wiener Zeitung* with reports about art, and it is again worth mentioning that he directed his attention towards western Europe. His coverage in that widely read newspaper of the Paris world exhibition of 1855 became the first source of information for the Austrian public about the influential role of contemporary French art.

All of this is meaningful and instructive in relation to the academic activity of this unusual man, the veritable Heros Ktistes of the 'Vienna school'. The founding of his museum itself already took place in connection with that historical nursery, the Vienna school. It was with a secure intuition that he chose a young student from the recently founded 'Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung', Franz Schestag, who then worked with him for years at his museum. In 1863, Schestag was sent on travels into the provinces of the empire, as it then existed in its entirety, to find materials for the original loan exhibition. He realized the seminal idea from Böhm of basing his academic instruction on the individual artifact in technical, historical terms, and thereby escaped the danger of theoretical ramblings. Eitelberger taught classes uninterruptedly until his death – I myself participated in some of the last of these, 'Übungen im Erklären und Bestimmen von Kunstwerken' ('Seminar in the interpretation and attribution of the work of art', held in the museum around its objects. It was a custom continued by Moriz Thausing and my teacher Franz Wickhoff, extended then to other collections (the picture gallery, then in the Belvedere, the Albertina, the Imperial Library) - and which I myself have continued to practice in forty years of academic teaching to the present day. The successful combination of university and museum was first instituted in Vienna. The great institution of Eitelberger became a nursery for instructors. Above all, the department of textiles which played a prominent part for many years, producing scholars such

as Franz Wickhoff, Alois Riegl and more recently Moriz Dreger, later professor in Innsbruck, and whose main work, *Die künstlerische Entwicklung der Weberei* ('The artistic development of the arts of textiles') is based on that experience. We will later have to speak about the Albertina, where Moriz Thausing was employed. Even the greatest of the art collections from the old monarchy, those to have been united in that opulent palace on the Burgring since the 1880's, have taken up higher education in their programs. One must admit that this has been to the advantage of both, and has continued to characterize the truly monumental publication, the *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, founded by Quirin von Leitner and edited for many years by the excellent librarian Heinrich Zimmermann. It has included archaeologists such as my unforgettable colleague and friend Robert von Schneider, Hans Schrader, more recently Fritz Eichler now in charge of the department of ancient art, as well as numismatists and economic historians such as Wilhelm Kubitschek and August von Loehr, and last but not least actual art historians, aside from myself, my early departed classmate Hermann Dollmayr, my most excellent friend and successor Hermann Julius Hermann, and in the picture gallery most recently Ludwig von Baldass - all have filled this double role following the example of Eitelberger.

Further goals common to the 'Vienna school' can also be discerned in this honorable man, and leave a sense of the continuing influence from Josef Daniel Böhm. Beginning in 1871, Eitelberger published the series, *Quellenschriften für Kunstgeschichte und Kunsttechnik des Mittelalters und der Renaissance* ('Sources for the history of art and technology from the Medieval and Renaissance period') with the support of the Ministry of Education. These were originally limited by the state of research of the time, but in doing so, he founded the philologically-historical textual approach which has been particularly cultivated by Wickhoff and his pupils, and which has given the 'Vienna School' a well deserved reputation. The series survived directly up to the beginning of the First World War. In this series, I was able to posthumously publish the *Vasaristudien* of my colleague Wolfgang Kallab, who sadly died so early. Aside from Eitelberger himself, such excellent university teachers as Moriz Thausing, Hubert Janitschek, Alfred Woltmann and Hans Semper collaborated on these volumes.

Due to his position, Eitelberger was able to exercise a decisive influence on the development of higher education in Austria. He had been summoned by the Emperor Francis Joseph I into the offices of the monarchy and was given an influential spot in the ministry beside his friend Heider as an adviser on matters of art. He was able to establish a chair in the history of art at the University of Innsbruck for Hans Semper, son of the great architect Gottfried Semper, and also in Prague for Alfred Woltmann. Above all however, one must mention the hiring of Moriz Thausing at the University of Vienna, which cemented the relationship of art history with the Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, as it has survived into the present. In Theodor von Sickel's reorganization scheme of this nursery for historians, which had already existed since its original foundation by [Pater] Albert

[Josef] Jäger (1854), the history of art from the modern period was instituted as a required subject in the curriculum, and has prospered since then to the mutual benefit of both. Thausing became the first professor of the subject within the Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, and this brings us from the pre-history and antiquity of the 'Vienna School' into its 'medieval' period.

Moritz Thausing

Moritz Thausing (1835-1884) was born into a family of Bohemian German descent, and was originally trained in German literature, but transferred to the history of art under the influence of Eitelberger. He became a graduate of the Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, where he had been enrolled since 1859, impressed by the incomparable didactic personality of Sickel, who had by then been in charge for two years. The great advantages of the strict historically-philological foundation for the history of art were already becoming apparent. Until I had a chance to recall these facts in an obituary written in honor of my friend and benefactor Wilhelm von Bode, it had been almost entirely forgotten how great an influence Vienna and the Institut under the guidance of Sickel had been on the wider practice of the history of art in those times. At the suggestion of Anton Springer, Wilhelm von Bode - who would later become the mighty director of the Berlin museums - attended the courses at the Institut in 1869-1870 as a visiting member, where he too experienced the teaching of Eitelberger and his colleague, the famous archaeologist Alexander Conze - whose significant role in our story will emerge further on. Thausing remained attached to the Institut throughout his career. He had been made professor in 1873, Ordinarius 1879, and even into the final days of his emotional sickness in 1883, taught as an interim director of the 'Istituto Austriaco di studi storici' in Rome, which Sickel had recently founded. His inaugural lecture of 1873, 'The Place of the History of Art as an Objective Discipline' ('Die Stellung der Kunstgeschichte als Wissenschaft') - which he reprinted as the first essay in his 1883 collection 'Letters from Vienna on Subjects of Art' (*Wiener Kunstbriefe*) - is still estimable today, and clearly expresses the point of view of the emergent 'Vienna School'. Like Eitelberger, Thausing also worked as a journalist, although in a very different way of course. He was a brilliant essayist, intelligent and witty as in life, as well as being very capable of presenting purely scholarly arguments in a stimulating and elegant manner. The *Wiener Kunstbriefe* presents a collection of precisely such popular short essays.

Like his teacher and later colleague Eitelberger, Thausing had a double appointment. Already in 1864, he had been employed in the famous collection of graphic arts formed by the Duke of Sachsen-Teschen, which still bears the name 'Albertina', and in 1876 was made its director - probably due to his large and still valid monograph about Albrecht Dürer (1875). In this marvelous old milieu which will remain unforgettable and incomparable to those who can remember its art collections, an incident occurred which was to be decisive for the development of the

'Vienna School'. Thausing met the debonair connoisseur, who was among the most intelligent and original minds of the time, and hid behind the strange Muscovite pen name of Ivan Lermolieff and his putative German translator Johannes Schwarze. He was able to revolutionize the German practice of art history completely from outside of the establishment, and revealed himself to be none other than Giovanni Morelli, senator of the Italian realm. His earliest essays were published in the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 1875-1876. This no longer exists, but had led the field for many years under the informal name of 'Lützow's Zeitschrift' since it was edited by Carl von Lützow from Hanover, professor at the Akademie der bildenden Künste in Vienna since 1864 - again significantly edited in Vienna. In one of his most humorous essays published in the *Neue Freie Presse* in 1880, Thausing characterized the intellectual approach of the connoisseur for a wider audience. His final volume of essays, the *Wiener Kunstbriefe* is dedicated to this 'friend and brother in Raphael'. In the ideally quiet and bright spaces of the Albertina, Thausing introduced the senator to his young pupil Franz Wickhoff, who was to become a great apostle of the method. In the very same place, Wickhoff himself later introduced his own pupils whom he led in the same direction, above all Hermann Dollmayr, but also me, to the 'Senatore', and left us with memories that remain among the most cherished of our lives.

Franz Wickhoff

This brings us to the man who must be seen as the actual founder of the 'Vienna School' in the true sense, Franz Wickhoff (born in Steyr 1853, † Venice 1909, where he is buried). He is the one who united the constructive elements that we have until now seen in isolation into a grand synthesis of the most intimately personal sort, which revealed itself both in his development and his academic and literary work. This became the beginning of what had previously only existed rudimentarily, the Renaissance of the Vienna School – a mythological term we specifically apply to Wickhoff's actual and intimate personality – where (after the closely successive deaths of Eitelberger and Thausing) he assumed the chair of art history, which had been so organically integrated into the Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, and gave it an institute of its own.

Five men provided the decisive impulses for his intellectual development: Eitelberger, Thausing, Sickel, Conze as academic teachers, and Giovanni Morelli the outsider.

When Wickhoff arrived at the university in the mid 1870's, he found Eitelberger and Thausing teaching in the subject which he ultimately chose. Although Eitelberger had less to offer academically by this time, he did hire Wickhoff after the completion of his studies at the Institut in 1879 at his museum in the famous department of textiles, and this became decisive in his education (as it did yet more for Riegl later on). It was here that he was able to learn the techniques and history of the arts as well as the activities of museum officials. Wickhoff honestly honored and admired Eitelberger, although he liked to compare him to Grillparzer's character of Haman, while his weaknesses and peccadilloes provided his unshakable sense of humor with material for amusing anecdotes to the end of his days. Through Eitelberger, and having completed his Habilitation at the university in 1882, he received an inheritance from the Böhm circle which appealed particularly to his innate tendency to ideas and scholarly precision – his original enrollment in the natural sciences was not lost on him: to begin didactically with the original study of an individual work of art. When I was still a young student, he held lectures around carefully chosen objects in the galleries of the Österreichisches Museum on the history and technique of 'the technical arts', as they were then called. It was excellent training for future museum curators being trained for the official examination (as it still exists today) according to the curriculum established by Sickel. There was another thing. By this time, the series of source publications for the visual arts founded by Eitelberger was in full swing. This idea of making the primary and secondary sources systematically available – this had been underway for centuries in Italy - was another impulse that Wickhoff, a pupil of Sickel, bequeathed to the 'Vienna School'. In his seminars he relished the reading and careful interpretation of literary sources, primarily of the early Christian period. He urged his earliest pupils to make collections of written sources from the Merovingian, Carolingian and Ottonian periods in which the monuments are almost

completely lost. Of these, only the second category ever appeared in an edition which I prepared, while the first has remained a fragment due to the early death of my classmate Karl Hecke, and the third by J. Mantuani was never published. Along with a subsequent volume, my edition was published in the series of sources founded by Eitelberger. One must recall that we had the model of Overbeck's edition of ancient written sources for the history of Greek art from 1868. The sources for the history of art in the Byzantine Empire appeared in the Eitelberger series (imperfectly) edited by Friedrich Wilhelm Unger exactly a decade later (1878). I will later relate the great extent to which my own academic and editorial activity had a source in this. Yet the corpus inaugurated by Eitelberger was not limited to the medieval sources (such as Theophilus, Heraclius and Cennini). Completely in keeping with the spirit of the 1850's and 1860's as seen in Gottfried Semper, Theophil Hansen and Heinrich Ferstel, as well as the Österreichisches Museum, where the Italian and German Renaissance was already represented (with Eitelberger's edition of Lodovico Dolce and Condivi, Albert Ilg's of Biondo, Hans Semper's Donatello biography of Vasari and Janitschek's of Alberti). During the preparation of his large monograph about the artist, Thausing had provided an edition of the letters and diaries of Albrecht Dürer. The series also already included publications of account books and documents (Stockbauer, Patronage and collecting at the Bavarian court 1874) as they were later included in the *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* on a grand scale since 1885. The careful textual criticism begun by Wickhoff, exemplified in his insightful 1889 essay about the period of Guido da Siena, had its further influence on the editors of 15th and 16th century texts, not forgetting the assiduous work of my old friend Cornelius von Fabriczy in Stuttgart, and above all of Karl Frey in Berlin. My own studies of Ghiberti belong to this tradition. The work of our own scholarship holders at Sickel's 'Istituto Austriaco' in Rome bore fruit, particularly for Giorgio Vasari. Of course, Wolfgang Kallab (who came to Wickhoff from Graz and pre-deceased him in 1906) was no more able to finish those (these being the aforementioned fragments of Vasari Studies which I edited) than the completely unpublished tract by Giulio Mancini which I am finally now hopeful of bringing into print – almost thirty years later! These were the beginnings of source work on the Roman baroque – the *Groote Schouburg* of Arnold Houbraken had already appeared during the time of Eitelberger - as Riegl had brought it to the fore and Max Dvořák continued. Ludwig Pastor encouraged his Assistent Ludwig Pollak to pursue the great corpus of sources for the history of baroque art in Rome, but this was left incomplete by the death of this excellent man as a volunteer on the Galician front in 1914. His successor in this, Georg Sobotka who was also planning to complete Kallab's Mancini edition, then also died on the Italian front. Dvořák himself did not survive to see the publication, which was finally completed in 1928 by another Dvořák pupil, Dagobert Frey. Now, with the effective assistance of my old friend J. Ph. Dengel, currently director of the new Institute in Rome, I hope that another of my students will succeed in publishing the estate of Pollak. It is clear that the

tradition inaugurated by Eitelberger has grown far beyond its original conception and continued to have its effect in the Vienna School of Wickhoff.

Since he had been his actual mentor at the Institut in his own subject, the teaching of Thausing had a great influence in Wickhoff – as we have already stressed.

Although he always spoke reverently of Thausing, the influence in the younger scholar could still not be characterized as profound. I myself did not ever know Thausing – he had died by the time I first enrolled at the university late in 1884. Although both men were animated, chatty and humorous, I knew Wickhoff very well, and cannot but surmise that a certain antagonism must have existed between the more southern character of the Upper Austrian and the spikier humor of the German from the Sudetenland. Thausing was director of the Albertina by the time Wickhoff approached him, and this center of polished erudition assumed a particular importance for the remainder of his life. It was here (and in the Imperial Library) that he gained the extended knowledge of prints and drawings (as he had done with the decorative arts at the Österreichisches Museum) that became a mainstay of his teaching methods. His dissertation about Albrecht Dürer's study of antiquity was published in the *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* of 1880 and was clearly linked to the Dürer studies by Thausing. This was combined with another attraction of his youth and which grew to become the greatest experience of his life – classical archaeology. In his final years he again returned to these youthful climes with the 'Dürerstudien', published in the *Jahrbuch der Zentralkommission* 1907. His illuminating study about the role of Italian engraving with a primarily reproductive function, 'The Entrance of Marcantonio into the circle of Roman art', published in the *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 1899, was born directly from the milieu of the Albertina. It was related to his studies of Raphael, which was an interest he shared with Anton Springer. In the *Anzeiger* of the Vienna Academy in 1903, Wickhoff proposed a corpus of Raphael drawings, which again related to the Albertina and to the programmatic catalogue raisonné of its Italian drawings which he developed, in the *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, Volumes 12 and 13. He led one of his earliest students, Hermann Dollmayr (1865-1900) in this direction. The first work by Dollmayr about the workshop of Raphael appeared in the same volume of the *Jahrbuch*, and his second study of the development of Michelangelo appeared there in 1882. After Dollmayr died at a young age, Wickhoff published his third study about the relation of Giulio Romano to classical antiquity from his estate in the volume of 1901. This again vaguely recalls Thausing, who had dedicated his volume of *Wiener Kunstbriefe* to Giovanni Morelli, describing himself in a mixture of German and Italian as his 'fratello in Raffaele'. During the critical early years of his development in the Albertina, Wickhoff had been introduced by Thausing to this remarkable man. In this way he became the third 'extramural' mentor to Wickhoff (born in Verona 1816, † Milan 1891). Morelli is of great importance for the history of our discipline, and particularly for the 'Vienna School',

since he led the way out of German Romanticism into the positivism of the second half of the 19th century. Since a reactionary movement has recently set in, this historical role is often overlooked and underestimated. Morelli, whose ancestors had been southern French Huguenots who arrived in Lombardy through Switzerland, was given a German education, and had also been a friend of the German-Italian Bonaventura Genelli, of Cornelius and Kaulbach in Munich, as well as of Rückert, Clemens and Bettina Brentano and Görres in Berlin, where he had also still attended the lectures of Schelling. This man was a significant player in the history of the period – yet how few of the younger art historians have consulted the edifying biography, which his friend and pupil Gustavo Frizzoni from Bergamo (in touch with C. F. von Rumohr) appended to the third volume of his collected writings? All of the essays published under the pen name ‘Ivan Lermolieff Schwarze’ were written in a German which would do credit to most art historians of today. As Lombard ambassador to the Frankfurt parliament of 1848 he embodied the same unity of German and Italian culture that had been anticipated by the old bicultural figure of Johann Dominicus Fiorillo. By its contact with the scholarship of northern German Romanticism in the wake of Rumohr, the old homeland of art criticism and art history gained a new vigor which developed in the 20th century. After Morelli, as a native of Lombardy, had opposed it in 1866 in favor of a unified Italy, Austria again assumed its position of mediation between the north and south, as we shall soon see.

Morelli had begun in the natural sciences, having received his doctorate of medicine in Berlin in 1839. For Wickhoff, this was a circumstance of no mean importance. He himself had originally been a student of the natural sciences, and attended the lectures of the botanist Josef Böhm, who was later to become his brother-in-law. He was especially attracted to the theory of evolution, as it was widely discussed at that time, and this undoubtedly influenced his genetic interpretations. Again under certain German influences, Morelli had developed into a connoisseur and collector, based on the practical and empirical attitude common to his profession: he ultimately bequeathed his beautiful collection to his actual native city of Bergamo. In Paris, he became a particular friend of Otto Müндler, that unique intellectual character and excellent connoisseur of the 1860’s, who collaborated almost anonymously on the later editions of Jacob Burckhardt’s *Cicerone*. Yet this sort of connoisseurship remained uncomfortable since it was based on a silent intuition and could not satisfy a spirit so sharply and critically trained as Morelli. As a natural scientist and empiricist he required objective criteria. This led him to his famous ‘method’ which he first laid out in his witty and original dialogue ‘on principles and method’. It was not long earlier that Fechner, himself very original and devoted to science, had organized the almost comical inquiry into the Dresden Holbein dispute, which was doomed to fail by being based in the emotional judgments of laymen or semi-laymen. Morelli intervened to place the judgments about artistic personalities on a basis of precise observation of the unadulterated artistic handwriting, on the ‘maniera’ in the true sense of the old term, as these are available through the minutest and therefore most indisputable characteristics, the

'calligraphic' curlicues which constitute this handwriting and fix precisely this individual 'manner'. This began with the forms of ears, hands and fingernails, as spoofed by Otto von Thoren and others, a method that had long been current in the 'Bertillonage' system of handwriting analysis. We shall presently see why this method had a particular appeal in Vienna.

From this standpoint, with its basic, enduring truth as well as ineradicable errors, Morelli critically analyzed the great German collections in Munich, Dresden and Berlin, but then also those of the Borghese and the Doria-Pamphilj in Rome. These publications appeared exactly during the time in which Thausing and Wickhoff were teaching. Morelli recognized that in dealing with the burning questions of authenticity and spuriousness, originality, semi-originality, copies, imitation and open forgery, the painterly work of the artists as it stands in the churches and collections, and is reasonably authenticated by inscriptions, documents and contemporary sources – this is the place of philological criticism - cannot provide a basis for secure knowledge. It is instead necessary to study the most immediate evidence of the artistic handwriting, and that one must therefore consider the drawings, as they had already been used in Italy by Vasari, and especially in the period of Baldinucci – however unsystematically and uncritically. In the critical studies of Rumohr, drawings do not yet play a part. This was to come later. Morelli was very shrewd in defining his field of study. This was Italian painting of the Quattrocento, the 'età d'oro', in which the flow of direct documentation of artists is richest and clearest. This unusually knowledgeable author was fully aware that the application of his method to earlier or later periods or to sculpture would require adjustments. It has often been crudely misunderstood, but Morelli never envisioned his 'method' as a mnemonic device for the untalented. He was far too fine and educated a mind, far above the crowd of average art historians of his time, and above all gifted with a connoisseurship rooted deeply in a knowledge of the Italian popular spirit. He saw the configurations of artistic language arising from the great variety in the populace and landscapes of his native land, as Wickhoff once commented: 'like an experienced dialectologist'. He was also a man who felt the will and the need to do homage to the positivism of his day, in attempting to make the subjective judgment of the connoisseur as objective and teachable as possible - didacticism that is of course only possible for those in possession of the necessary aptitude and educational background.

It was inevitable that Morelli, whose innate sarcasm had an effect of a 'frusta letteraria' and a 'vespajo stuzzicato' – to mention two phrases from Italian book titles – would arouse many opponents, particularly in northern Germany, where he faced Wilhelm Bode as a spirited warrior working with different weapons. There were particular reasons for the fact that Vienna, with the Albertina and the 'Vienna School' at the university, became the first (and possibly only) place where he met with complete agreement and a following. As we have already heard, Moritz Thausing became the first to endorse him, and directed his pupil Wickhoff with the same provenance from the Institut in the same direction, and left him an inheritance,

having recognized the positivist and scientific streak and become the first to announce this in his essay in the *Wiener Kunstbriefe*. In his aforementioned catalogue raisonné of the Italian drawings of the Albertina, which would be unthinkable without the example of Morelli, Wickhoff piously recalled a letter sent by his mentor Thausing on the day before his unexpected death (August 12, 1880), conveying the task of the critical catalogue to a younger generation, after having hoped that it would become his own final work.

In the brilliant and eminently readable introduction to that catalogue, which is the first of its kind to be based on the method of Morelli, Wickhoff expounded the reasons why the way had been prepared for such studies in Vienna, the city which today is still the only place where an international periodical is published devoted exclusively to graphic arts of the older and newer periods, *Die graphischen Künste*, documenting that genre since 1879. Vienna possessed two large collections of graphic arts from a much earlier period, the engravings belonging to Prince Eugene of Savoy which later entered the Imperial library along with his marvelous collection of books, and the collection of prints and drawings belonging to the son-in-law of the empress Maria Theresa, Albert von Sachsen-Teschen, of Thausing's Albertina. This also includes parts of the collection of another original character from Viennese history, the Belgian Prince de Ligne (described by J. A. Bartsch, Vienna 1794), as well as that of Count Fries, the aforementioned patron of Josef Daniel Böhm. The first of these had already been catalogued by the important French connoisseur, collector and author J. P. Mariette († 1775), and it was these studies which provided the basis for the earliest and still valid and unsurpassed handbook of engravings, the *Peintre-Graveur* by the Viennese engraver Adam Bartsch (published Vienna 1803-1821). At the same time there was an influx from Switzerland, with Johann Rudolf Füeßli (1737-1806), scion of the Zürich family of painters and writers on art, who ended as archivist of the Akademie der bildenden Künste, where his father Johann Kaspar had already studied. This associate of Winckelmann and Mengs was commissioned with the task of forming a collection of engravings for the library of the Akademie, and published here in 1798-1806 the first four volumes of a critical catalogue of engravings by the greatest masters of all schools. His *Annalen der bildenden Künste für die österreichischen Staaten*, which only appeared in two volumes in Vienna 1801-1802, bear directly on Austria. In Vienna, the well considered conviction of Mariette left its mark, according to which a survey of engraving, which provides the vehicle for our knowledge of the history of painting, must be based on a close study of the individual artistic handwriting. Since Vienna pursued this idea, it still possesses the richest and most valuable collection of this kind, along with those of the Medici in the Uffizi in Florence that was once organized and supervised by Filippo Baldinucci, as well as those in Paris and most recently in London. It was natural that Giovanni Morelli should have found an attractive and facilitating scholarly atmosphere in the Albertina as it was run by Thausing. In fact, his activity (cf. Carl Lützwow's *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*) and his controversial fame emanated from our city. This came about since Franz Wickhoff followed Thausing to become his scholarly apostle. He

was the first to introduce his method as an academic instrument, and led his student Hermann Dollmayr – another member of the ‘School’ to have died too early - in this direction. This can be seen in Dollmayr’s aforementioned publications as well as his work on the reorganization of the picture gallery of the Kunsthistorisches Museum (since 1892). It is worth stressing that Dollmayr had attended the courses at the Institut für Geschichtsforschung, and after completing his Habilitation in 1897 used examples in the academic activities of the seminar from the works of Morelli’s collection, who by then had recently died. Wickhoff also warmly welcomed the appearance of that significant American critic resident in Italy, Bernhard Berenson, who was also inspired by Morelli, also worked outside of academia, framed the method more rigorously, deepened the concepts as ‘rudiments of connoisseurship’, and presented a summary in his book, *The Study and Criticism of Italian Art* 1901 and *The Drawings of the Florentine Painters* of 1903. In many later writings, Berenson felt the need to progress beyond the necessary elementary level of ‘textual philology’ or ‘lower’ criticism to the ‘higher’ and more innately art historical criticism, from ‘individuality’ to the actual ‘personality’ of the artist, from the ‘outer’ to the ‘inner’ linguistic form. His entire background and fundamentally positivist attitude prevented Wickhoff from following this. He recoiled from the thought of a return to the connoisseurship of a period preceding objectivity, and in his hard-won position he was largely correct in this warning, particularly in regard to later imitators. In reviewing one of the very few truly ‘art-historical’ monographs, the Giotto biography of Fritz Rintelen, Wickhoff’s pupil Max Dvořák expressed the same reservations with a greater differentiation. Although not an immediate pupil of Theodor von Sickel, this insightful man was imbued with this strict historical schooling and even spoke of ‘transferring the “Morelli method” to the inner structure of the art work’. We are not being impious to touch on the limits of Wickhoff’s gifts (conditioned by the historical situation). His was an essentially un-philosophical, even anti-philosophical mind who naturally reacted negatively to all schematic aesthetic jargon, against all pure formalism of ‘cobbler’s aesthetics’ (‘Schusterästhetik’), as he loved to call it in his typically amusing way, but basically against all manifestations of aesthetics. He still lived to experience that important event from the beginning of the 20th century, Croce’s *Aesthetics as Science and General Linguistic* of 1903, the first part of his *Philosophy of the Spirit* which led the speculative and historical insight into the phenomenon of art in new directions, departing from the grand tradition of German Romantic philosophy (consonant with the traditions of Naples where he lives) and which became the beginning of my decades old intellectual friendship with its author. In the *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen* of 1906, Wickhoff wrote a review of the German translation of the *Estetica*. This edition had been prepared by a gifted pupil, Robert Eisler, who later turned to completely different subjects. Of course, this has always seemed an overly subtle and exaggerated formulation to me, and Croce later expressed himself more perfectly and with greater modulation. I recall speaking about this with Wickhoff on numerous occasions. He acknowledged the historical chapters unreservedly.

However, he was as unable to recognize either that this is the necessary complement of the theoretical chapters, or the closely attached concept of the whole or totality – these being worlds away from his own experience of ‘aesthetics’.

It is necessary to return to Morelli. Wickhoff was attracted not merely by the ‘objective scientific’ disposition of his method that had already impressed Thausing, but also the connection to the historical and philological conceptions which he had assumed through the teaching of Theodor von Sickel. This brings us to a deeply decisive element in the development of this great scholar, which Wickhoff attributed throughout his life to Theodor von Sickel, the man he considered to be his actual mentor (besides the great archaeologist Conze, to be discussed below). It is ironic for the typical Austrian character of Wickhoff and appropriate to his sense of humor, himself having said that (in spite of an admiration for Bismarck) he felt reluctant and hesitant to travel north of the Main, that his two most influential intellectual models should have been natives of northern Germany. As fortune would have it, he chose to devote himself to a discipline that had been essentially inaugurated in the northern regions of Germany.

Theodor von Sickel

As a student of the famous *École des chartes* in Paris, Theodor von Sickel (born 1826 in Aken in Prussian-Saxony, died in Merano in 1908, just one year before his pupil) had assimilated the tradition of historical diplomatics as it had flourished in France since the 17th century. Since the 1850’s, he had been active in the institution founded by Jäger, the *Institut für Geschichtsforschung*, which he led as director from 1869 until he founded the ‘*Istituto austriaco*’ in Rome during 1901. We have already repeatedly referred to his reform of the Vienna curriculum (1874), in which he wisely included the history of art, where Thausing was put in charge as the first specialist within the Institut. From the beginning, the institute in Rome had also been conceived to include art historians as well, taking their place beside the Austrian colony of artists as it had resided in the *Palazzo Venezia* since the days of Josef Daniel Böhm. Until the beginning of the war, the scholarship holders of the ‘*Vienna School*’ were still able to enjoy that residence. We have already belabored the good amount of source work and archival research that was completed here.

With his revision of the honorable program of French ‘archival studies’, Sickel stressed and lent an autonomy to the ‘auxiliary sciences’ of history, paleography, chronology and diplomatics, removing them from their subservient place and bringing them into the company of that which is today often tautologically referred to as ‘intellectual history’ (*‘Geistesgeschichte’*). Any of those who had the good fortune to hear him lecture, and I was one of the last direct pupils of Sickel, will recall the mighty impression of his gift to invigorate and intellectually illuminate a material that might at first glance appear dry. His instruction on the subject of imperial diplomatics was ultimately an architectural work of art. In the following and less internally coherent subject of papal documents, he also conveyed

surprising insights into 'cultural history'. Art historians could learn an endless amount from this. Sickel was completely conscious of having included the history of art as an integrated, required element rather than a mere appendix to the curriculum for students of history. What it received from the historical and philological method, it returned in spades. By its relation to graphic forms of art, the development of medieval scripts in Latin paleography provided a very useful introduction to the study of artistic forms. It is unnecessary to belabor the fact that image and script are related, and that particularly in the medieval period which provided Sickel's exclusive interest, the two developed in tandem. The individual (stylistic) element was not neglected. By his reform of the traditional study of documents, Sickel intended to provide a solid foundation for the study of history by systematically treating the basic problems that had already preoccupied those great predecessors of the *École des chartes* - the learned Benedictines from the schools of St. Denis and St. Maurus. These are the problems of 'authenticity' and 'originality' - not always identical as might at first appear - on which the synthetic activity of the historian is based, and which can be pursued with an exactitude that approaches the (fundamentally different) methods of natural science. Paleography provided a firm basis for this. Beyond the conditions of the general formal language of the period, this included observation of the particular qualities of the individual scribes, as well as the actual topic of documentary studies, the structure, the habits and organization of the chancelleries, which assume their individual character by the peculiar color of their truly medieval formulae and use of models - the 'similia' that are so important for the history of art as well. This gives the appearance of presenting petty and workmanlike questions. Without its backbone in this ascetic preparatory work, all truly historical research could lapse into amateurism. We should recall the figure of Wagner, the intern to Faust, who is always treated crudely and simplistically by actors, but whose pedantry was brilliantly characterized by Goethe as merely apparent. Even if the narrow quotidian view might cause a comparison to qualities of the character of Wagner in Faust, this in no way diminishes the work of a great scholar.

Wickhoff completed the courses at the Institut für Geschichtsforschung under the direction of Sickel in 1877-1879 and, as we have already mentioned, so thoroughly internalized these teachings as to refer to his mentor as *κατ' ἐξοχήν*. He then became the successor to Thausing at the 'Kunsthistorisches Lehrapparat' of the Institut, as the professorial chairs were then still called. This makes it clear how he could discover Morelli through the introduction by Thausing, and then on the basis of Sickel's method in diplomatics, become his defender in academia, much in the character of his predecessor. Both shared a concentration on the exact, nearly experimental observation of small and minute characteristics to distinguish authenticity, inauthenticity, originals, copies and forgeries. Aside from this, the subject at hand was true historical scholarship and its foundations. The words which the aging teacher addressed to him on the occasion of his anniversary were borne by Wickhoff deeply within his spirit - he was confident that his former student 'would

never make a pact with amateurism'. At his address celebrating the 80th birthday of Sickel in 1906, he cited that sentence as 'the core of Sickel's exemplary character'. It has remained the motto of the Vienna School to the present day, and Wickhoff had no doubt about his reasons for insisting that his pupils all complete the courses at the Institut für Geschichtsforschung. This was the attitude that led him to found the *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen* in 1904 as a supplement – symptomatically - to the *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, in which he was supported by an excellent group mostly of his own pupils – including Max Dvořák, who continued after his death until 1914. In his preface to the first issue, Wickhoff clearly declared his goals, 'to separate the wheat from the chaff among publications' completely in the sense in which Sickel and Morelli distinguished 'authenticity' from 'inauthenticity'. 'This has not been fulfilled whatsoever. In spite of many scholarly achievements, the history of art is still not accepted by academic organizations or colleagues in related fields of history and literature. One must admit that this does not occur without reason, for there are very few disciplines other than the history of art, in which such verbal squalls and shallow misunderstanding find an unchiding audience, and that essays ridiculing the principles of objectivity are published and taken seriously'. These are words that could be spoken now, thirty years later, perhaps even with greater justification. Any of those familiar with Wickhoff's temperament will know that this new 'frusta letteraria' ('literary lashes')² did not exist in an atmosphere of academic coolness and Olympian peace. It is not difficult to imagine what this dear man would have said to the publications that have been appearing since the war and during the period of the inflation!

This deep feeling for authenticity and truth in scholarship, and abhorrence of all that is slipshod, inexact or dishonest, also led Wickhoff to classical archaeology, where the methods that had been refined through the centuries together with philology, provide a solid foundation to prevent excesses such as those that show themselves in the younger sister discipline, with its occasional growing pains. 'Den Bönhasen ist hier sehr bald das Maul gestopft'. ('It is easy to silence these blunderers'.) Wickhoff had the good fortune to study with one of the most excellent archaeologists, whose vision – like that of Heinrich Brunn - reached far beyond the limits of his academic discipline and included the entire development of art, a true representative of the history of art as it progressed beyond antiquarianism, κ.ε. antiquity, and who became the leader of the modern stylistically oriented 'archaeology'. Alexander Conze (born in Hanover 1831, died in Berlin 1914), who taught in Vienna 1869-1877, became the actual second mentor for Wickhoff. He often stressed this in lectures as well as privately during the years when I was still a student. Conze was followed by Otto Benndorf († 1907), who was also an excellent and very vivid teacher, whom I still gratefully recall. Wickhoff introduced me to him privately in his receptive and stimulating household. In combination with classical archaeology and the historical 'auxiliary sciences', this provided the triangle of art

² The title of a short-lived journal published in Venice.

historical instruction as it formed the basis for the earlier generation of Wickhoff pupils, nearly all of them graduates of the Institut für Geschichtsforschung - and as I myself attempted to restore it when I was forced to assume the teaching chair that had once been his.

Another interjection becomes necessary here. This also refers to the role of Vienna, which had a special place in the field of classical archaeology since the days of the great Habsburg Emperor Leopold I. Petrus Lambecius († 1680) from Hamburg had been prefect of the Imperial Library here since 1663, and Karl Gustav Heraeus (born 1671), a Swede of Mecklenburgian descent, worked in the imperial art collections during the reign of Joseph I. and Charles VI. He became most active in the field of numismatics, that assiduously cultivated archaeological 'auxiliary science', so important to cultural history and art history of the 18th century. The name of Heraeus is linked to the earliest illustrated architectural history done in Austria, the *Entwurf einer historischen Architektur* of 1723 by the elder Fischer von Erlach. Heraeus, who was a friend of the great [Gottfried Wilhelm] Leibniz, and was involved with him in the plans to create an imperial academy of sciences, also played a part in the plan to unite the Habsburg holdings of art in the residential city, as it only came to be realized during the reign of Francis Joseph I. What they did achieve at that time was a unification of the antiquities, including the coins. Francis I of Lotharingia, himself a collector of coins, was able to attract many notable scholars of French origin to Vienna and to establish the connection to French archaeology which we have already noted a few times. One must also not forget that the second edition of the history of art by [Johann Joachim] Winckelmann - who had been murdered and buried 1768 in Trieste on Austrian soil - was published in 1776 in Vienna at the expense of the academy (Akademie der bildenden Künste). This was done quite negligently, edited by Justus Riedel, in a way that would certainly have annoyed the great German-Roman ('Deutschrömer') whose youth was spent with strict textual criticism, and studying diplomatics of the German imperial chancellery. It was during this time that the 'Royal and Imperial Cabinet of Coins and Antiquities' ('K. K. Münz- und Antiquitätenkabinet') was founded, of which we have heard in connection with Eduard von Sacken, the youngest member of the Böhm-circle, and where I myself held my first curatorial position (as a numismatist!). It was there that the Abbot Joseph Hilarius von Eckel (1737-1798) was active - a native of Vienna, and member of the highly learned Society of Jesus, which assumed such an important place in the intellectual history of the 18th century. With his publication of the *Doctrina nummorum veterum*, appearing in eight folio-volumes from 1792 to 1798, he actually founded the systematic discipline of numismatics. Its famous Prolegomena includes a delineation of his system as an 'ars critica nummoria', in which each line breathes the spirit of this fine and liberal man who taught at the University of Vienna from 1775 as professor of 'Antiquities and Historical Auxiliary Sciences' ('Antiquitäten und historische Hilfsmittel') - as well as anticipating the productive combination of museum and university. The critical system proposed in that Prolegomena is based on the subtle distinction of 'authentic

and inauthentic' – original – copy – forgery. This is the same problem which occupied Wickhoff, Sickel and Morelli, and again demonstrates how deeply rooted it is in Vienna. When I myself wrote my lectures for the Habilitation on 'The Significance of the Sources for Modern Art History' (printed in the *Beilage der Allgemeinen Zeitung München* 1892, Numbers 219-220), I was still employed in the department organized by Eckhel, and consciously based my reflections on the scale of values from ancient numismatics.

To return to Wickhoff, one must stress that he remained devoted to classical archaeology throughout his life. As a student, he eagerly participated in the tutorials which Conze sponsored in connection with the Department of Archaeological Epigraphy, founded by the noted historian [Otto] Hirschfeld, and to the end of his days participated in the philological club known as the 'Eranos Vindobonensis', which still today meets in the same rooms. This was a circle of scholars to whom he felt a special affinity, and where he felt more at home than anywhere else. It was here that he formed the friendships that lasted throughout his life - with Otto Benndorf, Theodor and Heinrich von Gomperz, Emanuel Löwy who later taught in Rome, his close friend E. Szanto (who died at a young age), but above all, Robert von Schneider, director of antiquities in the imperial collections, and of the department of archaeology. Schneider became his colleague in the university and at the academy of sciences, a fine mind with a universal education, hardly known to the general public today from his sparse publications, but to whom I myself still owe decisive impulses from the time of my own introduction to work as a young Turk within the museum. We have already noted that Wickhoff in his earliest publications illuminated the connection of German and Italian Renaissance art with antiquity. In fact, these were the two subjects which preserved a spirit related to Jacob Burckhardt. By now, it is common knowledge that his main work in the field of ancient art with the philologist Wilhelm von Hartel, the supplemental volume of the *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, publishing the 'Vienna Genesis', presents nothing less than the earliest actual historical account of Roman art, that period which lies chronologically between archaeology and the history of 'modern' art, and itself presents the first manifestation of occidental art. It was often ignored in the years after Wickhoff. In his excellent introduction to the 1910 edition of the archaeological handbook of Geercke and Norden, Franz Winter dealt with Greek art, but completely ignored Roman art. When it appeared, this volume devoted to the 'Vienna Genesis' was subjected to an uncomprehending and sardonic criticism, and posthumous justice appears to have taken place since the name of Wickhoff seems to have acquired prestige among a new generation of archaeologists that devotes itself to the study of Roman art in art historical terms. This work, which will ensure that Wickhoff's thought remains a factor in the discipline, has an additional value in that it did not merely come about along the 'cold' academic path, but instead arose out of an artistic participation in its own period. Wickhoff had assimilated 'Impressionism' as an antithesis to the positivism of the second half of the 19th century, and discovered it as a 'ricorso' in Roman

antiquity. This was only possible for a spirit of artistic sensibility and training. Of all of his students, Hermann Dollmayr came closest to him in this, and was adept with the pencil and water color brush. It was only late in life, and of course in complete privacy, that Wickhoff devoted himself to painting, not merely technically but also making achievements on the artistic level. This can be seen among the effects of his estate, which we have piously preserved in our department at the university. This had arisen as an extension from his artistic intuition with the actual fireball of his earlier life, Goethe, whose *Pandora* he completed with no pretensions. As his last friends, and in commemoration of the Goethe anniversary of 1932, we were able to publish this small work in the city where *Pandora* was originally written.

A portrait of Wickhoff would be incomplete if another aspect remained absent which was important to him, his preoccupation with the subject matter of art, commonly described as 'iconography', a traditional term adopted and misapplied from classical archaeology. Here again, the threads lead back into the 'prehistory' of our Vienna School, into the meritorious contributions of Gustav Adolf Heider in this field. Naturally, the approach taken by Wickhoff was no longer antiquarian, but that of universal history. When he contributed an essay with the title 'On the historical unity of the universal development of art' ('Über die historische Einheitlichkeit der gesamten Kunstentwicklung') to the 1898 Festschrift of Max Büdinger, the last run down and misunderstood universal historian at our Alma Mater, this was spoken from the deepest recesses of his personality. As a didactic device, iconographical study always assumed a primary place in the Wickhoff seminars. For the early stages of university training, it presented a natural entry point into the study of the material and comparative reflection, something akin to the interpretation of texts. Yet it would certainly not have been acceptable to submit a dissertation topic to him from such an elementary academic level - and this in a time when trivial dissertations of the most shallow sort about individual sacred or secular subjects, torn completely from their context, have become such a widespread feature in academic art history. Within the practical limitations that were given, he demanded an original approach that was not arbitrarily chosen, a solution to an actual art historical problem - a principle in which I have followed him unto the present day. This reveals another aspect of Wickhoff's character on which we have touched once already. With his own artistic gifts and training in the methods of Sickel and Morelli, where all attention was devoted to the individual form, he was animated by an almost fanatical aversion to the purely formal consideration of art and its abstractions. He spurned and looked askance at the 'historical grammar' of forms - a linguistic construction that has since been recognized as a mere chimera. Riegl was also able to avoid that trap - Benedetto Croce later subjected it to a sharp but justified criticism. The fact that it takes a genius such as Heinrich Wölfflin to successfully deal with it becomes most apparent where it was taken up by his imitators and even applied to the history of poetry. It is impossible to overlook that Wickhoff was just in his youth when the heated dispute took place between the aesthetics of content and of form during the 1860's and 1870's, between the Hegelian

Friedrich Theodor von Vischer, whose system of aesthetics was published in 1857, and the Herbartian Robert von Zimmermann (+ 1898) whose 'General Aesthetics as the Science of Form' (*Allgemeine Ästhetik als Formwissenschaft*) had appeared in Vienna in 1865, where he had been teaching philosophy since 1861. As he felt with all philosophical speculation, Wickhoff had no more than a very superficial relation to the latter, under whom he had taken his university examinations and who then became his colleague. It was nonetheless inevitable that so broad-minded and versatile a person should have been touched by this in some way. In 1854, there appeared the small book 'On Beauty in Music Contribution to a Revision of Musical Aesthetics' (*Vom musikalisch Schönen Ein Beitrag zur Revision der Ästhetik der Tonkunst*), written by Eduard Hanslick, a near contemporary and Prague compatriot of Zimmermann, which was reprinted and translated innumerable times, and vaguely related to the teachings of Herbart. The book was not unintelligent and did have a certain purgative effect on the pseudo-aesthetic journalism that surrounded these subjects. Hanslick, who lived until 1904, was also a professor of music history and colleague of Wickhoff from 1861 until 1895. In the light of his great admiration for the house of Wahnfried and Cosima [Wagner] in particular, I must doubt all the more that Wickhoff read this book by the influential music critic of the *Neue Freie Presse*. One must assume that that most unaccepting editorialist against Richard Wagner must have annoyed him. Since his earliest youth, this unmusical person – itself a rarity in our possibly 'overly musical' Vienna - had been drawn in less by the musical language of the great music dramas, but more by their poetic and also national character.

It was a justifiable demand on the part of Wickhoff to his students, and anchored in his deepest convictions, that the subject matter should never be considered in isolation from the formal aspect of an art work. In spite of the fact that the periods under scrutiny might be intellectually inaccessible to us, or poorly documented, it is necessary to know what was being 'depicted' in the context of the earlier period. This had been a particular strength in the work of the older 'archaeological' generation from [Gustav Adolf] Heider all the way to [Anton] Springer, and with its philological acuity worked against spurious romantic-mystical interpretations. Otherwise one would arrive in a spot like the European connoisseurs who refer to eastern Asian art in purely formal terms with no knowledge of the subject – as this has often been satirized by specialists in Japanese art. There could be no return to the earlier 'anecdote painting' and historical 'theater opinions' of the bygone times of amateurism, which aroused Wickhoff to such passionate commentaries, primarily against the foggy mystification ('Blaublümelei') common among Germans, as opposed to the French and English, and especially against Arnold Böcklin whom he disliked - but he was often led by his congenital feistiness to overshoot the mark. Phenomena such as those which he liked to call 'cobbler aesthetics' in a derivation we have already noted from the traditional painter's anecdote, and an inability to progress beyond the 'crepida' or shoe level,

could only arouse such a man to emotional outbursts that appeared grotesque at times.

Like Jacob Burckhardt, with whom he otherwise had little in common, Wickhoff demanded a consideration of the cultural ambient, or what is today, from a fear of causing offence, more commonly called 'intellectual history' ('geistesgeschichtlich'), in which the work of art was born and flourished. In his bachelor existence, Wickhoff lived surrounded by a splendid specialized library and was always an eager reader and connoisseur of the literature, which he pursued to the farthest source. I recall him learning Hebrew during his work on the 'Wiener Genesis'. He commanded a universal education which placed him more in the company of the earlier art historians, and separated him from his academic colleagues. It went without saying for him that the art historian is required to familiarize himself with the literary and intellectual atmosphere in which the patrons and the artists themselves moved. This was how his essays came about, particularly those dealing with his favorite period of the Italian Rinascimento, that make up the larger part of his not particularly voluminous output, and particularly those which appeared in the *Jahrbuch der Königlich Preussischen Kunstsammlungen* 1890-1906. Among the most beautiful and finest is that dealing with the figure of Amor in the Italian medieval imagination (in 1890), but also that concerning 'The Library of Pope Julius II' (1893) and 'Giorgione's Paintings of Roman Heroic Poetry' (1895). The attitude and teaching methods that were typical of Wickhoff were expressed in a subject more remote from his greatest interests, 'Academic Studies of Rembrandt Drawings with Biblical Subjects' ('Seminarstudien über einige Zeichnungen Rembrandts mit biblischen Vorwürfen') which he still published in 1906. Here one sees how knowledgeable he was of the Bible, a quality that one does not always find among Roman Catholics. Those of us who were among his earliest students attempted to follow Wickhoff in this. We were led by Hermann Dollmayr, whose important and comprehensive study of 'Hieronymus Bosch and the Apocalypse in Netherlandish art of the 15th and 16th centuries' appeared in the *Jahrbuch* ('Hieronymus und die Darstellung der vier letzten Dinge in der niederländischen Malerei des XV. und XVI. Jahrhunderts', *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, Volume 19, 1898, pp. 284-343). One might also mention the studies by Hans Tietze, a long time and excellent teacher at our university, dealing with typology in medieval manuscripts, picking up where Heider had left off, as well as the Farnese Gallery of Annibale Carracci (1906), and the programs and subjects of the great Austrian baroque frescoes (1911) - to name only a few. I might also mention my own essays about the 'courtly' art of the later medieval period, in the *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 1893-1911. Although the actual medieval period in northern Europe did not loom very large to him, Wickhoff nonetheless provided the impulse - one thinks of Janitschek's publications - for the study of manuscript illumination, which was then still so inadequately and incompletely known. He was animated by the idea of a corpus edition, as this has borne fruit in ancient studies,

especially classical archaeology. One has but to think of the great name of [Theodor] Mommsen, but also of Conze. This became the genesis of the large and ambitious 'Descriptive Catalogue of the Illuminated Manuscripts in Austria' ('Beschreibendes Verzeichnis der illuminierten Handschriften in Österreich'), the first volume of which appeared in 1905, and was then continued by [Max] Dvořák, and most recently by my excellent friend Hermann Julius Hermann.

We have discussed isolated aspects of Wickhoff's character. From what we have said, it should be at least approximately possible to imagine, to whatever extent this is possible, how they united to form the complex of his rich personality, the richest one of the Vienna School, which he led. I hope that the reader can forgive his second oldest living pupil, whose friendship lasted for a quarter century, for dwelling on the figure of his teacher to such an extent. It was Wickhoff who provided for the publication of my earliest book on the architecture of European abbeys (Vienna 1889). Still today, I am all the more pained at my exaggerated reserve in not having dedicated it to him - since it grew from his seminars about written sources and his essay about the 'monasteria in Agnellus'. Because there were so many fewer students in those days, the relation to the teacher was much closer than was possible later, and I was able to assimilate the best as far as I could, quantum satis - as the aforementioned examples should show - and cannot, and will not ever forget it. Especially in the early years, it was difficult to follow his halting lecture style before he finally reached his conclusions, which were always dignified. As great a stylist as he was in print, Wickhoff did not possess the rhetorical gift. In spite of this, his lectures were more engrossing to us than many great speakers. In the obituary which he himself wrote for Hermann Dollmayr (*Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 1901), he discussed his own academic method of teaching.

Alois Riegl

Beside Wickhoff, another important figure of a very different character, origin, and development emerged 'like a disappearing comet', and provided very original impulses for the 'Vienna School'. In spite of not having taught more than a decade, and never having been in charge of the 'Lehrapparat', he might in some ways be seen as a stronger and more lasting influence than those of its actual founder or its renewer. This is Alois Riegl, born 1858 in Linz, close to the place of Wickhoff's birth, only five years later, and dying in 1905, just a few years before Wickhoff. Both his earlier and later work was inhibited and not rectilinear, but always essentially original. After a few years of studying law, forced upon him by meager circumstances, he decided to study philosophy and general history, which were then being taught in Vienna by the final Herbartian, Robert Zimmermann (+ 1898), and the last 'universal historian' Max Büdinger (from Kassel, 1828-1902, active in Vienna since 1871). It is not in and of itself surprising that Riegl soon lost interest in these subjects and turned to different things. Already as a young student this reveals the

symptomatic attitude that remained important to his development. In fact, Riegl was also immersed in the fluid of Herbartian realism (in truth the last great classical German philosophical system) which persisted in Austrian school psychology for a very long time, and his later development might reveal more than one spot, where one can sense an influence of Herbart's formalism as it reached him in a very diluted form through the aesthetics of Zimmermann. More symptomatic still is the turn to Büdinger's polyhistory, which extended in the traditional way from Greco-Roman antiquity through the medieval into the modern period. Its goal was to recognize the grand internal and universally historical coherences as they were not imposed from without, as had been the case with ancient polyhistory, but instead expressing themselves spontaneously. Like his autonomous approach to epistemology, this also distinguished him from the positivist, anti-philosophical empiricism of his later university colleague Wickhoff. This upright and straightforward man was certainly not animated by connivance or a sympathetic compliment when late in his career, in the *Festgabe zu Ehren Max Büdigers*, Innsbruck 1898 (where we have already noted that Wickhoff was also represented), he published 'Kunstgeschichte und Universalgeschichte' to honor his teacher who in spite of many strange excesses was often underestimated.

After this, Riegl entered the strict philologically historical school of Sickel, and although he was following the advice of a fellow student, this was certainly the result of a deep conviction on the part of his serious and profound personality. From 1881 to 1883 he was a member of the Institut für Geschichtsforschung (and held a scholarship in Rome after this). This was the third course to be headed by Wickhoff, and it was only here and, again from external impulses, that what had been developing within him was evoked, and he found his calling for the history of art, where Thausing was still teaching (beside Eitelberger). Aside from Wickhoff, he became the most distinguished pupil of that good man. When Wickhoff left the Österreichisches Museum, it was he who was appointed as a successor to the post in the famous department of textiles (1886), which he then headed for more than a decade (until 1897), and where he received decisive scholarly impressions. His systematic intellect - which had already revealed itself in the essays on medieval calendar illustration in the *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* Volumes 9-10 - honed by the instruction of Sickel, here came into contact with what Goethe called 'the oldest and most magnificent art', and the abundant sources of that most ancient art, and was able to develop richly. As it had been created by the founder of our school, that institution once again proved its reputation as a nursery for philologically and historically schooled research. Of course Riegl remained the constantly revising autodidact that he had been from the outset. In later years, his increasing deafness further heightened the interiority of this lonely man. His numerous essays on the textile arts which appeared in the *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Museums* from 1886 to 1897 show how seriously he took his duties. The broad range of his intellectual interests came to include the so-called 'folk art' and that of non-European cultures, making Riegl one of the most

seasoned curators of the Österreichisches Museum, then being led by Eitelberger's successor Jakob von Falke (1825-1897) from Mecklenburg - whom we already saw to have been nurtured in the circle of Josef Daniel Böhm. From the collection of textiles, Riegl came to occupy himself in greater depth with the Near Eastern carpets, particularly in the years 1890-1893, as preparation for that book of truly universal history, 'Questions of Style' (*Stilfragen*), (1893) which established his reputation and actually remained his main work. The whole man appears before us here, including his difficult struggle with expression and his painstakingly original terminology. He demonstrated universal history in the masterly way in which he was able to trace the genetic development of the acanthus ornament 'in nuce' from ancient Egypt into the period of Islam. By comparison with previous mostly dilettantish theories, he provided a fundamental illumination of the role of Hellenistic antiquity in the east both before and after the advance of Islam – revealing his unmistakable background in the strict schooling of Sickel in paleography and diplomatics. This led to Riegl's presentation of 'Late Antiquity'. The title of his book reveals the polemic intentions which Riegl, although always declaring himself to be a 'positivist', consistently felt in relation to the materialist conception of art, as this had been expressed in a truly important and influential book, 'Style in the technical and tectonic arts' (*Der Stil in den technischen und tektonischen Künsten*) by Gottfried Semper from Hamburg (1861-1863), and in 'Practical Aesthetics' (*Praktische Ästhetik*). Riegl appeared as the victorious opponent of the fundamental tenet (already present in Rumohr and Böhm!), that the (objective) 'style' is conditioned by material, technics and function, with all of its subsequent corollaries, whose characteristic late nineteenth century materialism he could oppose with an idealistic principle that anticipated the twentieth century.

He derived this from the national ethos, this 'spirit of art' which then congealed into the idea – not a concept - of the 'Kunstwollen', and ultimately survived to become famous and degraded into a slogan for journalism. It is typical for the development of Riegl that a psychological and genetic conception is used to replace a more traditional aesthetic and dogmatic one. It should not be forgotten that long before Semper and Riegl, the Hegelian Schnaase had energetically stressed the role of the intellectual principle against Rumohr's conception of style.

Riegl had completed his Habilitation at the university in 1889, was awarded the post of 'Extraordinarius' in 1895, 'Ordinarius ad personam' in 1897 and only very reluctantly' gave up his employment at the Österreichisches Museum. Conditions there became difficult for him. He felt bitter, and forsaken at losing his daily contact with the living original objects, itself a traditional and healthy feature of the Vienna School. When he told his student Max Dvořák that he felt as if he had lost his actual profession, this expressed a deep insight into his own personality, which tended to abstraction, psychology, and even speculation tipping into metaphysics. He was only to have eight more years of academic activity, yet these became the richest and most fruitful of his intellectual life, and the incredible effect he had on his audience must have provided a thorough compensation. I myself no longer experienced this

since I had already left the university in 1889, but I know this from those who did, and could also tell from my personal contact with this unusual man.

Beside Wickhoff and together with him, Riegl assumes a most eminent place in the history of the Vienna School, since he provided such a supplement to the completely different personality of Wickhoff. As long as they lived, both held to the basic historical and philological tenets of Sickel's school as the most reliable foundation for their academic convictions. Riegl had been primarily an historian, and his earliest publications are definitely in that field. Yet the urge to universal history which had drawn him to Büdinger – and at first appeared to be an aberration – turned out to be instinctively fortunate, and much more than had been the case with Wickhoff, grew continuously with his personality in an original and characteristic manner. Wickhoff who was planning a history of naturalism as his crowning achievement, and which would have been completely in keeping with his entire approach, had always remained the 'humanist' – similar to Jacob Burckhardt to whom he otherwise bore very little relation. The two fields closest to his heart had always been classical antiquity with its later Roman and even 'early Christian' variants, and the 'rinascimento' in the Italian sense. Aside from the occasional comparison, he only rarely considered the medieval and the 'Baroque' – two periods, which with a certain justification are often considered 'spiritual'. These were precisely the periods in which Riegl became a pioneer and a trend setter, characteristics emanating directly from his personality. His second main work, the *Spätromische Kunstindustrie* (inaugurated by the Österreichisches archäologisches Institut) the first volume of which appeared in 1901, was similar to the 'Vienna Genesis' ('Wiener Genesis') by Wickhoff, in that behind an insignificant title, it also concealed an entire history of 'Late Antiquity' that prelude to the 'medieval' art of western and eastern Europe – which could never be understood in isolation from it. He did not live to complete the second volume, which was to deal with the art of the migration period and lead more deeply into the 'medium aevum'. He resumed the story exactly where Wickhoff's observations about Roman art had left off. In the deepest sense of a Hegelian 'Aufhebung', more recent archaeological research has been lavishing more intensive attention on these formerly disdained and ignored periods, and in doing so, their recognition and revision owes a great deal to these predecessors. During the lifetime of Riegl, the older and more solidly and philologically based discipline maintained a more stand-offish attitude to his completely original results than it had to those of Wickhoff's 'Vienna Genesis'. Just as Riegl had overcome the technological-materialistic direction of the positivism of the preceding half century in the *Questions of Style (Stilfragen)*, so did he here surpass its historical and dogmatic tendencies – as Max Dvořák has already underscored in his obituary of Riegl, published in the *Jahrbuch der Zentralkommission* of 1906. In this he agreed with the old views of Schnaase, themselves based on Hegel and Savigny, especially regarding the first of these points (as we have said above). This presented the genetic reaction against the dogmatic conception of the development of art, addressing above all the question of 'decadence' or 'decline' – as this was seen to

have existed in the late antique, medieval (in spite of antiquarian archaeological interests) and what classicism decried as 'Baroque' – in disdainful term a similar to the 'Gothic'. It is here that the strongly psychological attitudes of Riegl inserted the idea of 'Kunstwollen' with an intellectual principle naturally appealing to these periods with a 'spiritual' bent and characterized by intensive conflicts of 'nature' and 'spirit'. This principle urges toward a definition in overly mythological terms as 'national character' or even as a very dubious 'racial' psyche, and enters in where Riegl proposes an opposition between 'optic' and 'haptic' qualities. These two concepts are derived from modern psycho-physics, along with a general shift of historical into psychological terms. It is also worth mentioning as symptomatic, that the first volumes of the 'Elements of Folk Psychology' (*Völkerpsychologie*) by Wilhelm Wundt had already appeared while Riegl was living, exactly at the turn of the century, although I am not aware whether Riegl knew of them. It was in this context that Riegl insisted on the world views of individual historical periods, with his strange point of view also applied to 'iconography', situated very differently than in the sensual-objective thinking of Wickhoff.

As a true historian, in dealing with 'late antiquity' and the early medieval period, Riegl saw himself facing the question of cultural decline, and could not accept this idea. The way in which he analyzed and illustrated the thoroughly original 'Kunstwollen' of each period is masterful and of lasting value. This remains true however much – just as with Wickhoff's 'Vienna Genesis' - his conclusions in *Die spätrömische Kunstindustrie* continue to be endlessly expanded, and in some case corrected by subsequent archaeological research. Even if every single element were to be contested, both of these have become and will probably remain classics of academic art history. They probably have this in common with Winckelmann's history of art in antiquity. It might have been inevitable that Riegl was led to another problem of cultural 'decline', namely the Baroque, which carries the traditional stigma in the meaning of the name. It is not as if the previous generations of art historians had not dealt with this period. Indeed, they had written a great amount, especially since the slackening of the 'Renaissance' revival in the final decades of the 19th century, and particularly in Vienna this 'style' was felt to be native. One should recall that in his timeless *Cicerone*, Jacob Burckhardt gave a description of the genuine Italian 'barocco' which is among the most brilliant and profound passages of the entire book, and has gained renewed importance in our own time. His attitude remained negative, and this might have been inevitable from the author who inculcated his contemporaries with the name and concept of the Renaissance. Traces of his attitude are of course still to be found in his pupil and successor Heinrich Wölfflin as well as in the first systematic survey of baroque architecture by Cornelius Gurlitt, which after all presents a continuation of the history of architecture written by Kugler and Burckhardt. Both of these books were known to Riegl (that of Wölfflin in its earlier inchoate version). Burckhardt's masterful *Erinnerungen aus Rubens* was only published posthumously in 1897, when Riegl had already immersed himself in the material with his first lectures about baroque art

(1894-1895). It is well known that the great Swiss historian assumed a completely different point of view in dealing with the great individual artist of the northern Baroque, that he was not interested in the artistic language of a period, but in a profound individual art historical problem.

It is not completely irrelevant that when Riegl turned to Baroque art, he was dealing with something of a native local Austrian subject. Here in the capital and residence of Vienna, the Italian Baroque (in the broadest sense and not merely in the visual arts) did in fact become a great force since the Counter-Reformation, continuing almost seamlessly from its most prosperous years of the medieval 'Romanesque-Gothic'. Eager local historians such as Kábdebo had studied the local 'Baroque' including Raphael Donner, the pupil of Giuliani. Above all, one must however mention Albert Ilg (born 1847, † 1896 as director of the former 'Ambras Collection') a genuinely gifted if undisciplined intellect. He was a pupil of Eitelberger, who also employed him at his museum from 1871, and associated with him particularly in editing the 'Quellenschriften'. Already in 1880, he published a humorously written short polemic *The Future of the Baroque Style* Vienna: Manz 1880, under the pseudonym Bernini the Younger. Here as in other publications, he passionately endorsed the emerging Neo-Baroque, which in his strange and not always unmotivated character as quintessential Austrian ('Stockösterreicher'), he described as the Austrian 'national style'. It is a subject that does not ring at all gracefully in our ears these days, and for so interesting and paradoxical an author as Hermann Bahr (another Upper Austrian like both Wickhoff and Riegl!), it still today constitutes that shibboleth of the 'Austrian type'. The collection of sources about the biography of Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach (and it is no more than that) was not published until 1895, just shortly before he died.

Study of the Austrian Baroque has remained a serious matter for our Vienna School down to our own time. Pupils of Wickhoff, Riegl, Dvořák, as well as my own, have produced valuable studies to illuminate its history in all aspects, with Hans and Erica Tietze deserving special mention. This research was only possible in conjunction with that of the Italian and specifically Roman Baroque, that place where the style actually originated - as Ilg completely omitted to consider. We have already mentioned the studies of documents and written sources made by Wolfgang Kallab and Oskar Pollak as scholars in residence at the Istituto Austriaco. Finishing touches are just now being put to the exemplary edition of the Lives by Passeri, by Jakob Hess, in Munich, who might be considered an 'affiliate' of our Institute.

All of this is another subject and undoubtedly owes something akin to intellectual paternity to Riegl. He held grand lectures and seminars three times on the subject of the Roman Baroque, 1894-1895, 1898-1899, 1901-1902, and made an indelible impression on his audience. It was a typically tragic delay in the sad life of Riegl that this material could only be published posthumously, necessarily imperfect and incomplete by his true friends Artur Burda, librarian of the Kunsthistorisches Museum for many years, and Oskar Pollak - first 'The Origins of Baroque Art in Rome' (*Die Entstehung der Barockkunst in Rom*) Vienna 1907 and 'The Life of Gian

Lorenzo Bernini by Filippo Baldinucci' (*Filippo Baldinuccis Vita des Gian Lorenzo Bernini*) Vienna 1912. In 1902, Riegl had himself published his large study of 'Dutch Group Portraiture' in our Jahrbuch ('Das holländische Gruppenporträt', *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 1902, pp. reprinted, Vienna: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei 1931) which reveals his scholarly character more clearly than any other publication. With it, his expansive 'universal historical' intellect turned to the northern European 'Baroque' – a term that is of course not apt.

The continuity among these studies seems clear. From the 'Baroque' of late antiquity - a term that has occurred more than once in recent archaeological publications such as those of A. von Salis - Riegl followed a genetic reversal to its more recent manifestation, which alone deserves the name. Even for so secluded an individual as Riegl, this also was related to his experience of the present. As much as he disliked the art of his own time, as Dvořák has testified, he could discover meaning and insight when the context became that of the universal historian, as he then also did as the official concerned with historical preservation of monuments. I recall an interesting conversation during the final year of his life in which I spoke to him about a performance in Vienna in 1904 of the *Sinfonia domestica* by Richard Strauß, who was just then rising to fame as a composer. Although this sort of art did not appeal to him, I vividly recall his interest in the new element in this music of the 'natural sound' ('Naturlaut'), which he somehow related to his historical theories. His approach as an author of speculative history made him something of a true 'reversed prophet' of that artistic current of 'Expressionism' which he himself lived to see emerge in its very beginnings. This again stood in the starkest contrast to Wickhoff who was based in the final manifestation of positivism, impressionism, who found his artistic experience here, and projected into the 'Vienna Genesis'. In the case of Riegl, the motion occurred in reverse. We can believe Dvořák when he said that Riegl viewed art according to his 'intellectual conclusions' rather than any given preferences. This remark by his pupil reveals itself again in our context, and illuminates his character quite deeply: 'in his view, the best art historian would be the one with no personal 'taste'.

We have already mentioned that Riegl differed completely from Wickhoff by his devotion to speculation. Even if this was not presented to him in a very appealing form by the Herbartianism of his early university training, one nonetheless has the feeling that he continued to be animated by this very fine fluid of strict formalism from the last grand system of German classical philosophy. As an isolated man, he constructed his very own type of psychology to accommodate his historical system, and accompanied this with a completely original terminology. The concept of 'attentiveness' ('Aufmerksamkeit') which he uses so extensively in the 'Dutch Group Portrait' seems to belong to the sphere of his opposition optical – tactical (later replaced with the word 'haptic') derived from the physiology of perception and employed in an unprecedented way.

This sensitive point, as well as the entire work of so unusual a mind as Riegl, whose negative aspects are also having a fruitful and fostering effect, must be seen

in a very particular way. By the remorseless death which destroyed his personality, Riegl was never able to bring his profound thoughts to a proper conclusion, and the danger exists, and it has already occurred, that they can disappear behind a 'system' and become 'mythological'. In spite of complete consciousness of the situation, and great care, one of my most gifted pupils, Hans Sedlmayr, has not been completely able to escape this in an exposition of the 'Quintessenz der Lehren Riegls'. Riegl's historical construct does in fact include an element of Neo-Vitalism. The 'development of art' is presented as emanating from a 'collective popular character' ('Volksgeist') in the form a personification or allegory of a concept, something like an hypostasized organism, governed by an internal necessity. In a similar way to the 'history of sight', expressed along lines kept closer to the individual artistic object by Heinrich Wölfflin, the history of art presents itself as a history of problems. Today, we believe to recognize that this sort of thing is possible within the logical sphere of thoughts (as shown brilliantly in Windelband, *History of Philosophy*), but not, or only very conditionally, within that of aesthetics. This would annihilate the individual and the personal element, which provides the very basis of the discipline, just as the physicist or chemist has no need for the individual object, which is merely an exponent of the 'laws' which they study.

From his interest in historical periods in which the anonymous – not biographically anonymous - aspect of art was particularly strong, it is again no coincidence that Riegl provides a contrast and a complement to Wickhoff. In so characteristic an essay by Riegl as 'The Dutch Group Portrait', it is striking how the original, highly wrought 'artistic will' recedes behind the 'Kunstwollen' in itself. The 'stylistic document' always provides the center of attention, and always presents itself in an abstract, conceptual setting, so that the visual and reflective impression, the aesthetic, is violated by the logical aspect. The objectification of judgment - which, contrary to past and some present opinion, is not universally subjective and hedonistic in the aesthetic field - appears here as an ominous downside. The brilliant accomplishment of Riegl belongs to an area completely other than the pure and genuine history of art *κατ' ἐξοχήν*, as the only place where the aesthetic vantage point is possible, and this has again become possible since the necessary and justified reaction of positivism against the old aestheticism has been overcome. One can and must mention the great names of Benedetto Croce and Karl Voßler. We are dealing here with the linguistic history also of the visual arts, which stands, aware of its abstract nature, on an equal footing beside the history of art in the narrower sense, as this has already been recognized in the field of poetry (and in music which remains inseparable from it).

The idea of 'decadence' had actually driven Riegl to a fruitful revision of its older dogmatic conceptions, and it is now becoming clear that in the field of pure stylistic history, dealing with the original creative and effective individual, he played another very different role than within the objectified history of style (or linguistic history of style). This was already realized by Ernst Heidrich, who contributed one of the most searching reviews of Riegl's method, and whose early death on the

western front in 1914 was one of the greatest losses to our discipline. The recent book by [Benedetto] Croce about the period of the Baroque (1929), although limited to the subject of Italian poetry, social and ethical life of the time, and consciously omitting the visual arts, is nonetheless of great importance for us since he dealt with the idea of 'decadence' from an autonomous art historical point of view.

As Heidrich has demonstrated so excellently, the relation of Riegl to Wickhoff can be compared 'typologically' to that between Schnaase and Burckhardt (or even by extension to their predecessors Hotho and Kugler). The intellectual similarity has also been stressed by one of the most original archaeologists currently working, Guido Kaschnitz von Weinberg, now teaching in Königsberg, but with his origins in Austria is closely familiar with the 'Vienna School'. In spite of his thorough criticisms in a review of the new edition of *Die spätrömische Kunstindustrie* (*Gnomon*, Volume 5, 1929), he stresses the brilliant achievement and nearly tragic intellectual struggle of this incomplete work, that (in spite of its undeniable mistakes of detail) has not been seen since Hegel's thoughts about history, and which can only be understood in terms of the historical situation of Riegl between the impressionist-positivist thought of the 19th, and the expressionist-idealist thought of the 20th century.

Shortly before his early death, Riegl once again revealed his unique character. A few years before his death, Riegl agreed to assume the great task of completely reorganizing our old and prestigious Zentralkommission after the death of the Freiherr von Helfert. In spite of the fact that he was himself already quite ill and aware of his condition, I clearly recall urging him to accept the responsibility of this office. I believe that my arguments were not ineffective, for it was quite clear to me that in spite of his great success, he felt his academic activity to be secondary, and that his restless nature craved an occupation closer to that of the museum and the return to the living aesthetic objects - which it had so disappointed him to leave those years ago. In this way he found himself back in the ambient which had played such an important part far beyond the borders of the old Austria in the times of Heider and Eitelberger at the beginning of the Vienna School. This became a true homecoming, and Riegl was able to leave an important inheritance to his pupils and their own pupils, above all [Max] Dvořák and [Dagobert] Frey. His proposals for the legal reorganization of the commission for historical monuments were not realized. The law for the protection of monuments as he had written it was published posthumously in the *Neue Freie Presse* in Vienna on 27 February 1905. From the high horse of his philosophical and historical thoughts, he was only able to see the promised land from a distance, for he only had a few more years to live, and then died in 1905. It is difficult to guess if this lofty intuition would have been possible to completely realize. His lecture with the title *Der moderne Denkmalkultus Sein Wesen Seine Entstehung*, 1903 provided an introduction, and shows all of the typical qualities of his latest work. From a very high vantage point, he again made the attempt to identify the values that had emerged from historical preservation of monuments through the centuries and clarify them in terms of the history of

philosophy. It should be noted that here again, as in all of Riegl's work, there are typically Austrian characteristics. With the influence of Karl Menger (professor at the university of Vienna since 1873, † 1921, in the same year as [Max] Dvořák), the Austrian school of economics arose, which either directly or indirectly related to the theory of value expounded by the followers of Herbart. These theories have been pursued and played a great role down to the present day among the 'Graz school' of [Alexius] Meinong and in that of [Christian von] Ehrenfels in Prague – where Zimmermann and Hanslick had begun. In this connection, one should record that a pupil of Wickhoff, Robert Eisler, whom we have already once mentioned, published a book of *Studies on the Theory of Value*. Leipzig 1902, still a few years before the death of Riegl, in which he delineated certain principles of aesthetic judgment, although with only partial success.

Max Dvořák

[Franz] Wickhoff was able to lead the Vienna School for the lustrum from the death of Riegl in 1905 until the Spring of 1909. He was assisted by his second oldest and by one of his younger students. I myself had completed the Habilitation in 1892, and then there was his particular friend Max Dvořák, who had been his Assistant since 1897 and completed the Habilitation in 1902. With the death of Riegl, Dvořák was given the post of 'Extraordinarius', while I had the title of 'Titular-Ordinarius' with the appointment to lecture - my independent chair, as I liked to call it, in lectures and seminars held in the museum. My specialization lay in my old place of employment – among the 'Sculpture and Applied Arts' ('Sammlungen für Plastik und Kunstgewerbe') as I changed the title to help it sound less cumbersome - at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, where I had become director at the turn of the century. In these circumstances, I was happy to increasingly leave the more strictly academic duties of dissertations, examinations, conferences etc to my esteemed younger colleague who worked closely together with Wickhoff. I only rarely attended the meetings of the college ('Kollegium'). I only mention such trivia since it explains some of the later developments.

When in the Spring of 1909, the kiss of death on his bonny afflicted forehead prevented Wickhoff in returning from Venice, the city of his heart, a critical period began for our Vienna School. Although the ad hoc committee had voted in the majority (9 to 2) for me in the first place and Dvořák as the second choice, this was done with the condition that changes might be made to the art historical curriculum after the Wickhoff chair was again filled. The minority had voted in the first instance for Josef Strzygowski - who had been teaching as 'Ordinarius' in Graz since 1892 - as the successor to Wickhoff, with the reverse condition of arranging changes in the curriculum to accommodate the needs of the Österreichisches Institut (as seat of the 'Vienna School'). A strange incident occurred at the meeting of the faculty on 3 July 1909 which reversed the majority vote, although only by a very narrow margin and following a violent and unusually long debate. This deflection did not occur by the

specialists in related subjects in the philosophical and historical subjects, but primarily by the natural scientists who had to some degree certainly been misinformed. From the very beginning, I was completely happy to turn down the appointment, not merely because I felt the far younger Dvořák to be much more capable, but also because I was quite content in my old spot in the museum surrounded by a circle of colleagues and friends - and that my 'free' chair perfectly fulfilled my desires for academic activity as it stood. I had already consciously decided to avoid the traditional university career in 1903, when in spite of the great honor of being elected unanimously as the first choice, I had without negotiation refused the appointment to the professorial chair vacated by Alwin Schultz in Prague. I thus requested my colleague from the museum and university, Robert von Schneider - himself to follow our mutual friend Wickhoff to the grave that fall - to convey my written waiver to the faculty. In the meeting of 7 July 1909, a compromise was reached and Dvořák was appointed as 'Ordinarius' in the history of art beside Strzygowski. After another long debate, this arrangement was accepted and confirmed by the ministry. Since this time, there have been two chairs in two separate departments of the history of art (called the I. and the 'II. Kunsthistorische Institut' only since my time and at my suggestion). The 'second' is historically in fact the first, and due to the 'personal union' with the Institut für Geschichtsforschung, it is the traditional seat of the 'Vienna School', and continues its unbroken tradition. Since the other chair was created for Strzygowski to meet his personal goals and purposes, and these have nothing in common with the Vienna School, indeed often contradict them, it can be completely omitted from our historical sketch. It was the older rather than the newly created department which Sickel in his reforms had given the role of training professionals for the museums and commission for the preservation of monuments. Now, eighty years later, it has maintained this function. The great majority of museum curators of old and new Austria, even in what are now 'foreign' countries, were trained in this school, especially those who also completed the courses at the Institut für Geschichtsforschung as regular and visiting members, and the by no means simple 'National Examination' ('Staatsprüfung').

Max Dvořák (born 1874 in Raudnitz on the Elbe [Rudnice nad Labem] and died 1921) did not assume his position in simple circumstances, and he was verily not spared life's difficulties. Of the dozen years he was still to be granted of academic activity, more than half were taken up by the grievous war years and the yet more severe post-war years. What he was able to achieve in this time is worthy of admiration.

As a child of the Bohemian soil, Dvořák appeared to us a close neighbor, but of different descent. This also did not simplify matters for him in the beginning. It is a sign of the success of our historical school that this young Czech was so fascinated and won over, that he became immersed and joined without reservations, remaining true and appreciative even beyond the collapse of the old monarchy which drew rigid boundary walls between his old and his new homes. In spite of the fact that he never denied his origins, and that a fair part of his publications were conditioned by

this affiliation, he nonetheless remained beholden to his true intellectual home, and spent even the final years of his life as an official in the new Austria uprightly and stoutly defending and preserving the monuments in this period when the artistic patrimony was exposed to decay and capriciousness. His relation to German scholarship – where he was involved in [Wilhelm von] Bode's foundation of the 'Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft' - was so close that in 1920, shortly before his death, he was honored with the offer of the chair in art history at the newly founded University of Cologne. From the fact that he did not accept this, one can see his devotion to Vienna. He was also shown gratitude by the Austrian Academy of Sciences when they elected him as one of their regular members, although he only lived a few months in that capacity.

Like Riegl, whom he later followed so closely, Dvořák also began as an historian (at first at the Czech speaking University of Prague) while his doctorate was also in this field. He had been well prepared for this by the atmosphere of his father's house – his father was archivist for Prince Lobkowitz. When he arrived in Vienna as a very young man and enrolled in the Institut für Geschichtsforschung, that nursery for austere German historical culture covering the entire old monarchy, he discovered his teacher and friend, who became like a second father, as well as his family and home, alas, disrupted by the early death of his wife. He had become familiar with death at an early age, when a sister was torn away as a beautiful girl in the prime of life and he himself only escaped the same by a sliver, as if by a miracle. This must have contributed to his appearance of maturity and solidity at a young age. I recall his handsome serious youthful figure as if I had just seen him yesterday.

Although he no longer studied personally under [Theodor von] Sickel, he was trained entirely in the same spirit. He attended the course at the Institut für Geschichtsforschung in 1895-1897. His earliest publication was based on the strict examination of documents used in his dissertation about a subject from his native area – the sources for Cosmas Pragensis. This became his farewell tariff to the rigorous school he had gone through, for under the influence of Wickhoff and Riegl he had turned to art history of the early modern period. While the first of the two became such a close friend, there can be no doubt that the latter had an undeniable similarity of character and provided the greater model for his scholarship. Both were devoted to research, true historians by nature and training, more intellectual than descriptive, as Dvořák himself once said of Riegl (and we have already ourselves noted). In this way he became his successor in more than a merely external sense, at the 'Institut für Denkmalpflege' [Bundesdenkmalamt] as Riegl had reorganized it. It was in the spirit of Riegl that Dvořák not merely continued its publications such as the *Jahrbuch für Denkmalpflege*, but also founded the 'Österreichische Kunsttopographie' (1906), a project whose contours had become discernable in the prehistory of the Vienna School (as we have already mentioned). Nothing stood in the way of his continuing Wickhoff's teaching activity as a member of the Institut für Geschichtsforschung, continuing the *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen* as well as the great publication of the catalogue of illuminated manuscripts in Austria, but then also his

own collaboration with the 'Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft' and its 'Monumenta' which must have appeared natural in comparison to the old and prestigious series of the 'Monumenta Germaniae'. In all of his work, he was assisted by an excellent group of pupils, of which I single out only Karl Maria Swoboda, especially since he served as his Assistant and mine, guiding the department through the difficult period of transition after the death of Dvořák. For me, it was a great source of satisfaction to sponsor the Habilitation of this young scholar who also had great gifts as a teacher. In a certain sense, Dvořák seemed to combine qualities of both Wickhoff and Riegl, but for his original and independent spirit, whose development grew more to resemble Riegl in the final years.

Seen in purely bibliographical terms, Dvořák's work as a scholar seems to recall Wickhoff in not being as voluminous. In spite of certain restraints which this might have caused, it is so closely interwoven with his activities as a teacher and administrator of the 'Denkmalamt' as to be indistinguishable. This is apparent when reviewing the unusual amount which he achieved as administrator, editor, reviewer, both in small and large formats. The sum of all of this is so great that one must marvel at the tenacity of a person who was never completely healthy and who died prematurely. The lectures which he very carefully wrote and prepared might have left a stronger impression on their audience than those of Riegl. In any case they enthralled his listeners in a way which these people still describe today. This can account for the fact that two of the most devoted of their number, Karl Maria Swoboda and Johannes Wilde, were able to reap such a rich harvest in the posthumous publication of these lectures - filling five volumes of the collected edition (Munich: Piper, since 1924). To summarize the entire diversity of his production seems impractical at this spot. He only left us less than a decade ago and seems too close to discuss 'historically'. In the case of Dvořák (indeed as with Riegl), it seems natural to recall the words spoken by Grillparzer at the grave of Schubert: death has here taken a rich possession, but perhaps yet more in beautiful promise. The life of a person itself creates its fate, and to the historian it is as pointless to speculate as to what might have been as it would be to fathom a deeper 'metaphysical' significance. We can however refer to an appraisal of Dvořák in historiographical terms by a devoted pupil, Dagobert Frey, 'Dvořák's Stellung in der Kunstgeschichte', *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, Volume 1, 1923, pp. 1-21 (himself the successor of his mentor at the Bundesdenkmalamt until his recent appointment at the university of Breslau). Beside this there is also the - for all its brevity - beautiful and sincere obituary by another faithful student and Wickhoff's final Assistant, now working in Weimar and Jena, Wilhelm Köhler - in the *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, Volume 39. A reflection of the deep impression of ethos made by Dvořák's lectures has been emphatically recorded by another enthusiastic student, Otto Benesch, 'Max Dvořák Ein Versuch zur Geschichte der historischen Geisteswissenschaften', *Repertorium für Kunstwissenschaft*, Volume 44, 1924, pp. 159-197.

At the beginning of his career, Dvořák's publications stood in the sign of Sickel and Wickhoff. From his first article about Byzantine influence on Italian miniature painting (which appeared in the *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Gesichtsforschung* of 1901 as did the aforementioned study in diplomatics), the development led first to a subject from his native region, the internationally influential Bohemian art during the reign of the Luxemburg kings and the essay about the illuminations of Johan von Neumarkt, (*Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 1901), concealing a broad universal topic behind a humble title, a few years later expounded in a seasoned way with 'Rätsel der Kunst der Brüder Van Eyck' (*Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* 1904), which might be said to have taken the Morelli method to its most mature and profound level. The culmination of his work, as published during his lifetime, came with his final published essay 'Idealismus und Naturalismus in der gotischen Skulptur und Malerei' significantly published in the *Historische Zeitschrift* 1918. This thin volume, as it was later reprinted, rightly caused a certain sensation and placed its author among the foremost art historians in the German language. The reason was that this brought out his central characteristic, the history of art as intellectual history ('Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte'), turning the history of art into the history of ideas. It was correct of the aforementioned pious editors of one of his posthumously published collections of essays to give it the title *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*. It reflects the shift that occurred in German intellectual life around 1900 on the basis of the distinctions between the humanities and the natural sciences as they were drawn by [Heinrich] Rickert and [Wilhelm] Dilthey. The latter was a particular influence on Dvořák, and Frey was correct to stress that this influence was already apparent in 'Les Aliscans', the contribution which he made to the Festschrift for Wickhoff in 1903. The art historical problems as they were laid out by Riegl are here developed in an idiosyncratic way. After he had already vaguely pondered the 'Medieval' and 'Renaissance' periods in his earlier writings, as a mature scholar he now followed the thinking of Riegl and with a study of the emerging Baroque from Italian 'Mannerism'. This is the point at which the intellectual affinity between the two become particularly apparent. Here again, the present played a part, the question of their art in relation to their 'world view'. Like Riegl before him, Dvořák also showed little interest in the art of his own time. Like his predecessor, he also projected the past onto the present, drawing 'intellectual' conclusions, while Wickhoff by contrast traversed the sensual view of the Impressionism of his youth ('sinnlich anschauend'), and himself said that this experience opened his eyes to the related phases in ancient art.

The most illuminating evidence of this is in the introduction which Dvořák wrote for a series of lithographs by his friend the Austrian artist Oskar Kokoschka, his only publication dealing with modern art. The comparison between the famous haystacks by [Claude] Monet and the variations on the head of a young woman by the contemporary artist, which he keenly contrasts as examples of Impressionism and Expressionism, immediately becomes a problem of 'intellectual history'

(‘geistesgeschichtliches Problem’) for him, the overcoming of pure observation by the arrival at a ‘world view’ (‘die weltanschauliche’). This is the attitude that came to the fore in Dvořák’s final writings. It is the ‘double track’ (‘Zweigeleisigkeit’) that has been attributed to the great work of [Karl] Schnaase, a parallel movement of stylistic history and cultural history, that is dissolved into a synthesis, fusing those elements requiring an aesthetic reading with those of a logical historical nature. One is reminded of a statement that Wickhoff made about his beloved and revered pupil, as once recalled by Wilhelm Köhler: ‘it is a shame that Dvořák did not become a cultural historian instead of an art historian’, which reveals as much about Wickhoff as it does of Dvořák. The question arises whether the history of art and its language does not run the risk of being mediatized. In fact, [Guido] Kaschnitz-Weinberg has already made this point clearly and forcefully in his aforementioned review of Riegl. The work of art is placed in the opposite spot from that of those strict formalists who would degrade it to a pure document of style and nothing else, allowing it to appear abstractly objectified, but still closer to its primal phenomenon, its creation. The danger of replacing aestheticism with a logicism (or in the case of Riegl a psychologism) and pressed into service of a priori formulations of theories of the world, the autonomous character of the discipline would be lost on the basis of a very insecure interpretation of written sources. This presents itself at more than one spot in his essay about medieval idealism and naturalism. An intellect such as his was able to avoid the problem, but most recently, weaker and less critical types have succumbed to it more than once.

These remarks are intended to do no more than to stress in passing the unavoidable limits that are also set for those with the greatest gifts. We allude to this since, the question has become more ‘pertinent’ today than ever, namely those essential questions that Riegl had already occasionally brushed - the ‘inner linguistic form’, the ‘structure’ of the art work within its historical context. With a certain youthful impetuosity, one of my most original students, Hans Sedlmayr, whom I have already mentioned, has sought to establish a connection to the ‘Gestalt Psychology’ that has again flourished in Austria, particularly developed by [Christian von] Ehrenfels. The younger generation has again begun to show an urge toward psychology similar to that felt by Riegl. I must mention my own dear ‘primal student’ (‘Urschüler’) Ernst Kris, whose most recent research (on [Franz Xaver] Messerschmidt, the artist anecdotes etc.) steers precisely in this direction, but with a very remarkable cautiousness. One thing can be stated with certainty – in spite of the considerations we have just mentioned, nothing can diminish the significance of Max Dvořák as a scholar. They simply cast his qualities in a clearer light.

Incipit Auctor

When Dvořák was torn from us so suddenly in 1921, at the age of only 47 – exactly that of Riegl - the Vienna School seemed to be faced with a crisis more ominous even than that in 1909 after the death of Wickhoff, and threatening even its very

existence. With the vacancy left by Wickhoff, Dvořák has been the obvious choice. As we have already said, I myself had long ago decided against the strictly academic life, and never thought that I would again be faced with the question, and least of all that an older person might be called to succeed the younger. To the very end of his days, Dvořák had always identified himself to me as a 'grateful student', which I of course took to be more of a polite turn of phrase on the part of that fine person than a felicitous description of the actual situation. Friends and opponents will probably confirm uniformly that when the commission of the faculty approached me, I had not previously expressed any interest whatsoever in assuming the chair. The conditions at my old position at the museum (and this was a true museum in the traditional sense, and more congenial to me than the more recent arrangements with so much broader goals) had completely changed since the collapse of the monarchy and the administration by the state. One can understand that I was very happy there, even if the days of my professional career were certainly drawing to a close. I was after all not a natural fit in the new system, and in the further aggravated economic situation with such greater pressures, did not wish to diminish my younger and more energetic colleagues and friends from their hour in the sun. There is no need to reiterate that the divorce from the daily contact with the world of the 'objects' appeared to me painful and even dangerous, as to Riegl before me. My 'free' professorship completely satisfied my modest ambitions, I had no desire for additional academic duties. This was especially true since my 'asocial', not very expansive, and somewhat skeptical nature had long made me an 'outsider' in the faculty, and I did not feel any particular calling as a teacher, and not at all the 'head of a school' ('Schuloberhaupt'). To be honest, the peculiar situation of our subject at the university was not appealing. For some time already, I had imagined myself retiring into a comfortable scholarly existence, which even in these harsh times I felt to have earned after thirty years of public service. Just at that point, the possibility also presented itself of ending my days on the Italian soil, which certain family traditions and part of my ancestry had led me to regard as my second home. It was not pointless, but with an ambivalence only apparent to my closest friends, when a few years before the war I dedicated my large edition of the *Commentarii* of [Lorenzo] Ghiberti to the 'Terra madre Italia'. It should therefore not appear completely inexplicable that I attempted two other resolutions of the university appointment without involving myself. For one, I suggested Wilhelm Pinder, then teaching in Leipzig and admired by both Dvořák and me. When Pinder ultimately declined after initially accepting, I suggested the excellent Wilhelm Köhler, who had been a product of our own tutelage, long director of the museum in Weimar and then completing his Habilitation at the university in Jena. As long as I could still be of use, I imagined a forbearable future and a fruitful period for our Vienna School with him in the post of an 'Extraordinarius' possibly my successor. When this arrangement was vetoed by the ministry, it was without a light heart that I assumed the chair and responsibility for the Institut, combined in the traditional 'personal union' with the post within the Institut für Geschichtsforschung out of a soldierly

duty and gratitude to the nursery where I had been trained. Whether I have been able, or to what extent, to steer perforce the unmanned ship, is a judgment that must be left to others and a later generation. It is unbecoming to me to make statements about my own scholarship. I can only allude in passing to an essay, not about my 'empirical' biography but rather my inner thoughts which addressed the period before assuming the university chair and was intended for the edification of my pupils, which I entitled 'Commentary on my Life' ('Lebenskommentar') in memory of my old friend Ghiberti. It was published in *Kunstwissenschaft der Gegenwart in Selbstdarstellungen*, edited by Johannes Jahn, Leipzig: Meiner Verlag 1924. An affectionate list of my publications was compiled by my faithful student and former second Assistant, Hans R. Hahnloser in the Festschrift that a small circle of close friends and pupils presented on my 60th birthday, edited by Arpad Weixlgärtner and Leo Planiscig, in Vienna by the Amalthea Verlag 1926.

It does however behove me to account for the scope and goals of what has in the mean time become my twelve year activity in the so-called 'II. Kunsthistorisches Institut' [the '2nd Department of the History of Art'], the seat of the 'Vienna School'. It soon became clear – and this was a reason for my initial rejection of the appointment - that there could be no fruitful cooperation with the department founded in 1910, since I do not possess the accommodating personality of Dvořák and compromises have always been an abomination to me. I was more inclined to relinquish my position than to become involved in this, and am grateful that the separation of the two could be achieved as smoothly as it in fact occurred: from that time, both departments have gone their own way. Far be it from me to claim that this is an ideal situation in which two classes of art historians are being trained totally differently, and I have been completely conscious of this. I could not burden my students with two completely divergent methods, each negating the other, ultimately causing more confusion than clarification or possibly leading them to a mechanical sort of 'memorization'. This division was not the result of mutual personal incompatibility as one might presume, but was instead purely objective - although not such that it could be productive or even a condition for illuminating problems in terms of differences of approach and method. It was more the result of a contradiction in scholarly creed, and not of a total opposition between an orthodoxy and heterodoxy defying any dialectical resolution, more the result of two completely irremediably differing languages and conceptions of those two fundamental pylons of the humanities - philosophical and historical knowledge in their reciprocity. This is not the place to do so, and it would be pointless to enter into criticism or polemics. It is sufficient to make note of the facts as they exist. As a result of this, it was natural that the 'Ordinarius' of the closest related field should stand in as second reader and in conducting intermediate and doctoral examinations – in this case my venerable friend and colleague Emil Reisch from classical archaeology, and I remain most grateful to him. This had the result that my students were forced to study that subject more closely than otherwise. This extended beyond the mere formal aspect into the substance, accorded with the tradition dating from Böhm and Eitelberger,

and one need not belabor the point that it was lent further importance by the work of Wickhoff and Riegl as well. This had the effect of restoring the relationship as it had existed before the turn of the century. When I myself completed my doctorate, the committee for the examinations consisted of Wickhoff, Benndorf and Sickel, the triumvirate of ancient, modern art, and the historical auxiliary sciences, a model that has always seemed ideal to me, and presumably to all historians. We were lacking only one final important element, the strict method of all historical research that had traditionally been so close to us in the school of Sickel. In the two year curriculum of the Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung there had always been at least one art historian subsidized with a scholarship (with the possibility of applying this to the institute in Rome) and administrator of the so-called 'Lehrapparat' who had completed his three year 'Tirocinium' (including the introductory course' ['Vorbereitungskurs']), to which they could only be admitted after completing the fourth semester at the university and successfully passed the admission examination. It was natural that the relations between the two departments should have grown looser in the years since the (then unique) Kunsthistorisches Institut first gained its autonomy under Wickhoff, and in spite of the fact, which we have frequently noted, that the two functions were always fulfilled by the same person. One might say that there were art historians of the first and of the second grade, those having passed the 'National Examination of the Department' ('Instituts-Staatsprüfung') that entitles them to employment in museums and libraries, and the others with a simple doctorate, and that this might have led to an atmosphere of competition to the detriment of the sustaining institution. On the other hand, the group of art historians had grown much larger in comparison to the small numbers of the earlier generations, and it was no longer possible for all of these to complete the curriculum of the Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, even as 'außerordentlich'. For this reason and to eliminate those without the necessary prerequisites, I then decided to introduce a two year introductory curriculum that would teach the theory and practice of the most important 'auxiliary sciences', Latin palaeography and diplomatics of at least the imperial documents, and which would then be examined orally. Only when they have passed this do I accept them as regular members of my department. It is a system that I believe to have been successful. I am grateful to my esteemed colleague Hans Hirsch, then the director of the Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, for adding the heavy burden of these classes to his other responsibilities, and whose careful and inspiring teaching has provided a great asset to my students. I only hope that I have been able to offer something of equal value to the historians of the Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung, whose curriculum has included the history of art since the period of Sickel, and who have always remained close to our department – one has but to recall Riegl and Dvořák. In this, I have also benefited greatly from the collaboration of my seasoned associate and colleague, Professor Karl Maria Swoboda, an excellent teacher, for whom I have recently been able to create a chair for the study of Austrian art on the conviction that not merely historians, but also

beginning art historians can gain the best introduction from lectures and seminars about monuments available to be seen in the original and locally. This has prepared my students to deal fastidiously with historical sources and it has maintained the traditional system of examinations, as we have discussed it above - as far as has been possible. I also by no means refrain from urging my students to pursue the modern languages, especially the important Romance languages, and this too has borne fruit. One can also imagine that I encourage a serious study of philosophy, in which they are already obliged to pass the 'secondary oral examination' ('Nebenrigorosum'). Here there has also been fortunate progress from the time when I was a student. It is no longer a matter of simply 'learning' formalities, but the present exponents take their subject seriously.

In the more than four decades that I have now been teaching, I have always emphasized lectures and seminars around the artistic objects, primarily those of the former 'Hofmuseum', where I could of course move more freely as a member of the staff. Since I am of the opinion that seminar activity provides the core of academic instruction, and encourages contact between the teacher and student, I have for a good dozen years now continued that well known tradition inherent in the Vienna School from the days of Böhm-Eitelberger through Thausing and Wickhoff. Direct autopsy proves its importance here once again. It is well known that judgments based on photographs and now also zincographs, have led to some of the most grievous mistakes - especially of sculpture (on which I have concentrated since it can often assume the role of a Cinderella in relation to its more widely available sister). Some years ago now, Konrad Lange made a humorous reference to 'autotypitis' ['Die Autotypitis Eine moderne Illustrationskrankheit', *Der Grenzboten*, 59, 17, 1900]. This sort of academic studies within the museum gain particular value in the hands of such excellent connoisseurs as Ludwig von Baldass, a fact which I stressed during his 'Habilitation'. I am further grateful to my esteemed colleague Emanuel Löwy that my students have also been able to train their eyes practically in the ancient collection. I have welcomed and encouraged a continuation of this practice by the current director of the ancient collection, Fritz Eichler. This is then supported by my own lectures at the university using a splendid episcopes that has been funded in our department by personal friends, and which provides an introduction to the secondary, written sources and the questions surrounding them. This again is an old local tradition of our school, dating from Eitelberger. It is only natural that the study of Giorgio Vasari's writings should continue to stand at the center of this study, since Vasari remains the exemplary figure on this subject, with Italian art theory and historiography providing the greatest achievement in this field and a model for the rest of Europe. In spite of this, it has still not received the attention that my long departed colleague Wolfgang Kallab called for, including a recognition of some of the pernicious effects Vasari has had in preventing an objective history of art in an equal standing to the other disciplines. This is hardly the be all and end all of these exercises, as some have occasionally objected. As with the sessions held in the museum, my students and I have in fact have covered the entire broad field from

late antiquity (such as the *Passio IV Coronatorum* and 'Heraclius') into the Baroque, not merely in Italy, but also the northern European, Germanic and French areas. Some of these seminars, to which my Assistant Hans R. Hahnloser participates with separate introductory exercises, include an introduction to the viewing of art, including modern art as well as papers read by more advanced students about important subjects for the general history of art, and by no means limited to European subjects. As in the museum, in this we have not shunned to look into neighboring subjects of archaeology, and even Islam, which is so important for the Christian medieval period. These exercises have provided the impulse for a considerable number of dissertations, as they should, although I agree with Wickhoff and have reiterated, that I do not believe that a dissertation topic should be assigned as in a grade school, because the independent and unimpeded choice of the topic already involves a certain proof of the necessary level of education. These topics must involve actual and not merely sham questions ('Scheinprobleme'), and cannot be limited to simple preliminary collections of material either. If there are some who might be led by this to classify me as a 'philologist', then I would be content, but not in the condescending sense in which the term is often used. I did in fact begin as a student of ancient literature, and it was through classical archaeology under the tutelage of [Otto] Benndorf and W. Klein that I arrived at the history of art. My early experience as a young museum curator in the old and venerable 'Münz- und Antikenkabinett' above which the name of Eckel still glowed, certainly did me no harm as an 'art historian'. I have always understood 'philology' in the accepted sense as the old established discipline which extends from the unavoidable and fundamental textual criticism forward to the ultimate sources of historical recognition. My thirty year intellectual affinity with Bernedetto Croce and Karl Voßler might at least serve as a symbol of this. When the latter dedicated his *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Sprachphilosophie* of 1923 to me, I felt this to constitute one of the greatest honors of my rather secluded existence.

I conceive my lectures as complementary to the seminars, ideally providing a synthesis of these, and in them I have always sought a synopsis in universal history. From an early and uncertain stage, I have attempted a didacticism in the history of art centered on the philosophical attitude that the historian should approach the phenomena as in 'inverted' philosopher, and above all ask the questions: what is art? What is history? By clarifying the synthesis of these two, both for myself and my audience, as well as the other necessary aspect of the genesis of art historical problems we arrive at a survey of the 'history of art history'. This led me from the well known example of language and 'literary history' - as it is so brilliantly illuminated by Voßler in the subjects he has treated - and to the distinction of pure, autonomous art history (which deals with the great original creations from the 'schools', imitators, copyists or industrious subjects) and the 'linguistic history' of art - what Voßler already in 1905 distinguished as the 'creation' and 'development' in language. I have attempted to clarify both of these problems in cycles of lectures about Italian art from the Dugento to the Quattrocento - consciously choosing

subjects that I had studied over a long period, as the problem requires - and since this period harbors all of the sources for an understanding of what is essentially 'medieval' art, I have attempted to delineate the history of the 'artistic language' on the basis of late antiquity. All of this is not done in the sense of a 'historical grammar' which has long been recognized as an aberration and a sham ('Scheinproblem'). I happily and graciously acknowledge that my aspirations have had support and direction from the 'Neo-Idealism' of Croce's thinking. This was the reason that I devoted a few years to making translations of a series of the relevant publications by Croce. In my youth, 'aesthetics' had been a dread and an abomination to art historians. [Robert] Zimmermann, who was the last to propound a system of Herbartian aesthetics, had stopped teaching long before I entered the university. I vividly recalled how the fine literary and art historian Hermann Hettner, whose influence still survives today, was misled into dogmatic thinking by the denial of all aesthetics. As a young lecturer, I was lost in that maze, and in secondary school was touched by the disdained ideas of [Friedrich Wilhelm Joseph] Schelling, and preoccupied myself with some of those 'systems'. Finally I also delved into that of the art historian Konrad Lange (*Vom Wesen der Kunst*, 1901), until the *Estetica* of 1903, and the friendship of Croce ultimately liberated me from all of that. Everything that I have said relates to what I might call an upright will. Whether this is matched by the necessary ability is something that my natural skepticism has often led me to doubt.

I have digressed too far into personal matters, and must change the subject, since I see my own role in the history of the 'Vienna School' as nothing other than that of a 'torch bearer', to again borrow the phrase from the Lucretius that I have loved since my school days. I am happy to see my mission as having been to maintain the tradition of our old school, and above all of transferring the heritage of my teachers Sickel and Wickhoff into the hands of my successor - when the time comes.

For this reason I would not like to end this historical sketch with my ephemeral name, but instead to direct attention to the place in which our school has arisen and flourished, our city of Vienna - even if I myself was born here almost by coincidence, and belong here neither by descent nor mentality, but only by my education. It is characteristic of the colorful mosaic and the particular mission of the second largest German speaking city of the former Holy Roman Empire, that not a single professor in this department from Eitelberger to Dvořák was a native - this can also be seen in the appended list of graduates and 'affiliates' of our 'Vienna School' by my faithful assistant Hans R. Hahnloser.

At a number of points we have spoken of the Viennese character and the particular atmosphere that surrounds it and might summarize at the conclusion. The ancient Roman border castellum that lay at the crossing point of the land route from north to south and on the river route from west to east was always as subject to influences from all four parts of the world as it also gave them off itself. This city with its diverse ethnic mixture since before recorded times, Celtic-Roman in

antiquity, Germanic and Romance in its development with Slavic influences, has always been observed to combine deeply rooted tradition with sensual demonstrative movement – it has all too often been the necessary down side of its character that were emphasized resentfully from Aeneas Sylvius to [Otto] Nicolai and [Friedrich] Schiller. It has probably been the unique mixture of northerly-southerly and westerly-easterly elements that have accounted for the magical attraction of this only true ‘imperial city’ in the German speaking area. This shows itself in the ‘school’ that has arisen in this place. Its patriarch was a Protestant colonist from the German minority in Hungary, whose circle included true Viennese such [Gustav] Heider, [Eduard von] Sacken, but also [Albert von] Camesina, the descendent of a family from the Romance regions of Switzerland. The most important of them was a native of the Sudetenland, whose decisive energy has always distinguished itself from those of the Alpine areas, where Wickhoff and Riegl had been born. Thausing whose unforgettably distinct character stood out both in Prague and Vienna, was a native of the ‘fields and meadows’ of the royal city on the Moldau which has always been so closely related to Vienna. [Giovanni] Morelli from Lombardy, who had been so deeply involved in German intellectual history, began as a (political) enemy of Vienna, to become a friend and guide, and had a greater influence here than anywhere else - while it was two northern Germans, above all Sickel and then Conze who lent the ‘Vienna School’ its characteristically objective profile. Finally this old city whose true population often satirizes it as the ‘capua of the intellectuals’ succeeded in making one of its best discoveries and acquisitions in [Max] Dvořák, that son of Czech soil, whom the Viennese, Austrian, German cultural sphere won over nearly completely. The author of these lines, who became his successor in the ‘Vienna School’ against all expectation and aspiration, can end these pages in no better way than with his unforgettable name.

Karl Johns completed his doctorate in the history of art at the Fogg Art Museum, and has worked with the Dallas Museum of Art, the Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe in Hamburg, and the Los Angeles County Museum of Art among others. His publications have centred on the art of the Netherlands in the early modern period and the earlier Viennese art historians.

Karl Johns
270 Goins Court
Riverside CA 92507

KarlTJohns@aol.com