

## Glasgow Colloquium



*Abstracts for Viennese Art Historiography Colloquium in Glasgow 2<sup>nd</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> October 2009*

Location: Department of the History of Art, The University of Glasgow

Contact: [richard.woodfield@arthist.arts.gla.ac.uk](mailto:richard.woodfield@arthist.arts.gla.ac.uk)

### ***Max Dvořák, Wilhelm Worringer and the History of Medieval Art***

Hans Aurenhammer (Frankfurt)

The intellectual development of Max Dvořák (1874-1921), one of the chief protagonists of the so-called 'Vienna School of Art History', was characterized by a constant process of methodological revision, self-criticism and adaptation to the current tendencies of modern art.

With regard to the study of medieval art this process is known above all by his two main published texts on this subject: *The Enigma of the Art of the Van Eyck Brothers* (1904), strongly influenced by the evolutionist thinking of Wickhoff and Riegl and by an 'impressionistic' view of modernity, and

*Idealism and Naturalism in Gothic Sculpture and Painting* (1918), one of the most important essays of Dvořák's late, 'expressionistic', period. Knowing only these two texts, the decisive turn undertaken by Dvořák around 1920 could be interpreted as a sudden change of paradigm. This view has to be corrected, however, after having read and analyzed Dvořák's lectures on Western European Art in the Middle Ages which were held at the University of Vienna four times from 1906 to 1918. In my paper I will present Dvořák's changing views on Medieval Art contained in the ca. 4400 pages of these hitherto unpublished manuscripts.

Their topic is not Late Gothic art as in the above mentioned published texts but the long transition from Late Antique to Early Medieval Art and the prehistory of the Gothic architectural system from the 9th to the early 12th centuries. In his lectures, Dvořák develops, for instance, a new evaluation of the paintings of the Early Christian catacombs and of the church type of the basilica which he first criticized as aesthetically insignificant but from ca. 1914 onwards interpreted as allegories of a spiritualistic and anti-classical *Weltanschauung*. He strictly rejected the nationalist and racist theories of his Viennese colleague Josef Strzygowski. Dvořák kept also his distance of the popular theses of Wilhelm Worringer about the phantom of a supra-historical and typically Germanic 'eternal Gothic style'. As can be shown, he seems deeply influenced, anyway, by the antithetical conceptions formulated by Worringer in *Abstraction and Empathy* (1907) and in *Problems of Gothic Form* (1910). As the moving force behind historical evolution, the late Dvořák identified an antagonistic struggle between materialism and idealism. This conception was, of course, indebted to the spiritualistic ideologies of the 2nd decade of the 20th century. But Dvořák is here also reusing specific art historical categories 'naturalism vs. abstraction', 'material mass' vs. 'de-materialized structure' which he had used since his earliest lectures and which he is now reading as outward expressions of an inner, cultural mentality of a given time. The categories of formalistic art history have become principles of *Weltanschauung*. Dvořák's late writings thus can be understood only in part as a return to the cultural history of the late 19th century. He remains a formalist because he is convinced of the power of formal analysis to unveil cultural meaning in a direct way.

### ***Fritz Novotny and the New Vienna School***

Agnes Blaha (Vienna)

During the last decade, Fritz Novotny (1903-1983) was on several occasions described as a member of the so-called New Vienna School[1]. In my paper, I will argue that Novotny's relation to this group of scholars is rather ambiguous. To do so, I will discuss similarities between the texts Fritz Novotny wrote on Cézanne during the 1930's with texts written by Hans Sedlmayr and Otto Pächt at about the same time as well as some reasons against seeing Novotny as part of the New Vienna School.

One example for parallels between Novotny's argumentation and the method of "Strukturanalyse" (structural analysis) typically associated with the New Vienna School can be found in Otto Pächt's "Design principles of western painting". The feature of 15th century Flemish painting he underlined most in this text is the existence of breaks within central perspective which exist because the illusionistic character of space was overruled by the requirements of the surface. Pächt's insisting on the relevance of the equal value of pictorial space and the organization of the surface reminds of Novotny's discussion of the character of the pictorial surface with Cézanne, as in Novotny's book "Cézanne and the end of scientific perspective", the relation between pictorial space and picture plane plays a central role. Similarly, parallels can be found between the way Hans Sedlmayr described the role of microstructure in Brueghel's painting in his text "Brueghel's macchia" and Novotny's analysis of the influence the individual patches of colour have on the formation of space in Cézanne's painting.

Other aspects Novotny, Sedlmayr and Pächt had in common include their relatively little concern for questions of iconographic content and their dislike of biographic methods.

In spite of the similarities in the descriptions of formal qualities, Sedlmayr and Pächt on the one hand and Novotny on the other had a very different opinion in their attitude towards the role of the individual artwork. For Sedlmayr and Pächt, analyzing and understanding the individual work was the most important task of every art historian, while Novotny explicitly rejected the individual work as an appropriate starting point for his analysis in “Cézanne and the end of scientific perspective”. Instead, he used a combination of three large complex theories he had developed since 1929, using pictures as examples for the existence of the described phenomena without discussing them in detail. Together with the differences that can be discerned from a more biographic point of view – Novotny was student and later assistant to Josef Strzygowski, the academic adversary of the Vienna School – his different attitude towards the individual work is the strongest argument against categorizing Novotny as a member of the same scholarly group.

[1] See, for example, Christopher Wood, *The Vienna School Reader. Politics and Art Historical Method in the 1930s*. Zone Books, New York 2000; Roger Kimball. Introduction to the transaction edition, in: Hans Sedlmayr. *Art in Crisis. The Lost Center*. Transaction Publishers, Edison N. J. 2006, p. XIII; Anthony Vidler. *Histories of the Immediate Present: Inventing Architectural Modernism, 1930-1975*. PhD Dissertation, University of Delft, 2005, and Christopher S. Wood. Une perspective oblique: Hubert Damisch, *la Grammaire du Tableau et la Strukturanalyse Viennoise*. Cahiers du Musée National d'Art Moderne 58, 1996, pp. 106 -129.

### **Max Dvořák's *Denkmalpflege***

Jonathan Blower (Edinburgh)

The art historiography of Max Dvořák (1874-1921), director of the so-called ‘second’ Vienna School from 1909, has long been available to the English reader.

However, a significant part of his life's work languishes in obscurity: his writings on *Denkmalpflege*. These remain a problematic and, perhaps precisely for this reason, unwritten chapter in the history of cultural heritage.

Dvořák succeeded Riegl as Conservator General at the *Zentral-Kommission* in 1905, becoming the spiritual leader of Austria's preservation movement and spearheading a patriotically charged propaganda campaign for the protection of cultural heritage. He established the Austrian *Kunsttopographie*; reorganized the administrative structure of the Central Commission; and, for example, directly contributed to the failure of Otto Wagner's Karlsplatz museum project. His agitation ultimately culminated in Austria's monument protection law (1923). One of the few books Dvořák published during his lifetime, the polemical *Katechismus der Denkmalpflege* (Vienna, 1916), dealt specifically with the subject of preservation and was read as the ‘*Marseillaise der Denkmalpflege*’ by the next generation of conservators. I have translated this influential text, along with Dvořák's other writings on the theme, and am now able to present them to an English readership for the first time.

My paper will provide a critical introduction to Dvořák's *Denkmalpflege* based on a close reading of these texts and the monuments in question. It will outline the context and content of the modern preservation movement; define Dvořák's position vis-à-vis modern architecture; consider the implications of the First World War for Austrian cultural heritage; and it will trace the emergence of

Austrian monument legislation. Overlooked or brushed under the carpet on account of its all-too-patriotic overtones, the 'spirit' of Dvořák's quasi-religious *Denkmalpflege* is a telling symptom of its times, with a problematic legacy that arguably stretches right up to our present heritage industry (Charter of Venice, UNESCO, etc.). It is perhaps not unreasonable to hope that this lesser-known half of Dvořák's work will also throw new light on his approach to art history.

### ***Pieter Brueghel's Macchia and Hans Sedlmayr's art of physiognomic seeing***

Daniela Bohde (Frankfurt)

Sedlmayr's article *Die „Macchia“ Bruegels* from 1934 is a very famous example for his method 'Strukturanalyse'. In his two articles on Bruegel he considered the structure of the paintings as the most important way to understand their meaning and psychological expression. Very often Sedlmayr's method is regarded as very unique, but his interest in psychology and interpretation was very typical for the period between 1920 and 1945. His methodology was inspired by the work of gestalt psychologists such as Max Wertheimer, Kurt Koffka, Kurt Lewin and Johannes von Allesch, which he interpreted in a very particular way. He adopted however also different psychological concepts, especially of Ernst Kretschmer and Philipp Lersch. One constant factor in his changing methodology was his interest in the first impression. He believed that by simply beholding an artwork one could grasp its meaning or character ('anschaulicher Charakter'). He called this kind of viewing 'physiognomic seeing'. Especially in his writings of the 1940s he tried to establish a physiognomic method. One text, which explores the potential of this physiognomic method, is his second article on Bruegel *Pieter Bruegel: Der Sturz der Blinden – Paradigma einer Strukturanalyse* (published 1957, but written in 1944). Here, he used a psychological experiment to show that one can intuit the entire character of Bruegel's *Parable of the Blind* by just seeing it for split seconds. In the *macchia*-article Sedlmayr relied on a similar concept. His main argument was that an attentive viewer gets the impression that Bruegel's paintings are foremost patterns of colour patches (*macchie*): The figures begin to disintegrate, fall into pieces and lose their meaning. For Sedlmayr the disintegration of form was loaded with emotions, it "corresponds in the real world to the process of destruction". Sedlmayr discovered in Bruegel's paintings an alienated world. The figures seem to be isolated, mute and numb. It is interesting to compare Sedlmayr's pessimistic interpretation of Bruegel with Wilhelm Fraenger's psychological reading of Hercules Seghers' engravings. Sedlmayr relied very much on Fraenger, who was influenced by the Heidelberg school of psychiatry (Jaspers, Prinzhorn), but the Viennese scholar had a very different agenda. His *macchia*-article was mainly a device to get to grips with modernity. He described Bruegel's paintings as if they were paintings by Vlaminck, Cézanne or Schlemmer. In contrast to his later writings such as *Verlust der Mitte* he did not condemn modernity but showed himself to be deeply fascinated by it. Bruegel's art was a chance for Sedlmayr to acknowledge the modern world and at the same time to distance himself from it.

### ***Words of Suspension: The Definition of Textual Sources in Schlosser's Kunsthistorie***

Ricardo De Mambro Santos (Willamette)

In the opening pages of his encyclopaedic *Kunsthistorie* (1924), in a short yet dense introduction entitled "Idea and Extension of the Sources of Art History," Julius von Schlosser offers a programmatic definition of the field of study that he intends to explore throughout his volume—i.e. the so-called "Art Literature"—a field that, while incorporating the philological premises of the *Quellenkritik*, largely overcomes its hermeneutic principles to provide a more philosophically-based analysis of the "literature" related to the arts. In light of Schlosser's sustained, intense dialogue with Croce's *Estetica*

and Vossler's linguistics, the paper will examine Schlosser's restrictive definition of "textual sources" (*Quellenkunde*) in the attempt to understand their multiple functions as interpretive tools in the correlated domains of "Art History" (*Kunstgeschichte*) and "Cultural History" (*Kulturgeschichte*).

### ***Reality as the Cause of Art: Alois Riegl and Austrian neo-kantian-realism***

Adi Eyal (Tel Aviv)

In my paper I'll present a possible philosophical orientation for understanding Riegl's *Kunstwollen*, a philosophical orientation not yet accounted for in Riegl-scholarship, and that bias is Austrian neo-kantian-realism, led, around the turn of the last century, by *Alois Riehl*.

I propose the metaphysical premises of Riehl's neo-kantian-realism as adequate for a contextualization of Riegl's art-historiography, suggesting that the Riehl's orientation can help us to understand various central characteristics of the Riegl's *Kunstwollen*.

Neo-kantian-realism, or rather realist-neo-kantianism, is a peculiar variant of the neo-kantian movement. Riehl's neo-kantianism was peculiar for the fact that he believed that it is possible and indeed necessary to hold-on to the critical-transcendental kantian epistemology, while nevertheless abandoning what he considered as the dualist kantian metaphysics in which "things (in themselves)" are absolutely un-approachable for the human subject. Instead, Riehl suggested a realist critical metaphysics, in which things exist in an absolute unity and continuity with the human subject. Our representations of the world are the images of the *relations between* real things. Reality, thus, is the real cause for our perceptions and presentations, the latter holding always some objective status. We can say, thus, that reality is conceived as the *limitation*, as well as the *Cause* of perception. According to that suggestion, spatial-reality is always objective to some extent, while the subject's activity constantly aspires to retain and to regulate its unity with nature.

Riehl was an Austrian philosopher, who taught at Graz before moving to Germany. His pupil, Carl Siegel, continued to write and clarify his metaphysics.

In *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, at the important chapter on Architecture, in which Alois Riegl presented his notion of the late-antique *Kunstwollen*, he refers his readers to Carl Siegel's book *Entwicklung der Raumvorstellung des Menschlichen Bewußtseins* (1899), in which Siegel presents a neo-kantian-realist elaboration of the notion of the representation of spatiality. Therefore, we can safely assume that Riegl was more than aware to the neo-kantian-realist orientation, being able even to integrate it to his presentation of the *Kunstwollen*.

Thus, I believe that neo-kantian-realism can shed light on several important aspects of the *Kunstwollen*:

- (1) The unity of space and time in Riegl's presentations of the *Kunstwollen*
- (2) The importance of the role of reality, of "things," and factuality in the working of the *Kunstwollen*
- (3) The centrality of the notion of "Distance" and its dynamics in shaping the *Kunstwollen's* activity.
- (4) The complex causal-relation which exists between Things, Sensation, Perception and Presentation in the *Kunstwollen*.

Referring to all these central points, Riegl exhibited remarkable affinity with the neo-kantian-realist school. On the more general level, neo-kantian-realism can account for the complex relationship between subject and object in Riegl's *Kunstwollen*, and to orient us towards considering the

*Kunstwollen* and working with it while taking into account not just the expression of (collective or plastic) subjectivity that it entails, but rather the objective horizon to which it is directed; thus, we can view the *Kunstwollen* as a continuous (plastic) *regulation of subjectivity by the reality of things*. This paper will serve as the basis for my next intervention in the Vienna-school-research-group, which will present Riegl's essay concerning the Culture of Monuments as a supplement to neo-kantian-realist ethics.

### **Riegl Renaissances**

Andrew Hopkins (Aquila)

In 1923, eighteen years after his death, two works by Alois Riegl (b. Linz, Austria 1858 d. Vienna 1905) were republished: his earliest book *Issues of Style* (1893) and his penultimate, posthumous publication, *Roman Baroque* (1908). These were followed in 1927 with the reprint of his *Late Roman Art Industry* (1901), in 1929 with a collection of his essays, and in 1932 with the republication in volume form of his *Dutch Group Portrait* (1902). This decade or so of refocused attention on Riegl's work had begun around 1920, with an important essay by Erwin Panofsky (b. Hanover 1892 d. Princeton NJ 1968) on his concept of *Kunstwollen*, and closed with two further influential essays by Hans Sedlmayr (b. Hornstein, Austria 1896 d. Salzburg 1984) on the 'Quintessence of Riegl's Thought' and the review by Guido von Kaschnitz-Weinberg (b. Vienna 1890 d. Frankfurt am Main 1958) of the republication of *Late Roman Art Industry* in 1929. What might be described as the first Riegl Renaissance was followed at a distance of half a century by a second beginning in 1979 and continuing until the present day. Its impetus came from the rise of New Art History in Anglo-American academe, with theses dedicated to Riegl's work from both sides of the Atlantic – by Margaret Iversen (b. New York 1949) and Margaret Olin (b. Chicago 1948) – and the 1981 translation of Panofsky's *Kunstwollen* essay in *Critical Inquiry*. A closer look at this second wave of interest indicates the extent to which it was largely conditioned by just two articles of the 1920s, with its almost exclusive focus on the early *Issues of Style* (1893) and the concept of *Kunstwollen*. Only belated attention to and translation of his *Dutch Group Portrait* came in the 1990s and even today, in the wake of almost thirty years of renewed scholarship focusing on his work, only limited attention has hitherto been paid to Riegl's *Roman Baroque*.

### **The role of process in Franz Wickhoff's theory of pictorial narratives**

Gyöngyvér Horváth (East Anglia)

Commemorating the centenary of Franz Wickhoff's death, my paper deals with his theory of pictorial narratives. In his influential *Wiener Genesis* (1895), Professor Wickhoff elaborated a triple scheme of narrative strategies for classifying Late Roman reliefs and Early Christian book illumination. According to Wickhoff, continuous narration, one of the three methods he defined, was as important innovation of the Romans as the vaulted ceiling. Wickhoff framed his theory with a Hegelian evolutionary model, which could explain not only the change of styles, but the succession of narrative methods as well. This model has been surpassed by today, however, his notion of continuous narrative became the only widely accepted type of narrative images. Besides, his classification set off a long discussion of typology in narrative theory for the visual.

I will examine the origin and role of process in Wickhoff's concept of continuous narration, stating that it corresponds to the process-based aesthetic perception as well as to Bergson's idea of time as key phenomena in human experience.

Narrative theory is often blamed for being merely a study of forms. Wickhoff's inductive-interpretive approach to pictorial narratives is offering a method with which forms can again be turned into meaningful structures in art.

### ***Julius Schlosser as an Unwilling Grey Eminence***

Karl Johns (Los Angeles)

Although he was well aware that his radiance as a lecturer could not bear comparison with either of his predecessors or his own "Assistenten," Julius Schlosser nevertheless taught concentrated, critical and methodologically serious classes throughout a particularly fertile period with very few interruptions from 1892 to 1936, and attracted a group of doctoral students whose contributions to art historical scholarship might surpass those who congregated under any other single academic.

Although he and some of his pupils repeatedly expressed themselves in detail and with candor on these subjects, the latter half of his career includes ambivalence. Leaving aside the tortured style of his writing or his unswerving identification with Benedetto Croce, questions arise as to what he was urging upon us and what has been the nature of his influence. In some cases, his tendency to teach by example gave way to difficult theoretical texts.

Against his innermost nature, and in the difficult years following the collapse of the monarchy, he felt the need to publicize his definition of the so-called Vienna School, to resort even to polemic, retire from his beloved place in the museum, and devote his time to the university. Among his students, a certain rigor can be discerned in the definition and pursuit of specifically art historical problems ("stachelige Probleme" as opposed to "Scheinprobleme") and a clarity in what was considered ripe for publication – common to so diverse a group as Otto Pächt, Johannes Wilde or Julius Held who have little or nothing in common other than their tutelage in Schlosser's "Übungen."

A common criticism that he was an incomprehensible shallow bore, and that he limited himself to Italian sources which were already well known, or presented a conservative extremism beyond credibility, are all contradicted by a reading of his entire work, which seems never to have been undertaken in the last eighty years.

Beyond the problems of periodization, transitional moments, historical continuity within genres, national and universal stylistic qualities, cataloguing, or the publication of primary sources which preoccupied the Viennese scholars, Schlosser in fact was among the earliest to make functional interpretations and address the difficulties surrounding the metaphor of "grammar" and language – among other things such as his unmatched knowledge of art theory. Even in the more abstract thoughts of his later years, he still retained his orientation to historical and social reality, and like other idiosyncrasies of his personal style and personal interests, this has preserved his work from the shortcomings that have curtailed most of the currents in the academic practice of the intervening years.

### ***'Rondom Rembrandt' – Otto Neurath's (r)evolutionary art-related exhibition***

Hadwig Kraeutler (Vienna)

This contribution relates to Otto Neurath's ideas and projects connected to questions of exhibitions as means for learning.[1] Neurath, best known as an influential member of the Vienna Circle (of

Philosophers), founded, and was director of, the Gesellschafts- und Wirtschaftsmuseum (1925-1934) in Vienna.

In recent years, renewed interest in Neurath's work has developed in areas as varied as political economy, fine art, design, philosophy, cultural theory, and urban studies, but especially also in Isotype (International System of Typographic Picture Education).[2] With an interdisciplinary team of experts, Neurath (after 1934 in exile, in the Mundaneum and Isotype Institutes, respectively) developed an effective methodology using predominantly visual material (Isotype-charts; pictorial statistics) for engendering active engagement and discourse on the exhibition users' side. In my 2008 book, I refer to 'Rondom Rembrandt' (Around Rembrandt, an exhibition prepared in 1936/37 in the Netherlands), however, I do so from a museum studies perspective.

Based on archival materials, especially looking at 'Rondom Rembrandt', this paper aims to present specific aspects of Neurath's work and to open up a discussion in an art historical context. With practical examples, I will describe some features of Neurath's sociologically integrated and user-centred exhibition work, (r)evolutionary in his time, and – my opinion – in many practical and theoretical aspects still today.

[1] Otto Neurath (1882, Vienna/Austria – 1945, Oxford/UK) was a philosopher, sociologist, political economist, historian. For a contextualisation of Neurath, and information on his life and work see: Stadler, F. (2001), *The Vienna Circle – Studies in the Origins, Development, and Influence of Logical Empiricism*, Vienna-New York: Springer; also: [http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Otto\\_Neurath](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Otto_Neurath).

[2] Cf.: Kraeutler, H. (2008), *Otto Neurath. Museum and Exhibition Work – Spaces (Designed) for Communication*, Peter Lang Internationaler Verlag der Wissenschaften, Frankfurt, Berlin, Bern, Bruxelles, New York, Oxford, Vienna; Vossoughian, V. (2008), *Otto Neurath. The Language of the Global Polis*, NAI Publishers, Rotterdam; Nikolow, S. und Schirmacher, A. (eds., 2007), *Wissenschaft und Öffentlichkeit als Ressource füreinander. Studien zur Wissenschaftsgeschichte im 20. Jahrhundert*, Campus, Frankfurt/M.; Hartmann, F. and Bauer, E. (eds., 2002), *Bildersprache. Otto Neurath – Visualisierungen*, WUV-Facultas Universitätsverlag, Vienna; [http://www.hyphenpress.co.uk/journal/2008/05/12/isotype\\_recent\\_publications](http://www.hyphenpress.co.uk/journal/2008/05/12/isotype_recent_publications).

### **Hans Sedlmayr writes to Meyer Schapiro 1930-1935**

Evonne Levy (Toronto)

In recent years there is a revitalized discussion of the work of Hans Sedlmayr. On the one hand Hans Aurenhammer and others have laid out Sedlmayr's activities prior to and after the Anschluss of Austria, showing beyond a shadow of the doubt that Sedlmayr was an early member of the Nazi party and participated in the purging of the University of Vienna's art history institute of Jewish students and faculty. Aurenhammer has also shown that two of Sedlmayr's post-war publications *Verlust der Mitte* and the *Die Gotische Kathedrale* were largely conceptualized and written before the end of the war and that Sedlmayr's work did not experience a post-war correction per se. On the other hand, Christopher Wood in his Introduction to the *Vienna School Reader* and Frederick Schwartz in *Blind Spots* have brought Sedlmayr's intellectual ambition in the 1920s and 1930s into view, in the case of the latter, taking steps to reconstruct Sedlmayr's larger intellectual milieu. While these authors are well aware of Sedlmayr's relationship to National Socialism it is implicit in their accounts that should not exclude his work from consideration and they underplay the political register in order to clear a space for a re-reading of Sedlmayr's work. This paper will ask if this is possible, taking as its



evidentiary basis a cache of unpublished letters written by Sedlmayr to Meyer Schapiro between 1930 and 1935. These letters --largely a digest of Sedlmayr's scholarly production, comments on authors he is reading and colleagues whose work he admires— were driven by a desire for both international contacts and substantive scholarly exchange with Schapiro. But once their political allegiances were on the table, they struggled to maintain the discussion of their work. The correspondence could not be sustained once Sedlmayr's "political anti-semitism" was on the table and Schapiro broke it off. One of the interesting questions that this poses is whether the dilemma about how to deal with Sedlmayr doesn't go much farther back. Meyer Schapiro wrote his critical accounting of the Vienna School and of Sedlmayr in particular immediately after the break in their correspondence. Here I will consider also how we might read Schapiro's article in light of the letters.

### ***Frederick Kiesler's Viennese Period (1908 – 1926)***

Roula Matar-Perret (Rennes)

The visionary architect and artist, Frederick Kiesler (1890-1964), produced a body of works that embrace several fields such as theatrical set design, gallery layout and exhibition presentation, painting, sculpture or architecture. If the recent research into his oeuvre highlights a belated rediscovery of his work, a part of Kiesler's life still remains unexplored. Indeed, recent research has little to say about the early days of his career, between 1908 - when he began his studies and enrolled at the Wiener Technischen Hochschule and then joined the Akademie der Bildenen Kunste in Vienna – and 1923, the year when he produced his first work, a major set made for Karel Capek's play *R.U.R.* which was performed in Berlin, at the Theater am Kurfürstendamm. After his beginnings in Berlin, Kiesler would develop manifestos on theatre and visionary stage installations. From the conception of the *International Ausstellung neuer Theatertechnik*, at the Vienna Konzerthaus, in May 1924, up until 1926, the year he emigrated to the United States, and the imposing *International Theater Exhibition* in New York, these early projects give glimpses, through his new vision of the "stage-space" (*Raumbühne*) of the premises of key concepts around which his subsequent architectural projects would be woven.

My paper proposes to deal in some detail with the contribution of Kiesler's "Viennese period" – which he recognized as being a formative one – to the establishment of his key spatial concepts, essentially based on two fundamental themes: the endless space and the continuity of vision. By studying the set made for *R.U.R.*, constructed on the basis of visual moving screens, producing a space "in tension", at once fluid and rhythmic, we can better grasp how Kiesler's work, based on optical perception, bears the marks of Viennese spatial debates, which his historiography, oddly enough, does not take into consideration. For proof, some of Kiesler's professors - Adolf Loos for example (for whom Kiesler worked) - contributed actively with their works to these debates. It is from this angle that we shall look at the history of the development of the notion architecture conceived around bodily movement, rhythm and, more importantly, "space", a notion that stemmed in the late 19th century from German psychological theories of *Raum*, introduced by Schmarsow, and were then developed by art historians such as Alois Riegl and Paul Frankl. By considering the relation between architecture and art history, I want to discuss more particularly Alois Riegl's important contribution to the architectural field. In expounding Frederick Kiesler's studies, I shall be introducing the initial stages of this comprehensive research.

### ***Aby Warburg's and Fritz Saxl's assessment of the Wiener Schule***

Dorothea Mcewan (Warburg Institute, London)

The paper is an attempt to locate both scholars' views in the discussion of the direction and scope of the Wiener Schule. Warburg, who corresponded with members of the Wiener Schule and Saxl, who was trained by its teachers, whilst reading the important books of its members, never wanted to be drawn into their research agenda. Warburg was clear that he wanted to pursue a different form of 'Kulturwissenschaft', all but untranslatable into English, possibly approaching a term like cultural 'science', and Saxl, whilst sympathetic to proponents of the Wiener Schule, understood quickly that a similar analysis of art production, institutionally anchored in Hamburg University, would not work in the KBW. The result was friendly coexistence in equidistance.

### ***Individualism-Holism in the Art History of the Weimar Era***

Branko Mitrović (Unitech NZ & The Clark)

The debate between individualist and collectivist approaches to history writing is well-known in all fields of intellectual history. [1] When we say that a certain author (artist, scientist, philosopher, composer) produced a work with a certain property *because* he or she was a member of a certain group, are these groups to be conceived of as entities in their own right or should we think of them as mere sums of individuals? To explain something is to state its cause—so, what kind of causality do we postulate when we say that membership in a collective *explains* (and therefore *determines*) the creativity of individuals? Is the creativity of a culture or an epoch (e.g. the Renaissance) the sum of the creativities of the individual humans who participated in it, or is it a force in its own right, driving and determining individual creativities?

Writing in 1929, Hans Sedlmayr observed that the standard position in the art history of his time was marked by the assumption that collective entities are irreducible to the sums of individuals.[2] From this position, individuals are to be understood as manifestations of their collectives, which ultimately determine all individual mental capacities, such as perception, rationality, aesthetic preferences and creativity. A historian explains individual creativity by classifying individuals according to the specific explanatory group (nation, race, culture, tradition, etc.). When reading Weimar era historical works it is not hard to find numerous examples that confirm Sedlmayr's observation. In Wilhelm Worringer's *Griechentum und Gotik* artistic influence, *Einfluß*, is a spiritual process completely divorced from the human subjects by whom it could be transmitted.[3] Artists simply create in a certain way *because* they belong to a certain group; groups are said to influence each other even if no communication, direct or indirect, between individuals that belong to these groups can be documented. Similarly, according to Max Dvořák, the development of Gothic art is the result of spiritual developments within the epoch, while the reader is never explained how these intellectual trends could have reached the individual artists and architects.[4] But at the other end of the spectrum were art historians such as Ernst Gombrich who rejected collectivist history writing from the beginning. Erwin Panofsky is particularly interesting in this context since his views underwent drastic evolution. In his early work Panofsky still subscribed to a strong collectivist programme.[5] However, his position changed after migrating to the USA and the programme of "humanistic art history" which he formulated in 1938 postulated the rationality and free will of individual historical subjects.[6] If human reasoning capacities are assumed not to vary according to cultures or traditions, then creativity cannot be directly *explainable* by an author's membership in these groups; if artists are assumed to exercise free will when making their creative decisions, then one cannot say that an artist had to produce an artefact in a certain way because he or she was a member of a specific group.

In recent decades a few important studies about the lives and works of individual historians who left Germany after 1933 have been published in English while a number of younger German scholars

have initiated biographical research on those Weimar-era scholars who stayed in Germany and were involved in the political events during the Third Reich. My project concentrates on the history of the way this specific methodological problem affected art history. I believe that it may provide a particularly relevant contribution to the understanding of the intellectual forces operating on the cultural map of the Weimar era. More widely, it will throw light on the origin of important historiographical paradigms still operating in contemporary history writing.

In a 2007 paper published in *History and Theory*, I analysed the formal-methodological implications of various approaches to the collectivism/individualism dilemma, so I have a good view of the various positions that can be articulated within the debate.

Another paper I have recently completed about Erwin Panofsky's views on the collectivism-individualism debate is scheduled to come out in the *Kunsthistoriske Tidskrift* by the end of the year. At this moment I am particularly interested in Hans Sedlmayr's and Gombrich's views.

[1] For a methodological analysis of this debate see Ernest Gellner, "Holism versus Individualism in History and Sociology" and J. W. N. Watkins, in his "Historical Explanation in the Social Sciences" Ernest Gellner in Patrick Gardiner (ed.), *Theories of History*, Glencoe: The Free Press, 1959, 489-503, 503-515; Arthur Danto, *Narration and Knowledge*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1985, 257-284 and Branko Mitrović, "Intellectual History, Inconceivability and Methodological Holism", *History and Theory*, 46 (2007), 29-47.

[2] Hans Sedlmayr: "Einleitung" in Alois Riegl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Augsburg: Dr. Benno Filser Verlag, 1929, xxxi-xxxii. Not all collectivist positions postulate such immaterial entities—in particular, Karl Marx famously argued that a human beings' consciousness does not determine their being, but that their social being determines their consciousness. (Karl Marx, *Zur Kritik der politischen Oekonomie* in Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels: *Werke*, Berlin: Ditz, 1972, vol. 13, 9.)

[3] Willhelm Worringer: *Griechentum und Gotik*, Munich: Piper, 1928, 61 and 88.

[4] Max Dvořák, "Idealismus und Naturalismus in der Gotischen Skulptur und Malerei", in Dvořák, *Kunstgeschichte*, 41-148.

[5] See for instance Erwin Panofsky, Erwin Panofsky, "Das Problem des Stils in der bildenden Kunst", *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, 10 (1915), 460-467; "Der Begriff des Kunstwollens", *Zeitschrift für Ästhetik und Allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft*, 14 (1920), 321-339, "Die Perspektive als 'symbolische Form'", in Fritz Saxl (ed.) *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg 1924-1925*, Leipzig and Berlin 1927.

[6] Erwin Panofsky, "The History of Art as a Humanistic Discipline", in Erwin Panofsky, *Meaning in the Visual Arts*, Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1955, 1-25.

### ***Meyer Schapiro and the New Vienna School***

Cindy Persinger (West Virginia)

American art historian Meyer Schapiro (1904-96) had a close yet complex relationship with the ideas and art historians of the New Vienna School. While Schapiro condemned the group's substitution of racial for real historical factors in explaining style, he was also intrigued by their close attention to formal qualities and their application of new scientific findings to the study of art. This paper explores

the complex and often contradictory nature of Schapiro's dissemination and transformation of the ideas of the New Vienna School to an English-speaking, primarily American audience. Schapiro strongly opposed the idea that style was shaped by unchanging racial or national essences, and in late 1934, he initiated a dialogue with Otto Pächt on this topic. Unconvinced by Pächt's arguments that a belief in racial and national constants need not lead to a "Nazi attitude," Schapiro went on to criticize the New Vienna School's approach for its lack of "scientific rigor" in his 1936 review of the group's journal *Kulturwissenschaftliche Forschungen*. Schapiro's criticisms notwithstanding, the goal of his review was to share their ideas with a non-German speaking audience. Schapiro's interest in the New Vienna School's emphasis on formal qualities is further evidenced by his 1939 article on the Romanesque sculptures at the abbey church of Souillac; here his approach is shaped by Hans Sedlmayr's theorization of *Strukturanalyse*. In a letter to Schapiro dated 3 June 1939, Pächt praised this article as "the first 'Strukturanalyse' [sic] of an [sic] high medieval work of art." Through a consideration of both his published work and his unpublished and previously unconsidered correspondence with Pächt, I intend to explore how Schapiro's response to and his removal from the political turmoil of Europe shaped his application of New Vienna School ideas to his American art history.

### **MUTE STORIES: Franz Wickhoff's contribution to figurative narratology**

Andrea Pinotti (Milan)

The famous distinction, inspired by Lessing's *Laokoon*, between space-arts (architecture, painting, sculpture) and time-arts (poetry and music), endlessly varied in the following centuries, conflicts with a quite delicate and complex question: the figurative narrative, i.e. the way (or better the ways) in which an image or a series of images (articulations of space in juxtaposed lines, colours, surfaces, volumes: what the German language calls *Nebeneinander*) are able to tell a story (articulation of a series of events in time one after the other: what the German language calls *Nacheinander*).

In the second half of the 19th century, independently one from the other, two scholars – Carl Robert (1850-1922), philologist and archaeologist of the University of Halle, with his works *Bild und Lied* (1881) and *Archäologische Hermeneutik* (1919)[1], and Franz Wickhoff (1853-1909), art historian of the University of Vienna, with his *Die Wiener Genesis* (1895)[2] – laid down the basic principles of a figurative narratology that later innervated the researches developed by Kurt Weitzmann[3] and Pao-chen Chen[4] in Princeton, and that nowadays keeps inspiring the contemporary investigation in this field (see for instance Göran Sonesson's studies[5]).

If the general frame of such works belongs to the ancient issue of the representation of time (dynamic) through a figurative image (static), the more specific question they try to address is: how can an image tell us a story? The approach shared by these scholars is of *typological* nature: they all aim at obtaining a classification of the fundamental types of figurative narration, and of the hybrid cases that intertwine and complicate such types.

In my paper I will first of all focus on Wickhoff's personal contribution to this problem, and subsequently deal with the general stakes implied by a figurative narratology for a philosophy of image.

[1] C. Robert, *Bild und Lied: archäologische Beiträge zur Geschichte der griechischen Heldensage*, Berlin, Weidmann, 1881; *Archäologische Hermeneutik: Anleitung zur Deutung klassischer Bildwerke*, Berlin, Weidmannsche, 1919.

[2] F. Wickhoff, *Die Wiener Genesis*, hrsg. v. W. Ritter von Hartel und F. Wickhoff, F. Tempsky (Prag-Wien) – G. Freytag (Leipzig), Buchändler der Kais. Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, 1895.

[3] K. Weitzmann, *Illustrations in Roll and Codex: a Study of the Origin and Method of Text Illustration*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1970; *Late Antique and Early Christian Book Illumination*, New York, George Braziller, 1977.

[4] Pao-chen Chen, "Time and Space in Chinese Narrative Paintings of Han and the Six Dynasties", in *Time and Space in Chinese Culture*, ed. by Chun-chieh Huang, E. Zürcher, Leiden, Brill, 1995, pp. 239-285; see also J.K. Murray, "What is "Chinese narrative illustration"?", in *Art Bulletin*, a. LXXX, n. 4, 1998, pp. 602-615.

[5] G. Sonesson, "New Issues in the Study of Pictorial Texts", in *Interart Poetics. Acts of the Congress "Interart Studies: New Perspectives"*, Lund, May 1995, ed. by U-B. Lagerroth, H. Lund, E. Hedling, Amsterdam & Atlanta, Rodopi 1997, pp. 243-252.

### ***For the Love of the Fatherland: Patriotic Art History in the Kronprinzenwerk***

Matthew Rampley (Teesside)

Discussions of art history in Austria-Hungary tend to focus on texts written by academic art historians for consumption by other art historians. In this paper I consider writing on art and architecture in the multi-volume work "Austria-Hungary in Word and Image." Published between 1887 and 1902, the "Kronprinzenwerk," so called after its sponsor and initiator Crown Prince Rudolf, purported to provide a depiction of the numerous peoples of the Empire for a non-specialist readership, with the aim of promoting mutual respect and understanding amongst the different subject peoples. It included extensive descriptions of the history of visual arts of each region of the Empire; as such, the "Kronprinzenwerk" was one of the very works to attempt an art history of Austria-Hungary as a whole. My presentation considers how the "Kronprinzenwerk" articles depicted some of the cultures of the Empire, and I focus in particular on how such representations reflected the wider cultural and political tensions of the late Habsburg Empire, including, attitudes of the metropolitan elite of Vienna towards peripheral regions, relations between national groups within the Empire, and the relation between nationalist ideologies and the imperial cosmopolitan discourse of Unity in Diversity.

### ***The Vienna School of Art History & Austrian Expressionism***

Kathryn Simpson (Concordia)

"A great artist never stands absolutely outside the spiritual and intellectual ferment of his time and if the threads binding him to it are invisible to us then it means that we have failed to look deeply enough into his art or into the age in which he lived." Max Dvořák

The Vienna School of Art History is often understood as comprising two opposing interpretive methods: formalist, as championed by renowned scholar Alois Riegl, and idealist, as developed initially by Max Dvořák and continued by Otto Benesch. What was at stake in formalist versus idealist paradigms for Viennese art historical practice, and how did these art historians assess contemporaneous Austrian art? Dvořák was interested in avant-garde art, specifically Expressionism, whereas Riegl's attention was focused on ornament, late Roman art, and Dutch Baroque art. Yet in his essay "The Rigorous Study of Art," literary theorist Walter Benjamin makes the surprising claim

that “forces...stirring subterraneously in [Riegl's] *Late Roman Art Industry*...will surface a decade later in expressionism.”[1] Moreover, Otto Benesch had an intimate link to the Austrian Expressionist Egon Schiele (1890-1918), as his father, Heinrich Benesch, was one of Schiele's most loyal patrons, and Otto Benesch wrote several essays on Schiele and Expressionism. My paper would examine the formalist and idealist traditions of the Vienna School of Art History and contemporaneous Austrian art in order to enrich our understanding of the relationship between artistic theory and practice in late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century Vienna.

[1] Walter Benjamin, “The Rigorous Study of Art,” translated by Thomas Y. Levin, *October* Vol. 47 (Winter 1988), 88

### ***Eitelberger: the influential career of a non-specialist***

Francesca Torello (Carnegie Mellon)

This paper explores the role of Rudolf Eitelberger, a key actor in the cultural debate of mid-Nineteenth century Vienna, focusing on the complex implications of his multifaceted activity.

Often just one name in the list of initiators to the “Vienna school” of art history, Eitelberger, who was involved in historical research and associative life already before 1848, later came to personify the accumulation of roles and titles typical of the Viennese elite of the *Gründerzeit*. Chair of *Kunstgeschichte und Kunstarchäologie* at the University of Vienna, the first in Austria, in 1852, he took part in the creation of the *Institut für Geschichtsforschung* in 1854 and later had an important role in the institution of both the *Museum für Kunst und Industrie* and the *Kunstgewerbeschule*.

Less well known but equally important is his involvement in other sectors of Vienna's cultural life: from his vantage point as a publicist for the *Wiener Zeitung*, he participated in the debate on the enlargement of the city. He was a member of the Jury for the competition in 1858, wrote pamphlets and influenced the public opinion, supported architects and projects, published an extremely influential commentary of the competition entries. He oriented policies of documentation and conservation of monuments, put in place by the *k.k. Central-Commission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Baudenkmale*, of which he was one of the founding fathers. He published one of the first systematic studies on the Habsburg territory, the *Mittelalterlichen Kunstdenkmäler des österreichischen Kaiserstaates*.

In Eitelberger's Vienna, this accumulation of roles was not extra-ordinary: architects were also archaeologists, historians were consultants for museums and private collections, journalists were sometimes ambassadors and sometimes spies in foreign lands. Even in the richest and more cultivated bourgeois milieu, which supported financially the activities of the intellectuals, the same families were the backers of archaeological digs, commissioners of art works and also real estate investors, deeply involved in the urban transformation.

The consideration of Eitelberger's figure allows following some threads between distinct areas of his activity, exposing connections between distant environments and the functioning of a complex web of personal acquaintances, financial interests and political objectives. It also provides important insight about the awareness of foreign examples, always present in the Viennese debate of the second half of the Nineteenth century, which sheds light on the approach towards history of an early generation of scholars and on how history was used, filtered and strategically oriented by the cultural elites. Finally,

it highlights the elements of the peculiar and fragile substrate on which rested a unique cultural debate, in an age when the scientific boundaries between disciplines were just about being created.

### ***Materializing Sedlmayr***

Ian Verstegen (Philadelphia)

A few years it was strange to hold admiration for the works of Hans Seldmayr, the brilliant art historian who suffered two indiscretions: membership and academic profit from membership in the Nazi party (being in fact promoted to Professor of Art History in 1936 at the University of Vienna) and spearheading the most notorious anti-modernist crusade in the German-speaking world. Thoroughly discredited by the German generation of 1968, whom he taught and who had to read him, it is perhaps easier for a non-German speaker to pick and choose from his work without worrying about all the cultural baggage. Frederic Schwartz has already admirably rehabilitated Sedlmayr for contemporary art historians, filling in intellectual debts and building bridges to adjacent thinkers (the Frankfurt school particularly) that were too often overlooked in the winners and losers paradigm of art historical heroes.[1] The surprising antimony of theoretical heavyweights Panofsky/Sedlmayr, first put forward by Christopher Wood, is increasingly natural to invoke. Therefore, my belief that the thesis of "Toward a Rigorous Study of Art" ("Zu einer strengen Kunstwissenschaft" of 1931) is fundamentally sound and represented genuine 'progress' in art historical method may not seem too perverse.[2]

[1] Frederic Schwartz, *Blind Spots: Critical Theory and the History of Art in Twentieth-Century Germany* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2005).

[2] Hans Sedlmayr, "Zu einer strengen Kunstwissenschaft," *Kunstwissenschaftliche Forschung* 1 (1930/31), 7-32; trans. in Christopher Wood, ed., *The Vienna School Reader* (Zone Books: New York, 2000), hereafter cited by German/English page number.

### ***The Vienna School and modern architecture***

Jindřich Vybíral (Prague)

The thesis that art history is closely linked to art production of the time was one of the cardinal premises of the Vienna School. Even though the key interest of almost all of its protagonists laid in older art, a number of them also did work on the art scene of their period. Hans Tietze, the author of a book on Otto Wagner (1922), was the one who most closely followed the trends of modern architecture. But even before, this theme was being dealt with by Josef Strzygowski and Max Dvořák. The latter's lecture "Die letzte Renaissance" given in 1912, later published by Hans Aurenhammer, is one of the most important sources for learning about the stance of the Vienna School regarding contemporary architecture.

Viennese art historians, namely Dvořák and Tietze, shared a critical attitude toward historicism and eclecticism of the 19th century with their contemporaries. They regarded Otto Wagner as the most influential architect of the generation of 1900, but at the same time, they protested his belief that architectural form could be based solely on constructional reason and utility. As much as Alois Riegl, they defined the notion that art emerges first from nonmaterial ideals. In opposition against architectural realism, based on the characteristics of technological society, they hold that architecture should be a product of imaginative subjectivity. Unlike advocates of empirical utilitarianism, finding their voice at the time, they stressed on importance of cultivating artistic tradition.

The paper analyzes the texts of Viennese art historians from the point of view of the historiography of modern architecture, as well as from the standpoint of history of art history. It investigates the way these authors interpreted contemporary architecture, and also traces the basic premises of the Vienna School in their views. The paper looks at correspondences as well as at differences in the stances of the particular protagonists.

### ***Riegl's Roman Baroque: a reconstruction***

Arnold Witte (Amsterdam)

In his lectures on the Roman Baroque, given three times between 1898 and 1902, Alois Riegl both developed his theoretical position with respect to *Kunstwollen*, and tried to break new ground in the new field of Italian Baroque studies. In the lecture notes he was preparing for publication at the moment of his untimely death, Riegl spoke for the first time of *Kunstwollen* in terms of something personal of artists such as Bramante and Michelangelo, a concept quite different from his earlier suggestions of an immanent force taken up and developed by Erwin Panofsky and Hans Sedlmayr. Moreover, Riegl also seemed to accept the existence of more than one *Kunstwollen* at any particular given moment in time.

In the Roman Baroque, Riegl analyzed all three arts of Painting, Sculpture and Architecture together and interpreted Mannerism in terms of a falling of spiritual absorption and linked it to the Counter Reformation. While he focuses predominantly on Rome, he also looks closely at artistic developments elsewhere in Italy, such as Michelangelo's Florentine architecture and Correggio's painting. Both in terms of approach and of content, this planned book was to offer a notable different account from that of Heinrich Wölfflin's Renaissance and Baroque and other approaches taken by his contemporaries. Indeed, Riegl's Roman Baroque outlines the beginning of a new artistic era that extends from the 1520s to the seventeenth century, and like his parallel work on The Dutch Group Portrait of 1902, this book also discussed the differences between Northern and Southern ways of painting from a proto-social and cultural point of view. But it was especially the way in which Riegl here took the spectator into consideration that seems the most valuable point of inspiration for present-day readers.