

A monumental step for Riegl and Schlosser in France

Review of:

Alois Riegl, Christopher S. Wood, Emmanuel Alloa, *L'industrie d'art romaine tardive*, trans. Marielène Weber, Sophie Yersin Legrand, Paris: Éditions Macula 2014, 476 pp., 23 col. plates, 126 ill. b/w, 44.00 €, ISBN 978-2-86589-075-0, ISSN 1159-4632

Julius von Schlosser, Patricia Falguières, *Les Cabinets d'art et de merveilles de la Renaissance tardive: Une contribution à l'histoire du collectionnisme*, Paris: Éditions Macula 2012, 372 pp., 115 ill. b/w, 31.00 €, ISBN 978-2-86589-073-6, ISSN 1159-4632

Alois Riegl and Julius Schlosser are well known names in the creation of an objective foundation for the history of art as an academic discipline. As the topics slowly emerged from archaeology and the program for historical training in the Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung at the university in Vienna, there were almost no specialized periodicals, and with the help of photography, the most basic collections of materials were still emerging from a very simple and primal stage. There were no accepted terminologies or distinctions of particular aspects of art so that each individual forged ahead on the basis of their own experience in archaeology, history, literature and philosophy. From the crop of the earliest students, Riegl and Schlosser emerged as two of the most prolific in their early posts in the Vienna museums, and each in their own way gravitated back to the university. With the strong training in classical languages and predominantly florid styles of writing which did not change until the end of the monarchy, their intense reflections on fundamental academic problems have always provided something of an obstacle to readers. When my own grandmother (who heard some of their lectures and was acquainted with their students) would chide me for reading a translation, I already then had the wit to reply that I was reading Samuel Butler and not Homer. Since those early days of the historical auxiliary sciences and of a more pervasive sound classical education, translations have become far more important in the world, more as things might have been in the 10th century. These two books can only be welcomed.

Since its first publication in 1901, Riegl's *Spätromische Kunstindustrie* has been considered profound but problematic, and always aroused contradictory responses.¹

¹ Alois Riegl, *Die Spätromische Kunst-Industrie nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn*, Vienna: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1901, reprinted as Alois Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, Vienna: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1927 and now in a French edition, Alois Riegl, *Industrie d'art romain tardive*, Paris: Macula, 2014 with an index, chronological supplements, an 'introduction' by Christopher S. Wood, a 'postface', entitled 'Tactiques de l'optique', by

The 1927 edition was prepared by a young Otto Pächt in a smaller format for a more 'popular' consumption. Its introduction by Emil Reisch is distinct from the afterword by Pächt, and makes it clear that specialists were divided into those who were enthusiastic and others who were politely reticent. The new French edition is back to a slightly larger format, although only half the height and less than half the weight of the 1901 folio edition, but similar in the way it includes an introduction by Christopher S. Wood and an afterword by Emmanuel Alloa. There seem to always be more than one person eager to speak and not content with what others might say. 2014 provides an interesting comparison to 1927 in this regard.

Alois Riegl will probably be remembered for having analyzed less prominent works of art in such a way as to bring them to life more vividly than ever before or since, and in this way to have provided the basis for a study of the history of art independent of other academic and pseudo-scientific disciplines. In grappling with a field including very few dated monuments, he analyzes the intrinsic development of ornament as a reliable guide to the progression of art which he seems to consider to be vaguely inevitable. Ornament and architecture are important to him since they do not include the human figure which he considers to distract from the actual subject of the visual arts – 'das eigentlich Bildkünstlerische.'² Some archaeologists were surprised at the time to open a book about decorative arts and find a chapter about sculpture of equal length to the actual subject in the title.³ Riegl explains this along with the decision to publish the first volume separately in that during the course of work he discovered the 'guiding laws' (leitende Gesetze) of the development which 'remained common consistently and through all ages' (immer und allezeit für alle Kunstgattungen gemeinsam).⁴

During this time he wrote an unusually large amount and vigorously addressed a number of questions, contentions and current affairs to various levels of society, and did so for audiences with differing degrees of education and interest. No complete list of his publications seems yet to have been published. He is clear and sometimes critical about what he considers to deserve encouragement, and he lectured in public and wrote idiomatically in a straightforward way about a wide array of subjects in periodicals ranging from the hallowed yearbook of the imperial collections and the bulletin of the decorative arts museum on down to the popular journals for textiles, anthropology and Asian studies while reviewing books in the daily newspapers almost to the day of his untimely death in 1905 at the age of 47.

As a curator of textiles in the Österreichisches Museum für Kunst und

Emmanuel Alloa as well as a French translation of Riegl's relatively polemic review, 'Spätrömisch oder orientalisch?' and a selection about Riegl in French from Schlosser's 'Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte: Rückblick auf ein Säkulum deutscher Gelehrtenarbeit in Österreich', *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung Ergänzungsband*, vol. 13, no. 2, as cited below, n. 22.

² 2014 ed., 70, 1927 ed., 19.

³ Philip B. Whitehead, *American Journal of Archaeology*, vol. 33, no. 1, March 1929, 146-147.

⁴ 2014 ed., 57-58, 1927 ed., 2.

Industrie, the present-day Museum für angewandte Kunst, Riegl catalogued more than 600 Egyptian fabrics from the late-antique and early medieval period, and then also developed his insights into patterns of ornament in the book *Stilfragen Grundlagen zu einer Geschichte der Ornamentik*, Berlin: Siemens, 1893.⁵ During this time he lectured frequently at the Österreichisches Museum and also published articles and books about near-eastern carpets, the past and future economic situation of textile production, a thorough survey of textiles in a large handbook, and was commissioned to compile what became the *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, originally intended to be one chronological segment of a corpus edition dealing with all historical periods in the Austro-Hungarian territories. He welcomed the chance to expand his study beyond the limits of ornamental patterns, and rectify both the iconographical emphasis of what was called 'Christliche Archäologie', as well as the theory of a 'barbarization' of Roman art and its accompanying notion of an undocumented original influence on Europe from Nordic and eastern nomads. For us today, this book remains interesting for his argument as to having discovered principles governing the development of all genres of art throughout history, and his conception of the artistic will. In this book he never by way of an introduction explicitly delineates such things as his idea that some artists and entire periods call for relatively closer or more distant viewing. This along with other critical terms such as the 'Kunstwollen' emerge more from their usage in the course of the analysis, and there is clearly a greater advantage in considering his other writings in clarifying some points.

Mariélène Weber is known for her work in conveying Austrian and German psychoanalytic writings to a French reading audience. This places her in the perfect position to present the complexity of Alois Riegl to the outside world. Her translation is relatively literal. When Riegl's use does not leave it completely clear whether he refers to the depth or breadth of relief carving, she leaves the term at an exact translation. It does the most to preserve the original and allow the reader to themselves interpret the ambiguities. She does not make life any easier for the French reader than it is for today's German speaking audience. The style is unlike anything they are accustomed to. After a remarkable migration of French intellectual life toward German romantic philosophy from the 'clear and distinct ideas' affirmed in the French 'age classique', Riegl to a certain degree belongs to this more obscure category, and what is certainly one of his most significant books should be well-received by such an influential segment of the world as its francophone areas.

Less important essays by Riegl have appeared in French translations in recent years, but this influential text has been surprisingly long in coming. For a number of decades already, Editions Macula have been providing the French reading public with important art historical books both original and in translation. With support from the Fondation Cercle Macula and the Fondation Jan Michalski,

⁵ Available in an excellent English edition: Alois Riegl, *Problems of Style. Foundations for a History of Ornament*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1992.

the publisher has been able to do justice to Riegl with a sewn binding and sharp illustrations of the small artefacts which are important in revealing often minute distinctions pivotal to a complicated argument. The colour plates are quite good and the fibula from Apahida is at its best (306, plate 99-101). Notes which have been added are clearly distinguished from the original, the index will be useful to many, and the addition of subtitles within the text does not disturb the 'flow.'

Some of the misunderstandings surrounding the *Spätromische Kunstindustrie* are due to a failure to bear in mind that the book as we have it is a fragment left unfinished. His other publications on the subject must for this reason be taken into account in order to anticipate his responses to the criticism of his approach and conclusions. He frequently interrupts the discourse to announce that the conclusion will be found in the next volume, but almost no notes for that volume survived.⁶ The additional notes supplied in this new edition will be very helpful to the reader.

Although Riegl's final years were largely preoccupied with his university lectures and the editorial and bureaucratic duties of drafting the law for historical preservation, he was still able to produce a serious analysis of the Krainburg trove, the equine décor unearthed in western Hungary, diverse notes, a close review of the comprehensive book by Bernhard Salin and of that by Falke and Frauberger about the German early medieval cloisonnée. As editor of the journal published by the Zentralkommission, the predecessor of today's Bundesdenkmalamt, he also continued to treat individual discoveries made at the eastern and south-western edges of the Austro-Hungarian empire which provide us with the clue to the content of the second volume of the *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*.

In introducing the new edition, Prof. Wood inquires into the 'longevité' of this book and presumes the title to be obscure (31), the work to be formalist (32) and to espouse relativism (35). Some will say that none of these points are true. As far as the 'longevité' is concerned, I cannot be certain whether I have met two people outside of Vienna who have read the *Spätromische Kunstindustrie* in its entirety. The 'longue suite de publications et republications posthumes de ses textes' (28) has not gone further than a small part of Riegl's work and includes much from the vague and threadbare lecture notes. There has been great progress in disseminating the writings of Schlosser in France, Italy and Spain, and we can only hope that Riegl's work will be taken more seriously in its detail and progress beyond generalizations based on only one or two of his publications. Such improper generalizations from too narrow a base of evidence are probably the greatest logical error in current art-historical writings.

While it is true that Riegl does not introduce unknown material in this

⁶ The second volume appeared as Alois Riegl, *Die spätromische Kunst-Industrie nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn. Im Zusammenhange mit der Gesamtentwicklung der bildenden Künste bei den Mittelmeervölkern. 2. Kunstgewerbe des frühen Mittelalters*, Vienna: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1923, with E. Heinrich Zimmermann as 'Bearbeiter' explaining in a preface how little had been written down for this manuscript by time of Riegl's death.

instance, he is far from urging nobody to do so. In this book, he is writing the introductory text to a corpus edition. From Alexander Conze's complete edition of Attic stelae (1893-) to Otto Demus's mosaics of San Marco (1984) or Pächt's catalogues of the Viennese illuminated manuscripts, such corpus editions remained an important medium to the Viennese art historians who notably produced almost no monographic studies of individual artists.

In his own published version of 1901, Riegl acknowledges the criticism of his chronology of the Constantinian family sarcophagi which was offered in the informal meetings of students and friends of Eugen Bormann held regularly in the department of ancient history and epigraphy.⁷ This weakness in the argument was noted by Kaschnitz and became one point of departure for the analysis by Jozef Bodonyi and his classmate Ernst Gombrich.⁸

As far as the ambivalence is concerned, Riegl in his inimitable way spends a few pages defining 'spätantik' and gives his reasons for preferring it to alternative expressions and datelines.⁹ The term 'Kunstindustrie' was also not ambivalent to the readers of the time. Jules Labarte's *Histoire des arts industriels* was a current handbook cited also by Riegl, *Industrial arts* was founded as a journal in 1877, and a glance into the public access catalogues of the western European national libraries show how common the term was at the time.¹⁰ Riegl uses the expression in his extended and very unambiguously written survey of textiles in the three volume manual edited by Bruno Bucher.¹¹ To the readers of the time Riegl was being perfectly clear as far as this is concerned.

As for 'formalism', Riegl repeatedly insisted that the historical development of style provided the only appropriate access point for what he consistently termed a scholarly study of the history of art. Unlike the 'formalism' of 19th-century artists, Riegl always acknowledged that his stylistic analysis is based on a flat-footed scholarly archeological record. He defers quite explicitly to the archeological method in his discussion of the Krainburg trove, the equine décor from western Hungary, the ornament of New Zealand, and his numerous reviews of anthropological literature. On the other hand, when the evidence called for it, his argument could also be exclusively functionalist, as when he dealt with the origin of the knotted carpet. Aside from his exclusively historical publications of medieval

⁷ 2014 ed., 184, note 48, 1927 ed., 173, note 1.

⁸ Guido Kaschnitz, 'Alois Riegl: Spätromische Kunstindustrie', *Gnomon*, vol. 5, no. 4-5, 1929, 195-213 reprinted in Kaschnitz, *Kleine Schriften zur Struktur*, Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1965, 1-14, Josef Bodonyi, *Entstehung und Bedeutung des Goldgrundes in der spätantiken Bildkomposition*, doctoral dissertation, University of Vienna, 1931 and the notice by Ernst Gombrich, *Kritische Berichte zur kunstgeschichtlichen Literatur*, vol. 5, 1932-1933, 65-76.

⁹ 2014 ed, 65-72, 1927 ed. 16-22.

¹⁰ Elizabeth James ed., *The Victoria & Albert Museum: Bibliography and Exhibition Chronology, 1852-1996*, London: Fitzroy Dearborn 1998, 779-780 see 'industrial arts', 'industrial design.'

¹¹ Alois Riegl, 'Textilkunst', Bruno Bucher ed., *Geschichte der technischen Künste*, vol. 3, Stuttgart: Union, 1893, 335-399, for instance 365.

literary sources, he also published his purely iconographical studies of calendars over a number of years. His concluding chapter summarizing the late antique artistic will is devoted to the parallels in intellectual history much as he outlined it in his review of the grandly conceived volumes by Moriz Dreger.¹² In that review he himself suggests how his ideas should be further extended to other subjects.

Riegl was also inconsistent. In an earlier review of a plate volume of the Liechtenstein collection of paintings, he referred to 'particular cultural conditions' clinging inseparably to each individual work of art and ultimately contradicting the thrust of his own arguments in the *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*.¹³ After affirming it here, in his lecture apparently held close to the end of his life about the early Christian basilica, he then denied that there was any awareness of the question of perspective.¹⁴ His approach was not exclusively through style but closer to what we would call eclectic, and his work would probably have taken a very different path if he had been sent to the coin room or put to work with the Greek vases or medieval manuscripts. Commentators in this volume and elsewhere ought to remain aware of this.

'Relativism' is a far more complicated issue. While some of Riegl's conclusions have led to the theory of national constants in artistic style and to accusations of 'racism' from others, many passages exhibit precisely this relativism. This itself becomes problematic in light of the teleological character of other arguments particularly in his substantial chapter devoted to sculpture.

Walter Benjamin and Felix Guattari might be expected to make an appearance in the afterword as part of the survey of reception, but the introduction should probably have instead referred to Riegl in his relationship to Gottfried Semper or Franz Wickhoff, and perhaps Guido Kaschnitz or Ernst Garger. The thoughts of Julius Schlosser would certainly have been more apt. Far from 'assurer la renommée' of Riegl (27), a number of the dissertations and published seminar reports done for Schlosser addressed subjects specifically eluding Riegl's analysis of stylistic principles and other statements. Schlosser's own earlier essay about the history of wax portrait sculpture traced an undatable genre from ancient Assyria to the nineteenth century, and again demonstrated the role of written evidence and the importance of the human figure and face to the history of art. Ernst Kris's study of casts from nature was centred on a specific period but also covered an aspect not

¹² Riegl discusses his conception of how the artistic will or intention is part of a more encompassing cultural intention, 'Die Entwicklungsgeschichte der Textilkunst', *Wiener Abendpost Beilage zur Wiener Zeitung*, Thursday, October 27, 1904, 25-26, 7-8 of the supplement.

¹³ Riegl, 'Die Fürstlich Liechtenstein'sche Galerie in Wien. Mit Text von Dr. Wilhelm Bode. Wien, Gesellschaft für vervielfältigende Kunst, 1896 (Gross 4^o, 138 Seiten.)', *Mitteilungen der Gesellschaft für vervielfältigende Kunst: Beilage der 'graphischen Künste'*, 1896, no. 4, 20.

¹⁴ Riegl, 'Die Entstehung der altchristlichen Basilika', *Jahrbuch der K. K. Zentral-Kommission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der kunst- und historischen Denkmäler*, new ser., vol. 1, 1903, 195-216, and reprinted in Alois Riegl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Augsburg/Vienna: Filser 1929, 91-110.

directly subject to the 'tendencies' of 'artistic intentions.' Karl Maria Swoboda's *Römische und romanische Paläste* is also based on a refutation of a passage from Riegl.¹⁵ In his analysis of decorative arts, the relation of the pattern to the ground was an essential element of Riegl's interpretation of the 3rd- to 5th-century developments. He states it in the first few pages of his introduction and it continues throughout the entire text. With that as an impetus, the aforementioned Jozef Bodonyi analyzed the function of the gold ground and came to conclusions other than Riegl.¹⁶ In acknowledging discussions with Otto Pächt and others, Bodonyi also gives us a glimpse into the arguments then being made privately among the later students of Schlosser.

As far as Riegl's ideas are concerned, Wilhelm Worringer might have been influential as a popular author in the 1920's-30's, but he was hardly a 'médiateur plus efficace'. Discussions such as those suggested in Bodonyi's footnotes, and the ironic references from Schlosser show how irrelevant these more popular authors were considered to be at the time. Most of the animus against Josef Strzygowski was based on Strzygowski's slipshod use of sources and hasty conclusions. While August Schmarsow made important comments on Wölfflin's categories, on Lessing's *Laocoon*, and published original material such as the diary of Johann Fischart or the drawings from Rugby school and elsewhere, his *Grundbegriffe der Kunstwissenschaft* cannot be described as an 'oeuvre ambitieux' or a 'commentaire de grande portée' (25). Neither Worringer nor Schmarsow have survived in any serious research, and both were quite harshly reviewed in the journal founded and edited by Wickhoff and continued by Riegl's admirers.¹⁷ Describing them this way is to misunderstand

¹⁵ Swoboda's *Römische und romanische Paläste: Eine architekturgeschichtliche Untersuchung*, Vienna: Schroll, 1918, 2nd ed, 1924 seems to have its point of departure in the sentence where Riegl states that nothing of this type was known before the Gothic, Riegl, 'Über Renaissance in der Kunst Vortrag, gehalten im K. K. Österreichisches Museum am 6. und 13. Dezember 1894', *Mittheilungen des K. K. Österreichischen Museums für Kunst und Industrie: Monatschrift für Kunstgewerbe*, new ser., 10th year, no. 111 (354), March, 1895, 342-348, no. 112 (355), April 1895, 363-371, no. 113 (356), May 1895, 381-393, 368. Max Dvořák was the *Doktorvater*, and as head of the *Denkmalamt*, was spending much time in Dalmatia around the palace of Diocletian, while Swoboda also acknowledges the assistance of Schlosser in developing his ideas.

¹⁶ 2014 ed., 67, 1927 ed., 14 'der Goldgrund...ist nicht mehr Grundebene, sondern idealer Raumgrund...' 'le fond d'or des mosaïques byzantines...n'est plus plan de fond mais fond spatial idéal...' Riegl returns to the subjects toward the beginning of the chapter about mosaics and painting, 2014 ed., 239, 1927 ed., 244. Ernst Garger worked in the sculpture department of the same applied arts museum, begged to differ, and devoted most of his publications to that subject.

¹⁷ Wilhelm Worringer, was reviewed by Heinrich Gomperz, 'Dr. Wilhelm Worringer, Abstraktion und Einfühlung. Ein Beitrag zur Stilpsychologie', *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, 1910 no. 3, 65-73. August Schmarsow was reviewed by Wickhoff, 'Grundbegriffe der Kunstwissenschaft am Übergang vom Altertum zum Mittelalter kritisch erörtert und in systematischem Zusammenhange dargestellt 1905', *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, vol. 2, no. 4,

the history of art as an academic discipline. Erwin Panofsky and Julius Held have both gone on record recalling how closely the *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen* were read and the trepidation with which its reviews were awaited.¹⁸

It is difficult to accept the idea that Riegl intended his title to be ambiguous (31). Aside from some of his quirky neologisms and some difficulties they provide in long sentences and obsolete constructions, he always intended to speak to a large audience and constantly refers to them in his reviews and essays. As we have said, he is straightforward in explaining that while studying the subject of the late antique troves in Austria-Hungary he felt that he had discovered the 'laws' governing the development of all genres of art in all periods, and as we know, that this made it necessary to also include separate sections about architecture, sculpture and painting, and therefore expand the *Spätromische Kunstindustrie* to two volumes, the latter having finally appeared in 1923 as the work of Ernst Heinrich Zimmermann. He was felicitously described as a 'prophet geared to the past' and he intended to communicate to all. In the passage cited above, Schlosser had already complained about later misinterpretation and obfuscation of his terms and was doing so as an intelligent critical colleague who knew him personally.

Although Wood is now able to avoid emotionalism about nations and races, his rather glib brand of Geistesgeschichte is still somewhat cavalier with facts. On a more mundane level, the final doctoral candidate of Schlosser was not Gombrich (30) but Ernst Saenger, who was living in Vienna until recently and was listed in the telephone book.¹⁹ He would probably have been happy to give Wood a clearer idea of the subject, but do such urban legends actually have any bearing on the subject at hand?

Such a broad survey as the *Spätromische Kunstindustrie* is unusual in Riegl's work, but if it had not remained such a fragment, there can be no doubt that iconographical aspects would have played a part much in the way that Wickhoff discusses them in connection with the MS 387 of the Nationalbibliothek.²⁰ It must be

1905, 103-106, the latter reprinted, Franz Wickhoff, *Abhandlungen: Vorträge und Anzeigen*, Die Schriften Franz Wickhoffs, vol. 2, Berlin: Meyer & Jessen, 1913, 365-370. Andrea Pinotti 'Body-building. August Schmarsow's 'Kunstwissenschaft' between psychophysiology and phenomenology', Mitchell B. Frank and Daniel Adler eds., *German Art History and Scientific Thought*, Farnham and Burlington VT: Ashgate, 2012, 13-31, has recently given a more balanced analysis of Schmarsow.

¹⁸ Erwin Panofsky, 'Zum Geleit', in Arpád Weixlgärtner, *Grünewald*, Vienna: Schroll, 1962, 6. Julius S. Held, 'Hans Tietze 1880-1954', *College Art Journal*, vol. 14, 1954, 67-69.

¹⁹ When the race laws prevented that dissertation from being printed in the *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen*, Schlosser made efforts to get it published elsewhere, discussed the problem in a letter to Croce, and a short summary appeared as 'Über die Struktur des Bilderkodex im Trecento', *Critica d'Arte*, 1938, no. 16-18, 131-135. It was finally published in its entirety in the *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* somewhat belatedly in vol. 84, new ser., 48, 1988, 7-91.

²⁰ Franz Wickhoff, 'Die Ornamente eines altchristlichen Codex der Hofbibliothek', *Jahrbuch der Kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, vol. 14, 1893, 196-213.

borne in mind that the very abstract discussion of the introduction as well as the 'postface' to this volume is unlikely to have met the approval of the author himself or any of his classmates, friends or associates. These were scholars based in the archaeological method who spent much time cataloguing textiles, drawings, prints, manuscripts or sculpture, and only then began to ponder the deeper questions they are now remembered for. They considered the two to be vitally interrelated.

With this excellent new edition, a vast number of serious students will have greater access to the sometimes obscure recesses of Riegl's most wide-ranging study and can hopefully judge such things for themselves. These new readers can contemplate his idea of ethical implications in relation to the sensual aspect of art, judge his peculiar usage of certain terms such as the 'composition of masses', the *Kunstzweck* ('Geschichte der altchristlichen Kunst') (3), mood, inflections of will or the putative role of the beholder. They can now decide for themselves where relativism began and ended with Riegl, the degree to which architecture actually went through precisely the same vicissitudes as the buckles and decorated harnesses, or whether it reveals the *Kunstwollen* more overtly, to say nothing of the impulses behind the development of sculpture. They can consider whether there was a natural ground plane in earlier periods which was crowded out in Roman art and then emerged again in the form of 'ideal space' in late antiquity, and what such an ideal quality might have entailed. They might ponder resolving the teleological problem in the rather extensive chapter about sculpture. Does Riegl reveal the 'ineffaceable vestiges of eternal universally valid formal laws...?'²¹ They will be able to judge for themselves to what extent the rules governing the development of all art have indeed been discovered and elucidated in these chapters.

Just two years earlier in 2012, Macula published a well made and handsomely bound French edition of Julius Schlosser's *Kunst und Wunderkamern*. In some ways, the work of Schlosser complemented that of Riegl – who was seven years older, had made waves, spoken truth to power and suffered the consequences – although he inspired students in many different ways and directions. Schlosser was privately more of a shy personality who blended into the bureaucracy and with notable exceptions avoided confrontation while cultivating friendships with his colleagues and students. By coincidence of age, Schlosser never associated with Riegl as a fellow student, pupil or colleague, but only related socially as he has described it in his reminiscence about the 'Vienna School.'²² Even when the gulf had grown to become practically unbridgable, Schlosser held more to the traditions of

²¹ 2014 ed., 119, 1927 ed., 84.

²² Julius Schlosser, 'Die Wiener Schule: Rückblick auf ein Säkulum deutscher Gelehrtenarbeit in Österreich', *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung Ergänzungsband*, vol. 13, no. 2, Julius Schlosser, 'Alois Riegl', translated by Matthew Rampley, Richard Woodfield ed., *Framing Formalism Riegl's Work*, Amsterdam: G+B Arts, 2001, 41, now also electronically, translated and edited by Karl Johns as 'The Vienna School of the History of Art', *Journal of Art Historiography*, no. 1, 2009.

the Institut für Geschichtsforschung and although this is also not strictly true, leaves us the impression of being more at home with written sources.

As a curator of sculpture with a strong interest in 14th- and 15th-century Italy, Schlosser published a systematic series of articles inspired by objects in the Vienna museum collections and approaching art-historical problems from various facets including patronage, changing styles and 'world view', as well as materials and shifting theoretical underpinnings. With Wickhoff, Riegl, Croce and much else under his belt, he emphasized that the patron can affect the art, that the definitions of art change and the later collector can also create a new context or meaning. On the basis of descriptions in inventories, he was able to identify forgeries being sold to Jean de Berry and again cast a shadow on 'radical formalism.'²³ To his students, he stressed a need to analyze art in the original and with Riegl presumably in mind, was quick to point to errors arising from too great a reliance on reproductions. The *Kunst und Wunderkammern* centres on the Ambras collection of Archduke Ferdinand of Tyrol (1529-1595). Aside from fine paper and binding, the new Macula edition has also taken care to provide sharp illustrations and an index. As with Riegl, the 'préface' and 'postface' offer a plethora of later material to be handled with care. These commentaries and their notes nearly approach the length of the original book itself. We know that the bibliography is overwhelming, but since it seems to be a source for the book by Debora J. Meijers (20, note 33) based on the collection curated by Schlosser, the insightful analysis by Thomas Ketelsen might also have been mentioned.²⁴ Although Hans Semper certainly had associations with Vienna, his academic career took place in Innsbruck and not as a Viennese colleague of Schlosser (45, note 73). Semper's bibliographical notices of art historical publications in northern Italian journals are particularly valuable and certainly include discussions of Schlosser. In his essay about the Embriachi, Schlosser was politely critical of Semper's work relevant to that subject.

The German 1978 edition of this book made changes to the text without identifying them.²⁵ Schlosser was a literary figure, wrote bad poetry of his own and laced his lectures, writings and apparently even his less formal conversations with oblique phrases from Goethe and lesser poets. Previous Italian and Spanish translations of other works of his have sometimes gone further in the direction of paraphrase. From the passages I have compared, Lucie Marignac has given us a

²³ Julius von Schlosser, *Les Cabinets d'art et de merveilles de la Renaissance tardive*, Paris: Macula, 2012, 208, Schlosser, *Die Kunst und Wunderkammern der Spätrenaissance: Ein Handbuch für Sammler und Liebhaber; Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Sammelwesens*, Leipzig: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1908 ed., 27-28.

²⁴ Thomas Ketelsen, *Künstlerviten, Inventare, Kataloge. Drei Studien zur Geschichte der kunsthistorischen Praxis*, Ammersbak: Lottbeck Jansen, 1990, Debora J. Meijers, *Kunst als Natur*, Geneva: Skira, 1995.

²⁵ Schlosser, *Kunst und Wunderkammern der Spätrenaissance: Ein Handbuch für Sammler und Liebhaber*, zweite durchgesehene und vermehrte Ausgabe, Bibliothek der Kunst- und Antiquitätenfreunde, 52, Braunschweig: Klinkhardt & Biermann, 1978.

solid and apt French version of a style which is actually more difficult than Riegl. In the anecdote, the Rabbi says 'beides probiert, gar kein Vergleich.' We can only reiterate in the words of one of Schlosser's most devoted students that to understand him it is necessary to read what he wrote, and a large number of people will now be better able to do so.

In both of these volumes, the commentaries stray from the meanings of the authors, but even their occasional inaccuracies do not present a problem since they separate themselves from the text itself and offer the reader both. Riegl was already being misunderstood at an early date. If they encourage a new generation, these volumes can only be welcomed as a rare phenomenon for art historical scholarship from more than a century ago. Riegl and Schlosser both experienced the Franco-Prussian war in their youth and remained suspicious of French scholarship throughout their careers. While the Italian and Spanish editions of their books offer something of an extension of their original intentions into the lands of the blossoming lemons, the French Connection provides a constructive departure and we can expect these two editions to enrich the discussion of problems raised in these two quite distinct approaches which have lain relatively dormant for several decades.

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.

KarlTJohns@aol.com