Josip Mantuani, First Slovenian student at the Vienna School of Art History and his long obscurity within Slovenian art historiography

Katja Mahnič

On 18 March 1933, when Josip Mantuani, the retired director of the former Provincial Museum of Carniola or the later National Museum in Ljubljana, passed away, he left behind over 330 published papers and a number of unpublished texts at different degrees of completion, as well as a comprehensive personal archive of various notes and material he had collected over the course of his career. Consequently, the starting conditions for a proper evaluation of his professional and scientific work, and for placing him in a broader historical development were favourable. However, owing to his many areas of activity – he is considered one of the last Slovenian universal polyhistors of the early 20th century – he has presented a challenge from the very start. Even though archaeology and ethnology are mentioned among the basic scientific disciplines on which he had left his mark, art history and musicology are currently considered his main areas of activity. Furthermore, one cannot overlook the fact that, partly in connection with his post of museum director, he devoted a great part of his professional attention to problems in monument protection and museology, which he tackled in a distinctly interdisciplinary way.

1 The most comprehensive bibliography of Mantuani’s works, which was published in a miscellany on the 60th anniversary of his death, contains 336 bibliographic items. The last eight were published posthumously; Edo Škulj, ‘Mantuanijeva bibliografija’, in Edo Škulj, ed, Mantuanijev zbornik. Simpozij ob 60. obletnici smrti, Ljubljana: Družina and Cerkveni glasbenik, 1994, 183-197. During my own research into Mantuani’s work, it became clear that this bibliography, which is partly based on Mantuani’s own incomplete lists of published texts, is also incomplete. In the ‘autobiographical’ text written by Mantuani in 1927, he stated that he had published 357 texts, whereas 117 more had been prepared in manuscript form; Josip Mantuani, Avtobiografija, 1927, Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Glasbena zbirka, inv. nr. 6/58, fol. 13. For more on the issue of his ‘autobiography’, see Gašper Cerkovnik, ‘Rokopis avtobiografije Josipa Mantuanija iz leta 1927 v Glasbeni zbirki Narodne in univerzitetne knjižnice v Ljubljani’, Arhivi, 35: 2, 2012, 463-479.

2 Today, his personal archive is kept by the Archives of the Republic of Slovenia and by the National and University Library. Also important for researching Mantuani’s professional activity is the archive of the National Museum of Slovenia, in which many texts by Mantuani, as well as official letters are preserved.


Despite the fact that Mantuani was one of the two oldest academically educated Slovenian art historians and the first to be educated at the Vienna School of Art History, which was incredibly important for the development of Central European art history, after his passing he was forgotten by his own profession for a long time. Over the last two-and-a-half decades, a historiographical treatment of Mantuani’s work in the field of art history has slowly begun to be established at last. So far, researchers mostly focused on a general presentation of his work and on placing him in an institutional framework. By clearly highlighting his versatility and individual special achievements, the first debt owed to Mantuani as a ‘doyen of Slovenian art history’ has certainly been paid.

Mantuani’s museum work received even more attention. Although the papers focus on his management of the museum
or on his work in connection with individual museum collections, they also help to form a clearer picture of Mantuani as an active art historian – or, more precisely, of the role he attributed to the fine arts and art history in the broadest social context.

In the future, the profession will have to thoroughly examine the conceptual framework of Mantuani’s work in the field of art history and place him in the overall development of art history. Two things should be pointed out. The research conducted thus far has shown that the reason he was forgotten partly lies in his

Figure 2 Izidor Cankar, France Stele and Vojeslav Mole in Vienna (1912), National and University Library, retrieved from [http://www.dlib.si/details/URN:NBN:SI:IMG-X06V9T9J](http://www.dlib.si/details/URN:NBN:SI:IMG-X06V9T9J)

personal relationships with the younger generation of art historians, especially with Izidor Cankar, but also with France Stele and Vojeslav Mole; this purely personal aspect also formed part of the context of the previous assessments of his work. Another important aspect which influenced how his work was assessed and which will have to be considered in future research is connected with the circumstances surrounding Mantuani’s professional and scientific work. The first phase of his career, when he was working at the Court Library in Vienna – first in the graphics collection and later in the music collection –, was characterised by his research into European fine arts. After moving to Ljubljana, where he took up the post of Director of the Provincial Museum of Carniola, he started researching ‘local’ fine arts; at first, he limited himself to Carniola, that is to the territory of a province of Inner Austria, but after the end of the First World War he focused on the entire Slovenian territory.

Figure 3 France Stele (1930), Photo by Matej Sternen, National Gallery, Photodocumentation, inv. nr. 3690, retrieved from https://sl.wikipedia.org/wiki/France_Stele_(umetnostni_zgodovinar)#/media/Slika:France_Stele_1930.jpg

The first attempts at defining Mantuani as an art historian clearly reveal the intertwining of both aspects, which is completely understandable from a historical perspective. The task of preparing the first assessment of Mantuani’s work fell to the generation of his younger colleagues, with whom he did not have the best
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Figure 4 Front cover of Ethnologist, V/VI: 1 (1933), National and University Library, retrieved from http://www.dlib.si/details/URN:NBN:SI:DOC-WKBHNOCH

Figure 5 Front cover of Art History Journal (1933), National and University Library, retrieved from http://www.dlib.si/details/URN:NBN:SI:DOC-F4FF73EA

Figure 6 Front cover of Newsletter of Museum Society of Slovenia (1933), National and University Library, retrieved from http://www.dlib.si/details/URN:NBN:SI:DOC-RCO2WW9R

relationships, at least professionally if not personally. On Mantuani’s passing, France Stele devoted as many as three obituaries to him, and a few months later he published a lexical entry on Mantuani in Slovenski biografski leksikon (Slovenian Biographical Lexicon). The obituaries were published in three journals devoted to two scientific disciplines, namely art history and ethnology, and to one professional interdisciplinary field, museum practice. The obituaries can undoubtedly be viewed as a reflection of Mantuani’s many areas of work. At the same time, one cannot overlook the fact that Stele had deliberately designed the obituaries and the biographical entry on Mantuani so that they each focus on an individual aspect of his work. As he himself pointed out, the biographical entry was meant to present Mantuani’s scientific and cultural work; the obituary in the journal Etnolog (Ethnologist) was to present his ethnographic work; and the obituary in the museum newsletter Glasnik Muzejskega društva za Slovenijo (Newsletter of Museum Society of Slovenia) was to present Mantuani as a museologist. Even though he published Mantuani’s obituary in Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino (Art History Journal), that is the shortest one and it gives a general presentation of his life and work, focusing especially on his monument protection activities. In his last sentence, Stele

9 For more on this topic, see, for example Lavrič and Resman, ‘Josip Mantuani’, 91, 95; Cerkovnik and Höfler, ‘Josip Mantuani’, 172-173.
12 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Glasnik), 136.
announced that he would be assessing Mantuani’s ‘work in the field of art history, which is less known in Slovenia’ in a special study.\textsuperscript{13} It is not clear from this announcement whether he was already writing the study or whether he was preparing to write it. At any rate, the fact remains that he never published a separate text on Mantuani’s work in the field of art history. Thus, Stele avoided a more thorough assessment of Mantuani as an art historian and defined the work of his older colleague rather superficially, particularly in the two other obituaries, and also in the biographical entry while presenting his scientific work.

It is obvious that all three obituaries were based on the same source text, because they repeat the same thoughts, sometimes word for word. Stele defined Mantuani the scientist as a humanistic polyhistor,\textsuperscript{14} who could only have evolved in a large scientific centre such as Vienna.\textsuperscript{15} He described him as an extraordinary analyst, but one that lacked the relevant synthetic component, which made him, a priori, qualified for quality lexicographic and bibliographic work, and for the study of sources (‘Quellengeschichte’).\textsuperscript{16} He mentioned that two of his qualities were exceptional memory and a consistent use of methodological tools.\textsuperscript{17} In Stele’s opinion, he published at least one work in each of his areas of interest that ‘elevated him above the merely local significance of a Slovenian scientist’;\textsuperscript{18} however, his many areas of interest were the exact reason why he was unable to develop ‘a comprehensive concept of a profession’ in any of them.\textsuperscript{19} In other words, he allegedly did not make any original contributions in his works, but was the best when it came to accuracy, thorough criticism and collecting material.\textsuperscript{20} Throughout his active involvement in all fields, he was said to have remained loyal to his ‘solid method of scientific historical work’, which he had acquired during his studies.\textsuperscript{21} He was described as mainly methodologically oriented, especially towards the study of sources (‘Quellengeschichte’), while lacking intuitive insight and a synthetic review of entire complexes. His works were said to be characterised by distinct descriptiveness, and his research by a rigid clunging to bibliographic tools.\textsuperscript{22} Stele’s assessment of Mantuani as a scientist is especially interesting because it wavers between Mantuani’s traits or living circumstances on the one hand and the overall context of his activities on the other. In the obituaries for \textit{Etnolog} and the museum
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newsletter and in the biographical entry he mentioned the true fact that after finishing primary school, Mantuani trained as an artisan and only afterwards enrolled in a general secondary school. However, in all three texts he used this piece of information to help him assess Mantuani as a person or even a scientist. Whereas his obituary for the newsletter mentions, quite neutrally, Mantuani’s persistence which had enabled him to get an education and a career in science,23 his obituary in Etnolog points out that he was characterised by a rare confidence and persistence in pursuing his goals, making him a genuine ‘self-made man’.24 He also associated his original profession with his later scientific work, stating that Mantuani’s ‘craftsmanship’ was important for his later scientific attitude towards ethnography.25 The rest of the text reveals that he was not merely referring to a special understanding of craft as the object of study,26 because he mentioned Mantuani’s ‘qualities’, such as a broad knowledge of the humanities and languages, memory and methodological diligence, and highlighted his life and work experiences, pointing out that he had ‘evolved into a scientist from a practising craftsman!’ 27 He reiterated this thought, including the exclamation mark, in the biographical entry.28 Stanko Premrl, the author of Mantuani’s obituary in Cerkveni glasbenik (Church Musician), included the same fact in his presentation of the deceased but in a different manner; he presented Mantuani’s training as an artisan as the result of his parents’ demands, and contrasted it with Mantuani’s own desire for knowledge and an academic education.29 On the other hand, Stele, as has already been said, placed Mantuani’s traits into a broader context by stating that despite his ‘perfected methodical apparatus’ the state of Slovenian science, which was still in its infancy in

23 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Glasnik), 136.
24 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Etnolog), 283.
25 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Etnolog), 283.
26 He also highlighted this aspect in the final part of the obituary in Etnolog, stating that Mantuani, being a trained craftsman, had an advantage over other researchers in the field of ethnology, because he had an ear for technique. Since the aspect of technique is very important when discussing ethnographic monuments, it allegedly enabled him to point out many an issue that was beyond the grasp of other researchers; Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Etnolog), 286.
28 Stele, ‘Mantuani, Josip’, 43.
29 Stanko Premrl, ‘Dvorni svetnik profesor dr. Josip Mantuani’, Cerkveni glasbenik. Glasilo Cecilijinega društva v Ljubljani, 5/6, 1933, 71. The development of Mantuani’s career was similarly described by Vladimir Pfeifer in a text published on Mantuani’s seventieth birthday. He also made it clear that such a development was common in those days; Vladimir Pfeifer, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani – sedemdesetletnik’, Zbori. Glasbeno književna priloga, VI: 2, 1 April 1930, 19. That he owes the development of his academic career, of which his parents disapproved, to his own persistence was also written by Mantuani himself in an introductory note in a notebook in which he kept information about his publications; Arhiv Republike Slovenije, SI AS 934, Mantuani Josip, fas. 10. For more on this topic, see Lavrič and Resman, ‘Josip Mantuani’, 87.
all fields, did not provide Mantuani with enough opportunities to evolve into a scientist who could surpass local boundaries.\(^{30}\)

In light of the announced, but apparently never realised, special study dedicated to assessing Mantuani’s work in the field of art history, the few short sentences in the obituary in the museum newsletter constitute Stele’s most concise assessment of Mantuani as an art historian. In it, he began by stating that Mantuani started his scientific career as an art historian in the graphics collection of the Court Library in Vienna, in which time he published a few art history papers that have preserved their scientific relevance.\(^{31}\) As an example, he mentioned Mantuani’s study on the ivory covers of the *Evangelium longum* manuscript from Sankt Gallen and his commentary in the edition of the *Vienna Dioscorides*. In the obituary in *Etnolog*, which was otherwise dedicated to Mantuani the ethnographer, he pointed out that both works enabled Mantuani to make a name for himself as a professional in a broader context and not only as a Slovenian scientist;\(^{32}\) he also mentioned the first of the two works in the biographical entry on Mantuani, where he added that Mantuani had been the first to solve the question of authorship of the monument in question.\(^{33}\) Nevertheless, in the obituary in the museum newsletter, Stele concludes that Mantuani, a doyen of Slovenian art historians, who had originated from the same school as the younger generation, that is his own, never evolved into an art historian in the full and contemporary meaning of the word.\(^{34}\) When describing Mantuani’s museum practice in the rest of the obituary, Stele once again returned to art history as one of the fields in which he was active while managing the museum’s collections. He claimed that Mantuani the art historian could relate more to arts and crafts and regional art (‘heimische Kunst’). However, he added that he had not made any new discoveries in those two fields either, which was why he mostly limited himself to organising and scientifically describing all kinds of material.\(^{35}\)

Besides what and how Stele points out when writing about Mantuani as an art historian, it is also interesting to see what he does not write about. In the obituary in the museum newsletter he mentioned that Mantuani originated from the school of art history to which he too belonged, namely the Vienna School of Art

---

30 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Glasnik), 137.
31 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Glasnik), 137.
32 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Etnolog), 285.
33 Stele, ‘Mantuani, Josip’, 43.
34 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Glasnik), 137. Alongside art history, Mantuani was said to have researched the history of music, which he had already focused on in Vienna, and to which he returned after retiring from his position as museum director. Stele pointed out once again that in this field, similarly as in that of art history, Mantuani never developed his method beyond a historical one, therefore keeping it descriptive; on the other hand, he also pointed out that music history was the field to which Mantuani devoted the most attention; Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Glasnik), 137. Stele highlighted Mantuani’s love of music history, which was allegedly stronger than the affiliation he felt towards his other areas of research, in other texts, too; See Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Etnolog), 283; Stele, ‘Mantuani, Josip’, 43.
35 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Glasnik), 138.
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History, but he never mentioned his teachers. This is that much more obvious because in the biographical entry which, according to Stele, gives the fullest description of Mantuani as a scientist and cultural worker, he explicitly mentioned Josef Böhm and Anton Bruckner, under whom he had studied the history of music in Vienna. On the other hand, we learn nothing of his two teachers at the Institute of Austrian Historical Research, Franz Wickhoff and Alois Riegl; not even in the shortest obituary published in Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino – as has already been mentioned, that obituary presents Mantuani solely in the context of his monument protection activities –, nor in the obituary in the museum newsletter, which defines Mantuani as an art historian. It is understandable that his music history teachers are mentioned in other texts that discuss Mantuani as a musicologist, but it is nevertheless interesting that those texts also discuss Mantuani’s art history education quite thoroughly; in his obituary, Stanko Premrl even mentioned the title of Mantuani’s doctoral dissertation ‘Über die Kleinkunst und die Kunstindustrie der Ottonenzeit 911-1024’, which Stele never mentioned. Wickhoff and Riegl as Mantuani’s teachers, and the title of his doctoral dissertation are also mentioned by Janko Barle in his presentation of Mantuani as an important musicologist in the Croatian journal of church music Sv. Cecilija.

The discussed texts about Mantuani provide an interesting picture of how he was perceived by his contemporaries. On the one hand, Stele’s texts clearly show a distance: even though he calls Mantuani ‘a doyen of Slovenian art historians, who had originated from the same school as the younger generation’, it is also perfectly clear that he uses the word doyen merely in the sense of the oldest, but not also the leading or most influential one, for he continues that Mantuani ‘never evolved into an art historian in the full and contemporary meaning of the word’. With these words, Stele not only defined Mantuani as an art historian, but also indicated the gap between him and the members of the younger generation, who later became known as the first Slovenian art historians. Stele most likely partially contributed to that by pointing out music history as the most important area of Mantuani’s research, claiming that his research had introduced the order that was needed to ‘root this profession in our country’. On the other hand, the authors of texts

36 Stele, ‘Mantuani, Josip’, 43.
37 Whether the reason for that was indeed the ‘planned’ special study on Mantuani as an art historian, or whether he was deliberately trying to draw attention only to his monument protection activity, can only be speculated.
38 See for example Pfeifer’s text on Mantuani’s seventieth birthday; Pfeifer, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’.
41 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Glasnik), 137.
42 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Glasnik), 137.
44 Stele, ‘Mantuani, Josip’, 44.
intended to present his work in the field of music history also present him as an art historian with much greater fondness and detail. One can also observe the much greater personal fondness these writers felt towards Mantuani. Stele’s texts are objectively cold; the only time he mentions Mantuani as a person is when he points out his confidence and persistence as qualities that were important for his career. In contrast, other authors are much fonder of him as a person and portray him as a magnanimous and kind man.

The fact that the mentioned texts so clearly reflect the authors’ personal attitudes towards Mantuani is not only understandable, but, to a degree, also expected—these texts were written by contemporaries about someone they knew personally, in one way or another. In individual cases, this personal acquaintance influenced the text differently, not just by showing a (lack of) fondness towards Mantuani, more or less obviously. For instance, Gašper Cerkovnik has proved that Barle’s presentation of Mantuani from 1928 was based on an ‘autobiographical text’, which had been given to him by Mantuani himself. That Barle asked Mantuani for a short description of his life and work must not have come as a surprise for him, because he used a similar practice of obtaining biographical information when organising the museum’s collection of paintings. However, we cannot overlook the fact, which Cerkovnik has already pointed out, that Mantuani’s text is subjective—on the one hand because it was based on his own memories, and

45 Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Glasnik), 136; Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Etnolog), 283.
47 Despite the fact that, at least in the case of Stele’s obituaries, the obituaries were published in professional journals, an obituary as a type of text enables (also) a more personal approach to presenting the deceased. In this context, the obituary written by Janko Barle stands out among Mantuani’s obituaries as it is full of personal memories of the deceased and of Mantuani’s own words, which Barle quoted from their correspondence; Janko Barle, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’, Sv. Cecilija. Smotra za crkvenu glazbu s glazbenim prilogom, 27: 2, 1933, 44-46. Though it is expected of a biographical entry to give an objective portrayal of the life and work of an individual, it is, to some extent, impossible if the author is describing someone with whom he had a personal relationship. This is especially evident in Stele’s entry on Mantuani, which, as has already been mentioned, he based on the same template as all three obituaries.
48 Mantuani, Avtobiografija.
49 Cerkovnik, ‘Rokopis biografije’.
50 Mantuani prepared a special questionnaire for the authors of paintings in the museum collection regarding their life and work, and then sent it to them; Kos, ‘Josip Mantuani’, 26. A letter from Ladislav Benesch to Mantuani, in which he provides information about his life, studies and oeuvre, has been preserved in the archive of the National Museum of Slovenia; Letter, 10 October 1914, Arhiv Narodnega muzeja Slovenije, doc. nr. 659/1914; for more on this topic, see Katja Mahnič, ‘Vključitev del’, 207-219.
51 As an example, Cerkovnik quotes Mantuani’s incorrect mention in his ‘autobiography’, claiming that he received his PhD with the dissertation ‘On the Painting of the Ottonian
on the other because it gave Mantuani an opportunity to present his life, the
development of his professional career and his scientific achievements from his own
perspective, occasionally by leaving things out. Or by emphasising others. Thus, in
his ‘autobiography’, Mantuani mentions not only his two art history teachers,
Wickhoff and Riegl, but also his other teachers at the University of Vienna and at the
institute. These omissions and emphases are not necessarily the result of deliberate
deception but of a highly subjective understanding of one’s own life and
achievements. In this regard, the autobiographical texts do not differ much from the
texts written about Mantuani by his contemporaries, which, as has been shown in
the examples discussed, are also full of omissions and emphases. Both types of texts
involve projections and are especially important from a historiographical
perspective, because they say more about the ‘subject’ than about the ‘object’; the
only difference being that in the first type the two are seemingly the same person.

Period (911-1024)’, which Barle then attempted to correct, though once again incorrectly.
According to Barle’s explanation, the mentioned thesis was his dissertation at the faculty,
whereas he received his PhD from the institute with the dissertation ‘Über die Kleinkunst
und die Kunstindustrie der Ottonenzeit 911-1024’. In reality, the first title refers to
Mantuani’s assignment while studying at the institute, whereas the second title was indeed
his doctoral dissertation; Cerkovnik, ‘Rokopis biografije’, 465. In the seminar, Wickhoff gave
three of his students the assignment to collect written sources from periods from which only
a few monuments had been preserved: Karl Hecke was to focus on the Merovingian period,
Julius Schlosser on the Carolingian period, and Mantuani on the Ottonian period; Julius
Schlosser, Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte. Rückblick auf ein Säkulum deutscher
Gelehrtenarbeit in Österreich, Innsbruck: Universitäts-Verlag Wagner, 1934, 162. Since
Mantuani’s assignment proved to be too comprehensive for two years of research, they later
decided to narrow it down to a treatment of Ottonian painting. The new title of the
assignment was ‘Über die Malerei der Ottonenzeit 900-1024 mit einer Einleitung über die
Quellen, deren Wert und Behandlung’; Alphons Lhotsky, Geschichte des Instituts für
Österreichische Geschichtsforschung 1854-1954, Graz and Köln: Hermann Böhlau Nachf., 1954,
264. As far as Schlosser recollects, he was the only one who brought Wickhoff’s assignment
to a successful conclusion – publication. Karl Hecke died before finishing his research,
whereas Mantuani’s work reportedly remained in manuscript form; Schlosser, Die Wiener
Schule, 162. Mantuani’s archive contains material which he had collected within the scope of
his seminar work and which is still awaiting examination. It is a file comprising 1612
references to printed sources up to 1000 or c. 1024 A.D. and additional 114 references to
printed ‘verses and gleanings’ (numbered by Mantuani). Moreover, a collection of index
cards with individual quotes from the collected sources has been preserved; Arhiv Republike
Slovenije, SI AS 934, Mantuani Josip, fas. 12. A few individual cards or texts relating to
sources for Ottonian art have also been preserved; Arhiv Republike Slovenije, SI AS 934,
Mantuani Josip, fas. 8.

52 Cerkovnik specifically mentions Mantuani’s retirement, which Mantuani himself left out
of his ‘autobiography’; Barle later mentioned his retirement in his own text and,
 furthermore, was one of the rare ones who agreed with Mantuani’s understanding of the
course of events; Cerkovnik, ‘Rokopis biografije’, 465.
A thorough reading of Stele's obituaries provides us with a clear enough picture of how he was perceived as an art historian by his younger colleagues. This is also interesting in the light of the subsequent development of the historiographical treatment of Mantuani's work. The silence of the next generations is a telling sign that the image of Mantuani as a music historian rather than an art historian, as created by Stele, was adopted by Slovenian art historians to such an extent that the profession paid no special attention to him for the next six decades. As has already been mentioned, in the last two-and-a-half decades, important shifts have occurred. The studies of individual researchers once again include Mantuani in the development of Slovenian art history, while clearly pointing out some of the aspects, mainly personal ones, that led to his professional oblivion. Despite partial attempts at defining the individual areas or topics of art history that he was researching, an in-depth examination of his thoughts regarding art history remains a task for the future. That task is made difficult by at least two important factors: firstly, in addition to his numerous publications, most of the results of his work in the field of art history exist in the form of notes, drafts and other archival material, which have yet to be systematically processed; and secondly, a potential limitation

54 For more on this topic, see Lavrič and Resman, ‘Josip Mantuani’, 95-96. Another problem lies in the fact that Mantuani’s voluminous archive was divided and, as has already been pointed out, is currently kept by two institutions. In principle, the archive was divided between the two institutions based on the area of Mantuani’s research: everything relating to music history was transferred to the music collection of the National and University Library, while the rest of the material was transferred to the Archives of the Republic of Slovenia. However, a rather cursory review of the archival material kept in both institutions has
to our understanding of his work in the field of art history is the previous division of his activities into individual fields. A joint discussion of Mantuani’s art history texts and texts relating to museology, and even more so to monument protection seems logical considering the then organisation of the monument protection activity in the broadest sense and its connection to art history in Austria-Hungary. The Central Commission’s reform, initiated by Riegl in 1903 and realised by Max Dvorak in 1911, established not only an institute of art history but also a clear connection between the theory of art history and the practice of monument protection. But, so far a clear need for establishing a broader connection with his work in musicology has not arisen, even though it could be justified by one of the references in his ‘autobiography’. In the latter, after concluding a presentation of his higher education, Mantuani wrote down something that could be considered his personal credo and, simultaneously, an explanation of his scientific work. He begins with his realisation that all forms of art, though each with its own principles and development, are a part of the same general culture. Hence, he continues, he evenly divided his attention between the fine arts and the art of music, focusing in particular on comparative studies. That which contemporary historiography considers two different areas of Mantuani’s research, he considered two closely related areas if not a uniform one.

Therefore, a great deal of archival and comparative studies will be required before we can properly place Mantuani’s work. To begin with, Slovenian art history will have to finally define all of Mantuani’s work in the field of art history, as seen in his published texts relating to art history and monument protection, and in his unpublished manuscripts and documents. Only then will it be able to properly evaluate his line of thought and place it into the overall development of art history as a profession. In a broader sense, his ideas will have to be examined within the scope of the development of the Vienna School of Art History. His adherence to the method of collecting and interpreting primary sources, and carefully preparing

revealed that the material was divided up in haste, so that occasionally some parts of the same document or notes are kept in one institution and some parts in the other.

55 For more on this topic, see for example Eva Frodl-Kraft, Gefährdetes Erbe. Österreichs Denkmalschutz und Denkmalpflege 1918-1945 im Prisma der Zeitgeschichte, Wien, Köln and Weimar: Böhlau, 1997, XXV-XXVIII and XXXI-XXXIV. In this context, it is not surprising that Mantuani’s teacher, Riegl, and his younger colleague, Stele, were both active writers in both fields. For a comparison between Mantuani’s understanding of monument protection, which is closely connected with his concept of the nature of art, and Stele’s understanding, who, to a large extent, adopted and built on Riegl’s ideas, see Katja Mahnič, Collective Memory between Tradition and Archive: Josip Mantuani, Heimatschutz and Monument Protection, Ars & Humanitas. Revija za umetnost in humanistiko, XIII: 1, 2019, 205-218.

56 Mantuani, Avtobiografija, 2.

57 After all, this is clear from Mantuani’s article on Heimatschutz, which he presented to the public as a ‘cultural movement’; in its scope of operations he included art and urban monuments but also ethnographic heritage, with emphasis on folk poetry; Josip Mantuani, ‘Domovinsko varstvo’, Čas. Znanstvena revija »Leonove družbe«, VIII: 2, 1914, 73-101.
documentation with information on individual artists and their works,\textsuperscript{58} based on his own research and on previous publications, can easily be connected to his studies at the institute.\textsuperscript{59} His focus on the arts and crafts production and his interest in folk art are not merely a consequence of his job as a museum director but can also be considered his teachers' legacy.\textsuperscript{60} In the narrower sense, his ideas will have to be compared with the work of his contemporaries who were responsible for the way he was perceived by the profession in the decades that followed. As far as Mantuani the art historian is concerned, this second aspect of the research into his work is important for yet another reason. Namely, the possibility that the gap between Mantuani and the younger generation of art historians was not merely of a personal nature, as the majority of recent studies have pointed out, but may have been the result of their conceptual differences, suggests itself. When Stele calls him 'a sort of humanistic polyhistor' possessing broad knowledge but lacking insight and synthesis in individual fields, which he believed was the result of his broad-ranging interests and at least partly of switching between areas of work,\textsuperscript{61} he is, of course, speaking from his own viewpoint, that is through his own understanding of the fine arts or of the profession of art history. Mantuani, who allegedly complained to Barle in a letter that the younger generation was accusing him that not enough work was being done, which he apparently saw as a personal attack,\textsuperscript{62} may have viewed his

\textsuperscript{58} This has already been pointed out by Lavrič and Resman, ‘Josip Mantuani’, 96. Besides the aforementioned file containing sources for Ottonian art, which he had been preparing during his studies at the institute, a few other files have been preserved in his archive, which contain information he gathered on a specific topic, quotes from literature or bibliographic information.

\textsuperscript{59} For more on the long tradition of collecting primary sources and information, to which Mantuani's art history teacher Franz Wickhoff adhered, and on how he introduced Mantuani to this method by his seminar assignment, see Schlosser, \textit{Die Wiener Schule}, 161-162. The founder of this philological-historical school was another of Mantuani's teachers, Theodor von Sickel; Schlosser, \textit{Die Wiener Schule}, 171 and following. It was Sickel who offered Mantuani his first job at the Austrian Institute of Art History in Rome; Mantuani, \textit{Avtobiografija}, 2. Wickhoff's influence on Mantuani can also be observed in the importance he ascribed to the technical aspect of artefacts; Schlosser, \textit{Die Wiener Schule}, 161-162. Namely, there was an essay among Mantuani's manuscripts entitled 'Art, Technique and Craft', which has been preserved as a fragment; Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, Glasbena zbirka, inv. nr. 41/47, fol. 5.

\textsuperscript{60} For more on the tradition of research into folk art at the Vienna School of Art History and on Riegl's role in changing the discursive frame of its treatment, see Matthew Rampley, \textit{The Vienna School of Art History. Empire and the Politics of Scholarship, 1847-1918}, University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013, 116-140. For Riegl see also Diana Reynolds Cordileone, \textit{Alois Riegl in Vienna 1875-1905. An Institutional Bibliography}, Farnham, Burlington: Ashgate, 2014, 109-149.

\textsuperscript{61} Stele, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (Glasnik), 136.

\textsuperscript{62} Janko Barle, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (1933), 45. In the same letter he goes on saying that he decided to let them take over the work; however, in a subsequent letter he wrote that he would nevertheless keep working; Janko Barle, ‘Dr. Josip Mantuani’ (1933), 45. Such
own ‘fragmentation’ in a completely different way. For him, it was logical to work in various fields; he did not draw any rigid dividing lines between his research into the fine arts and music, for he considered both fields a part of a broader whole, namely culture.
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pressure, accompanied by medical problems, may be the reason why after his retirement in 1924 he focused mainly on one field, the history of music. However, in the process he never abandoned his cultural mission, as he understood it.