

The scope and ambition of Izidor Cankar's 'systematics of style'

Rebeka Vidrih

Introduction

When the Slovenian University of Ljubljana was established in 1919 – a most meaningful culturally-political gesture within the newly founded Kingdom of Serbians, Croats and Slovenians – Izidor Cankar, by then already a well known personality in Slovenian cultural life, accepted the task to establish its department of art history.¹ Cankar studied theology in Ljubljana, aesthetics in Leuven and art history first in Graz and finally in Vienna, being a student of Max Dvořák, along with Vojeslav Molè and France Stelè. He graduated in 1913, and upon the return to Ljubljana he established himself as a critic, a writer and an influential editor. He returned to Vienna and to Dvořák in winter semester of 1919–20 in order to prepare for the professorship at the Ljubljana university and started lecturing in spring semester of 1920. Cankar was therefore the first professor of art history, the founder of art-historical discipline in Slovenia, not only in terms of the organisation of studies but also – just as importantly, if not even more – in terms of their theoretical and methodological foundations.

In 1926 his *Uvod v umevanje likovne umetnosti. Sistematika stila* (Introduction into Comprehending of the Visual Art. The Systematics of Style)² and in 1927 the first instalment of the first volume of the concomitant survey of European art, *Zgodovina likovne umetnosti v Zahodni Evropi. Razvoj stila* (The History of Visual Art in Western Europe. The Evolution of Style),³ were published, originating of course in the very immediate, local needs for the professional terminology in Slovenian language,⁴ but also in Cankar's own much wider, more global ambition, regarding

¹ Izidor Cankar's life was quite eventful in itself; see the 'Appendix' for a short biography.

² Izidor Cankar, *Uvod v umevanje likovne umetnosti (Sistematika stila)*, Ljubljana: Narodna galerija, 1926. A second edition was published in 1959, and in 1995 the third edition followed.

³ Izidor Cankar, *Zgodovina likovne umetnosti v Zahodni Evropi, I. del, Od početkov krščanske umetnosti do l. 1000, Razvoj stila v starokrščanski dobi in zgodnjem srednjem veku; II. del, Od leta 1000 do leta 1400, Razvoj stila v visokem in poznem srednjem veku; III. del, Od leta 1400 do leta 1564, Razvoj stila v dobi renesanse*, Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1992.

⁴ Cankar had to start at the very beginnings, at the general term for the arts of architecture, sculpture and painting. He argued against the terms '*oblikujoča umetnost*' and '*upodabljaljoča umetnost*' which were, translated from the German '*bildende Kunst*', used in Slovenian art criticism hitherto. He claimed that they 'neither in form nor in meaning do not fit to Slovenian thinking' and argued for the term '*likovna umetnost*' (*likovni* from *lik*, (visual) shape). Izidor Cankar, '*Likovna umetnost ali drugače*' (Visual art or differently), *Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino*, 6: 4, 1926, 222–223. Earlier yet, he carried on a polemics with Christian

the international art-historical context. This ambition of his is clearly evident from the following passage from the 'Preface' to his *Introduction*:

During my own studies, debating about art and while reading artistic literature, professional as well, I got convinced that the artistic terminology hitherto, if it discusses the style, has been uncertain, which is a sign of loose, uncertain concepts. Following that, while pondering over the character of styles, particular insights arranged themselves to me in such a way that it seemed possible to me to delineate a stylistic systematics, which I propose here in this outline and to which, for the purpose of greater clarity, I added some introductory chapters about various views upon art which are not stylistic-systematical.

The art-historical literature has so far engaged in specific characteristics of the stylistic structure relatively little. And it has not undertaken the attempt to a stylistic systematics at all. However, the conditions for it have been created, so that its outline nevertheless is not premature, with the investigations of Alois Riegl, Franz Wickhoff and Heinrich Wölfflin, of which the first two elaborated some concepts in their researches about Late Roman art and Riegl in his book about the Roman Baroque, whereas the latter elaborated 'basic art-historical concepts' for the age of transition from the Renaissance to the art of the seventeenth century. The undersigned have attempted to complete those investigations, to sum up the marks of style into a system regardless of the historical evolution, to create *in nuce* some sort of a grammar of art formation, to point at the logicity and organic functionality of its laws and their necessary relation to the general human consciousness.⁵

It is most obvious that Cankar understood his own work in close relation to the work of Riegl, Wickhoff and Wölfflin; specifically to Wickhoff's *Römische Kunst. Die Wiener Genesis* (1895, 1912²), to Riegl's *Spätromische Kunstindustrie nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn* (1901) as well as *Die Entstehung der Barockkunst in Rom* (1908), and to Wölfflin's *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Das Problem der Stilentwicklung in der neueren Kunst* (1915).⁶ Cankar, attempting 'to complete those investigations, to sum

art critics, who insisted that art should be judged according to moral and pedagogical criteria. Cankar advocated the autonomy of art. See: Izidor Cankar, 'Trideset let' (Thirty Years), *Dom in svet*, 29: 11/12, 1916, 327–332.

⁵ Cankar, *Uvod*, 5–6.

⁶ Franz Wickhoff, *Roman Art. Some of Its Principles and Their Application to Early Christian Painting*, trans. Mrs. S. Arthur Strong, New York: Macmillan; London: Heinemann, 1900; Franz Wickhoff, *Römische Kunst (Die Wiener Genesis). Die Schriften Franz Wickhoffs herausgeben von Max Dvořák. Dritter Band*, Berlin: Meyer & Jessen, 1912; Alois Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, trans. Rolf Winkes, Roma: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1985; Alois Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, Wien: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1927; Alois Riegl, *The Origins of Baroque Art in Rome*, trans. Andrew Hopkins and Arnold Witte, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2010; Alois Riegl, *Die Entstehung der Barockkunst in Rom*, eds. Arthur Burda and Max Dvořák, Wien: Anton Schroll, 1908; Heinrich Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History. The*

up the marks of style into a system', declared therefore his work to be a further and a final elaboration of their theoretical attempts and efforts. This contribution raises the question whether his declaration was justified, and it attempts to chart the affinities and the differences between Cankar's achievements and those of his predecessors.⁷ Perhaps surprisingly, Max Dvořák, whose student Cankar was, is not mentioned in this preface. Dvořák is nevertheless the only exemplary art historian whom Cankar foregrounded in the introduction of *The History of Visual Art in Western Europe. The Evolution of Style*, apparently referring to his *Idealismus und Naturalismus in der gotischen Skulptur und Malerei* (1918), published again posthumously in *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte* (1924).⁸

The systematics of style

Following the 'Introduction' in which his announcement was laid down, Cankar deemed necessary first to discuss non-artistic aspects of an artwork (the historical values and the age values of an artwork, art-historical aspects) and then the artistic aspects with the aesthetic-subjective values – as a sort of justification for a need for a truly scientific art-historical approach (Table 1). Only after that the proper 'systematics of style' begins, with its definition of an artwork as an organism and with the stated intention 'to reveal the formal-organical character of an artwork'.⁹ An artwork, defined as a 'lawfully ordered, organic formation, in which a single form is subordinated to the meaning of the whole and it supports and explains this meaning in its own way',¹⁰ is then regarded from four points of view. First there are the motif and subject matter (*predmet in snov*), which indicate a specific 'relation of artistic matter towards nature',¹¹ or, in other words, the worldview. Then follow the formation of corporality (*oblikovanje telesnosti*), the formation of space (*oblikovanje prostora*), and figural composition (*figuralna kompozicija*), which together constitute a specific way of depicting, the style.

Problem of the Development of Style in Early Modern Art, trans. Jonathan Blower, Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2015; Heinrich Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe. Das Problem der Stilentwicklung in der neueren Kunst*, München: Hugo Bruckmann, 1917².

⁷ The aim of the present contribution is not a comprehensive presentation of the theoretical positions in their entirety, either of Cankar's predecessors or Cankar himself, but merely a close reading and comparison between Cankar's *Introduction* and those texts that Cankar is referring to.

⁸ Cankar, *Zgodovina*, I, 6. Max Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism in Gothic Art*, Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1967; Max Dvořák, *Idealismus und Naturalismus in der Gotischen Skulptur und Malerei*, *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte. Studien zur abendländischen Kunstentwicklung*, Berlin: Gebr. Mann, 1995.

⁹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 139.

¹⁰ Cankar, *Uvod*, 219.

¹¹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 78–79.

Table of contents	Vsebina
Introduction	Uvod
Non-artistic aspects	Neumetnostni vidiki
Historical values of an artwork	Zgodovinske vrednote umetnine
Age values of an artwork	Starinske vrednote umetnine
Art-historical aspects	Umetnostno-zgodovinski vidiki
Artistic aspects	Umetnostni vidiki
Aesthetic-subjective values	Estetsko-subjektivne vrednote
An artwork as a an organism (The systematics of style)	Umetnina kot organizem (Sistematika stila)
Motif and subject matter	Predmet in snov
Idealism	Idealizem
Naturalism	Naturalizem
Realism	Realizem
'Impression and expression'	'Vtis in izraz'
The formation of corporality	Oblikovanje telesnosti
Planar style	Ploskoviti stil
Plastic style	Plastični stil
Painterly style	Slikoviti stil
The formation of space	Oblikovanje prostora
Spaceless stage	Brezprostorno prizorišče
Bounded stage	Omejeno prizorišče
Boundless stage	Brezmejno prizorišče
Figural composition	Figuralna kompozicija
Tied composition	Vezana kompozicija
Tectonic composition	Tektonska kompozicija
Free composition	Svobodna kompozicija
The content of an artwork	Vsebina umetnine

Table 1: Izidor Cankar, *Uvod v umevanje likovne umetnosti (Sistematika stila)*, Table of contents.

From these four aspects there emerge three fundamental categories for comprehending works of art (Table 2). Regarding the worldview, or the choice of content (the motif and the subject matter), there are first two poles, which have roots deeply in human nature and between which the human taste oscillates; two forms, two ways of expressing which indicate the limits of artistic activity in general: idealism and naturalism.¹² Idealism (*idealizem*) represents the position from which natural phenomena are comprehended as expressions of supramaterial ideas; naturally given matter is merely a means for expressing mental content,¹³ as seen, for example, in the *Crucifixion* (c. 750) in Santa Maria Antiqua in Rome. Idealistic subject matter is characterised by emphasizing the mental content, by abandoning the material details which are not necessary for the notional comprehension of a picture, by free remodelling of natural shapes and by an inclination towards typisation.¹⁴ The subject matter, given in nature, is for the idealistic art merely a means for creating its own world, created according to an idea *a priori*.¹⁵

¹² Cankar, *Uvod*, 67.¹³ Cankar, *Uvod*, 79, 89.¹⁴ Cankar, *Uvod*, 87.¹⁵ Cankar, *Uvod*, 87.

At the other end, naturalism (*naturalizem*) represents recapitulation¹⁶ of actual nature, a position which comprehends nature as sensual impression, and nothing more than that.¹⁷ A naturalist, such as Willem van de Velde the Younger in his *Cannon Shot* (c. 1680, Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum), tries to offer as much details as possible, closely following the naturally given models; he does not know the type, he is writing out in full the nature, in which only the individuals exist.¹⁸ If, on the one hand, the subject matter of idealism is nature as an expression of the artist's mentality, then the subject matter of naturalism is nature treated as the artist's sensual impression.¹⁹ And then there is the third form, realism (*realizem*), in between these two extremes, a union of both.²⁰ A picture, such as Gerrit Dou's *Young Mother* (1658, The Hague: Mauritshuis), is an impression and an expression at the same time, a combination of a naturalistic recapitulation of objects for its own sake and an idealistic mental tendency, which in this case would be a celebration of maternal happiness.²¹ Cankar observes that there exists a certain law in regard to the selection of subject matter, but admits, too, that this law is not so rigorous so that the same motif could not be used by the idealist, the realist and the naturalist alike.²²

The remaining three aspects, regarding the style, proffer the three solutions to a formal problem: how – on a surface, which extends only in height and width and is therefore two-dimensional – to represent the corporality of objects, which all extend also in depth and are three-dimensional.²³ From the formation of corporality, the formation of space, and the figural composition, that is, from the way the bodies are modelled, the way the space is formed and the way the bodies are set in the space, a specific style can be discerned.

In the planar style (*ploskoviti stil*), which necessarily, by its nature, associates with idealistic subject matter, disproportioned and anatomically incorrect bodies are projected into a flat plane and partitioned into separate surfaces, bounded by lines – for that the plane style may also be called linear style (*linearni stil*).²⁴ Typical and schematic flat shapes do not need space for their existence, they appear on a

¹⁶ Cankar quite consistently uses the word '*obnova (narave)*', which we translate as 'recapitulation (of nature)', rather than 'imitation'; Cankar's choice of the term namely corresponds to the German '*Wiederherstellung*'.

¹⁷ Cankar, *Uvod*, 89, 92.

¹⁸ Cankar, *Uvod*, 89.

¹⁹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 92.

²⁰ Cankar, *Uvod*, 90.

²¹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 92, 100. In Cankar's *Introduction*, the painting is erroneously attributed to Rembrandt.

²² Cankar, *Uvod*, 101–102.

²³ Cankar, *Uvod*, 105. Whereas architecture creates entirely new material organisms, according to Cankar, the activity of painting and sculpture is the artistic recapitulation of nature, of the things that a man sees (Cankar, *Uvod*, 77–78). The 'systematics of style' is concerned with painting and sculpture alone; Cankar, however, intended to include architecture as well. He wrote a draft for the lectures in 1931–32 about the 'systematics of architectural style', but he did not expand on the text and prepare it for publication. The draft was published as an appendix in the second edition of his *Introduction: Izidor Cankar, Uvod v likovno umetnosti (Sistematika stila)*, Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1959, 205–226.

²⁴ Cankar, *Uvod*, 107, 123–125.

spaceless stage (*brezprostorno prizorišče*).²⁵ The tied composition (*vezana kompozicija*) – as it can be seen in *Ascension of Christ* (c. 1125) on the tympanum of the central portal in the narthex of the Vézelay abbey church – with its tendency towards absolute symmetry, puts visible things into an ideal, abstract order, which is not known to nature.²⁶ The things are not presented to us such as they are or such as they are seen, but as mentally transformed things; objects are presented in a permanent, eternal existence, in an unchanging, motionless condition.²⁷ Idealistic planar style presents a subjective mental reconstruction of the objective world, a subjective interpretation of objective nature.²⁸ It is the most abstract style, it despises the sensually established character of phenomena and represents, instead of what we perceive, merely an abstraction of perceptions.²⁹ The idealistic planar style is not about a 'correct' copy of something, which is seen from the outside, but about its invisible, intrinsic meaning, which exists solely in the world of ideas; in the mind it remodels the forms, works upon the subject matter, so that their supramaterial, spiritual sense is revealed.³⁰

The plastic style (*plastični stil*) is an expression of realism.³¹ Since the artist's aim is to recapitulate things in their full corporality, about which he was informed by the experience of his senses, not merely by the sense of vision but also by the sense of touch, bodies are represented in such a way as they are felt by touch, and because of that this style could also be called a haptic or tactile style (*haptični ali taktični stil*).³² By means of shading, a full corporality is achieved, objects are isolated and individualised with sharp and clear outlines.³³ Depicted things and events are naturally possible but they are idealised.³⁴ In Dirk Bout's *Last Supper* from the altarpiece of the Holy Sacrament (1464–68, Leuven: collegiate church of St Peter), figures appear in moderate motion and on a bounded stage (*omejeno prizorišče*): they appear in a real space, but one nevertheless remodelled into a contained spatial unit.³⁵ Persons move freely but their gestures are connected by means of an imagined compositional shape.³⁶ By means of tectonic composition (*tektonska kompozicija*) they are reordered as possible, but into a higher order raised configurations which can mostly be reduced to geometrical shapes.³⁷ Realistic plastic style thus presents nature as it is seen and experienced, but also, at the same time, remodelled into an evident compositional organisms.³⁸

²⁵ Cankar, *Uvod*, 148, 178.

²⁶ Cankar, *Uvod*, 199, 201–202.

²⁷ Cankar, *Uvod*, 123, 126, 149, 201–202.

²⁸ Cankar, *Uvod*, 123, 125.

²⁹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 123.

³⁰ Cankar, *Uvod*, 79, 126.

³¹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 169.

³² Cankar, *Uvod*, 144, 146, 151–152.

³³ Cankar, *Uvod*, 86–87, 133, 145, 191.

³⁴ Cankar, *Uvod*, 191.

³⁵ Cankar, *Uvod*, 150, 191.

³⁶ Cankar, *Uvod*, 204–205, 212.

³⁷ Cankar, *Uvod*, 203–204.

³⁸ Cankar, *Uvod*, 212.

Lastly, painterly style (*slikoviti stil*) is an expression of naturalistic worldview. It is the way of representing with an aim to only recapitulate the visual impression of things, to register the impression of the eye, and for that it may be also called optical style (*optični stil*).³⁹ In contrast to realistic plastic style, in a painting such as Titian's *Christ Crowned with Thorns* (c. 1570, Munich: Alte Pinakothek) or in a statue such as Edgar Degas's *Dancer Putting on a Stocking* (c. 1896–1911, Paris: Musée d'Orsay), sharp outlines are now being lost, clear plasticity becomes blurred, the images become complexes of patches of light and colour.⁴⁰ Things are depicted in their changeable, moveable form, and they appear on a boundless stage (*brezmejno prizorišče*) that spills over the edges of the picture.⁴¹ Small gatherings of people are dynamically agitated and spatially scattered in a free composition (*svobodna kompozicija*).⁴² Naturalistic painterly style presents nature exactly as it is seen at a particular moment, without any subjective interpretation of it whatsoever.⁴³ The object is the source of the form, the object is the standard of an artwork, the seen actuality is the artistic ideal.⁴⁴ Naturalistic subject matter presents what there is and not what it could or should be; naturalistic-painterly style is a flight from ideality into an actual nature and is therefore at the same time a flight from ideal plane and realistically-narrow scene into boundless stages of the visible world.⁴⁵

<u>predmet in snov</u> (motif and subject matter)	idealizem (idealism)	realizem (realism)	naturalizem (naturalism)
<u>oblikovanje telesnosti</u> (formation of corporality)	ploskoviti stil (planar style) (linear style)	plastični stil (plastic style) (haptic/tactile style)	slikoviti stil (painterly style) (optical style)
<u>oblikovanje prostora</u> (formation of space)	brezprostorno prizorišče (spaceless stage)	omejeno prizorišče (bounded stage)	brezmejno prizorišče (boundless stage)
<u>figuralna kompozicija</u> (figural composition)	vezana kompozicija (tied composition)	tektonska kompozicija (tectonic composition)	svobodna kompozicija (free composition)

Table 2: Izidor Cankar, *Uvod v umevanje likovne umetnosti (Sistematika stila)*.

According to Cankar, idealism attained its culmination in Early Middle Ages, whereas 'the ages of strong naturalistic thinking' were Italian quattrocento and The Netherlands in the fifteenth century, reacting to mediaeval idealism, but also the end of the nineteenth century, as a consequence of general materialistic

³⁹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 152.

⁴⁰ Cankar, *Uvod*, 150–151.

⁴¹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 171, 192.

⁴² Cankar, *Uvod*, 212–213.

⁴³ Cankar, *Uvod*, 169.

⁴⁴ Cankar, *Uvod*, 169.

⁴⁵ Cankar, *Uvod*, 197.

philosophy.⁴⁶ Realism would be the most widespread worldview and style. Considering the examples he mentions or discusses in the text, an approximate division could be delineated between idealistic art of the Middle Ages, realistic art of the Renaissance, and the naturalistic art of the Baroque and onwards, but he refuses to set firm boundaries between the periods or firm correlations between the worldviews and the specific historical periods. All illustrated examples, from various periods and historical styles, are meant to be just various demonstrations of those three general principles.

In the last chapter, 'The Content of an Artwork', Cankar offers some concluding thoughts about the style as such and its meaning for or function in the art-historical science (*umetnostna znanost, Kunstwissenschaft*). For Cankar, idealism, realism and naturalism are 'reflections of the fundamental artistic mentality', 'for when we speak about idealism, realism and naturalism, we speak about more than a style, we speak about the way in which the image of the world forms itself in the human soul at all'.⁴⁷

Because the final ground of every style is in this mentality, which contains more than artistic presentations, which contains the whole world, the style sprouts out of the depth of the human soul, out of his worldview and his feeling of life. When, therefore, a fight for an artistic form flares up, it is not merely a fight for an artistic form but it is a fight for the formation of the whole human soul or for the expression of this soul.⁴⁸

The style is a man, but the style is also an age. When the art-historical science analyses it, it analyses the individual and the age. (...) The style speaks to it about the unified, consistent, strong ages, about the weak, internally shattered, uncertain ages, about the ages which confess something else and think or feel something else again. In this the art-historical science sees the content of the art and the artwork, in these results of its analyses lies the justification of its existence. Herein lies its meaning, because by its analyses of the style it discloses the law of the man's spirituality and his artistic activity.⁴⁹

However, in Cankar's opinion, his work was not yet finished:

In our discussion about the style, we have observed it only from the formal point of view, but if we spread it out developmentally in the chronological sequence of its forms, a whole history of human spiritual development opens up in front of us.⁵⁰

The 'systematics of style', laid out in the *Introduction*, merely laid the foundations, provided the tools for actual art-historical analyses, the means for writing the

⁴⁶ Cankar, *Uvod*, 95, 97.

⁴⁷ Cankar, *Uvod*, 219.

⁴⁸ Cankar, *Uvod*, 219.

⁴⁹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 223.

⁵⁰ Cankar, *Uvod*, 220.

history of art in its entirety.⁵¹ It was meant to be supplemented with, or realised in the 'evolution of style' from the very beginning: the first volume of his *History of Visual Art in Western Europe. The Evolution of Style in Early Christian Age and Early Middle Ages (up to 1000)* was published only a year after *Introduction*. Later followed *The Evolution of Style in High and Late Middle Ages (from 1000 to 1400)* and *The Evolution of Style in the Age of the Renaissance (from 1400 to 1564)*.⁵² He planned to continue his work, he prepared an outline for the fourth book, on the Baroque art, but unfortunately he did not complete it and it remained unpublished.

'The conditions for it have been created' ...

Cankar operates with the terms and concepts quite well known and established in art history of the time; he was indeed building upon the tentatives and the achievements of the aforementioned art historians and he did do his best to systematise their various notions into a comprehensive and yet simple system, which would be easy enough for students to use and with which an analysis and an assessment of all existent works of art would be possible.

Franz Wickhoff, in his groundbreaking discussion *Roman Art. Some of Its Principles and Their Application to Early Christian Painting*, took a famous Early Christian manuscript, the Vienna Genesis – with its continuous method of pictorial narration and its illusionist style of painting – as the starting point for an investigation into the development and consequently the principles of Roman art in general and even Ancient art at large.⁵³

Beginning with three methods of pictorial narration (Table 3), with three possible ways of telling a story – Egyptian or Asiatic complementary method, Hellenistic isolating method and Roman continuous method –,⁵⁴ Wickhoff then moves on to discussing different ways of representing in general. He proposes an opposition between two principles, between the art that creates types and the art that aims at individualising, that is, between an art intent upon the type and an art aimed at pictorial effect (*als ... malerisch wirken sollte*), which for him is also an opposition between the art of the East and the Western art.⁵⁵ Then he renames the

⁵¹ Cankar, however, began his history only in Early Christian era. He disregarded the Antiquity and wrote, as the title suggests, history of art of only Western Europe.

⁵² His *History* was first published in instalments. The first volume, *Zgodovina likovne umetnosti v Zahodni Evropi, I. del, Od početkov krščanske umetnosti do l. 1000, Razvoj stila v starokrščanski dobi in zgodnjem srednjem veku* (The Evolution of Style in Early Christian Age and Early Middle Ages, up to 1000), consisted of three parts (1927, 1928, 1928); the second volume, *Zgodovina likovne umetnosti v Zahodni Evropi, II. del, Od leta 1000 do leta 1400, Razvoj stila v visokem in poznem srednjem veku* (The Evolution of Style in High and Late Middle Ages, from 1000 to 1400), consisted of two parts (1931, 1933), and the third volume, *Zgodovina likovne umetnosti v Zahodni Evropi, III. del, Od leta 1400 do leta 1564, Razvoj stila v dobi renesanse* (The Evolution of Style in the Age of the Renaissance, from 1400 to 1564), consisted of two parts (1936, 1951). The entire *History* was reprinted in 1992.

⁵³ Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, 173–174; Wickhoff, *Römische Kunst*, 188.

⁵⁴ Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, 13–16; Wickhoff, *Römische Kunst*, 14–17.

⁵⁵ Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, 19–20, 71; Wickhoff, *Römische Kunst*, 22, 82.

individualising principle, first as the illusionist principle and further to the illusionist style, and finally adds an additional phase, a precursive phase to the illusionistic style: an intermediate style, or the imitative-naturalistic style.⁵⁶ He then proceeds, with focusing on the essential difference between the illusionist style and the naturalist style, on 'the great revolution' from naturalism to illusionism, from the Oriental Hellenic style to the Occidental-Latin one.⁵⁷

Naturalism, which can be, in his opinion, best observed in the art of the fifteenth century, strives first of all to inter-relate the determining forms in a self-contained composition; so, the completed picture is not the result of merely one, definite act of vision, but is rather an amalgamation of the impressions received in several acts of vision, it is therefore the result of a continuous study of the object that is to be represented.⁵⁸ The illusionist style, which was general and fully developed in the seventeenth century, and which was at work to the Wickhoff's day, on the contrary, forces the spectator to perform the final act himself: the painter induces the spectator to go through analogous physiological processes to those of the act of vision, he demands of the spectator to transform the disconnectedly juxtaposed colour tones into a spatial unity, to combine his impressions into shape.⁵⁹ Finally, summing up his discussion, Wickhoff differentiates between the stylists, the naturalists and the illusionists (*Stilisten, Naturalisten, Illusionisten*).⁶⁰ These categories, however, function for Wickhoff as formal, stylistic categories alone. After he has discerned and described the various ways of representing, his work is done. He is only interested in specifics of each style, and not in the spiritual content of these styles as well. He is not concerned with these styles as expressions of that or other worldview.⁶¹

<u>asiatische Kunst</u>	<u>hellenistische Kunst</u>		<u>römische Kunst</u>
komplettierende Erzählungsweise der bildenden Kunst	distinguierende Erzählungsweise der bildenden Kunst		kontinuierende Erzählungsweise der bildenden Kunst
die Typen gestaltende Kunst			die individualisierende Kunst
			illusionistische Prinzip
			illusionistische Stil

⁵⁶ Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, 48; Wickhoff, *Römische Kunst*, 54–55.

⁵⁷ Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, 99, 118; Wickhoff, *Römische Kunst*, 113, 133.

⁵⁸ Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, 118–119; Wickhoff, *Römische Kunst*, 133–134.

⁵⁹ Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, 114, 120–121, 149; Wickhoff, *Römische Kunst*, 136–137, 161.

⁶⁰ Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, 95, 103; Wickhoff, *Römische Kunst*, 107, 117.

⁶¹ He does mention that the difference between modern art and older art is more than a mere difference between two methods of art, that there is a radical difference in the conception of art. He also points out the existence of a certain correspondence between visual arts and poetry, but he does not develop these thoughts any further. Wickhoff, *Roman Art*, 3, 19, 150; Wickhoff, *Römische Kunst*, 3, 20, 163.

	imitativ-naturalistische Stil	
	Naturalismus	Illusionismus
	morgenländisch-hellenistische Stil	abendländisch-lateinische Stil
	15. Jahrhundert	17. Jahrhundert
Stilismus	Naturalismus	Illusionismus

Table 3: Franz Wickhoff, *Roman Art. Some of Its Principles and Their Application to Early Christian Painting*.

Alois Riegl, in his *Late Roman Art Industry*, investigates the same period as his predecessor. Furthering the Wickhoff's work in 'destroying the prejudice' against late Roman art for being 'neither beautiful nor animated', for being a period of decay,⁶² Riegl too considers himself to be the art historian whose aim is objectivity: since an objective art-historical observation will discover in each period of style some kind of advantage, he appraises the late Roman art as a necessary last transitional phase in ancient art, which made way for a new artistic perception regarding the relation between objects and space.⁶³ Riegl, too, aims at the ascertainment and the presentation of the essence and the governing laws of the development of late Roman art.⁶⁴ But in contradistinction to Wickhoff, for Riegl the notion of the worldview is of paramount importance and he introduces the concept of *Kunstwollen*, which functions as an intermediary between the worldview on the one hand and the artistic style on the other. *Kunstwollen* is a determining factor within the development of art.⁶⁵ It rules all four media of the visual arts, architecture, sculpture, painting and crafts; and there is in general only one direction of the *Kunstwollen* at a time which finds its expression (*der Ausdruck*), its form of realisation (*Äußerungsform*) in the one dominating style.⁶⁶ *Kunstwollen*, as an aesthetic *Wollen*, however, is only one human *Wollen* among others – Riegl mentions the poetic and the religious, ethic *Wollen*, too – and their character is always determined by the general conception of the world at a given time, by the current worldview (*Weltanschauung*).⁶⁷

For Riegl, attempting to understand the whole (art)historical development of humankind, there is a contrast between the art of Antiquity and the modern art (Table 4). The Antiquity strives for the representation of material individual objects, sharply separated in their individual appearances, connected, composed only on a

⁶² Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 8–9, 11, 78; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 7, 11, 130.

⁶³ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 56, 63; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 93, 104.

⁶⁴ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 6; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 2.

⁶⁵ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 9; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 9.

⁶⁶ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 15, 147–148, 231; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 19, 264–265, 400.

⁶⁷ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 95, 120, 227, 231; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 162, 213, 394, 401.

single, visual plane.⁶⁸ Our, newer art, on the contrary, strives for the representation of the material individuals in free and infinite space, it attempts to connect individual shapes in deep space, to tie them into collective appearances.⁶⁹ In the turnabout from one pole to the other, the role of the late Roman art was crucial: individual figures were separated from the plane, and this isolation of the individual shapes led to the emancipation of the space between them; however, this space was still formed into rhythmic intervals and was not yet a shapeless, infinite deep space of modern art.⁷⁰ But late Roman art nevertheless broke the ancient negation of space and made the future representation of the individual shape in infinite space possible.⁷¹ Late Roman art paved therefore the way for our modern conception of space.

<u>Die bildende Kunst des gesamten Altertums</u>		<u>Die neuere Kunst</u>	
die Verbindung unter den Einzelformen lediglich in der Ebene		die Verbindung der Einzelformen im Raume	
die Außendinge in ihrer klaren stofflichen Individualität wiederzugeben, scharfe Trennung der Einzelercheinungen		die Darstellung der stofflichen Individuen im freien unendlichen Raume	
Komposition der Figuren in der Sehebene		auf ihre Verbindung zu Kollektiverscheinungen	
		mittels der Linie (16. Jahrhundert)	mittels des Lichtes (17. Jahrhundert)
		Romanen: das taktische Problem	Germanen: das optische Problem
der grundsätzlich raumfeindlichen klassischen Antike	spätromische Kunst: der Raum hat sich emanzipiert, aber er wird zu rhythmischen Intervallen geformt	die Formlosigkeit des unendlichen Tiefraumes grundsätzlich betonenden neueren Kunst	

Table 4: Alois Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, Ancient art and Modern art.

⁶⁸ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 12, 21, 23, 58, 223, 231; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 13, 26, 30, 95, 389, 402. Riegl and Wickhoff understand the 'individualising' differently: for Wickhoff it is attention given to things in the world such as they are, every being and every thing is specific, something particular – in contrast to typifying, seeing things as mere examples of something, pointing to their common characteristics. For Riegl (and Wölfflin, too), individualising means to see beings and things as separate, isolated forms without any ties among them, as opposed to their connectedness. Dvořák (and Cankar, too) will stick to Wickhoff's definition, he will understand individualising as a characteristics of naturalism (Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism*, 108; Dvořák, 'Idealismus und Naturalismus', 114).

⁶⁹ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 12–13, 26, 223; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 13–14, 34, 389.

⁷⁰ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 13, 224, 229; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 14, 390, 398.

⁷¹ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 78; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 130.

Focusing then on ancient art, Riegl distinguishes three main phases of the development of the visual arts, parallel to the three periods of development of the ancient worldview (Table 5).⁷² In ancient Egyptian art, the tactile conception of things from the near view (*taktische, nahsichtige Auffassung von den Dingen*) corresponds to the religious worldview of materialistic monism; individual forms are sharply discerned, shadowless, and composed on the plane; the tactile materiality and the clearly bordered dimensionality of an individual shape is emphasised.⁷³ The classical art of the Greeks follows with its tactile-optical conception of things in the normal view (*taktisch-optische, normalsichtige Auffassung von den Dingen*) and with its more subjective and personal worldview of philosophy and science; individual shapes are disclosed through half-shadows, there exist logical relationships among them, but the plane remains still the overriding element.⁷⁴

Finally, the art of late Roman Empire, with its optical conception of things by means of the distant view (*optische, fernsichtige Auffassung von den Dingen*), corresponds to the religious worldview of spiritualistic monism; objects are endowed with full three-dimensionality, but the space exists only as long as it adheres to material individual shapes.⁷⁵ With the distant view, with the move of the beholder away from the individual shape, there also increased the appeal to the beholder to build the connecting bridges across the optical discontinuity with his own intellectual experience; in the third period of antiquity previous mechanistic theory of connection was thus replaced with another kind of connection, with magic.⁷⁶

<u>ägyptische Kunst</u>	<u>klassische Kunst der Griechen</u>	<u>spätromische Kunst</u>
taktische nahsichtige Auffassung von den Dingen	taktisch-optische normalsichtige Auffassung von den Dingen	optische fernsichtige Auffassung von den Dingen
materialistischer Monismus	Philosophie und Wissenschaft	spiritualistischer Monismus
Isolierung der Einzelform		Tiefe

Table 5: Alois Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, the development of Ancient art.

Riegl uses the same two fundamental categories of tactile and optical in his *Origins of Baroque Art in Rome*; here, however, focusing on the opposition between the Renaissance and the Baroque styles, and focusing on the stylistic traits more pronouncedly than on the different kinds of *Kunstwollen* and the worldviews within

⁷² Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 24, 231; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 32, 402.

⁷³ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 24–25, 58, 73, 231, 233; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 32, 95–96, 122, 402, 405.

⁷⁴ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 25, 73, 232; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 33, 122, 402.

⁷⁵ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 26–27, 233–234; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 34–35, 405.

⁷⁶ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 73, 147, 232; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 122, 264, 403.

them (Table 6). Whereas the art of the Renaissance is an art of the tactile surface, of the tactile line, and the proximate view, an art of details and of the repose of the whole, Baroque art is marked by optical deep space and optical shade, by the distant view, by the whole and the movement of the parts within it.⁷⁷ But most of all, Baroque style aims at forming a unified whole from all the parts, with one dominant element to which everything else is subordinated, in contradistinction to the measured subordination of the Renaissance and to the coordination found in even earlier, mediaeval art.⁷⁸

The modern, the Baroque artistic view is characterised by subjectivity,⁷⁹ too, namely artists depict natural objects as they see them, as they appear to them, and this new art, with its subjective composition in space, strives for the connection of things, while older art was characterised by objectivity, by an objective composition on a plane and by the depiction of objects as closely as possible to how they were.⁸⁰ And then there is the Italian Renaissance as the intermediate period of reconciliation between the two positions, as the period of equilibrium, similarly to the intermediate position of the art of Classical Greece in Antiquity.⁸¹

	<u>Renaissance</u>	<u>Barockstil</u>
	taktische Ebene	optische Tiefraum
	taktische Linien	optische Schatten
	Nahsicht	Fernsicht
	das Einzelne	das Ganze
	Ruhe des Ganzen	Bewegung der Teile
Koordination des Mittelalters	maßvolle Subordination der Renaissance	Subordination der Barockstils
		die moderne Kunstanschauung

⁷⁷ Riegl, *Origins of Baroque Art*, 113–116; Riegl, *Entstehung der Barockkunst*, 33–36. Already in *Late Roman Art Industry*, Riegl hinted at two ways of connecting things in space: by means of the line, as it was done in the sixteenth century, and by means of light as in the seventeenth century; he elaborated on that in *The Origins of Baroque Art in Rome*. He also mentioned that the Latin people pursued the tactile problem, whereas the Germanic people preferred the optical one, and added in *The Origins of Baroque Art in Rome* that in Italian art the main emphasis is on external action, whereas Germanic art places the main emphasis on the impulses of the soul. Riegl, however, left it to Heinrich Wölfflin to expound on the difference between these two peoples. Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 243, 26; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 405, 34. Riegl, *Origins of Baroque Art*, 94; Riegl, *Entstehung der Barockkunst*, 3.

⁷⁸ Riegl, *Origins of Baroque Art*, 113; Riegl, *Entstehung der Barockkunst*, 33.

⁷⁹ Let us remember that Riegl and Wölfflin considered the Baroque, and not the Renaissance, the beginning of the modern age, of our modern world.

⁸⁰ Riegl, *Origins of Baroque Art*, 130–132; Riegl, *Entstehung der Barockkunst*, 50–52.

⁸¹ Riegl, *Origins of Baroque Art*, 131; Riegl, *Entstehung der Barockkunst*, 52.

Objektivismus	Renaissance als die Zeit des Ausgleiches	Subjektivismus
die Naturdinge so wiederzugeben, wie sie sind		die Naturdinge so wiederzugeben, wie die Künstler sie sehen
objektive Ebenkomposition		subjektive Raumkomposition

Table 6: Alois Riegl, *The Origins of Baroque Art in Rome*.

Riegl's terminology sounds quite different from Wickhoff's. Wickhoff's stylism, naturalism and illusionism, strained between typification at the one end and individualisation at the other, seems far away from Riegl's tactical near view and optical distant view. However, in *Historical Grammar of Visual Arts*,⁸² while discussing the elements of the artwork, discussing the motifs, before moving on to the two 'most artistic elements'⁸³, form and surface, with their basic categories of the tactile and the optical and of the near view and the distant view, we find passages in which Riegl translates Wickhoff's concepts, that he took over, into his own notions.

Motifs regard the man's competition with nature, his striving for the improvement of nature, whether physically or spiritually, that is, in Riegl's conception, the man's relation towards nature, the worldview.⁸⁴ Man's artistic activity regarding the motifs (Table 7), which can only be taken from nature,

⁸² *Historical Grammar of Visual Arts* is the founding text of Riegl's theory of art history: published unfortunately only in 1966, it consists of a book manuscript of 1897–98 and the lecture notes of 1899. *The Late Roman Art Industry* (based on his lectures of 1896–97, 1898–99 and 1900) as well as *The Origins of Baroque Art in Rome* (based on lectures of 1894–95, 1898–99 and 1901–02) focus on specific timeframes within the most general art history, comprised in *Historical Grammar*, reiterating and refining those basic categories in view of specific topics. In *Historical Grammar*, Riegl divides the history of visual art into three major periods: the Antiquity up to the year 313 BC, when Christianity was proclaimed as the official state religion of the Roman Empire, with its antique anthropomorphic polytheism as the governing worldview; the Middle Ages with the Renaissance up to 1520, with the death of Raphael and Pope Leo X, when Christian monotheism ruled the day; and the modern era after the expansion of the Reformation with its natural-scientific worldview. The development of visual arts so follows from the tactile perception in the near view in the earliest period to the optical perception in the distant view of the present day, with the normal-view perception during periods of balance, in classical Greek art and in the Italian High Renaissance. The near view grasps only bits and pieces, the distant view sees only the whole and not the parts; inbetween them the normal view takes up the whole and the parts simultaneously. Riegl remarks that the terms 'plastic' and 'painterly' are synonymous with 'oriented toward the near view' and 'oriented toward the distant view' respectively. Alois Riegl, *Historical Grammar of the Visual Arts*, trans. Jacqueline E. Jung, New York: Zone Books, 2004, 55, 307, 323, 337, 399–401; Alois Riegl, *Historische Grammatik der bildenden Künste*, eds. Karl M. Swoboda and Otto Pächt, Graz and Köln: Hermann Böhlau, 1966, 23, 221, 231, 243, 290–292.

⁸³ Riegl, *Historical Grammar*, 123, 302; Riegl, *Historische Grammatik*, 75, 218.

⁸⁴ Riegl, *Historical Grammar*, 137–138; Riegl, *Historische Grammatik*, 75, 87.

whether inorganic or organic, therefore fluctuates between two poles: the harmonic (*Harmonismus*), which emphasises the immutable formal law of crystallinity, and the organic (*Organismus*), whose goal is to represent the accidental and transitory momentary appearances.⁸⁵ In modern terminology, admits Riegl, can 'harmonism', a worldview that values natural things only in physically improved form and is linked with the tactile, be also termed idealism (stylisation), whereas for 'organism', a worldview that strives exclusively for the spiritual improvement of nature and is linked to the optical, the term naturalism (illusionism) too could be used.⁸⁶

die Motive	Harmonismus		Organismus
Weltanschauung	die Naturdinge nur in ihrer körperlichen Verbesserung gelten läßt		die nur die geistige Verbesserung der Natur anstrebt
	Idealismus (Stilismus)		Naturalismus (Illusionismus)
Form und Fläche	die taktische oder objektive Fläche		die optische oder subjektive Fläche
	der Tastsinn		der Gesichtssinn
	die Nahsicht sieht bloß Teile	die Normalsicht sieht das Ganze und die Teile	die Fernsicht sieht nur das Ganze
	plastisch		malerisch
	<u>Altertum</u>	<u>Mittelalter</u>	<u>Neuzeit</u>
	anthropomorphischer Polytheismus	christlicher Monotheismus	naturwissenschaftliche Weltanschauung
	naturverbessernde Kunst	naturdurchgeistigende Kunst	die Kunst als Wiederschaffen der vergänglichen Natur
	die taktische Aufnahme in der Nahsicht	die Aufnahme in der Normalansicht (klassische Kunst der Griechen, italienische Hochrenaissance)	die optische Aufnahme in der Fernsicht

Table 7: Alois Riegl, *Historical Grammar of the Visual Arts*.

Riegl himself otherwise hardly uses the terms 'idealism' and 'naturalism'. In a footnote in the concluding chapter of *Late Roman Art Industry*, Riegl mentions the two terms and makes a comment that every work of art without exception combines in itself the naturalistic and idealistic side, for each style of art strives for a true representation of nature and nothing else; therefore, in Riegl's opinion, to reclaim

⁸⁵ Riegl, *Historical Grammar*, 123, 137; Riegl, *Historische Grammatik*, 75, 87.

⁸⁶ Riegl, *Historical Grammar*, 137–139; Riegl, *Historische Grammatik*, 87–88.

the 'naturalism' for particular styles can only lead to misunderstandings.⁸⁷ However, he does use it in precisely that sense in the last chapter of *The Origins of Baroque Art in Rome*. Here, contrarily to his position in *Late Roman Art Industry* that naturalism cannot be a specific style, he discusses the style of painting of Caravaggio and his followers: '...the naturalists intended to paint nature as it was, which is to say in the way that they saw it or believed they saw it. Of course, by this they meant optical perception (*das optische Sehen*)'.⁸⁸ Back in *Historical Grammar of the Visual Arts*, when discussing the art of the Middle Ages, he praises Giotto for attaining both spiritualisation and the measured approximation of nature's transitory appearances.⁸⁹ Here again, he understands naturalism and idealism – even though he does not use those exact terms anymore – as two sides which can co-exist in a work of art, as two strivings that can be combined in a style, and it is on this intertwining of naturalism and idealism, that Dvořák focuses on in his later discussion about Gothic style.

In keeping up with the tradition of the Vienna School, Max Dvořák attempts to prove, in *Idealism and naturalism in Gothic Art* (1918), that the art of the Middle Ages and Gothic art in particular, is 'not less important and noteworthy than the endeavors of classical antiquity or the Italian Renaissance'.⁹⁰ His aim is to establish the standards of judgement which would be more compatible with the Medieval Art, by means of which 'the peculiar individuality of medieval representational art' could be more fairly observed.⁹¹ Following Riegl, he defines idealism and naturalism as two directions (*zwei Richtungen*) within the overriding, religious, spiritualistic, mediaeval worldview of the Gothic art.⁹² Precisely on account of this intertwining of the two tendencies, Dvořák proposes that Gothic Art should be regarded as an independent and self-contained phase in the general evolution of European art: precisely because of the simultaneous spiritualisation of material factors and materialisation of all spiritual elements, conditioned by an extremely complicated historical development of a certain secularisation of the spiritual authorities within the framework of this medieval culture.⁹³ Dvořák places Gothic Art within the development of the relationship between the figures and their surrounding space since Antiquity, as proposed by Riegl. He posits Gothic art with its 'ideal union of cubistic forms in a real section of infinite space' as the next necessary step in the progression towards the modern, infinite space, as it started, according to Riegl, by emancipation of the interval in late Roman art.⁹⁴ Dvořák is primarily interested in those formal specifics within Gothic style which disclose that Gothic naturalism is something more than simple imitation of the natural world. He

⁸⁷ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 226; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 394.

⁸⁸ Riegl, *Origins of Baroque Art*, 249–254; Riegl, *Entstehung der Barockkunst*, 201–207.

⁸⁹ Riegl, *Historical Grammar*, 81; Riegl, *Historische Grammatik*, 42.

⁹⁰ Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism*, 4; Dvořák, 'Idealismus und Naturalismus', 44.

⁹¹ Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism*, 8; Dvořák, 'Idealismus und Naturalismus', 46.

⁹² Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism*, 10, 42, 107; Dvořák, 'Idealismus und Naturalismus', 48, 70, 113.

⁹³ Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism*, 18, 28, 49, 90; Dvořák, 'Idealismus und Naturalismus', 53, 60, 75, 103–104.

⁹⁴ Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism*, 62–71; Dvořák, 'Idealismus und Naturalismus', 85–92.

foregrounds those elements which disclose the idealistic tendency within naturalism, the spiritualisation of naturalism: rhythmical arrangement of figures, impetus toward movement, the endeavour to develop the composition out of the picture surface and not into it; the representation of the psychic contact between the individual figures, the representation of the emotions, the relationship to the external world.⁹⁵

His primary aim, however, is the presentation of 'the spiritual culture of the Middle Ages'⁹⁶ and he devotes more attention than Riegl would to describing the (social and philosophical) context for such an intertwining of the material and the spiritual, a linking of the worldly beauty and the ideals of a Christian life, emphasising especially a similar dissention, a similar discord between what is known by means of concepts and what is experienced by means of subjective observation, in the philosophic 'conflict of universals'.⁹⁷

For giving more attention to the links between the art and the culture of the time, for explicating the parallels between the style of works of art and, for example, the philosophical debate, Dvořák is usually credited with being the founder of *Geistesgeschichte* within art history, with performing a break with the formalism of his predecessors, Wickhoff and Riegl.⁹⁸ However, as we have seen, it was only Wickhoff who was not (yet) interested in worldview matters of art, focusing on formal classification and characterisation of styles alone, but already for Riegl the connection between artistic styles and the governing worldviews was most important. Riegl already explained different styles according to different worldviews, according to a spiritual content, even though he did not take much time to explicate it as he did to explain the formal categories by means of which the spiritual content is expressed.⁹⁹

⁹⁵ Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism*, 53–61, 86–88; Dvořák, 'Idealismus und Naturalismus', 79–84, 101–102.

⁹⁶ Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism*, 11; Dvořák, 'Idealismus und Naturalismus', 49.

⁹⁷ Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism*, 98, 105; Dvořák, 'Idealismus und Naturalismus', 109, 112.

⁹⁸ Cankar himself seems to agree with that: 'In opposition to this mechanical conception, the great founders of the Vienna art-history school created their developmental synthesis; according to them, the artistic development is autonomous, logically running from form to form, from style to style, independent from other historical events, amongst which it takes place. Such mentality was needed as a reaction to the materialistic conception of art of the time, according to which the form of an artwork would be a consequence of the artistic technique and material, but nowadays it is no longer suitable. The connection between the cultural development and the development of art is seen so clearly, so that we should consider that presupposed autonomy of art as a mistake in spiritual organicism, without which life cannot be even imagined, and so has Maks Dvořák alone, in his last greater work before his death, set out on a new path and searched for parallels between art and other emanations of spiritual life; to him, before the end of his life, history of art has become "history of spirit"' (Cankar, *Zgodovina*, I, 6).

⁹⁹ In our opinion, there is no real rupture within the Vienna School, on the contrary, Dvořák continued and furthered Riegl's work, Dvořák's achievement should be seen as an elaboration of Riegl's conceptions. See Rebeka Vidrih, *Institucionalizacija umetnostnozgodovinske vede in formalizem kot njena prva paradigma*, *Philological studies*, 1, 2009, 11 pp, online ed.

Heinrich Wölfflin's *Principles of Art History* (1915) are based, similarly to Riegl's *Origins of Baroque Art in Rome*, on the period of transition from the Renaissance to the Baroque. Whereas Riegl was focused more on the coming into being of the Baroque style and its characteristics, in contradistinction to the previous, Renaissance style, Wölfflin's attention is turned to the juxtaposition of these two stylistic units. Wölfflin acknowledged his conceptual debt to Wickhoff and especially Riegl.¹⁰⁰ He took over Riegl's categories of tactile versus optical, renamed them as linear (*das Lineare*) and painterly (*das Malerische*), and corroborated them by further systematisation by means of five pairs of concepts (*fünf Begriffspaare*).¹⁰¹ These categories of perception (*Kategorien der Anschauung*), Wölfflin claims, are not deduced from one principle but he admits that they are still mutually dependent, and one might well designate them as five different views of one and the same thing.¹⁰²

Renaissance art is thus linear, characterised by the plane, the closed form, multiplicity and absolute clarity, but Baroque art is painterly, characterised by the recession, the open form, unity and relative clarity (Table 8). Linear images, depicting the solid figure and the enduring form, are representations of things as they are, whereas the painterly images, registering the changing appearance and the movement, are representations of things as they look, as they seem to be.¹⁰³ Whereas the linear is an art of being, depicting the things in themselves, the painterly is an art of semblance, depicting the things in context.¹⁰⁴ On the one hand, plastic and contoured seeing isolates things; on the other, the painterly eye combines them; the graphic style sees in lines, the painterly – by means of light and shade – in masses; the one is all border, tangible plane, isolated objects; the other is all transition and movement.¹⁰⁵

<u>Renaissance</u>	<u>Barock</u>
das Lineare	das Malerische
Fläche	Tiefe

http://philologicalstudies.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=252&Itemid=90

¹⁰⁰ In the Preface to the first edition of the *Principles of Art History*, he referred to all Riegl's major works up to the time. '...Alois Riegl is probably the most prominent example of a scholar who, with a complete mastery of his material, gave serious methodological consideration to the reasons for the formation of style and consistently sought to refine his conceptual tools. His terms "optic" and "haptic" (tactile) – visual and tactile values – are especially effective and were coined after Franz Wickhoff's powers of observation had already produced a couple of significant pages on the painterly.' Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 73; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, viii–ix.

¹⁰¹ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 96; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 15.

¹⁰² Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 306; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 244.

¹⁰³ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 97, 102; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 17, 23.

¹⁰⁴ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 27, 97, 103; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 17, 23, 31.

¹⁰⁵ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 96, 100, 111–112, 131; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 15, 20, 34, 53.

geschlossene Form (tektonisch)	offene Form (atektonisch)
Vielheit (vielheitliche Einheit)	Einheit (einheitliche Einheit)
Klarheit (unbedingte Klarheit)	Unklarheit (bedingte Klarheit)
die Darstellung der Dinge, wie sie sind	die Darstellung der Dinge, wie sie erscheinen
der zeichnerische Stil sieht in Linien	der malerische Stil sieht in Massen
Linie	Licht und Schatten
die Dinge für sich	die Dinge in ihrem Zusammenhang
eine Kunst des Seins	eine Kunst des Scheins
Tastbild	Sehbild
(italienische) Renaissance	(germanische) Barock

Table 8: Heinrich Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History. The Problem of the Development of Style in Early Modern Art*.

For Wölfflin too, linear and painterly are not just the most general forms of representation (*die allgemeinsten Darstellungsformen*), but also two forms of perception (*Anschauungsformen*), two fundamentally different ways of seeing, that is, two different worldviews (*zwei Weltanschauungen*).¹⁰⁶

Different times produce different art, but at the same time there also exist more permanent national differences of the eye are more than just a matter of taste: they determine and are determined by the foundations of the entire worldview of a people, so there is a specifically Italian and a specifically German mode of visualisation.¹⁰⁷ 'Temporal character intersects with national character' and therefore every people will have art historical epochs that appear as the more characteristic revelation of national virtues than others; for Italy it was the linear sixteenth century, for the Germanic north it was the painterly baroque.¹⁰⁸ In the south, 'man is the measure of all things, every single detail is an expression of this plastic-anthropocentric perspective', but in the north, 'no binding measures are taken from man', in the north, man surrendered to the divine.¹⁰⁹

... 'to complete those investigations, to sum up the marks of style into a system'

Wickhoff's, Riegl's, Wölfflin's and Dvořák's point of departure is always an investigation into a specific artistic period (Wickhoff's and Riegl's late Antiquity,

¹⁰⁶ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 95, 98, 100, 149; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 14, 17, 20, 73.

¹⁰⁷ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 89, 315, 317; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 8, 254, 257.

¹⁰⁸ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 89, 316; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 8, 256.

¹⁰⁹ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 316; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 255–256.

Dvořák's Gothic), or a comparison between two specific artistic periods (Riegl's and Wölfflin's comparison of the Baroque and the Renaissance). Their stylistic categories are derived from the actual styles under consideration and are only potentially universal, only subsequently they can be used for the investigation of the other artistic periods.¹¹⁰ In contradistinction to them, Cankar attempts from the very beginning to set up a system of stylistic categories which would be general or abstract enough so that they could be suitably used for all existing periods of the history of art. Consequently, his categories function to a greater extent as simply descriptive, and not as evaluative as, for example, Riegl's and Wölfflin's appreciation of optical and painterly Baroque, on account of its supposed German character and religiosity. Only hinted at in Riegl, it is obvious in Wölfflin where the discussion of the linear and painterly styles keeps turning into a comparison between the Italian and the Germanic worldviews, between the anthropomorphic, atheist linear Italian Renaissance and the still sincerely religious painterly Baroque of the Germans.¹¹¹ For Cankar, spiritually inclined idealistic planar style is just as valid artistic position as thoroughly materialistic naturalistic painterly style. Also, in Riegl and in Wölfflin, the worldviews are always already quite well defined in terms of a specific, foremostly religious content. So Riegl speaks, for example, as we have seen, of materialist monism expressed in tactile Egyptian art, of philosophical and scientific worldview of tactile-optical art of Classical Greece and of spiritual monism expressed in Early Christian art, whereas for Cankar the worldviews of idealism, realism and naturalism designate only very general ways of human relating to the nature, to the world at large. Idealism is a position only interested in man's own ideas about the world, whereas a naturalist focuses all his attention upon the world around him. He does mention specific artistic periods as 'summits', as 'especially strong periods' of that or other worldview,¹¹² but idealism, realism and naturalism in themselves, for Cankar, remain basically empty forms, which can be used in various contexts, with various content.

For Cankar, just as for Riegl, Dvořák and Wölfflin, there is an essential connection between a style and a worldview. The art-historical category of style does not exist on its own, but it is necessarily sustained and corroborated by the historical category of worldview. Even though the pressing task of (the scientific) art history is to investigate its proper subject, which is the artwork's form, – and not the

¹¹⁰ Only in *Historical Grammar* was Riegl's view truly comprehensive.

¹¹¹ In the 'Introduction' to the *History*, Cankar acknowledges a constant 'character of ethnological groups' but states that it does not bear on the development of art in any meaningful way (Cankar, *Zgodovina*, I, 6). It was the spirit of the age alone, and not the spirit of the people as well, that interested Cankar. Dvořák, too, in the last chapter of his *Idealism and Naturalism in Gothic Art*, describes the differences in the development of late Gothic art between Italy and the Northern Europe – from Giotto onwards art in Italy, influenced by Antiquity, achieved a certain autonomy, whereas Early Netherlandish painting continued the development of the naturalistic tendency of Gothic art – but he does not explain these differences in terms of different worldviews of southern and northern peoples (Dvořák, *Idealism and Naturalism*, 114–126; Dvořák, 'Idealismus und Naturalismus', 130–135). In this sense, Cankar appears to be Dvořák's heir.

¹¹² Cankar, *Uvod*, 95, 97.

artwork's content, which art history, in Riegl's words, shares with poetry and religion – art history cannot remain secluded from the rest of the world and the rest of the life. Since art is part of human world, it partakes the general human consciousness in a form of a worldview: 'art is an expression of the spiritual state of an age, society and its parts, just as religion, philosophy, ethics, knowledge, social order, poetry, music',¹¹³ therefore, the worldview is an integral component of art-historical investigation.

Cankar, of course, is fully cognizant of Riegl's concept of *Kunstwollen*. He mentions 'artistic will' (*umetnostna volja*) occasionally, as in, for example, 'artistic will is the primary and means of drawing are only its consequence',¹¹⁴ but he nevertheless does not use the term that often, or consistently, in terms of a specifically defined concept. It seems that Cankar does not deem necessary for there to be an intermediate, intermediary concept between an artistic style on the one hand and a general worldview on the other: that 'plastic form is the expression of realism',¹¹⁵ seems for him, being closer to Wölfflin than to Riegl in this regard, to be enough.

Generally, in content there is sufficient similarity between Cankar's concepts of idealistic planar style, realistic plastic style and naturalistic painterly style and Wickhoff's, Riegl's, Wölfflin's and Dvořák's conceptions, allowing for the nuances of meaning and differences in terminology (Table 9). Dvořák's terms of idealism and naturalism may seem to be the most obvious origin of Cankar's categories, since Riegl and Wölfflin preferred to use different expressions, but in fact for Dvořák those two terms designate only two stylistic tendencies within one worldview – two general tendencies combined within a specific style and a specific worldview – and are not considered as self-dependent categories. For Dvořák, they are not defined as autonomous styles, let alone as distinct worldviews with their own specific styles. Similarly to Cankar, Dvořák's idealism is characterised by spiritual aspirations, whereas naturalism's distinctive trait is attention given to the actual world.¹¹⁶

¹¹³ Cankar, *Zgodovina*, I, 6. Cankar stresses that 'stylistic changes are causally connected to the changes in general spiritual life' (Cankar, *Zgodovina*, I, 30), and that 'for a new style to be enforced in some social group, a new mentality must be formed within it' (Cankar, *Uvod*, 220).

¹¹⁴ Cankar, *Uvod*, 155.

¹¹⁵ Cankar, *Uvod*, 169.

¹¹⁶ Cankar used the terms idealism and naturalism in Dvořák's sense, as two tendencies within a style, in his dissertation on Italian Baroque painter Giulio Quaglio, who painted the ceiling of Ljubljana cathedral (1913); he also employed (Riegl's) 'artistic will' a few times, though not in such a loaded sense as Riegl himself. Cankar's early discussions, before embarking upon his *magnus opus*, the *Introduction* and the *History*, were, following the Vienna School tradition, focused on the typical periods of 'decay', the Baroque (dissertation on Quaglio) and Early Christianity. Izidor Cankar, 'Giulio Quaglio: prispevek k razvoju baročnega slikarstva' (Giulio Quaglio: A Contribution to the Development of Baroque Painting), *Dom in svet*, 33: 3/4, 1920, 77–84; 33: 5/6, 1920, 131–137; 33: 7/8, 1920, 186–192; 33: 9/10, 1920, 240–245; 'Umetnost v krščanskem slovstvu drugega stoletja' (Art in Christian literature of the second century), *Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino*, 1: 1/2+3/4, 1921, 59–75+168–185; 'Realizem v starokrščanskem slikarstvu' (Realism in Early Christian Painting), *Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino*, 6: 1, 1926, 1–25; 'Stilni razvoj starokrščanske skulpture' (Stylistic

However, Dvořák does not dwell on specifics of either idealism or naturalism, he does not offer detailed analyses or definitions of either idealistic or naturalistic tendency; he is more interested in the general context and in the general idea of the intertwining of the two within the Gothic style. Furthermore, in contradistinction to Riegl and Wölfflin, Dvořák does not attempt, at least not in the text Cankar is referring to, to elevate them into two universal, generally valid categories and to build a system for potential interpretation of all works of art, even though he understands them as two general tendencies; just as he neither uses Cankar's third term, realism.

Thus, just as Cankar himself stated in the 'Introduction' to *History*, Dvořák was his model in accounting for the cultural and social circumstances and conditions of art, but not as much in a systematic explication of the stylistic categories. In this, the most important models for Cankar are Riegl and Wölfflin. However, Cankar's systematics of style consists of three categories, whereas Riegl's and Wölfflin's conceptions are basically binary. There is another major difference as well, between Riegl and Wölfflin on the one hand and Cankar on the other: Riegl and Wölfflin included architecture in their deliberations on stylistic categories, whereas Cankar built his original systematics on painting and sculpture alone, and only afterwards he attempted to complement it with the architectural systematics.

Cankar's designation of 'uncertain ... artistic terminology' is, as we have seen, quite well justified in Wickhoff's case. Wickhoff's characterisations are only gradually developed through the text, even though his final categories of stylism, naturalism and illusionism could correspond to an extent to Cankar's idealism, realism and naturalism. The 'art that creates types', the stylism of the older art, with its abstracting tendency, could be a distant predecessor of Cankar's idealist planar style, and Wickhoff's 'art that aims at individualising' could be paralleled with Cankar's naturalism. Nevertheless, it would be Wickhoff's illusionism – a summary representation of one single impression at the time – that is similar to Cankar's naturalism, whereas his naturalism – in which an image is the result of a combination of a few impressions, received in several acts of vision – actually corresponds better to Cankar's realism.

In a way Riegl, too, uses three categories, tactile, tactile-optical and optical, but in fact only two – the tactile and the optical – are fundamental. Similarly to Riegl, Cankar explains his realistic view as a combination, a union of idealistic and naturalistic views, but in Cankar's case realism does become an autonomous category, whereas in Riegl's case tactile-optical remains just that, just a position of a reconciliation between the two extremes. In fact, the position of the Renaissance even to Riegl himself is not very clear: in some places he defines it as the tactile, as an opposition to the optical Baroque, whereas elsewhere he defines it as the tactile-optical, as the moment of balance between the two poles.¹¹⁷ Wölfflin, on the other hand, is less doubtful: his linear Renaissance is decisively contrasted with the painterly Baroque, and he does not allow for an intermediary phase at all.

Development of Early Christian Sculpture), *Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino*, 7: 2/4, 1927, 49–120.

¹¹⁷ Riegl, *Origins of Baroque Art*, 113–116, 130–132; Riegl, *Entstehung der Barockkunst*, 33–36, 50–52.

The greatest concurrence is obviously between Cankar's painterly style and Riegl's optical and Wölfflin's painterly styles. Cankar himself uses the same term as Wölfflin (painterly) and he explicitly connects it with Riegl's optical style: since its aim is to register the impression of the eye, it could be called optical style.¹¹⁸ Cankar's naturalistic-painterly style is a way of representing with an aim to recapitulate only the visual impression of things.¹¹⁹ A naturalist artist tries to offer as much details as possible, closely following the naturally given models, even though his images contain no sharp and clear outlines, but they become complexes of patches of light and colour.¹²⁰ Figures are depicted in their changeable condition, they are dynamically agitated, spatially scattered in a free composition, appearing on a boundless stage of the visible world.¹²¹ The naturalist presents recapitulation of the actual nature, he presents what he sees, he presents what there is, objectively, and not what it could or should be.¹²²

Riegl, however, defines the optical conception of things by means of the distant view as fundamentally subjective.¹²³ The optical artists depict natural objects as they see them, as they appear to them, they depict their subjective impressions.¹²⁴ Observing the world from afar, they form a unified whole from all the parts, they emphasise the connection of things.¹²⁵ In the optical image, according to Riegl, deep space, the play of light and shadows, the whole and the movement of the parts within it are foregrounded.¹²⁶ Wölfflin's painterly style, too, is characterised by light and shade, by transition and movement, by recession into space and by an open composition.¹²⁷ The painterly eye combines things, sees in masses; it registers the changing appearance and the movement of things, and the connections between them.¹²⁸ The painterly images are thus representations of things as they look, as they seem to be, as they appear.¹²⁹

¹¹⁸ Cankar, *Uvod*, 152.

¹¹⁹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 152.

¹²⁰ Cankar, *Uvod*, 89, 150–151.

¹²¹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 171, 192, 212–213.

¹²² Cankar, *Uvod*, 89, 92, 197.

¹²³ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 26–27; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 34–35.

¹²⁴ Riegl, *Origins of Baroque Art*, 130–132; Riegl, *Entstehung der Barockkunst*, 50–52. Riegl regards subjectivity in terms of the senses, Riegl's optical artist depicts what he sees with his own eyes, as he himself sees the world, from his subjective standpoint. Cankar's subjectivity is on another level, it regards not the senses but the mind: Cankar's idealist artist depicts the world according to his own, subjective ideas, and it is the naturalist who, by means of his senses, sees and comprehends the world objectively. Within the same relation between the eye and the world, in the optical and the painterly style respectively, Riegl emphasises the subjectively seeing eye whereas Cankar emphasises the objectively seen world.

¹²⁵ Riegl, *Origins of Baroque Art*, 113, 130–132; Riegl, *Entstehung der Barockkunst*, 33, 50–52.

¹²⁶ Riegl, *Origins of Baroque Art*, 113–116; Riegl, *Entstehung der Barockkunst*, 33–36.

¹²⁷ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 111–112, 131; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 34, 53.

¹²⁸ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 27, 96–97, 102; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 15, 17, 20, 23, 31.

¹²⁹ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 97, 102; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 17, 23.

If there is, as said, quite a similarity between Cankar's naturalistic-painterly style and Riegl's and Wölfflin's optical and painterly styles, there is no such a simple correspondence between Riegl's tactile and Wölfflin's linear styles and Cankar's realism or idealism respectively.

Whereas Wölfflin consistently uses the term 'painterly' for his second category, he is not so completely singleminded regarding the 'linear'. He explains it by connecting it to other designations: to the planar style (*Flächenstil*), regarding the formation of space, to the graphic and the plastic (*zeichnerisch, plastisch*), and he defines the linear image as a tactile image (*Tastbild*).¹³⁰ The linear style is thus the result of the plastic and contoured seeing which isolates things and sees in lines.¹³¹ The linear image is an image of borders and isolated objects, of a tangible plane and closed composition.¹³² The linear artist depicts the solid figure and the permanent, measurable and bounded forms; he represents things as they are, things in themselves.¹³³ In Riegl's tactile conception of things from the near view, too, the individual forms are sharply discerned and clearly bordered, they are shadowless and composed on the plane.¹³⁴ The tactile art is an art of the surface and the line, of details and of the repose of the whole.¹³⁵

In general, one could say that Cankar's realism is the inheritor of Riegl's tactile and Wölfflin's linear styles; most of the characteristics of these two styles can be found in Cankar's realism. In realistic-plastic style, objects are isolated and individualised with sharp and clear outlines, but by means of shading, a full corporality is also achieved.¹³⁶ Figures move freely but their motion is moderate, they move in a real space, but their stage is bounded; by means of tectonic composition, the figures in a contained spatial unit are connected and reordered into imagined configurations.¹³⁷ The realist artist's aim is to recapitulate things in their full corporality, about which he was informed by the sense of touch (and for that plastic style can also be called a haptic or tactile style).¹³⁸ The realistic-plastic style thus presents nature as it is seen and experienced, but also, at the same time, as idealised, at least to a certain extent.¹³⁹ Realism is thus a union of an objective, naturalistic recapitulation of objects for its own sake and a subjective idealistic mental tendency.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁰ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 100, 187; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 20, 113.

¹³¹ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 96, 100; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 15, 20.

¹³² Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 131; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 53.

¹³³ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 27, 97, 102; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 17, 23, 31.

¹³⁴ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 24–25, 58, 73, 231, 233; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 32, 95–96, 122, 402, 405.

¹³⁵ Riegl, *Origins of Baroque Art*, 113–116; Riegl, *Entstehung der Barockkunst*, 33–36.

¹³⁶ Cankar, *Uvod*, 86–87, 133, 145, 191.

¹³⁷ Cankar, *Uvod*, 150, 191, 203–205, 212.

¹³⁸ Cankar, *Uvod*, 144, 146, 151–152.

¹³⁹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 191, 212.

¹⁴⁰ Cankar, *Uvod*, 92, 100.

Cankar's realism nevertheless appears to be more moderate in regard to Riegl's tactile and Wölfflin's linear style. The movement, for example, in plastic style is not absent, in contradistinction to the painterly style, it is still present, only it is calmer. It is absent, however, in idealism: here, objects are presented in a permanent, eternal existence, in an unchanging, motionless condition.¹⁴¹ In realism, the space still exists, even though it is bounded and contained. The stage becomes spaceless and the plane is foregrounded only in idealism: here, disproportioned and shadowless bodies are projected into a flat plane and partitioned into separate surfaces, bounded by lines (and for that the plane style may also be called linear style).¹⁴² The idealistic-planar style does not present things as they are or as they are seen, but as expressions of supramaterial ideas.¹⁴³ Idealism is about a subjective mental reconstruction of the objective material world, a subjective interpretation of objective nature.¹⁴⁴

Cankar thus differentiates Riegl's and Wölfflin's related categories of the tactile and the linear into two separate categories, the realistic-plastic style on the one hand and the idealistic-planar style on the other. In a way, Cankar solves Riegl's ambiguity regarding the tactile, which comprises, as we have seen, depending on the context, both the non-mimetic Egyptian art (in *Late Roman Art Industry*) and the mimetic art of the Renaissance (in *The Origins of Baroque Art in Rome*); the ambiguity, which Riegl hastily explains away with the additional category of the tactile-optical.¹⁴⁵ Cankar, as we have seen, explicitly connects realistic-plastic style with (Riegl's) haptic or tactile, and idealistic-planar style with (Wölfflin's) linear style: in regard to Cankar's explanations of the two styles, his designation is completely justified. But if we compare Cankar's realism and idealism with Riegl's definition of the tactile and Wölfflin's definition of the linear, Cankar's realism seems closer to Wölfflin's linear style and Cankar's idealism closer to Riegl's tactile conception of things, rather than the other way round.

		Cankar
Wickhoff	stylism	planar idealism
	naturalism	plastic realism
	illusionism	painterly naturalism
Riegl (<i>Late Roman Art</i>)	the tactile	planar idealism
	the tactile-optical	plastic realism
	the optical	painterly naturalism
Riegl (<i>Baroque Art</i>)	the tactile	plastic realism (planar idealism / plastic realism)

¹⁴¹ Cankar, *Uvod*, 126, 149, 201.

¹⁴² Cankar, *Uvod*, 107, 123–125, 178.

¹⁴³ Cankar, *Uvod*, 79.

¹⁴⁴ Cankar, *Uvod*, 123, 125.

¹⁴⁵ Riegl's distinction between the tactile and the tactile-optical is not really explicated, the tactile-optical is neither described nor properly defined, other than a reconciliation of the tactile and the optical. Since Wölfflin focused on mimetic art alone, on the Renaissance and Baroque styles, and disregarded earlier art, he was not faced with a similar problem.

	the optical	painterly naturalism
Wölfflin	the linear	plastic realism (planar idealism / plastic realism)
	the painterly	painterly naturalism
Dvořák	idealism	planar idealism
	naturalism	painterly naturalism

Table 9: Wickhoff's, Riegl's, Wölfflin's and Dvořák's categories of style in comparison with Cankar's.

Finally, considering the system of categories, the systematics itself, it was Wölfflin of course who was Cankar's foremost rival, since others, the mentioned Vienna School scholars, did not succeed in building such a methodological system, for their attempts remained in an unpublished draft form. Cankar himself emphasised this significance of Wölfflin's *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe* in the draft for the lectures on the 'systematics of architectural style'.¹⁴⁶ However, he also pointed to its deficiencies.

Albeit it is a remarkable book, I did not find it completely satisfactory: (1) historical matter upon which Wölfflin tests his concepts, refers to only one long period (Renaissance – Baroque) and not to stylistic possibilities in general; and (2) I miss in it a synthesis as well as an argumentation of how and why particular stylistic characteristics belong together.¹⁴⁷

Like Riegl and unlike Wölfflin, Cankar attempts to build a systematics which would enable him to include earlier, non-mimetic mediaeval art as well. Cankar's ambition is a universally valid system of categories, which could be used for all works of art and for any style in the history of mankind. Unlike Wölfflin and Riegl, Cankar does not focus that much on the development from one stylistic category to another. If Riegl is after the 'governing laws of the development' of art,¹⁴⁸ and for Wölfflin the transformation from the linear to the painterly is 'the most important reorientation in the history of art',¹⁴⁹ Cankar does not feel burdened with the need for a smooth and regular course of development from idealism through realism to naturalism, with a lawful sequence of alternating styles.¹⁵⁰ He is more interested in building up a

¹⁴⁶ "“Vienna School” did nothing to create a “systematics of style”, even though Wickhoff and Riegl have done a lot, so that the concepts of “planarity”, “plasticity” in “painterliness” were explained. A draft of a systematics is only Wölfflin's classic book “Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe”.' Cankar, *Uvod*, 1959, 207.

¹⁴⁷ Cankar, *Uvod*, 1959, 208.

¹⁴⁸ Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry*, 6; Riegl, *Spätromische Kunstindustrie*, 2.

¹⁴⁹ Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 103; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 24.

¹⁵⁰ In *History of Visual Art in Western Europe*, he willingly adjusts and accommodates the proposed categories to the actually existing artistic styles and the actual course of events, to a much higher degree than Riegl or Wölfflin do, and he does not seem to mind if things get a bit less neat and a bit more complicated.

generally useful classification of all possible styles. Cankar, too, just like Riegl, presupposes that each and every art is – in its essence – about the re-creation of nature: that the starting point of each and every artist is the existing world, the bodies in space as actually seen, which does not mean – neither for Riegl nor for Cankar – that each and every artistic style is necessarily mimetic.

Cankar follows Wölfflin in his definition of an artwork as an organism, with its character of inevitableness,¹⁵¹ and he follows Wölfflin in his pointing out the connections between various characteristics of a particular styles,¹⁵² even though Wölfflin, in Cankar's opinion, is not thorough quite enough in that. Nevertheless, Cankar's systematics does appear to be more articulate, more clearly and intelligibly composed and therefore easier to use. The arrangement of chapters alone is telling. Whereas Wölfflin arranged the chapters according to the two stylistic principles, the linear and the painterly, and their five subcategories, Cankar arranged the book according to the criteria on the basis of which the stylistic categories are then distinguished and defined: first how the depicted bodies are shaped, then how the space is formed, and finally in what way the bodies occupy the space (Table 10). The fundamental terms themselves, too, are easier to comprehend in Cankar's scheme of things, compare, for example, Cankar's tectonic and free composition with Wölfflin's clarity and unclarity, without a clear pointing out what exactly this clarity or unclarity refers to, whether to composition, or the formation of space... Each pair of Wölfflin's concepts seems already to include all the aforementioned aspects of a depiction (the bodies, the space, and their placement in it), although each pair is to emphasise one aspect over the others. One gets an impression that Wölfflin analyses the (already two-dimensional) picture plane, and judges the already done impression of a scene upon a picture plane; whereas Cankar analyses the scene that is to be depicted, he judges the composing of (an essentially three-dimensional) scene onto a picture plane. Cankar's course of analysis thus appears to be more systematic, more logical, even though it could be (and it also was) reproached for oversimplification.

¹⁵¹ 'Every work of art is something formed, an organism. Its most essential attribute is its characteristic of necessity: nothing can be changed or moved; everything has to be just the way it is.' Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 204; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 133.

¹⁵² Cankar emphasises, for example, that 'linear style necessarily, by its nature, associates with idealistic subject matter' and that 'spaceless stage regularly associates with the planar style' (Cankar, *Uvod*, 125, 174), whereas Wölfflin mentions that 'the linear-plastic is as closely associated with the compact strata of space in the planar style as the tectonic-closed category is naturally related to the independence of parts and consistent clarity' (Wölfflin, *Principles of Art History*, 306; Wölfflin, *Kunstgeschichtliche Grundbegriffe*, 244).

Table of contents	Inhalts-Verzeichnis
Introduction	Einleitung
Non-artistic aspects	Das Lineare und das Malerische
Historical values of an artwork	Allgemeines
Age values of an artwork	Zeichnung
Art-historical aspects	Malerei
Artistic aspects	Plastik
Aesthetic-subjective values	Architektur
An artwork as a an organism (The systematics of style)	Fläche und Tiefe
Motif and subject matter	Malerei
Idealism	Plastik
Naturalism	Architektur
Realism	Geschlossene Form und offene Form
'Impression and expression'	Malerei
The formation of corporality	Plastik
Planar style	Architektur
Plastic style	Vielheit und Einheit
Painterly style	Malerei
The formation of space	Architektur
Spaceless stage	Klarheit und Unklarheit
Bounded stage	Malerei
Boundless stage	Architektur
Figural composition	Abschluß
Tied composition	
Tectonic composition	
Free composition	
The content of an artwork	

Table 10: Wölfflin's and Cankar's Table of Contents.

To conclude, Cankar seems indeed to have succeeded in 'completing those [previous] investigations', and 'to sum up the marks of style into a system', just as he had declared in his preface. His *Introduction* with the systematics of style, written first and foremost for the students of art history with the aim of introducing them to art-historical discipline and offering them appropriate tools for their basic research work, does his job well. Cankar's ambition, however, was even more far-reaching. Joining the 'discussions how to consider the history of art', he thought that

... we cannot conceive it other than developmentally and organically, that is, as a sequence of events, which co-determine each other in the chronological succession, but are, at the same time, in an organic connection with the remaining development of spiritual life.¹⁵³

His *Introduction* was thus meant to be only the foundation stone for writing the history of art. He continued therefore his work with *The History of Visual Art in Western Europe. The Evolution of Style*, and with that, with an art-historical survey,

¹⁵³ Cankar, *Zgodovina*, I, 5–6.

based upon an explicit theoretical grounding, Cankar's efforts are, in the present context, quite unique.

Appendix: Izidor Cankar's biography

Izidor Cankar was born in 1886 in Šid in Serbia, his father a was Slovenian tailor and his mother came from a wealthy German family. In 1897 he was sent to Ljubljana to attend the grammar school, and he stayed there to study at the Theological Seminary (1905–09). He continued his studies at the Catholic University in Leuven (1909–10), from where he also visited Brussels, Berlin, Paris, and London. Then he went on to study art history with Josef Strzygowski in Graz (1910–11), and followed Strzygowski to Vienna, where he eventually became Max Dvořák's student (1911–13). He graduated in 1913 with a thesis on the Italian Baroque painter Giulio Quaglio, and returned to Ljubljana. He began writing and translating early, already as a student, but now he became an established figure of Ljubljana cultural life. He wrote literature and art reviews, and a novel *S poti* (From the Road). He also took on the editorship of an influential Christian periodical *Dom in svet* (Home and World) (1914–19), he modernised it into a contemporary art review committed to the art of the highest quality and persevered in the clash with the more conservative Catholic circle.

In 1915 he was called up and spent ten months as an army chaplain in Graz and Vienna. After his return from the army, he became an ardent supporter of Slovenian and Slavonic emancipation from Austro-Hungarian Empire. He started a close collaboration with Anton Korošec, a prominent member of Slovenian People's Party as well as a member of parliament in Vienna, and in 1918 he became the editor of the conservative and most read daily newspaper *Slovenec* (Slovene Man). But, after the establishment of Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes in 1918, he renounced a promising political career, he resigned the editorship of both *Dom in svet* and *Slovenec*, and instead he exerted himself towards the founding of the Ljubljana University. After it was successfully established, he spent the winter semester of 1919–20 back in Vienna with Max Dvořák for his habilitation, and in spring semester of 1920 he started the Seminar of Art History at the Faculty of Arts. His lectures on the history of art in Western Europe were attended by still few students but were quite popular by the general public. In 1921 he established *Umetnostnozgodovinsko društvo* (Art History Society) as well as its journal, *Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino* (its editor 1921–30). He took part in preparation of exhibitions *Slovensko slikarstvo* (Slovenian painting) (1922) and *Slovenski portret* (Slovenian Portrait) (1925) at the National Gallery in Ljubljana; in 1925 he also founded *Slovenski biografski leksikon* (Slovenian Biographical Lexicon).

The year 1926 was another turning point in his life. Not only he published *Uvod v umevanje likovne umetnosti (Sistematika stila)* (Introduction into Comprehending of the Visual Art. The Systematics of Style) and had the first parts of *Zgodovina likovne umetnosti v Zahodni Evropi. Razvoj stila* (The History of Visual Art in Western Europe. The Evolution of Style) ready for publication, he also decided to leave the clergy and the Church and he married Ana Hribar from a prominent Ljubljana family, with whom he later had two daughters. He continued with his

professorial duties and organisational projects unabated for ten more years: in 1929–30 he served as a Dean of Faculty of Arts, in 1933 he founded Slovenian section of PEN International (its president 1933–35), and he tried hard to achieve the establishment of the Museum of Modern Art (succeeded in 1947).

Yet in 1936, he resigned his professorship at the Faculty of Arts and returned to politics. As an ambassador of Kingdom of Yugoslavia he moved first to Buenos Aires (1936–42) and then to Ottawa (1942–44). In 1944, amidst the turbulent political situation during the Second World War, he resigned from the post and entered the Yugoslav government-in-exile of Ivan Šubašić in London, but resigned fairly quickly as well. He broke off with Slovenian People's Party, argued for cooperation with Tito's partisans and consistently opposed to German Nazism. In 1945, he returned to Yugoslavia, to Belgrade. While waiting for a new job, he kept translating from French and English. Finally, but for only a very short period, he got posted in Athens. Then he returned to Ljubljana, but the new socialist government remained suspicious of him on account of his pre-war political activity, and he was retired in 1947. He spent his time translating and writing about Slovene painting, as well as serving on committees of National Gallery and Museum of Modern Art. In 1953 he was elected a member of Slovenska akademija znanosti in umetnosti (Academy of Sciences and Arts) and in 1954 he divorced his already long estranged wife. Afterwards, he kept only a closed circle of friends and died in 1958.¹⁵⁴

Rebeka Vidrih is assistant professor at the Department of Art History at the Faculty of Arts, University of Ljubljana. She lectures on art and architecture from Renaissance onwards, on photography and contemporary art, and on the history of art history. Her foremost research fields are theories of visual arts and of art historiography.

rebeka.vidrih@ff.uni-lj.si



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

¹⁵⁴ 'Izidor Cankar', *Letopis Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti*, V, 1952–53, 67–73; France Stelè, 'Izidor Cankar. Utemeljitelj ljubljanske umetnostno zgodovinske šole', *Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino*, n.v., 4, 1957, 9–30; France Stelè, 'Izidor Cankar', in: Cankar, *Uvod*, 1959, 231–277; Francè Koblar, 'Spremna beseda', in: Izidor Cankar, *Leposlovje – eseji – kritika. Prva knjiga*, Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1968, 317–361; Francè Koblar, 'Spremna beseda', in: Izidor Cankar, *Leposlovje – eseji – kritika. Druga knjiga*, Ljubljana: Slovenska matica, 1969, 373–428; Tomaž Brejc, 'Pro et Contra. Osemdesetletnica znamenite knjižnice', *Umetnostna kronika*, 13, 2006, 10–31; Andrej Rahten, *Izidor Cankar. Diplomats dveh Jugoslavij / A Diplomat of Two Yugoslavias*, trans. Manca Gašperič and Olga Vuković, Mengeš: Center za evropsko prihodnost; Ljubljana: Znanstvenoraziskovalni center Slovenske akademije znanosti in umetnosti, 2009; Tone Smolej, 'Dunajska študijska leta Moleta, Steleta in Cankarja', *Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino*, n.v., 48, 2012, 177–196; Andrej Rahten, 'Prelomna obdobja Izidorja Cankarja', *Zbornik za umetnostno zgodovino*, n.v., 48, 2012, 199–219; Željko Oset, 'Vogalni kamni kulturnih ustanov', in: Alenka Puhar, ed., *Izidor Cankar. Mojster dobro zasukanih stavkov*, Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 2016, 187–203; Alenka Puhar, 'Biografija po letnicah', in: Alenka Puhar, ed., *Izidor Cankar. Mojster dobro zasukanih stavkov*, Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 2016, 248–253.