

'Wien oder Salzburg?': late Sedlmayr as a symptom and cure*

Stepan Vaneyan

Abbruch und Annäherung als zwei
Seiten eines Prozesses. Wieder das
Thema von Verlust und Gewinn¹
Werner Hofmann.

Late texts of any scholar – do they merely take stock of what one has achieved or do they attempt to reconsider one's contribution to scholarship? This question is especially pertinent if such a contribution resulted in all sorts of ruins...

This article proposes to look at the work of Hans Sedlmayr through his own eyes. On the one hand, this gives an opportunity to see a similarity of his work to the work of an artist. On the other hand, it allows the author to use a hermeneutic approach, or iconology in the broader sense of the word. This will imply not only re-constructing the meaning of the scholar's work but also actively constructing it. In Sedlmayr's case, such an approach promises some interesting and enlightening results if one applies his method of structural analysis of 'critical forms' to his own work. These need to be 'critical forms' not of art and culture, which Sedlmayr analysed², but rather those of his own texts and of their implications, both cognitive and ethical.

The author has had the opportunity to observe the 'patient' (Sedlmayr) for a long time.³ However, this article is limited to preliminary impressions and provisional considerations regarding his texts as whole entities rather than text

* Paper presented at the conference 'The Influence of the Vienna School of Art History before and after 1918', organised by the Institute of Art History of the Czech Academy of Sciences in cooperation with the Department of Aesthetics of the Faculty of Arts of the Charles University and in partnership with the Austrian Cultural Forum and the National Gallery in Prague 3–5 April 2019. Another version of this paper has been published in English and Russian by the Lomonosov Moscow State University in *Aesthetica Universalis*, Vol. 2 (10) 2020. 9-48.

¹ 'Breaking off and coming together as parts of the same process. Again, the theme of loss and acquisition'.

² Hans Sedlmayr, *Verlust der Mitte. Die bildende Kunst des 19. Und 20. Jahrhundert als Symbol der Zeit*, Salzburg: Otto Müller, 1948. The principal ideas about 'critical forms' by Sedlmayr: 'Unter den Formen, in denen eine Epoche sich im Felde der Kunst verkörpert, sind radikal neue immer sehr selten <...>. Und weil radikal neue Formen so selten sind, liegt es nahe, sie als bloße Absonderlichkeiten zu nehmen <...>. Es ist vielmehr geradezu zum heuristischen Prinzip zu machen, dass sich in solchen absonderlichen Formen Eigentümlichkeiten enthüllen <...>'. And, arguably, the main methodological idea of the book: 'Hier wird jene Zone der Unbewussten erreicht, denn der eigentlichen Sinn solcher Formen ist ihren Erzeugern nicht bekannt' (9-10).

³ С.С. Ванеян, *Пустующий трон. Критическое искусствознание Ханса Зедльмайра*. Москва: Прогресс-Традиция. 2004.

analyses. It seems fruitful to problematise Sedlmayr's 'condition' in general through articulating new questions. In addition, analysis on the textual level would belong to a different genre, requiring more space. Hence, the current question is: what diagnosis could be made and what prognosis could be given, considering such 'general symptoms' as Sedlmayr's *Verlust der Mitte* (1948), *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale* (1951) and *Die demolierte Schönheit* (1965)? While the last text is the shortest, it seems most significant, because it was final and conclusive in many ways.

Arguably, it is possible to see how certain analytical/interpretive methods can not only deal with critical events and objects but also generate them. 'The conflict of interpretations', as Ricœur put it,⁴ is one of the rules of the game whose name is hermeneutics. The main condition is that the game should be conscious and reflected upon. An interpreter should be involved in it not as a 'referee' but rather as a participant who knows that she/he can or will become an object of next interpretations.⁵ This also means that when she/he observes signs of unconscious processes (Freudian's 'primary' processes⁶), she/he has the right to see them as symptoms, speculate as to their reasons and even draw conclusions and make diagnoses

The question is what exactly should be seen as the primary material for such hermeneutic 're-construction'? Sedlmayr's texts? His secret intentions hidden in them? The theme of 'ruins'? Or maybe his treatment of texts and ideas of others? Does the interpreter need at first not even to de-construct but to 'grind' the data, subject it to ruination? Does she/he have such a right? Does she/he do this consciously or is it a side effect of a too assertive, even aggressive, analytical policy, of a method understood as an almost moral imperative? Is one – even though a 'rightful' person – able to go through the whole hermeneutic cycle? Does she/he have a capacity for de-constructing and then constructing anew a whole science – art history – as a whole entity? What is there in the outcome? Is there an outcome? Or is it a long-lasting building project? Or ruins? Can one take on two roles rather than one? Isn't there an absolute necessity to introduce the position of a traditional analyst (if not a supervisor) at the very beginning of any meta-critical attempts?⁷

⁴ Following Freud, Ricœur writes about 'Anwendung der Interpretation als Taktik des Zweifels und als Kampf gegen die Masken' (Paul Ricœur, *Die Interpretation. Ein Versuch über Freud*, Kapitel II 'Der Konflikt der Interpretation', Frankfurt a. Mein: Suhrkamp, 1993, 39. Compare 'Illusionsabbau', 40 and 'Destruktion' as 'Moment einer völlig neuen Grundlegen', 47, with reference to Heidegger).

⁵ 'Bei Heidegger und Gadamer ist unser Verstehen ein bedingender Teil des Zirkels' (Hügli, A., Lübcke, P. (Hrsg.), *Philosophie im 20. Jahrhundert. Bd. 1: Phänomenologie, Hermeneutik, Existenzphilosophie und Kritische Theorie*, 4, Afl. Hamburg: Rowohlt, 2002, 204).

⁶ Primary and secondary processes (the activity of the unconscious and of the ego) 'sind zusammen für Hervorbringungen wie die Kunst verantwortlich' (Richard Kuhns, *Psychoanalytische Theorie der Kunst*. Frankfurt a. Mein: 1986, 48) and their interaction can result in artistic activity as a kind of tertiary process (see Philipp Soldt, 'Bewusst/unbewusst', *Handbuch psychoanalytischer Begriffe für die Kunstwissenschaft*, Gerlinde Gehrig und Klaus Pfarr (Hg.), Giessen: Psychosozial-Verlag, 2009, 54, with reference to E. Kris). One can suggest that 'Kunstwissenschaft' is already a 'Quaternary' process.

⁷ Cf. An observation regarding Sedlmayr's 'objectivism', when he avoids the role of the subject of vision and ascribes a destructive, decomposing visual structure ('*macchia*') to the

Would such an analyst be ready to meet the blow of Sedlmayr's ideological projections?⁸

It seems possible to suggest that Sedlmayr's work as a whole could be seen as an application of a kind of unusual constructivist approach, whose purpose is the 'de-realisation of the material' (De-verwirklichung/Verfremdung, according to Nicolai Hartmann).⁹ If this is the case, the 'derealiser' himself may be subject to derealisation during the next cycle. An interpretive text can be the tool and means of such reduction-derealisation, if it 'stages' as a ruin the principled 'illegibility' of Sedlmayr's text, which 'exists under the spell of an insoluble contradiction, loss and death'¹⁰.

The disintegration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire accelerated the 'atomisation' of the Vienna School of Art History, which had started with the discussion 'Orient oder Rom?' and the conflict between M. Dvořák and J. Strzygowski after A. Riegl's death. This process resulted in the interdisciplinary approach of 'The New Vienna School',¹¹ which involved the pre-war generation of Julius von Schlosser's students, including Ernst Kris, Otto Pächt and Ernst Gombrich. Here one can talk about the obvious absence of one method accepted by everybody. And not only this but also one can observe a variety of ways of the avoidance of Dvořák's teaching. In this sense, decentralisation could be seen as either a conscious or unconscious strategy, and Salzburg was one of the escape points.¹² It seems symptomatic that it is in Salzburg that the most controversial Schlosser's or maybe, after all, Dvořák's student – Hans Sedlmayr – 'rests in academic peace'.

Today Sedlmayr's persona might seem behind the times, probably belonging in the 1950s,¹³ although he considered himself one of the central figures in modern

artist himself. Oskar Bätschmann, *Einführung in die kunstgeschichtliche Hermeneutik: Die Auslegung von Bildern*, Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft 2009, 29.

⁸ Cf. 'Trotz – oder vielleicht wegen – des Wustes an Worten, den bloßen Behauptungen, dem unangemessenen Anspruch und den bedenklichen Ideologie ist Sedlmayr in Kunstgeschichte als Theoretiker ernstgenommen worden' (Bätschmann. *Einführung in die kunstgeschichtliche Hermeneutik*, 73, with a reference to Dittmann and Hofmann).

⁹ 'Künstlerische Formung bedeutet für Hartmann vor allem Umformung in Sinne einer Entwirklichung, d.h. Herauslösen des Stoffes aus den realen Kontexten' (*Ästhetische Grundbegriffe: Historisches Wörterbuch*. Hsg. Von Karlheinz Barck, Martin Fontius, Dieter Schlenstedt, Burkhard Steinwachs, Friedrich Wolfzettel. Bd. 2, Stuttgart: J.B. Metzler, 2010, 476).

¹⁰ Aleida Assmann, 'Text und Ruine' in *Ruinenbilder* (herausgegeben von Aleida Assmann, Vonika Gomille und Gabrielle Rippl), München: Wilhelm Fink, 2002, 163-164 (Derrida).

¹¹ Meyer Shapiro, 'The New Viennese School', *Art Bulletin* 18 (1936), 258-66.

¹² That said, after the war, in Vienna, there was no talk about 'Öffnung zur Psychoanalyse, zur Ikonologie des Warburg-Institut, zur Wahrnehmungspsychologie' (Hans Aurenhammer, 'Das Wiener Kunsthistorische Institut im Ständestaat und im Nationalsozialismus', *Wiener Schule. Erinnerung und Perspektive. / Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*. Bd. LIII. Wien-Köln-Weimar: Böhlau, 2004, 53).

¹³ Norbert Schneider, 'Hans Sedlmayr (1896–1984)' in: Heinrich Dilly (Hrsg.), *Altmeister moderner Kunstgeschichte*, Berlin 1990, 68-81.

art history. His reputation was ruined by his involvement with the Third Reich;¹⁴ later it was almost restored,¹⁵ though not at home ('unheimisch').¹⁶ The process of Sedlmayr's denazification throughout the 1950s was followed by his 'denationalisation': he was rehabilitated in Munich,¹⁷ outside Austria. However, after becoming emeritus (in 1964), he moved to Salzburg – a cultural-historical parallel to Vienna.

One should be aware of the traditional cultural-historical rivalry between Salzburg and Vienna, in order to understand why Sedlmayr decided to return to this town rather than to Vienna. In Vienna, he was confronted even as late as in 1956 when his new monograph about Fischer von Erlach the Elder was published.¹⁸ A number of professors who returned from immigration (including Otto Demus) organized a different exhibition, also dedicated to Fischer von Erlach,¹⁹ which was intended as a counterweight to the work of the 'old Nazi'. By contrast, the situation in Salzburg can be characterised by the following fact. When in 1950 in Salzburg was organized a personal exhibition of sculptor Fritz Wotruba,²⁰ who came back from emigration, simultaneously, there took place an alternative exhibition of Josef Thorak,²¹ the official sculptor of the Third Reich (whose work, by the way, includes a monument for Fischer Erlach the Elder).²²

Going back in time, it was in Munich that the so-called 'Sedlmayr's school' began. It was based on his seminars, for which he had prepared two 'methodological guides' – two 'exemplary interpretations', in his own words, of Jan Vermeer's 'The Allegory of Painting' and Fischer von Erlach's Karlskirche in Vienna²³. Such a claim for 'exemplarity' together with a kind of unusual lack of self-reflection and self-criticism, seem characteristic and symptomatic. What if Sedlmayr himself was an exemplary result of his own method at work, its product, if not a victim?

¹⁴ '...ein der wenigen faschistischen Intellektualeb von hohen Grad' (Willibald Sauerländer, 'Zersplitterte Erinnerung' in *Kunsthistoriker in eigener Sache* (Hg. von Martina Sitt), Berlin: Riemer 1990, 305.

¹⁵ About the danger of 'springtime for Sedlmayr' and the general ambiguity of an interest in 'Nazi art history' see Benjamin Binstock, 'Springtime for Sedlmayr? The Future of Nazi Art History', *Wiener Schule. Erinnerung und Perspektive...*, 73-86 (as a conclusion: 'The Future of Nazi art history might thus lie in Jewish hands' – *ibid.* 86).

¹⁶ Cf 'Gerade so aber eröffnet sich in Heideggers Sicht die ,eigentliche Freiheit' – auf dem Hintergrund der ,Unheimlichkeit' der Welt/ in der radikalen Befindlichkeit des Unzuhausesein' (Heidegger, *Handbuch. Leben – Werk – Wirkung* (Dieter Thomä (Hrsg.)), 2. Aufl. Stuttgart – Weimar: Metzler, 2013, 61.

¹⁷ About students' reaction to Sedlmayr's appearance in the university see: Sauerländer, 311.

¹⁸ Hans Sedlmayr. *J. B. Fischer von Erlach*. Wien: Herold, 1956.

¹⁹ *Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach. Ausstellungskatalog*. Graz, Wien, Salzburg 1956/1957. Hrsg. von Hans Aurenhammer. Wien: Schroll, 1956.

²⁰ 01.08.1950 – 31.08.1950: *Steinskulpturen* – Galerie Welz, Salzburg.

²¹ 'Thorak in Salzburg', Mirabellgarten and also Am 15. Juli 1950 begann im Zwergelgarten.

²² See about it in detail in: Eva Frodl-Kraft, 'Hans Sedlmayr, 1896-1984'. *Wiener Jahrbuch f. Kunstgeschichte*, 1991, 44, 7-46.

²³ 'Zwei Beispiele zur Interpretation: Jan Vermeer: *Der Ruhm der Malkunst* and Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach: *Die Schauseite der Karlskirche in Wien*' in *Kunst und Wahrheit*, 160-201).

The only significant work he wrote in Salzburg was a text on preservation of monuments – 'Die demolierte Schönheit – Ein Aufruf zur Rettung der Altstadt Salzburgs' (1965). His notable silence for the last twenty years of his life resulted in the thin brochure (only 39 pages) which might seem unimportant or incidental as compared with Sedlmayr's other works. There was a real-life reason for writing this text but, at the same time, it might be seen as coming back to his origins – to his teacher Dvořák, the author of 'Des Kathedismus der Denkmalpflege' (1916)²⁴. How can one interpret this and some other facts of Sedlmayr's biography if she/he follows Sedlmayr's method and seeks to achieve his level of iconological interpretation, - however, not of works of art but of works of the 'science about art'?

Sedlmayr noted once²⁵ that his 'Die Entstehung der Kathedrale' is a realisation of his model of art history, which starts with the sacral complex of interconnected phenomena: its origins, flourishing, decline, and disintegration, until art becomes secular. In turn, these four stages of art history are very similar to the four stages or levels of comprehending/interpreting a work of art, in Sedlmayr's version, in which the eschatological 'type' of meaning, implying disintegration and ruination, is also considered.²⁶ However, significantly, disintegration is not the final stage: it is followed by new integration. These levels of understanding are:

- I. Physiognomic.
- II. Formal.
- III. 'Noetic', which includes another four types of meaning, where the eschatological type belongs.
- IV. Integral.

What if Sedlmayr's work as a whole follows a similar scheme? Applying his method of four-level interpretation to his work, one can observe what seems to be certain methodological symptoms, notably – structuralism per se as a 'document' of existential processes (in Panofsky's sense of the word) becoming an 'object' of *Denkmalpflege*. The question is: did Sedlmayr, albeit unconsciously, search the past for both ideological continuity and 'monumentalisation' of his scholarly experience, in order to achieve the integral level (Level/type IV)? Otherwise, his methodology seems informed exclusively by the eschatological meaning and, probably, feeling (Level/type III). This fact might be partly explained by the characteristics of the epistemology he had chosen: phenomenological reduction in tandem with gestalt psychology, which resulted in a kind of 'structural analysis', in his understanding.

A few more words about disintegration. According to Belting's observations,²⁷ Sedlmayr's early project of the 'new science about art' implied as its material not

²⁴ A comparison of Dvořák and Sedlmayr's concepts see Sandro Scarocchia, 'Denkmalpflege und Moderne: Die Lehre Max Dvoraks' in *Max Dvorak. Schriften zur Denkmalpflege*, Wien-Köln-Weimar: Böhlau, 2012, 205-206.

²⁵ Sedlmayr wrote about this book of his: 'eine große Schlacht im Kampf um eine konkrete, antimuseale Kunstgeschichte', admitting that it was written at the time when 'in der am meisten von der Krise der Kunstgeschichte die Rede war' (*Die Entstehung der Kathedrale*, 535-536).

²⁶ Hans Sedlmayr. Pieter Bruegel. 'Der Sturz der Blinden', *Hefte des Kunsthistorischen Seminars der Universität München*, II, 1957.

²⁷ Belting Hans. *Das Ende der Kunstgeschichte. Eine Revision nach zehn Jahren*. München: Beck, 1995, 150.

only art but also knowledge about art, and the latter was provided by a 'decomposition' of the previous tradition. This feature seems key to understanding Sedlmayr's epistemological strategy. At the same time, the moment of 'ruin' is characteristic of the traditional hermeneutic paradigm.²⁸ Consider this parallel: post-structuralism and deconstruction originate in structuralism, and similarly, Sedlmayr's structural analysis stems from phenomenological reduction and gestalt methodology. For Sedlmayr, to build a new ('strong') science²⁹, it was necessary to falsify, even devalue, previous achievements, reduce them to 'a background'. Thus, before «Kathedrale», he wrote «Verlust der Mitte». The collapse of the present state of affairs, in which contemporary art was seen as a 'fatal illness' ('die Krankheit zum Tode')³⁰, prepared the emergence of the new cathedral, having all the features of an eschatological and final building. As New Jerusalem is preceded by a cosmic catastrophe³¹, so the 'new' science was preceded by the ruination of the 'old' science.

However, arguably, ruins were not only before/behind Sedlmayr. Perhaps, it is impossible to state that others undergo a crisis and believe, at the same time, that you are not impacted by it. Doctors fall ill as well as patients, and prophets can be condemned. Thus, as a kind of prophet, even though secular³², Sedlmayr might have had to see himself not only above the situation that he described and analysed but also inside it. This means that the end and the dying that he witnessed involved himself – directly and literally eschatologically. It has been noted that Sedlmayr's *Die Entstehung der Kathedrale* erected from the ruins of post-war Germany³³. However, it is important to emphasise that without those real, non-metaphysical ruins his new structure might not have been possible at all. The same is true about his method as such, as Dittmann pointed out³⁴. Sedlmayr's 'structural analysis'

²⁸ This paradigm is built on a preference for the direct truth rather than any 'method', which is basically phenomenological and typical of Gadamer. Cf 'Das Problem stellt sich ihm (Gadamer) wieder in der Form etwa der ruinösen Alternative Wahrheit oder Methode' (Oskar Bätschmann. *Beiträge zu einem Übergang von der Ikonologie zur kunstgeschichtlichen Hermeneutik // Bildende Kunst als Zeichensystem*. Band I: Ikonographie und Ikonologie. Theorien – Entwicklung – Probleme. 5. Aufl. Köln: DuMont, 1991, 476. Cf: 'Die Kunstgeschichtliche Hermeneutik unterscheidet sich von der tradierten Interpretation von Werken der bildenden Kunst. Im Gegensatz zum dieser hat sie ihren Gegenstand nicht im Sinn des Werkes <...>, sondern im Werk selbst' (Bätschmann. *Einführung in die kunstgeschichtliche Hermeneutik*, 9).

²⁹ Hans Sedlmayr, 'Zu einer strengen Kunstwissenschaft', *Kunstwissenschaftliche Forschungen*, Bd. I, Wien, 1931.

³⁰ Hans Sedlmayr, *Verlust der Mitte*, 164.

³¹ '...die textualisierte rhetorische Situation beschwört eine Krisensituation herauf' (Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza. *Das Buch der Offenbarung: Vision einer gerechten Welt*. Stuttgart-Berlin-Köln: Kohlhammer. 1994, 150).

³² Regarding 'Leienpropheten', Sedlmayr writes in 'Kierkegaard über Picasso' (Hans Sedlmayr. *Der Tod des Lichtes. Übergangene Perspektive zur modernen Kunst*. Salzburg: Müller, 1964, 63).

³³ 'Aus dem Dunkel jener Jahre und der Besorgnis über den Weg des modernen Europa erhob sich die Lichtgestalt der Kathedrale' (Bernhard Rupprecht, 'Vorwort', *Sedlmayr. Die Entstehung der Kathedrale*, XV).

³⁴ Lorenz Dittmann. *Stil, Symbol, Struktur - Studien zu Kategorien der Kunstgeschichte*. München: Fink, 1967. 'Strukturanalyse' needs for 'zerstörten Zustand' its objects (191).

needs ruins, resulting from crises which it sometimes, actually, causes. Not only cultural and ontological remains in general but also Sedlmayr's personal and existential ruins, obvious at the level of methodology, which was too potent and thus inevitably destructive.

Hence, facing 'threats and hopes of the technical age'³⁵, Sedlmayr may have returned to the past, even if unconsciously, to achieve integration (Type IV), both in the sense of ideological continuity and 'monumentalisation' of his scholarly experience. He might have felt that only going back to the experience of his teacher Dvorak, who had converted him, the young veteran of the great war, to the art historical 'belief', he would have been able to consolidate the results of his personal and scholarly endeavour. To draw a parallel with Dvořák's methodological strategies, for Sedlmayr, the outcome was 'preservation of monuments' rather than the 'history of the spirit'. The latter, in the middle of Sedlmayr's life and of the Second World War, was transformed by him into the history of crises of the human spirit³⁶. 'Preservation of monuments' – or rather protection, taking care (*die Pflege*) of them – was he perhaps thinking about his own 'monument' – unconsciously created ruins? Far from being revenge, this assumption seems an appropriate conclusion to his work exactly because the eschatological level of understanding, according to Sedlmayr himself, is not the final one. The completion of the interpretational endeavour of comprehension might lie in tropology, in figurative use of language. It might be possible to 'convert' Sedlmayr to 'positive thinking' and 'cleanse' him by plunging him into the font of his own methodology.

Summing up, the author has tried to show that ruins can be not only a reminder of the past but also a symptom, a symbol and even a cure. Using certain motifs and themes of Sedlmayr's work, the author subjected him to the same procedure as that Sedlmayr used when approaching the works of others. In this particular case, it seems appropriate to answer well-known questions 'Athen oder Jerusalem?'³⁷ OR 'Orient oder Rom?'³⁸ this way: 'Wien und alles anderes!'³⁹

'Sedlmayr findet in dem von ihm analysierten Gegenstand das Negativ seiner eigenen Theorie. Die Untersuchungsmethode ist strukturell und ganzheitlich, der Untersuchungsgegenstand zerspalten' (193). 'Nur dann kann das Werk durch die Kritik, die Strukturanalyse, vollendet werden, wenn es in sich selbst unvollständig, unvollkommen ist' (210).

³⁵ Hans Sedlmayr, 'Gefahr und Hoffnung des technischen Zeitalters', *Elektrotechnik und Maschinenbau*, 75, 1958, 1-7.

³⁶ See in 'Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte – Das Vermächtnis Max Dvořák's' (1949): 'Kunstgeschichte als Geschichte der Epiphanie des absoluten Geistes in den Brechungen des zeitabhängigen menschlichen Geistes' (Hans Sedlmayr, *Kunst und Wahrheit. Zur Theorie und Methode der Kunstgeschichte*, Hamburg, 1958, 85).

³⁷ 'Quid ergo Athenis et Hierosolimis?' (Tertullian *De praescriptione haereticorum*, VII).

³⁸ Strzygowski, J. *Orient oder Rom? Beiträge zur Geschichte der Spätantiken und frühchristlichen Kunst*. Leipzig: J.C. Heinrichs, 1900.

³⁹ The author of this article used the following texts about The Vienna School of Art History: Benesch, O. 'Die Wiener kunsthistorische Schule', *Österreichische Rundschau*, 1920. Bd. 62. S. 174–178. Julius von Schlosser, 'Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte. Rückblick auf ein Säkulum deutscher Gelehrtenarbeit in Österreich', *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*, Ergänzungs-Band 13, Heft 2, 1934. 13ff.

Stepan Vaneyan 'Wien oder Salzburg?': late Sedlmayr as a symptom and cure

'Everything else' is an opportunity to go away from 'either – or' in favour of 'not only... but also...'. Such an equality of voices, taking part in a performative-transformative discourse, is called – still called – 'Kunstwissenschaft'. And even the ruins of a personal biography can be restored through the efforts of collective historiography – if such ruins are worth restoring.

Translated from Russian into English by Elena Vaneyan

Stepan Vaneyan is Professor of the Department of General History of Arts, Faculty of History, Lomonosov Moscow State University, PhD in Art Theory, the author of many papers in the European history of art, a member of AU Editorial Board; Elena Vaneyan is a philologist and an interpreter who develops and teaches special courses for students in art history at the Lomonosov Moscow State University and the Higher School of Economics, Moscow, Russia

vaneyans@gmail.com



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

³⁹ The following works reflect the latest and the most general research about The Vienna School of Art History: Ettliger L.D., Krenn Stefan und M. Pippal (Hg.) 'Wien und die Entwicklung der kunsthistorischen Methode', *Akten des XXV. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte*, Bd. 1, Böhlau Verlag; 1. Auflage. 1985; 'La scuola viennese di storia dell'arte / A cura di Marco Pozzetto', *Atti del XX Convegno Istituto per gli Incontri Culturali Mitteleuropei*, Gorizia, 1986; 'Wiener Schule: Erinnerung und Perspektiven', *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte* LIII, 2004. Wien, 2005. *Vienna School Reader: Politics and Art Historical Method in the 1930s* edited by Christopher S. Wood, New York: Zone Books, 2000; Edwin Lachnit, *Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte und die Kunst ihrer Zeit*, Böhlau: Wien 2005; Mathew Rampley, *The Vienna School of Art History: Empire and the Politics of Scholarship, 1847–1918*, Penn State University Press 2014.