

Conference report on:  
Max Dvořák and the 'Denkmalpflege'  
13 October 2021  
Monuments Board of the Slovak Republic

Tomáš Kowalski

**International symposium: Max Dvořák and 'Denkmalpflege'**



Max Dvořák, ca. 1897. Photo: Institute of Art History, University of Vienna.

The centenary of the death of Bohemia-born Max Dvořák (b. 4 June 1874, d. 8 February 1921) is significant for professionals in both art history and monument protection. One of the key figures of the Vienna School of Art History,<sup>1</sup> Dvořák has left a deep mark in the latter branch thanks to his service on the 'Central Commission for Research and Preservation of Artistic and Historic Monuments' of imperial Austria. That unit was included into the state administration system with

<sup>1</sup> Still valuable general overview from one of the direct exponents: Julius von Schlosser, 'Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte. Rückblick auf ein Säkulum deutscher Gelehrtenarbeit in Österreich', *Mitteilungen des Österreichischen Instituts für Geschichtsforschung*, Supplement 13: 2, 1934, 141–228; for English translation and edition by Karl Johns see *Journal of Art Historiography*, 1, December 2009 <https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2011/08/karl-johns-schlosser-trans-wienerschule-revised.pdf> Retrieved 25 October 2021. – Early rediscovery of the Vienna School in the 1980s: Stefan Krenn, Martina Pippal, eds., *Akten des 25. Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte: Wien und die Entwicklung der kunsthistorischen Methode*, vol. 1, Vienna: Böhlau, 1984. – Of the secondary historiography Matthew Rampley, *The Vienna School of Art History: Empire and the Politics of Scholarship, 1847–1918*, University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013.

the permission of Emperor Francis Joseph I on 31 December 1850, but it started its activity only in 1853. After the Austro-Hungarian Compromise its area of operations was restricted exclusively to the Cisleithanian, the western (plus northern and southern), part of the monarchy (1867–1918). The Statute of 18 July 1873 entered the internal subdivision of the Central Commission: Section 1 – Archaeology of Prehistory and Classical antiquity; Section 2 – Medieval and Early modern Artistic Monuments till end of the 18th century; Section 3 – Archival Heritage.<sup>2</sup>

Max Dvořák's occupation as the *Denkmalpfleger*<sup>3</sup> began close to Alois Riegl (1858–1905), who in the last years of his life set out the groundbreaking ideas which changed the paradigm of protection. The earlier practice of '(stylistic) restoration', dominant for the branch in the decades under Baron Joseph Alexander Helfert (1820–1910, Commission president from 1863),<sup>4</sup> was replaced by the idea of 'conservation', i.e. preservation of a monument without completing or cleaning to the presumed original state. *Moderne Denkmalkultur* by Riegl (1903) contrasted the 'commemorative value', 'historical value' and 'age value' of a monument, as opposed to its 'relative art value', 'use value' and 'newness value'. It became the theoretical basis for the new trend and the necessary change in the practice of monument protection, as well as for drafts of the Austrian law on the protection of monuments,<sup>5</sup> which were circulated at the time, although the law itself was only adopted by the National Assembly of the Republic about twenty years later.<sup>6</sup>

At the time of Riegl's fatal illness and after his premature death, Max Dvořák took over his posts: in sequence, he became a member of the Central Commission (appointed 22 February 1905), then editor of the publications from the 2nd Section (1 December 1905) and finally the General Conservator of medieval and early modern artistic monuments in the provinces of Austria (21 December 1905). Dvořák's Czech origin was significant especially for his latter post: in a multinational state with a significant share of the Slavic-languages people, he was able to speak more directly with local parties. On the other hand, he always accepted the functions as 'temporary', and several times intended to resign from them.

<sup>2</sup> The first five decades of the official monument protection in Austria (1850/53–1903) discussed Josef Alexander Freiherr von Helfert, ed., *K. k. Zentral-Kommission für Kunst- und historische Denkmale: Festschrift anlässlich ihres fünfzigjährigen Wirkens*, Vienna: Braumüller, 1903; breakthrough historiography by Walter Frodl, *Idee und Verwirklichung: Das Werden der staatlichen Denkmalpflege in Österreich*, Vienna-Cologne-Weimar: Böhlau, 1988.

<sup>3</sup> Comprehensive reader of his papers: Max Dvořák, *Schriften zur Denkmalpflege*, ed. Sandro Scarrocchia, Vienna-Cologne-Weimar: Böhlau, 2012.

<sup>4</sup> Recently studied in general by Theodor Brückler, *Zur Geschichte der österreichischen Denkmalpflege: Die Ära Helfert*, vol. 1: 1863–1891, Vienna-Cologne-Weimar: Böhlau, 2020; Martha Fingernagel-Grüll, *Zur Geschichte der österreichischen Denkmalpflege: Die Ära Helfert*, vol. 2: 1891–1910, Vienna-Cologne-Weimar: Böhlau, 2020.

<sup>5</sup> Michael S. Falser, 'Zum 100. Todesjahr von Alois Riegl. Der „Alterswert“ als Beitrag zur Konstruktion staatsnationaler Identität in der Habsburg-Monarchie um 1900 und seine Relevanz heute', *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Kunst und Denkmalpflege* [hereinafter ÖZKD], 59: 3-4, 2005, esp. 298–307; Michele Lamprakos, 'Riegl's "Modern Cult of Monuments" and the Problem of Value', *Change Over Time*, 4.2, 2014, 418–435.

<sup>6</sup> Eva Frodl-Kraft, *Gefährdetes Erbe. Österreichs Denkmalschutz und Denkmalpflege 1918–1945 im Prisma der Zeitgeschichte*, Vienna-Cologne-Weimar: Böhlau, 1997, 50–64.

The heir presumptive to the throne, Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Habsburg-Este (1863–1914), who had just been elected as the honorary member of the Central Commission from 14 June 1905, paid attention to the movement in monument protection, one of his favoured fields alongside military issues, politics, and art collecting. With the designation of Franz Ferdinand as the Protector of the Central Commission, from 22 January 1910, the *Militärkanzlei* at the Belvedere Palace became the highest authority for matters of monument protection.<sup>7</sup> The Protector's influence initiated transformations in the agency – from a semi-voluntary structure into a system of state officials experienced in art history. These basic features remained relevant until recent days for the successor states after the empire's fall in October 1918. Furthermore, Dvořák's most popular book, *Katechismus der Denkmalpflege* (1916),<sup>8</sup> was encouraged and consulted by the Archduke during the writing process in 1913. He reserved himself the right of imprimatur and demanded that the book be distributed among the administrative and church authorities, to the schools and other public offices. Its principle should be *Piety towards the monument* – a kind of modern religion similar to Riegl's *Denkmalkultus* –, whose lack causes the loss of monuments.

In the past decades, the tradition of commemorating Max Dvořák has developed in connection with anniversaries of his death: firstly at Vienna in 1951,<sup>9</sup> then twice in Prague 1961 and 1971,<sup>10</sup> and a decade ago, in 2011 by the Institute of Art History, Bratislava.<sup>11</sup> On 15–16 April of the current centenary year, an online conference took place under the auspices of the Institute of Art History of the Czech Academy of Sciences.<sup>12</sup> Six months later, on 13 October 2021, the Monuments Boards of the Slovak Republic held the international online symposium *Max Dvořák and the 'Denkmalpflege'*. The invitation from Bratislava was accepted by renowned experts in the history of monument protection. Their active involvement enabled the symposium program to cover most of the important aspects and areas of Dvořák's work.

<sup>7</sup> Theodor Brückler, *Thronfolger Franz Ferdinand als Denkmalpfleger. Die „Kunstakten“ der Militärkanzlei im Österreichischen Staatsarchiv (Kriegsarchiv)*, Vienna-Cologne-Weimar: Böhlau, 2009; Alma Hannig, *Franz Ferdinand. Die Biografie*, 2nd ed., Vienna: Amalthea, 2014, 85–98, 242–43.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Jonathan Blower, 'Max Dvořák, Franz Ferdinand and the Katechismus der Denkmalpflege', *Umění/Art*, 58: 5-6, 2010, 433–444; Géza Hajós, 'Max Dvořák und die Heimatschutzbewegung', *Ars*, 44: 1, 2011 (n. 11), esp. 77–82.

<sup>9</sup> Karl M. Swoboda, 'Vortrag zum 30. Todestag von Max Dvořák (Gehalten an der Universität Wien)', *ÖZKD*, 28: 3, 1974, 74–81 (volume to centenary of Max Dvořák's birth).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. *Umění/Art*, 9: 6, 1961, 525–640; *Umění/Art*, 19: 6, 1971, 612–17.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. *Ars*, 44: 1, 2011 (ed. Ján Bakoš) [dejum.sav.sk/docs/mag/ARS\\_2011\\_1.pdf](http://dejum.sav.sk/docs/mag/ARS_2011_1.pdf). Retrieved 25 October 2021.

<sup>12</sup> Tereza Hrdličková and Tomáš Murár, 'The Influence of the Vienna School of Art History II: The 100th Anniversary of Max Dvořák's Death', *Journal of Art Historiography*, 25, December 2021. [https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2021/06/hrdlickova\\_murar-report-1.pdf](https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2021/06/hrdlickova_murar-report-1.pdf). Retrieved 25 October 2021.

The symposium was opened by the invitation address from the temporarily appointed General Director of the Monuments Boards of the Slovak Republic, **Dr. Radoslav Ragač**. He welcomed the event with a focus on the monument protection in the final decades of the Austro-Hungarian Empire ruled by the Habsburg-Lorraine monarchs.

**Tomáš Kowalski** (Bratislava) started the program with a survey of the milestones of life and work of Max Dvořák. His professional biography sourced from the beginnings as a student of history in Prague (1892) to his turn to art history at the *Institut für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* in Vienna under his mentor, Franz Wickhoff (1853–1909). The Viennese student, assistant, associate (*venia docendi*: 1902) and finally full professor at the university (1909) took his research travels to Paris (1898), southern France (1899), Rome – Siena – Florence (1900), Brussels – Antwerp – Ghent (1902), and regularly visited to northern Italy and Venice, fascinating hometown of Tintoretto.<sup>13</sup> From this period must be mentioned Dvořák's chief publications in art history:<sup>14</sup> *Die Illuminatoren des Johann von Neumarkt* (1901), *Das Rätsel der Kunst der Brüder Van Eyck* of 1904,<sup>15</sup> as well as his editorship of the *Kunstgeschichtliche Anzeigen*, review supplement to the *Mittheilungen der IfÖG* (1904–13). His opinion to the *Orient oder Rom*, in which Josef Strzygowski (1862–1941) insisted upon the Near East roots of late-antique and Christian art, in contrast to the predominant Rome-centred ideas of the Vienna School, became part of long-lasting polemics with political overtones.<sup>16</sup>

Moreover, Max Dvořák combined his university assistantship with increasing field work for the Central Commission, reporting particularly on medieval murals in the provinces of Bohemia (e.g. Doudleby/Teindles, 1903; Karlstein Castle, 1904) and Lower Austria (Rappottenstein, 1905). After the death of Riegl, his daily service as the General Conservator, responsible for dozens of cases, very quickly replaced previous occasional delegations. In addition to neighbouring inland provinces, his itinerary now included more distant crown lands such as the Austrian Littoral – *Österreichisches Küstenland* and Dalmatia in the south, or Galicia and Bukovina in the northeast. From 1906 Dvořák coordinated the standard series of the *Österreichische Kunsttopographie (ÖKT)*,<sup>17</sup> which was to cover the provinces represented in the Imperial Council of Austria, beginning with the volume on the district of Krems and a separate sub-volume: *Die Sammlungen des Schlosses Grafenegg* (1907). Someone can ask, why just Krems? At least a short stay will quickly convince us of the incredible preservation of the whole extent of the medieval city with notable elements of later styles. Vienna, on the other hand, was at the time changed

<sup>13</sup> Wojciech Bałus, 'Max Dvořák betrachtet Tintoretto oder über den Manierismus', *Ars*, 44: 1, 2011 (n. 11), 26–44.

<sup>14</sup> Hans H. Aurenhammer, 'Max Dvořák (1874–1921)', in: Ulrich Pfisterer, ed., *Klassiker der Kunstgeschichte*, vol. 1, Munich: Beck, 2007, 214–226.

<sup>15</sup> Artur Rosenauer, 'Das Rätsel der Kunst der Brüder Van Eyck – Max Dvořák und seine Stellung zu Wickhoff und Riegl', in: *Akten* (n. 1), 45–52.

<sup>16</sup> Ivan Foletti and Francesco Lovino, eds., *Orient oder Rom? History and Reception of a Historiographical Myth (1901–1970)*, Rome: Viella, 2018.

<sup>17</sup> Paul Mahringer, 'Geschichte und Zukunft der Inventarisierung in Österreich', *ÖZKD*, 64: 3–4, 2010, esp. 234–36.

by the boom of the real estate business to an extensive building site, where the old town was surrounded by a huge *Ringstrasse*; buildings along the 'ring' now included the *Kaiserforum* and the *Neue Hofburg* and imperial museums of nature and art history (*k. k. Hofmuseen / Kunsthistorische Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*).<sup>18</sup> By contrast, large numbers of medieval and early modern houses of *Alt-Wien* were being destroyed.<sup>19</sup>

Also in 1907, volume 27/2: *Raudnitz/Roudnice Castle* by Dvořák and Bohumil Matějka (1867–1909) was printed within the 'Inventory of historic and artistic monuments in the Kingdom of Bohemia' and sparked negotiations on the next megaproject: *Monumenta artis Germaniae*. This enterprise on behalf of the *Deutscher Verein für Kunstwissenschaft* was steered by a titan of German art historiography, Georg Dehio (1850–1932), together with Adolph Goldschmidt (1863–1944) and Dvořák, who took responsibility for his previous assignment: the catalogue of illuminated manuscripts.<sup>20</sup> Acceptance of a generation younger Dvořák also meant recognition for the 'Vienna School' as he used that term in his correspondence.

Certainly thanks to Max Dvořák, in 1907, the Central Commission hired a quartet of younger Czech-native professionals: Vincenz Kramář (1877–1960) and Zdeněk Wirth (1878–1961) as correspondents, and between 1912–16 Antonín Matějček (1889–1950), followed by Jaromír Pečírka (1891–1966), were employed by the bureau as adjuncts.

The early 1910s should be regarded as the 'golden years' of modern Austrian monument protection, possibly as the 'Era Liechtenstein' with respect to the Commission's President Franz I, Prince of Liechtenstein (1853–1938, head 1910–19) and his Vice-Presidents, Counts Karl/Karol Antoni Lanckoroński (1848–1933) and Vinzenz Baillet de Latour (1848–1913). Dvořák's correspondence with them remains something like a semi-official record of the events of his professional life.<sup>21</sup> In that period the Ministry of Religion and Education accepted several proposals from Dvořák, including the new Statute for the Central Commission, of 2 August 1911, which specified the structure of the administrative and technical office (*k. k. Staatsdenkmalamt*), created the Institute of Art History (*Kunsthistorisches Institut der k. k. Zentral Kommission*) and its advisory board (*Denkmalrat*), and allowed for the

<sup>18</sup> Margaret Gottfried, *Das Wiener Kaiserforum: Utopien zwischen Hofburg und MuseumsQuartier*, Vienna-Cologne-Weimar: Böhlau, 2001. The museum of natural history became accessible to the public from 10 August 1889, of art history later from 21 October 1891.

<sup>19</sup> Vienna was included to the ÖKT series only later, symptomatic with the main imperial residence, the palace of Hofburg (vol. 14: *Baugeschichte der k. k. Hofburg in Wien bis zum XIX. Jahrhunderte*, 1914). The following volume, *Kunsthistorischer Atlas der k. k. Reichshaupt- und Residenzstadt Wien und Verzeichnis der erhaltenswerten historischen Kunst- und Naturdenkmale des Wiener Stadtbildes* (1916) shows the principles of historical urbanism of Vienna, addressed to the authorities of city planning. At the same moment it can be noted as timely extension of the *Katechismus der Denkmalpflege* (1916).

<sup>20</sup> Jonathan B. Blower, 'Max Dvořák, Wilhelm von Bode and The Monuments of German Art', *Ars*, 44: 1, 2011 (n. 11), 92–124.

<sup>21</sup> Bogusław Dybaś and Joanna Winiewicz-Wolska, eds, *Listy Maxa Dvořáka do Karola Lanckorońskiego / Briefe von Max Dvořák an Karl Lanckoroński (1907–1921)*, Vienna: Polska Akademia Nauk, 2015.

hiring of paid conservators in the crown lands (*k. k. Landeskonservator*) and voluntary staff of the *Denkmalpflegers*. Following the audience of 13 March 1913, the Protector issued detailed internal regulation for the Central Commission, agreed with appointing the General Conservator for agenda of ethnography and folk art, Michael Haberlandt (1860–1940), and ordered officials to prepare monthly reports of their work. Despite Dvořák's intensive involvement in cases approaching politics, at the Salzburg meeting of the monument protection and *Heimatschutz*, September 1911, he stated that '*Ich bin ein Gast in der Denkmalpflege.*'

The assassination of Archduke Franz Ferdinand on 28 June 1914 radically changed the course of events, and resulted in the armed conflict between the rival coalitions of the Triple Alliance (Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy) and the Triple Entente (Great Britain, France, and Russia). The First World War brought with it unprecedented destruction and entirely new challenges for the professionals in art history and monument protection in the main war theatres – of the northwest (against France), in Galicia at the east (against Russia) and in the southwest, where the front opened after Italy entered the war (1915).<sup>22</sup> This latter front, dividing the Austrian *Küstenland* and Italian *Veneto*, continued to be an area of intense fighting and destruction until the very end of the war. In September 1915, Dvořák travelled to German-occupied Belgium, where the authorities of the General Government developed a conservation project for several cathedrals including that of Brussels. With his appointment as Vice-President of the Central Commission, on 4 July 1917, Dvořák reached his highest rank in the branch. In December of the same year he was ordered to attend the festive consecration of the military church in Olmütz/Olomouc. There he surely met the author of the project, the renowned Slovakia-born architect Dušan Jurkovič (1868–1947), who was currently serving at the northern military headquarters in Cracow. In summer of 1918 Dvořák visited the southern frontline, three months before the final transfer of the *Küstenland* into Italian territory.

In the years of the Great War, Max Dvořák, in his role as a professor, was already fully engaged by the problem of the changing of art forms over time. His lectures, *Idealismus und Naturalismus in der Kunst der Neuzeit* (1915–16), *Über das Verhältnis der Kunst im 17. und 18. Jahrhundert zu den gleichzeitigen geistigen Strömungen* (1916–17), and *Idealismus und Naturalismus in der gotischen Skulptur und Malerei* (printed 1918), are essentially comprehensive overviews of the historical processes of art. In his daily work as a member of the special committee of the Court museums, Dvořák discussed the problems of correct restoration in art museums. In his time occurred numerous changes of the ownership to artworks, especially leaving from the church properties in the areas of Austria into the hands of international art dealers. In this relation he emphasized the role of local museums and their importance alongside the central. On the other hand, he occasionally served as a consultant to various private collectors.

Max Dvořák's public lectures of 1919 addressed, among other topics, Baroque Vienna, and testified to his nostalgia for the lost glory of the imperial

<sup>22</sup> Robert Born and Beate Störtkuhl, eds., *Apologeten der Vernichtung oder »Kunstschützer«? Kunsthistoriker der Mittelmächte im Ersten Weltkrieg*, Cologne-Weimar-Vienna: Böhlau, 2017 <https://www.vr-elibrary.de/doi/pdf/10.7788/9783412508340> Retrieved 25 October 2021.

metropolis. The *Missione Militare Italiana per l'Armistizio* occupied the areas of (former) Austria-Hungary and its provinces from 28 December 1918; it established its headquarters in Vienna and sent delegations to Cracow, Budapest, Ljubljana, Klagenfurt, Maribor and Graz.<sup>23</sup> On 12 February 1919, a troop of Italian soldiers accompanying a trio of experts confiscated artworks in the gallery of the Academia and seized recently nationalised court collections and the Viennese state library.<sup>24</sup> Dvořák still loved his hometown and refused several invitations to take up professorships outside of Austria; in December 1918 came an offer from Prague, now ruled by the Czech-national representatives, and subsequently he received an offer from the University of Cologne. His lectures of 1920 reached fame under the title (added later) '*Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*'.<sup>25</sup> Here, Dvořák selected the great artists whose masterworks fully corresponded to the feeling and bleak prospect of the current time: apocalyptic visions of Albrecht Dürer and El Greco; landscapes with peasants, handicapped persons; grotesques and allegories testifying to the blindness of mankind, such as the famous painting by Pieter Brueghel the Elder. Nonetheless, Dvořák's paper on the latter master was also provoked by the sale of Brueghel's *Adoration of the Kings* (1564), oil on wood, which had been offered by its private holder in Vienna for the state collections, but was finally sold to the National Gallery in London.

After the declaration of the Republic of German-Austria (12 November 1918), the Central Commission was replaced by the *Deutschösterreichisches Staatsdenkmalamt*, but Dvořák's *Kunsthistorisches Institut* remained within the structure (Statute of 12 June 1920). Thanks to his continuing role in the branch, Dvořák took part in the professional congresses at Bregenz and Eisenach, both in 1920. At the latter meeting he discussed the problem of the preservation and alternative use of aristocratic residences, palaces and gardens, a question that had arisen in Austria after the state began confiscating Habsburg private estates in April 1919.<sup>26</sup> In spring and summer 1919, when a referendum in Vorarlberg resulted in a vote to join to the Swiss Confederation, Dvořák negotiated implementation of the

<sup>23</sup> Franz Christian Weber, 'Die italienische Militärdelegation in Graz nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg', *Blätter für Heimatkunde*, 78, 2004, esp. 91–95. Strictly different status had the Italian military mission to Czecho-Slovakia, based in Kroměříž (from 23 December 1918); its head officer, General Piccione, was appointed by the Ministry of National Defense in Prague as the commander-in-chief of the Czech-Slovak troops in Slovakia.

<sup>24</sup> Frodl-Kraft, *Gefährdetes Erbe* (n. 6), 23–24; Jonathan Blower, 'Max Dvořák and Austrian Denkmalpflege at War', *Journal of Art Historiography*, 1, December 2009 [https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2011/02/media\\_139127\\_en.pdf](https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2011/02/media_139127_en.pdf) Retrieved 25 October 2021.

<sup>25</sup> Max Dvořák, *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte. Studien zur abendländischen Kunstentwicklung*, ed. Karl M. Swoboda and Johannes Wilde, Munich: Piper & Co., 1924. Cf. Lukas Madersbacher, 'Max Dvořák, Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte. Studien zur abendländischen Kunstentwicklung', in: Johann Konrad Eberlein, Paul von Naredi-Rainer and Götz Pochat, eds., *Hauptwerke der Kunstgeschichtsschreibung*, Stuttgart: Kröner, 2010, 122–25.

<sup>26</sup> The Czecho-Slovak state ordered more radical changes: from April 1919 nationalised greater land ownership at all, entered the Land Reform, and following the Peace Treaties, in September 1921 issued the special 'Lex Habsburg' (no. 354/1921 Coll.).

ÖKT project in the westernmost province of Austria (this would be partially completed forty years later),<sup>27</sup> and consulted with the state government in Vaduz on the possible inclusion of the Principality of Liechtenstein into that series. Despite the field research and detailed work on the subject by Dvořák and his colleagues, the idea did not come to fruition, not because of political considerations but simply because of the shortages of the central budget in Vienna and lack of co-financing available from the principality and Franz Liechtenstein.

Shortly before the end of winter semester 1920/21, Max Dvořák collapsed during a lecture in Vienna. According to the intern, he should have immediately stopped working and relaxed. Only at the urging of his friends and colleagues, Dvořák decided to recuperate at the *Emmahof*, a countryside estate in the area of the community Schonau/Šenov, Moravia, owned by Count Karl Khuen-Belasy (1879–1963) and used as his private residence.<sup>28</sup> Dvořák had already spent a couple of weeks there a year before, in February 1920. New sources discovered by Marek Krejčí showed that Count Khuen-Belasy and Dvořák arrived from Vienna again on 6 February 1921, after having received the permission to cross the state border, requested already on 25 January 1921. The last report on that stay was written by the student of art history Johannes/János Wilde (1891–1970), accompanying Dvořák to *Emmahof*: on 7 February 'the professor had a good time, was kind and sagacious with everyone'. The next morning, on 8 February, 'the butler entered to wake [Dvořák] up, but found him unconscious on the floor by the bed. The doctor arrived in a quarter of an hour; he tried everything, made every effort, but did not succeed.'<sup>29</sup> Dvořák was paralysed by the stroke and died on the same day at 5 pm, attended by Khuen-Belasy and Wilde.

On 10 February 1921, Max Dvořák was buried at the cemetery of Hrušovany/Grussbach. Because he had died outside the municipality, a permission to transfer the coffin was needed from the district board in Znaim/Znojmo as well as the concerned parishes. The funeral service was led by Josef Weingartner, professor of theology at the Vienna University and former conservator of Tyrol. Visitors from Vienna and Prague attended, but did not give official speeches. The Austrian *Staatsdenkmalamt*, an umbrella structure for Dvořák's *Kunsthistorisches Institut*, received letters of condolence from the regional conservators at Innsbruck, Salzburg, Linz and Klagenfurt, as well as from the officials of Bohemia's German-language section in Prague, and the Archaeological Museum and regional conservators for Dalmatia in Split.

Kowalski concluded by noting that it was certain that Max Dvořák's burial in Grussbach was always meant to be temporary (*'die provisorische Beisetzung der Leiche'*) – until the establishment of a permanent grave in Vienna. The problem with

<sup>27</sup> Anneliese Schallmeiner, 'Inventarisierungsansätze 1918/1919 und einige Vorläufer in der österreichischen Denkmalpflege bis 1923', *ÖZKD*, 73: 1-2, 2019, 110.

<sup>28</sup> Rudolf Fukal, 'V Hrušovanech nad Jevišovkou je pochován učenec evropského jména' ['A scholar of the European fame is buried in Hrušovany nad Jevišovkou'], *Vlastivědný sborník moravský*, 13, 1958, 43.

<sup>29</sup> Csilla Markója, 'János (Johannes) Wilde and Max Dvořák, or Can we speak of a Budapest school of art history?', *Journal of Art Historiography*, 17, December 2017, 4. <https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2017/11/markoja.pdf>. Retrieved 25 October 2021.

that idea was the cost of construction and transport. But the re-burial in the Austrian capital required something else: the approval of the Czech authorities for the transport of the mortal remains abroad. As already mentioned, the administration in Prague had offered Dvořák a professorship, but without success. It is therefore hardly imaginable that the new leaders would 'release' the dead scholar, when they could no longer get him alive. For this reason, the 'cenotaph for Dvořák', promptly designed by Adolf Loos (1870–1933) for the Viennese *Zentralfriedhof*,<sup>30</sup> was to remain only a utopia.

In his paper, **Sandro Scarrocchia** (Milan) focused on the context and the sources of the connections between the monument protection, art and modern architecture, as they manifested themselves in Max Dvořák's thinking. In his paintings, Oskar Kokoschka (1886–1980) reprised the tradition of Mannerist art in its 'classical' forms of expression (Tintoretto, El Greco). The simplicity of the architecture of Adolf Loos, as opposed to contemporary eclectic and revivalism styles, suited the requirement for a neutral form necessary to replace damage to historic settlements. The speaker pointed out that the general ideas of Dvořák relating to monument protection, given in *Borromini als Restaurator*, in his introduction to the ÖKT series (1907), in the conservation remarks for Prague and Cracow Castles (1908) and Diocletian's Palace in Split, in his approach to mosaics conservation in Aquileia (1909), and finally in his *Alt-Wien* as well as *Promemoria über die Reorganisation der staatlichen Denkmalpflege in Österreich* (1910), would much later be incorporated in the Venice Charter (1964), the most influential guideline for the conservation and restoration of monuments and sites, though essentially based on Italian circumstances and environments.

The relation of Max Dvořák to Italy was examined by the following two scholars. **Vittorio Foramitti** (Udine) showed the detailed changes in the essence of conservation work in the *Österreichisches Küstenland* (northern part now in Friuli Venezia Giulia). The peacetime practices of *Denkmalpflege*, culminating in the basilicas of Grado and above all of Aquileia, its murals and particularly the early Christian mosaics (4th century; excavated 1909), or in the Adriatic Exhibition in Viennese Prater (May–October 1913), were replaced by the urgent *Kunstschutz* that recorded the damage caused during the series of battles of the Isonzo and Piave Rivers (1915–18). Foramitti's paper described the ways in which the war affected the various monuments including those of Görz/Gorizia, Spilimbergo, or Cividale del Friuli. Another major monument whose destruction disturbed Dvořák was that of the Castle of Duino on the Gulf of Trieste.<sup>31</sup> Overseen by Paul Clemen (1866–1947), German-speaking scholars published a comprehensive two-volume analysis entitled

<sup>30</sup> Eva Frodl-Kraft, 'Das Grabmal Max Dvořáks', *ÖZKD*, 28: 3, 1974, 144.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Vittorio Foramitti, 'The Central Commission in North-Eastern Italy: Protagonists and Restorations in Friuli and Küstenland, 1853–1918', *Monumentorum tutela – Ochrana pamiatok*, 30, 2020, 159–175  
[https://www.academia.edu/43026034/The\\_Central\\_Commission\\_in\\_North\\_Eastern\\_Italy\\_Prtagonists\\_and\\_Restorations\\_in\\_Friuli\\_and\\_K%C3%BCstenland\\_1853\\_1918](https://www.academia.edu/43026034/The_Central_Commission_in_North_Eastern_Italy_Prtagonists_and_Restorations_in_Friuli_and_K%C3%BCstenland_1853_1918). Retrieved 25 October 2021.

*Kunstschutz im Kriege. Berichte über den Zustand der Kunstdenkmäler auf den verschiedenen Kriegsschauplätzen.* The latter volume of this work introduced by Dvořák was devoted to Italy and the eastern front.

**Calogero Bellanca** (Rome) paid detailed attention to Dvořák's intensive rapport with the Eternal City, developed during his years of assistantship in the early months of 1900, and in the spring of 1901, 1902 and 1904. In addition to his research on late-Roman murals, which determined the forms of Byzantine art, his next stay (September 1907) resulted in the famous essay *Borromini als Restaurator* and the art-historical evaluation of Palazzo Venezia. Official relations continued later in the 10th International Congress of Art History (October 1910) and with architects, art historians and conservators such as Camillo Boito (1836–1914), Corrado Ricci (1858–1934), and Federico Hermanin (1868–1953).

**Franko Ćorić** (Zagreb), a specialist in the art and monument historiography in Croatia, researched Dvořák's official service for the Central Commission in matters concerning the Austrian province of Dalmatia, above all the Diocletian Palace with the Cathedral in Spalato/Split (from May 1905).<sup>32</sup> In the latter monument arose the problem of the monumental wooden doors, made by the *pictor de Spaleto*, Andrea Buvina (ca. 1214). Thanks to Dvořák, Anton Švimberský (1863–1945), professor of the Vocational School of Wood Processing in Chrudim, was appointed for its conservation.<sup>33</sup> In addition to official investigations in the area, the First Viennese University trip between 22 March and 1 April 1910 chose the northern and eastern Adriatic as its destination. A total of 300 participants travelled through the Austrian Littoral (Aquileia, Grado) and Istria (Parenzo/Poreč, Pola/Pula) to Dalmatia's Trau/Trogir, Spalato, Ragusa/Dubrovnik, Cattaro/Kotor, visiting the islands of Lissa/Vis and Lacroma/Lokrum, and finally sites in the interior of Bosnia-Herzegovina (Mostar). The visitors surveyed several different scholarly fields, including art history; here, their expert guides were Max Dvořák and Josef Strzygowski.

**Waldemar Deluga** (Ostrava) drew attention to the northeast of the former empire, namely to its crown land of Galicia (*Galizien*), which is now divided between Poland (western part) and Ukraine (eastern part), and to next of Bukovina, located now in both Ukraine and Romania. As his research demonstrates, in July 1906 Dvořák provided expert services for Orthodox Christian churches with fully frescoed facades in Bukovina (the main example in Suceava),<sup>34</sup> and at the same time,

<sup>32</sup> Cf. Franko Ćorić, 'Continuities and Discontinuities of the Policies of the Central Commission in Croatia', *Monumentorum tutela – Ochrana pamiatok*, 30, 2020, 177–188.

<sup>33</sup> For recent conservation-restoration project cf. Žana Matulić Bilač, 'A Historical Continuity: Research into and Conservation of the Medieval Doors of Split Cathedral', 2019 <https://www.iiconservation.org/content/historical-continuity-research-and-conservation-medieval-doors-split-cathedral> Retrieved 25 October 2021.

<sup>34</sup> Waldemar Deluga, 'Protection of Eastern Christian Monuments in Bukovina at the End of the 19th and the Beginning of the 20th Century', *Monumentorum tutela – Ochrana pamiatok*, 30, 2020, 51–59. [https://www.academia.edu/43044884/Protection\\_of\\_Eastern\\_Christian\\_Monuments\\_in\\_Buko](https://www.academia.edu/43044884/Protection_of_Eastern_Christian_Monuments_in_Buko)

advised on the conservation of the major churches in the East-Galician capital of Lemberg/Lviv: the 'Latin Basilica' of the Assumption, the churches of the Jesuits and Dominicans, St. George's Cathedral, the Church of the Assumption (formerly 'the Wallachian Church'), and the Armenian Cathedral. In the case of the latter church, the local authorities did not follow the regulations of the Central Commission and Max Dvořák.

In Cracow, discussed by the domestic senior expert, **Andrzej Siwek** (whose paper was presented by PhD-candidate Marek Świdrak), Dvořák was active in the conservation of the main palace at the Wawel Castle, which was abandoned by Austrian troops in 1905 and dedicated to the Polish people.

Austrian monument protection in relation to Galicia was confronted with the problems of churches (Catholic) and tserkvas (Orthodox) built of wood, a material common to the north and south of the Carpathians,<sup>35</sup> but often demolished by local communities who sought to replace wooden churches with brick structures. In 1913 Dvořák saw the basis of protection in a detailed topography and inventory.

Galicia in general remained opposed to Viennese oversight. The local politicians submitted their own proposals to the Imperial House of Lords for the law on monument protection, with ideas of strict decentralisation of the branch and right of appointing the responsible staff directly by the regional authorities (*k. k. Statthalterei / Landesregierung*). Finally, the conservators and correspondents serving for the Central Commission in both parts of Galicia formed the 'autonomous' professional associations: *Grono c. k. Konserwatorów i Korespondentów Galicyi Zachodniej* (Cracow, est. 24–25 May 1888), and *Koło c. k. Konserwatorów i Korespondentów [c. k. Konserwatorów Starożytnych Pomników] Galicyi Wschodniej* (Lviv, est. 21–23 November 1889).

**Andreas Lehne** (Vienna), emeritus of the Bundesdenkmalamt of Austria, researched the numerous articles in Viennese dailies of the 1900s and 1910s with a focus on the reconstruction of the imperial metropolis and the demolition of its ancient houses. He described Max Dvořák's campaign against development projects in the immediate vicinity of the Karlskirche, which was successful until the construction of a house for the Vienna Museum in the late 1950s. **Marek Krejčí** (Prague), known for his earlier publication of the correspondence between Dvořák and Vincenc Kramář,<sup>36</sup> now turned his attention back to the years of the First World War, to the cases of conservation in German-occupied Belgium, and similarly to the southwest frontline in Küstenland within specially the established *Kunstschutzgruppe*. The speaker illustrated history in both areas with examples of political propaganda, and numerous images of the devastation of their cultural heritage. The confiscation of dozens of artworks from the *Kunsthistorisches*

---

vina\_at\_the\_End\_of\_the\_19th\_and\_the\_Beginning\_of\_the\_20th\_Century\_Monumentorum\_Tutela\_vol\_30\_Bratislava\_2020\_pp\_51\_59. Retrieved 25 October 2021.

<sup>35</sup> For the general outline in English see David Buxton, *The wooden churches of Eastern Europe: An introductory survey*, Cambridge-New York-Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 1981 (also reissue ed., 2008).

<sup>36</sup> Marek Krejčí, ed., 'Dopisy Maxe Dvořáka Vincenci Kramářovi' ['Letters from Max Dvořák to Vincenc Kramář'], *Umění/Art*, 52: 4, 2004, 353–369.

*Museum* by the Italians, as well as other claims against Austria declared by the Treaty of Saint-Germain (signed on 10 September 1919) became a bitter outcome of Austro-Italian relations during Dvořák's lifetime; he tried to resist these circumstances by appealing to his Italian colleagues.

**Peter Buday** (Bratislava), co-author of the recent synthesis on the pre-1918 monument protection in Slovakia within historic Hungary,<sup>37</sup> offered in his lecture an overview of the topic since the mid-19th century. Although during the era of neo-absolutism in the 1850s the Central Commission was also responsible for Hungary, this region was granted its own organization in 1859 and its full independence after the Austro-Hungarian Compromise of May 1867. Despite the short distance between the 'Austrian' Cisleithania and the 'Hungarian' Transleithania, the modern trends of conservation promoted in Vienna by Riegl and Dvořák found only a limited reception in the eastern part of the Dual monarchy. The State Monuments Commission in Budapest thanks to its adviser László Éber (1871–1935) were more accepting of tendencies from Germany.

The symposium aimed to commemorate Max Dvořák's main activities in monument protection a century after his death. Its ambition was to deepen knowledge of the spectrum of his practices, which was unusually wide in terms of scope as well as territorial extent, ranging from Cracow to Cattaro/Kotor, in the north-south direction, and from Bregenz to the Bukovina in the west-east direction. Although Dvořák's professional lifetime lasted only about twenty-five years, that period was extremely dynamic and turbulent, as the 'idealism' of the long nineteenth century gave way to the 'naturalism' of the century to follow. We are thankful to all the international participants and contributors to this symposium, which presented a rich mosaic of the achievements and the personal life of the often cited, but less precisely known, Max Dvořák.

**Tomáš Kowalski** studied art history at the Comenius University in Bratislava (2005), serving as an advisor in the Monuments Board of the Slovak Republic. His research is focused on the problems of monument protection in the late 19th and 20th century. Recently edited volume of international proceedings to the 165th anniversary of the Central Commission in Vienna (1853–2018) and its impact on East Central Europe (*Monumentorum tutela – Ochrana pamiatok*, 30, Bratislava, 2020).

Tomas.Kowalski@pamiatky.gov.sk



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

<sup>37</sup> Štefan Oriško and Peter Buday, *Pramene k umelecko-historickému bádaniu a ochrane pamiatok na Slovensku (1846–1918)* [Sources for Art-historical Research and Protection of Monuments in Slovakia: 1846–1918], Bratislava: Stimul, 2017.