

IMPERIAL CULTURAL POLICY AND THE *JAHRBUCH DER KUNSTHISTORISCHEN SAMMLUNGEN IN WIEN*

ERIKA ESAU

In 1876, the Austrian Imperial house devised an elaborate cultural programme intended to enhance the status of the Habsburg monarchy by emphasizing its cultural achievements and artistic holdings. Part of this programme was the establishment of Das Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien, a scholarly journal that would present articles on art objects within the vast imperial holdings. Now more than 100 years old, the Jahrbuch's contents embody the evolution of art-historical thought. A close reading of its volumes also gives insight into the cultural attitudes of its publishers, as well as evidence of the impact of political events on cultural policy and production.

It would be no exaggeration to state that the one-hundred-year history of the *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* (hereafter referred to as the *Jahrbuch* or *JKSW*) mirrors the history of its grand house, Vienna's Kunsthistorisches Museum.¹ On an even more significant scale, a study of the beginnings of this journal reveals fascinating facts about the vast imperial bureaucracy which supported the Austro-Hungarian Empire – the last of the Habsburg dynasties. Indeed, one can say that the early volumes of the *Jahrbuch* serve as important vehicles for examination of the elaborate cultural policies which marked the last years of Kaiser Franz Joseph's reign. The *Jahrbuch's* long run has also spanned the major political upheavals of twentieth-century Vienna, a fact which only occasionally tainted the journal's scholarly pages, but which certainly played a part in its production. One of the major wonders of this publication, in fact, is that, amid such catastrophic events, it consistently presented some of the most influential and important scholarship in the development of modern art-historical thought.

The impetus for the creation of such a journal occurred in 1876, when an elaborately conceived cultural programme was initiated by the Austrian Imperial house. As a means of enhancing the Emperor's prestige through glorification of Habsburg cultural achievements, this programme proposed to organize the vast imperial art collections, which would then be displayed in a monumental public museum. Such a decision was in keeping with developments in other European nations of the nineteenth century, and Austria sought to rival and exceed any other country in the grandeur of its cultural manifestations.

As administrator and 'Protektor' for this immense project, the Emperor appointed Count Franz Folliot de Crenneville (1815–88), a high-ranking member of the Imperial staff. Like most members of Kaiser Franz Joseph's elite inner circle, de Crenneville was a military man; he went about his task as a field marshall organizing troops. Along with the organization of the collections

themselves and the construction of a museum to house them, the general programme of 1876 called for a publication which would serve 'as the scholarly organ of the Imperial art collections'.² This publication would present the most important scholarship concerning the enormous number of art-works in the possession of the Imperial house. Initial plans spoke of appointment of an editorial committee responsible for the publication, but this idea was abandoned when de Crenneville appointed Quirin von Leitner (1834–93) to the staff of the fledgling museum. Another military man and scholar, Leitner had already been actively involved in the organization of the Ambras-Sammlung, one of the largest Habsburg collections, which had originally been housed in a Tyrolean castle until it was removed to Vienna during the Napoleonic Wars.

Along with his other tasks for the new cultural programme, Leitner became the sole editor for the *Jahrbuch*. In 1879, he began preparations for the first volume of the annual, a task which occupied him for two years. (The first volume bears the date 1883, although it actually appeared in 1882.) At the same time, Leitner saw to the publication in 1880–2 of a facsimile edition of *Freydal*, the little-known volume of woodcuts devoted to the tournament of Maximilian I's time. This publication would be the first of the Museum's many editions of major Maximiliana.

Another person of singular importance to the scholarly success of the new *Jahrbuch* was Albert Ilg (1847–96). Ilg trained under Rudolf Eitelberger, the visionary Director of the Museum für Kunst und Industrie. De Crenneville recognized Ilg's abilities as a meticulous and prolific scholar and, in 1876, recruited him from the other Museum to become curator, and eventually Director, at the Kunsthistorisches Museum. Despite an aggressive and idiosyncratic nature, Ilg became one of the major forces behind the early endeavours of the *Jahrbuch* and would serve as a frequent contributor to the publication until his death.

The high scholarly standards set by the *Jahrbuch* were evident from the first volume, as were the aims of this new venture. The preface to volume 1, written by de Crenneville, outlined the goals quite precisely. Officially titled *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, the journal would be divided into two sections: 'The first section is dedicated to objects in the collections of the Imperial house and to the artistic endeavours of this ancestral house, specifically historical and critical discussions.'³ The emphasis here was on 'scientific', i.e. 'wissenschaftlich', and scrupulously unbiased essays of the highest scholarly quality. Topics covered in the first volume represented every major group of the new Museum's collections; this organizational approach would be the format most often used throughout the journal's publication history. Among the first articles were discussions of Egyptian sarcophagi and Roman medallions, essays by Ilg on the Rossellino *Madonna* and Adriaen de Vries, an inventory of the Museum's Flemish and other tapestries, and a reproduction and explanation of Maximilian I's *Triumph*.

As the house-organ of the Museum, these articles were meant to be impressive examples of the depth and importance of the imperial art collections, many of which had rarely been studied by serious art historians.⁴ In keeping with the oft-stated representational function of the journal, these articles also sought to emphasize imperial, especially Habsburg, themes. Along with the admirable facsimile publications of the three great works of Maximilian's day (*Freydal*, and in 1888, *Weisskunig* and *Theurdank*), articles on other aspects of Maximilian's

patronage appeared throughout the 1880s and 1890s. Another great Habsburg monarch, Rudolph II, was a favorite theme of Ilg, and served as a useful figure in the attempts to compare Franz Joseph to his cultural ancestors.

As impressive and scholarly as the *Jahrbuch*'s first section was, it was the publication's second section which would be its most enduring achievement. The purpose of this section was to publish primary resource materials from Habsburg archives concentrating on items which pertained in any way to art-objects. The publication of immense numbers of original documents – inventories, accounts, bills of sale, marriage contracts, wills and letters – dating from as early as the thirteenth century, provided an unprecedented body of knowledge for the fledgling field of art-historical scholarship. The goal of comprehensiveness in this monumental undertaking was announced in volume 1: here it was stated that any document which could conceivably be considered as pertaining to art-works would be included. The first *Regesten*, as this section was called, contained documents from the Haus-, Hof-, und Staats-Archiv in Wien – one of the largest Habsburg repositories. Included were documents from the thirteenth century up to the sixteenth century. Later volumes would include material from archives outside of Vienna, but within the Habsburg realm; these included items from the archives of Prague, Madrid and the other cities of Austria.

Not only was the second section an admirable example of organizational skill; the *Jahrbuch* also contained quite complete indexes for both sections in each volume. This recognition of the need for classification and ordering of information was one of the most extraordinary aspects of the early *Jahrbuch* volumes. It was a concern that stemmed largely from the introduction of the innovative historical methods then taught at the University of Vienna's Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung. Most of the Museum's early curators began their studies at this institute, a fact which is significant to the subsequent development of what would be called the Viennese School of Art History. The empirical basis of their methodology can be directly attributed to this historical training. The principal organ for this group of art historians was the *Jahrbuch*.

One of the graduates of the Institut was a contributor to the first *Regesten*. He was Heinrich Zimmermann (1855–1928),⁵ and his name would be associated with the *Jahrbuch* until his death forty-six years later. In 1884, Zimmermann was appointed as the first librarian of the Museum; in 1889, he succeeded Leitner as the editor of the *Jahrbuch* (he had been editor of the *Regesten* since 1885). Since this time, it has been customary for the Museum's librarian to take on the additional responsibility of the editorship of the *Jahrbuch*. An outstanding archivist with a prodigious memory and impeccable proof-reading skills, Zimmermann was the ideal person to oversee a publication as rigidly demanding as the *Jahrbuch*. As stated in the journal's tribute to him upon his death, his thirty-six years as editor marked the golden era of the publication.⁶ The direction and scope of the journal were largely determined by the contributions of Zimmermann in the *Jahrbuch*'s early years.

The appearance of the first volume was hailed as a major event. Printed by the art-publishers Adolf Holzhausen on fine paper in a large format (26 36 cm), the volume contained 31 copper-plates in heliogravure and etching, 72 zincographic text-illustrations and 70 woodcuts as supplement.⁷ To a modern audience accustomed to colour photographic reproduction, it is often difficult to recognize the tremendous breakthrough represented

by the new reproductive techniques of the nineteenth century. The Museum staff, and especially the editor Leitner, were justly proud of these reproductions, and guarded the secrets of their processes jealously. A request, for example, by a French art-historian for a photograph of the famous Bellerephon group was adamantly rejected; the next copy of the *Jahrbuch*, however, contained a reproduction of the requested piece.⁸ There were other stipulations aimed at controlling access to the contents: reprint rights were rarely granted, even to the authors, and Leitner stipulated that only Austrians could prepare the *Regesten* – apparently on the basis that the Archives might contain state secrets. (This last requirement was later waived, as foreign archives were included.)

This protectiveness may have been motivated by more than patriotic fervour. Despite generous subsidies from the Emperor, the luxurious production of the *Jahrbuch* necessitated a high sales price (one copy cost 60 Gulden, at a time when the average curator earned 1,000 Gulden a year). Public institutions in Vienna and throughout Europe often had to request a donation copy from the Emperor in order to obtain one for their libraries. The publisher Holzhausen, who had complete control over distribution, even required that the imperial administration purchase its own gift copies at full cost. Serious financial difficulties continued throughout the decade, causing more dependence on the subvention of the Emperor's treasury. The situation seemed to improve somewhat in 1890, when Holzhausen was replaced as publisher by Tempsky, although the specific reasons for this change were never clear. The significance placed upon the *Jahrbuch* within the imperial cultural programme, however, is apparent from the fact that funds were always provided and the quality of production was never sacrificed. Most notably, the journal's high standards of scholarship remained, seemingly undisturbed by external pressures.

In spite of these financial woes, major facsimile reproductions – always expensive undertakings – continued to appear in the first years. Volumes 6 and 7, both appearing in 1888, were devoted to two of the great art works of Maximilian's reign, the *Weisskunig* and the *Theurdank*. The latter volume was based on the original 1517 edition – unlike earlier facsimile editions based on the 1519 edition – and included a detailed historical analysis by Simon Laschitzer along with the reproduced plates. These volumes represented the final instalments in the *Jahrbuch's* publication of Maximiliana. The following year a lavish printing by Penndorf of the Heroon of Gjöl-bashi-Trysa appeared as a supplement to volume 9; the Heroon was an ancient relief uncovered by an Austrian expedition to the Near East, and heralded with great patriotic enthusiasm.⁹ Such productions were highly coveted by most museums and universities, and did much to enhance the status of the Museum and its publications. Circulation, however, remained very small while the *Jahrbuch's* scholarly prestige continued to grow.

The logical concentration on Habsburgian themes in no way limited the *Jahrbuch's* choices of topics, since the Habsburgs had collected in every possible field and in overwhelming abundance. An example of the innovative approaches to the subject which were explored by the Museum's curators can be seen in volume 5 (1887). The volume's *Regesten*, by the renowned (and eccentric) scholar Theodor Frimmel,¹⁰ comprised an inventory of the Museum's library – a library built upon the collection of Maximilian I as it was preserved through the Ambras-Sammlung. In his foreword to this inventory,

Frimmel outlined a plan whereby the *Jahrbuch's* first section would include lengthy essays based upon the material covered in the second section. In this case, the inventory included holdings from 1200 to the sixteenth century, with greatest emphasis on items pertaining to Dürer. Section 1 contained illustrations from Dürer's *Kunstbuch*. Logistical problems seem to have prevented this plan from being carried out consistently, although it was obvious that several contributions to Section 1 depended heavily upon primary resource material accumulated in various instalments of Section II.

The *Jahrbuch's* position as the standard-bearer of *Kunstwissenschaft* – serious, empirically-oriented studies – reached its peak in the 1890s. It was in this era that the ground-breaking research of Franz Wickhoff (1853–1909) and his followers appeared in the journal, establishing the first generation of the so-called Viennese school of art history. Wickhoff's first work in the *Jahrbuch* was in 1891, as editor of the Italian drawing collection at the Albertina. Even this seemingly straightforward topic gave Wickhoff the opportunity to display his biting sarcastic style and his rigid insistence on precise scientific analysis of art-works. In his introduction to this inventory his disdain of any popular, sentimentalized discussion of art was clearly evident: 'This index is not meant for a large public who are looking for fleeting entertainment, but it should bring the object before the eyes of the professional.' He then launched into an attack of Morellian connoisseurship, a common target in all of his writings.

Wickhoff spawned a school of followers, young scholars eager to rid art-historical studies of the purely emotional, romanticized views so prevalent in the nineteenth century, and to replace it with an empirically-based methodology, grounded in facts and precise observation of the object in its historical context. The *Jahrbuch* became the primary organ for espousing these views. Wickhoff's most famous study, *Die Wiener Genesis*, appeared as a supplement to volume 16 in 1895. Described as the first complete history of Roman art, this study still serves as the basis for an extrinsically oriented approach to art-objects.

Two of Wickhoff's most ardent disciples – the second generation of the Viennese school – made their first contributions to the *Jahrbuch* in 1892. They were Julius von Schlosser (1866–1938) and Alois Riegl (1858–1905). Schlosser came to the Museum in 1897 as an assistant; he was Director of Arms and Armour and Decorative Arts from 1902 until the 1920s, when he was involved with teaching at the University, and left the Museum. His first article for the *Jahrbuch*, on the Fulda Miniature manuscript in the Hofbibliothek, reflected an early interest in German art; the essay was certainly in keeping with the journal's efforts to consider neglected areas of art. Schlosser's later articles concentrated on Italian art, the field in which he made his greatest contributions.

Riegl, who in 1892 was curator of textiles at the Museum für Kunst und Industrie, has been called the most influential and exciting mind of the Viennese school. His first article in the *Jahrbuch* was a study of oriental carpets – one of the very few articles on non-Western art to be published in the journal. This early study presented some of Riegl's stimulating ideas on the evolution of pattern and ornament. Later, Riegl left museum work to teach at the University. Significantly, he continued to publish his major studies in the *Jahrbuch* – an indication of the close connection between the Museum and the University throughout the Museum's history. In 1902, the *Jahrbuch* published Riegl's 'Das holländische Gruppenporträt', one of his most complex

theoretical expressions and the source of his controversial concept of *Kunstwollen*.

Riegl's best student, the representative of the third generation of the Viennese school, was Max Dvorák (1874–1921). Dvorák published his greatest work in the *Jahrbuch*; in 1903, volume 24 contained 'Der Rätsel der Kunst der Brüder van Eyck', one of the landmark studies of the period. This volume also included articles by Schlosser on Ghiberti, and Wickhoff on Bonifazio's workshop, plus several other substantial contributions by other Museum curators. The sheer scholarly power of the *Jahrbuch* in these years is difficult to imagine today. The number of major articles appearing in its pages in the two decades from 1890 to 1910 was unsurpassed by any other publication of the time.

Concerned as it was with intellectual content, the *Jahrbuch* rarely included any editorial information; few references were ever made to the political or social situation of the day. This fact often makes it difficult to determine the underlying causes for changes in the publication's appearance or frequency, or to gain any sense of how political realities affected its publication. In the 1900s, for example, several double issues were issued: volume 26 was published for 1906/7 with similar double years through 1913/14. No explanation for this was given in the publication; it was perhaps due to changes in the direction of the Museum itself.

At this time, new ideas concerning the educational purpose of the Museum began to emerge; curatorial duties were redefined with less time available for uninterrupted research. Under the leadership of Gustav Glück, who became Director in 1911, a major rehanging of the galleries began. This project occupied most of the curators' time for several years, and they perhaps found it impossible to contribute a significant article every year. This fact, coupled with financial cutbacks to the Museum, may have necessitated a more limited publication schedule.

In any event, the quality of the *Jahrbuch* was not jeopardized. This period, in fact, represented an expansion of topics covered within its pages. Previously, the majority of articles dealt with classical or Renaissance art, preferably with a Habsburg emphasis. Although concentration on Habsburg themes remained strong, the 'discovery' of new periods for study caused a broadening of available topics. Particularly significant was the new recognition of the Baroque era. The popularity of this period increased with the studies of Hans Tietze (1880–1954) and Erika Tietze-Conrat (1883–1958). Tietze's first article for the *Jahrbuch*, on Annibale Carracci's *Galeria* in the Palazzo Farnese, was a major contribution to volume 26 (1906/7). This volume also included Arpad Weixlgärtner's discussion of Prince Eugen's *Prunkschrank*, another Baroque theme (the *Prunkschrank* has since been determined to be a fake). Weixlgärtner (1872–1962) joined the Museum staff in 1906 and was editor of the *Jahrbuch* from 1927 until the Nazi takeover.¹¹ Along with the Tietzes, he helped to make Baroque art an acceptable scholarly concern.

The lack of editorial commentary was especially noticeable in the volumes published during World War I: volume 31 appeared in 1913/14, volume 32 in 1915, volume 32 in 1915, volume 33 in 1916, and volume 34 in 1918. The only indication of the political situation of the time is that no specific 'Protektor' was named as publisher; publishing responsibility until 1916, however, was still given as 'seiner kaiserlichen und königlichen Apostolischen Majestät Oberstkämmereramt.' By volume 34, this imperial patronage was eliminated from the credits.

The first two volumes after the war – volume 35 in 1920/21 and volume 36 in 1923/25 – also made no mention of the new political order in Austria. Contributors still included many of the same names as before the war, including Ludwig Baldass (who joined the Museum in 1911),¹² Leo Planiscig, Gustav Glück and Erika Tietze-Conrat. Notably, these volumes contained no *Regesten*, the first time since its inauguration that this valuable section was omitted.

Volume 36 (1923/25) was the last volume of the first series. Apparently, this decision was planned in advance, as the volume contained an index to the entire run up to this date. This index was prepared with great thoroughness by Zimmermann, who by this time suffered from severe eye problems. 1926, then, marked the beginning of a new series under a new name. No longer was this the *Jahrbuch* of the imperial house; it became simply the *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien*.

The first volume of this new series contained an introduction by Leo Planiscig, the new editor. This introduction was the first explanation of *JKSW*'s status after the war and the political reshaping of the Austrian nation. The statement is relevant enough to be quoted in its entirety:

In the years which followed the political and economic devastation, we let the flame of our yearbook glow only as a spark, well guarded from violent acts of reform which were the order of the day, and by which it was intended to change the stuff of science and art from a fundamental level, just as had happened with control of the state. For twenty-four years, guided by one of the most prudent and caring editors, Heinrich Zimmermann, the 'Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses' held the first and noblest place among the great art-historical publications of world renown; in thirty-six volumes, not only the Viennese school of art history, but also scholars from the entire world were given the opportunity to present the results of their research in an exemplary manner. Indeed an apology for this oldest of art-historical publications need not be written here! We want to look into the future and, even if we keep in mind the tradition which continues – and which gives us a great responsibility – to create something new and living. The female is not extinguished, we want only to see it burn brightly again!

We are beginning – in keeping with the times – a new series of the *Jahrbuch*. Format and scope will be maintained. Rejecting cheap popularity, the uncompromisingly scholarly spirit will be maintained – the spirit which identifies this publication. A small group of benefactors are making possible the publication, which was once accomplished through the munificence of the Emperor. The generosity of the publishing house Schroll & Co., in whose hands we now believe our *Jahrbuch* to be secure, has relieved a portion of our concerns. The reception from foreign and domestic friends encourages our plans. Hofrat Zimmermann is departing from the editorship. We younger ones recognize his accomplished work, and we want to honour him; he showed us the way, which we, always in his debt, want only to continue...

This immensely telling and nostalgic statement was the only reference to the difficulties faced by the Museum at the collapse of the Empire. Gone was the generous support of the imperial policy-makers, to be replaced by a handful of private donors intent on seeing the *Jahrbuch* continue; the publisher now was listed simply as the staff of the Kunsthistorisches Museum. When one considers the near-anarchic situation existing in the Vienna of the 1920s, one can appreciate all the more the sometimes desperate efforts of the Museum to maintain a journal of the *Jahrbuch*'s standards.

Despite the obstacles faced by the new staff, one can barely sense a change in the new series – at least not in terms of scholarly content. As mentioned, the only significant difference was the omission of the *Regesten*, a

major loss for all art historians. Volume 1 was dedicated to Julius von Schlosser, who was retiring from the Museum. Articles included Planiscig on Jacopello dal Fiore, Baldass on Bosch, Ernst Kris on the 'Stil "Rustique"', Glück on Velasquez, and Otto Benesch's 'Seicentostudien'. Such impressive contributions in the face of financial and political difficulties were testament to the determination of the Museum to maintain the *Jahrbuch* at all costs.

The only sign of the changing political situation at this time was a slight shift in thematic concentration: articles in the 1920s and 1930s showed some preference for topics in Austrian art. Not only was there less money available to conduct foreign research, but here was also a need to establish a national identity after the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire. Volume 4 (1930), for example, edited by Weizlgärtner, contained essays by Hans Tietze on the building of St Stephan's Cathedral; Ernst Kris on Austrian sculpture of the fifteenth century; Otto Benesch on Old Austrian panel painting; and Ludwig Baldass on the Master of the Grazer Dom. In many cases, these essays were the first serious studies of the topic; as such, they preserved the *Jahrbuch's* commitment to the discussion of neglected areas of art history.

As in the past, the only reflective or editorial information appeared in the obituaries and tributes to museum colleagues. Volume 3 (1929) contained Weizlgärtner's laudatory essay on Zimmermann, providing scarce background on the man and the journal as he edited it. Volume 5 (1931) was dedicated to Gustav Glück on his sixtieth birthday and included an article by Baldass on the history of the galleries. The article concentrated especially on Glück's rehanging of the galleries and ended with list of Museum acquisitions under his directorship. Many of the art-works listed here were originally part of aristocratic collections broken up after the war as inflation took its toll.

By 1932, even *JKSW* was touched by the encroaching politicization which would soon affect all of Austria's institutions. A short tribute in volume 6 to Gustav Benda, a collector who had donated his works to the Museum, contained a strong statement in support of the 'Gross Deutschland' sentiments which were used to justify Austria's 'Anschluss' or annexation to Germany under Hitler. For a journal which had scrupulously avoided any political leanings in the past, this statement was an unfortunate omen.

In spite of growing political unrest, the *Jahrbuch's* scholarship remained impeccable throughout the 1930s. Of major importance were Ernst Gombrich's study of Giulio Romano (volumes 8 and 9/1934 and 1935), Karl de Tolnai on Breugel (volume 8/1934), Gustav Glück's three-part work on Habsburg portraits (volumes 7, 8 and 11/1933, 1934, and 1937), and the Tietzes' 'Tizian-Studien' (volume 10/1936).

From its contents, volume 12 (1938) appeared to be a normal publication; it was dedicated to Hermann Julius Hermann, retiring Director of the Museum. Upon closer examination, however, certain semantic alterations appeared which alluded to the political realities of the time. Weizlgärtner was no longer editor, but was succeeded by Erich Strohmmer;¹⁴ the publisher was listed as 'Leiter des Kunsthistorischen Museums' – a more official title than 'Direktor' had been, and more appropriate to the new administrative order. More significantly, the publication was labelled as 'printed in Germany', although the firms involved in the printing remained unchanged, all of them in Vienna. This volume was the last until 1944, the only volume published during World War II. Volume 13, edited by F. Dworschak, con-

tained a simple, non-polemical foreword, in which tribute was paid to Paul Buberl, a contributor to the volume who died during the war. The foreword also announced progress on the previously planned three-volume *Festschrift* in honour of the fiftieth anniversary of the opening of the Kunsthistorisches Museum's building (1891–1941). The *Festschrift*, written with great skill by curator Alphons Lhotsky, finally appeared in 1945; it remained, until Herbert Haupt's comprehensive study of the Museum in 1991,¹⁵ the most complete record of the Museum's development and the people who worked there.

Unlike World War I and its aftermath, when somehow the *Jahrbuch* managed to continue, World War II and the subsequent occupation of Austria made publication of the journal impossible. No volumes appeared again until 1953. These volumes were now printed in a smaller format, a concession to economic considerations. Under the new Austrian government, institutions such as the Kunsthistorisches Museum were subsidized by the State. The *Jahrbuch*, then, once again received funding from State resources, although hardly as generous as those provided under the Emperor. In the introduction to the new volume, the editor – at this time E. M. Auer – affirmed the Museum's desire to continue in the scholarly tradition of the *Jahrbuch* and stressed a commitment to publish not only research from Museum staff members, but to include the works of the best foreign scholars as well. The introduction also listed those members of the Museum who had died since the 1938 volume; among those for whom no obituary was printed in the *Jahrbuch* were Julius von Schlosser (1866–1938), Leo Planiscig (1887–1952), and Gustav Glück (1871–1952).

The introduction also announced a change in numbering: now all volumes since the beginning of the *Jahrbuch*'s publication would be run consecutively; the numbering of the new series would also be indicated. This volume, then, became volume 50 (N.f. XIV): the fiftieth volume by the old numbering and the fourteenth in the new series. Each subsequent volume has included both numbers, to the confusion of many a librarian and user. (For the purposes of this paper, the new series numbering will be ignored.) The editorial staff apparently felt that no division should be made between the pre-World War I volumes and those that followed, as such a distinction would, philosophically, necessitate another new series at this time.

As was expected, articles continued to emphasize artworks in the Museum's collection. Of major importance in the 1950s were a series of articles on Giorgione, by Ludwig Baldass and other curators. Baldass's first work on this artist had appeared in the 1944 *Jahrbuch* where he gave a comprehensive analysis of the controversy surrounding the Dresden Giorgione. Further groundbreaking studies included Erwin Neumann's 'Florentiner Mosaik aus Prag' (1957) and 'Materialien zur Geschichte der Scagliola' (1959), as well as numerous articles on the Museum's enormous arms and armour collection by Bruno Thomas and Ortwin Gamber. Other articles of interest in this period included one of the journal's infrequent articles on nineteenth-century art: Werner Hofmann wrote on Daumier's graphic work in volume 52 (1956). Volumes continued to be dedicated to Museum staff members. Volume 51 (1955) honoured Ernst Buschbeck and volume 53 (1957) celebrated Weixlgärtner's eighty-fifth birthday.

Despite its smaller size and less elaborate format – reproductions were now black-and-white photographs – the post-War *JKSW* still presented significant art-his-

torical scholarship. In 1958, a separate monograph, L. Luchner's 'Denkmal eines Renaissancefürsten', was published by the Museum as part of the *Jahrbuch*. Financial exigencies, however, made this practice unfeasible, and no other monographs have been published since then. Anton Schroll continued as the printing house, as it had been since 1926. The *Jahrbuch* also continued to be printed without advertisement. Until very recently, all articles were published in German. This policy frequently required that foreign articles be translated, as was the case with John Shearman's essay on Psyche's *Loggia* in the Villa Farnesina and Raphael's graphic style (volume 59/1963). It is only since the 1980s that a very few articles have appeared in English and French.

In 1973 Dr Georg Kugler became the Museum's librarian and editor of the *Jahrbuch*. At the same time, the publication revived a second section of resource material similar to the indispensable *Regesten* of the old series. Volume 82/83 (1986/87) consisted of the essays presented at a symposium on Albrecht Dürer's animal and plant studies, held at the Albertina in 1985; similarly, volume 84/86 (1989/90) presented the results of the symposium which accompanied the exhibition 'Prag um 1600'. IN 1988, volume 84 included a general index of the volumes since 1926, prepared by the Museum's archivist Herbert Haupt. Finally, the centenary of the Museum's opening was commemorated in 1991 with a volume of articles by members and friends of the Museum (volume 87).

The *Jahrbuch* is now more than one hundred years old. Its age alone makes it one of the most important art history publications. The impact of its scholarship in the formative years of art-historical studies cannot be overstated. The *Jahrbuch* persisted, despite financial and political limitations, in its presentation of impeccably thorough research focusing on the holdings of the Kunsthistorisches Museum. Founded as a scholarly symbol of imperial prestige, the *Jahrbuch* fulfilled this purpose; with the Empire gone, it remained as the voice of the Museum, increasing knowledge of its collections and contributing to the development of modern approaches to art-historical thought.

APPENDIX I

PUBLICATION HISTORY

Journal title and title change: *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* (1883–1918); *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* (1918–).

Volumes and issue data: Annual. Vols 1–36 (1882–1925); new series, vols 1–13 (1926–1944; no volumes 1938–1944); combined numbering 1953–, e.g. vols 50– (n.s. XIV–).

Publisher and Place of Publication: 'Herausgeber' always Kunsthistorisches Museum, under the auspices of 'Oberstkämmereramt des Kaiserhauses', 1882–1918; then simply as published by 'Beamten des kunsthistorischen Museums', 1918–; 'Verlag': Adolf Holzhausen, Vienna (1882–1890); G. Tempsky, Vienna *1890–1925; Anton Schroll, Vienna (1926–); Editors: Quirin von Leitner (1882–1889); Heinrich Zimmermann (1889–1925); Leo Palniscig and Erich Strohmmer (1926); Arpad Weixlgärtner (1927–1937); Erich Strohmmer (1938 and 1944); E. M. Auer (1953–1973); Georg Kugler (1973–).

Illustrations: Black-and-white reproductions; in early volumes, heliogravures, lithography and photography, some in colour.

Index sources: Each volume of the *Jahrbuch* has its own index; the entire run of *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses* (vols 1–36) also has a complete general index included in vol. 36. Vol. 84 (1988) includes a general index for the years 1926–88. As of 1910 (vol. 29), the *Jahrbuch* is also indexed in *Repertoire d'art et d'archéologie*; *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen in Wien* has also been in *Art Index* from 1929 (vol. 1 of the *Index*) and in *RILA* since that index's inception (1973); it is currently indexed in *BHA*, the successor to *RILA*.

Address for correspondence

Dr Erika Esau, Art History Department, The Australian National University, Canberra, ACT 0200, Australia.

Acknowledgements

The author wishes to thank Fr. Dr Anna Spitzmüller for her valuable assistance; she provided personal reminiscences of those involved with the *Jahrbuch*, as well as many pages of information from sources not readily available outside Vienna.

Notes and references

The following sources have been used extensively: Trevor Fawcett (ed), *The Art Press: Two Centuries of Art Magazines* (London, 1976), esp. p. 14; Udo Kultermann, *Die Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte* (Vienna, 1966), for information on the scholars of the Viennese School of Art History; Alphons Lhotsky, *Festschrift des kunsthistorischen Museums zur Feier des fünfzigjährigen Bestandes*, 3 vols (Vienna, 1941–45); L. Lutzeler, *Kunsterfahrung und Kunstwissenschaft*, 3 vols (Freiburg, 1975), for information on the art historians in the *Jahrbuch* and samples of their work.

1. One could indeed speculate that the *Jahrbuch's* title influenced the naming of the museum itself; the journal first appeared in 1882, while the museum opened, with the official and unusual name of Das Kunsthistorische Museum, in 1891.
2. H. Zimmerman, 'Quirin von Leitner', *Jahrbuch* 15 (1894), p. 404. All translations from German by the author.
3. Preface, *Jahrbuch* 1 (1883).
4. It is interesting to note that the contributors were well-paid for their contributions, and at least one essay, by Wartnegg, was rejected 'with good will' as not good enough to be included. See A. Lhotsky, *Festschrift des Kunsthistorischen Museums zur Feier des fünfzigjährigen Bestandes* (Vienna, 1941–45), III, p. 589.
5. Until 1906, he spelled his name Zimmerman.
6. A. Weixlgärtner, 'Heinrich Zimmerman', *Jahrbuch* n.s. 3 (1929), p. 1.
7. Quoted in Lhotsky, op. cit., (note 4), vol. III, p. 588.
8. Ibid., p. 593.
9. For a recent analysis of the Heroon of Gölbashi-Trysa, see Wolfgang Oberleitner, 'Das Heroon von Trysa: Ein lykisches Fürstengrab des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.', *Antike Welt: Zeitschrift für Archäologie und Kulturgeschichte* 25 (Summer 1994), (special issue).
10. For a fascinating discussion of this unusual and difficult man, see *ibid.*, pp. 649–50.
11. See Franz Glück's obituary to Weixlgärtner in *Mitteilungen der Museen Österreichs* 10 (1961), pp. 71–5.
12. See Günther Heinz, 'Ludwig Baldass †', *Mitteilungen der Museen Österreichs* 12 (1963), pp. 172–3.
13. Hermann's career is discussed briefly by August Liehr in *Mitteilungen des Instituts für österreichische Geschichtsforschung* 64 (1956), pp. 469–70.
14. Strohmer's unfortunate circumstances and the sad situation leading to his succession are discussed by Hermann Fillitz. *Mitteilungsblatt der Museen Österreichs* 11 (1962), pp. 123–8. See also Herbert Haupt's discussion of the Museum under the National Socialists in H. Haupt, *Das Kunsthistorische Museum: Die Geschichte des Hauses am Ring* (Vienna 1991), pp. 123–75.
15. See Haupt, op. cit. (note 14).