

Everyday life at the Dvořák Seminar, on the basis of contemporary sources

Addenda to the history of the Vienna School of Art History

Csilla Markója



Portrait of János Wilde. Foto: Trude Geiringer, Studio Dora Horovitz, Vienna, late 1920s
© Ilona Márta Kahler, Wilde estate, Budapest

Discussing the relationship of Max Dvořák and Johannes Wilde on a previous occasion,¹ I proposed – in passing – the provocative thesis that ‘there is no Dvořák without Wilde’. What justifies this polarized statement is the set of documents of source value found a few years ago in Wilde’s estate in archives at Budapest and London. Since then, we have contacted the descendants of the Wilde family living in Hungary, from whom we have received an un-published Wilde portrait, as well as documents.

Johannes Wilde cherished a profound relationship with his siblings, Ferenc and Margit, who did not have families of their own but lived with their mother Munisi until her death. They are the addressees of letters of invaluable importance

¹ Csilla Markója, ‘János (Johannes) Wilde and Max Dvořák, or Can we speak of a Budapest school of art history?’, *Journal of Art Historiography* Number 17 December 2017. 1-21.
<https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2017/11/markoja.pdf>

that Wilde wrote from Vienna and later from various stations of his forced exile. Wilde spent significant periods in Vienna twice: first, between 1915 and 1917, he was the student of the Vienna University department of art history nicknamed the *Apparat* led by Max Dvořák, and then, after the fall of the short-lived communist interlude, the Hungarian Republic of Councils, he returned to the Viennese capital as Dvořák's protégé, colleague and friend. The few years spent side by side deepened their professional and personal relationship so much that when fate put an end to the life of the Czech-born professor, still at an early age, Wilde was at the side of his death-bed and informed posterity of the details of this sorrowful event through his letters. In the previous paper I concentrated on this – second – period, the years between 1919 and 1923, exploring the circle of supporters including first of all aristocrats like Count Lanckoroński, from an old Polish family, who was also officially in charge of the protection of historic monuments in the area of Galicia, and the Count Khuen-Belasi of Hungarian relations, who became the guardian of the Dvořák children, and again, Count Wilczek, whose art historian son was Wilde's private student. The *Dvořák Verein*, the founding document of which an exemplar was also recovered in the Wilde estate in Budapest, was established to channel their financial support into Dvořák's department. It is also clear from this document that the department headed by Dvořák was not named the Vienna School of Art History later, but this designation was already in use in 1920. This strongly expropriative, declarative gesture is a clear indication of Dvořák's uncertain situation in relation to Strzygowski's parallel department. The document states:

The goal of the Society in Support of the Vienna School of Art History is to back up the art historical school of Vienna founded by Alois Riegl and Franz Wickhoff and continued by Max Dvořák. Admission into the Society is possible for the friends and supporters of art as founders and patrons, and for the graduates of the Vienna School of Art History and other art historians sharing its philosophy as ordinary members.²

In his most recent study of the Hungarian contacts of the Vienna School of Art History Ernő Marosi pointed out – following Otto Pächt³ – that Dvořák, who is often thought of as a historian of ideas (*Geisteshistoriker*) in the wake mainly of Wilde's activity as administrator and editor of his posthumous papers and works, was actually in most of his life someone 'who voted for the primacy of the eye over the word'. In other words, even in 1914 he thought that art history was incorrectly mistaken for cultural history: 'It is false to expect these scholarly fields to solve the problems of art history proper, as is often the case. For example, attempts were made to derive the Gothic style from the feudal system, or Netherlandish

² 'A Dvořák Verein. A Bécsi Művészettörténeti Iskolát támogató egyesület szabályzata' [The Dvořák Verein. Charter of the Society in Support of the Vienna School of Art History], in *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola II* [Johannes Wilde and the Vienna School], eds. Csilla Markója, István Bardoly, *Enigma*, 21, 84, 2015, 24–26. See Appendix for full text.

³ Otto Pächt: *Am Anfang war das Auge. Kunsthistoriker in eigener Sache. Zehn autobiographische Skizzen*. Hrsg. Martina Sitt. Berlin, 1990. 27.

naturalism from the bourgeoisification of culture.⁴ This Pächtian remark alluding to the 'pitting of the late Dvořák against the early one' is important for us because Wilde was just developing from Dvořák's student into the colleague whom Dvořák's widow would find worthy of taking care of the estate, in a period to which the 'Geistesgeschichte turn' is usually dated. That is, Dvořák had relinquished the objective concept of nature, or, in other words, he historicized nature in that nature had become a historically changing world view or mode of viewing the world. It can therefore be concluded that while Riegl's questions were targeted at the art work as the objectification of the *Kunstwollen*, the targets of Dvořák's questions mostly highlighted the changes in the concept of art and the major objectifications of culture. In this sense, he was a follower of Dilthey, who wrote about nature in *The Formation of the Historical World in the Human Sciences* in 1910: 'We are nature ourselves, and nature exerts its influence in us, spontaneously, in dark instincts; the states of mind get constantly manifested in gestures, facial expressions, words, and their objectifications materialize in institutions, states, churches, scientific institutions: history moves in this context.'⁵ It is a brilliantly dynamic wording that places the gestures, forms of pathos and the institutions that fix or enclose the states of mind like amber at the same level. It is Dvořák's greatest feat to have mobilized art history in this sense, to have made it more dynamic and expressive: art ceased to be a philosophical notion and became a historical notion. It is worth taking a note of the fact at this point that Wilde himself remained faithful to the style critical method and to the primacy of the descriptive eye throughout his life and did not become a *Geisteshistoriker*, contrarily to what could be expected of Dvořák's favourite student.

In the foreword to the first volume of the posthumous oeuvre edition of Dvořák's works Wilde formulated the gist of the turn to *Geistesgeschichte* in these words:

In the main creation of his first period Dvořák adhered to an autonomous, formal style history, but later he came to conceive of art history as part of the history of ideas. Earlier he thought of development as a continuous line, but later he interpreted the changes in history as the incessantly renewed condition of individual creation and a process signposting new developmental trends. That was how the critically self-rooted style historical analysis came to be embedded in the foundations of *Geistesgeschichte*. [...] Art is more than the solution of formal tasks and problems; it is always, and primarily, the expression of the ideas of humankind; its history – no less than the history of religion, philosophy or poetry – is part of the general history of the mind.⁶

⁴ Dvořák's review of Tietze is cited in Ernő Marosi, 'A bécsi művészettörténeti iskola magyar kapcsolataihoz' [Hungarian connections to the Vienna School of Art History], in *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola II* [Johannes Wilde and the Vienna School], eds. Csilla Markója, István Bardoly, *Enigma*, 21, 84, 2015, 9.

⁵ Wilhelm Dilthey, *A történelmi világ felépítése a szellemtudományokban* [The formation of the historical world in the human sciences], Budapest: Gondolat, 2004, 276. (*Bevezetés a szellemtudományokba*) [Introduction to the human sciences].

⁶ Wilde János – Karl M. Swoboda: Előszó a Dvořák-kiadás első kötetéhez [Foreword to the first volume of the Dvořák edition]. (1923) in *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola III* [Johannes Wilde

At this point Wilde adds, also in the name of Swoboda, that ‘the editors of the volume are of the opinion that the basic outlook and the contents of the writings justify their choice of the title’, that is, they undertake ‘responsibility’ for the posthumous program of *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*, art history as the history of ideas. Ernő Marosi proposed that perhaps the selection of the title was also influenced, in addition to Dilthey’s concept of *Geisteswissenschaften* ‘human sciences’, by the short-lived periodical of the philosopher György Lukács and the art philosopher Lajos Fülep, *A szellem* [The Spirit/*Geist*] published in Budapest. The role of Lukács’ informal group of friends, the Sunday Circle has hardly been studied in the historiography of the Vienna School of Art History, which is not a surprise in view of the lack of interest in the history of the Sunday Circle even in Hungary, in spite of the fact that it has given such art historians to the world as Frigyes Antal, who graduated with a doctoral degree from Dvořák’s school, or the other Dvořák students Johannes Wilde and Charles Tolnay, not to speak of the father of art sociology Arnold Hauser. The phrase ‘gave to the world’ is unfortunately literally true: these peak accomplishments of Hungarian art historiography are among the sad chapters of ‘migrant art history’. The Sunday Circle had a complex network of contacts with the Vienna School. The autonomous concept of form they developed owed very much to poet, writer and decorative artist Anna Lesznai’s ideas on ornamentation traceable to Riegl. Lesznai, a stalwart of the Circle, perpetuated her dialogues with Lukács in her diary as an equal in all regards. It is, however, to be remembered that although the Sunday Circle had first-hand information on Dvořák’s views from Frigyes Antal from 1914 onward, this information was obviously about the early Dvořák, but they shared from the beginning his anti-impressionism. We know from Wilde that Dvořák had a copy of Lukács’s work, *The Theory of the Novel*, in his private library. We venture into uncharted territory if we reverse the question what impact Dvořák exerted on his Hungarian students. Is it possible to speak about reciprocity? ‘When I met Max Dvořák personally in Vienna in 1920, he told me he registered this work as the most important publication of the ‘*geisteswissenschaftlichen*’ trend,’ Lukács wrote in the German preface to *The Theory of the Novel* in 1967.⁷ At the same place, exercising self-criticism as a Marxist, he declared of the method of the human sciences: ‘It has become a custom to construct general concepts synthetically from a few, mostly intuitively selected features of a trend, a period, etc., from which you descended deductively to the particular phenomena and thus arrived at some sweeping conclusion.’⁸ However, contrary to common belief, the Sunday Circle was not a basically Marxist formation: Lukács and Antal, too, only became radicalized during the Republic of Councils. As Hauser recalled:

and the Vienna School], eds. Csilla Markója, István Bardoly, *Enigma*, 21, 85, 2015, 5.

(*Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte. Studien zur abenländischen Kunstentwicklung*, ed. Johannes Wilde, Karl M. Swoboda, München: Piper, 1924)

⁷ Lukács György, *A regény elmélete. Történetfilozófiai kísérlet a nagyepikai formákról* (1916) [The Theory of the Novel: A Historico-philosophical Essay on the Forms of Great Epic Literature], Budapest: Magvető, 2009, 9.

⁸ Lukács, *A regény elmélete*, 9.

the Sunday Circle evolved quite spontaneously and we hadn't the faintest idea what an historic role it would play. As it appears now, the entire modern Hungary had its roots there and grew out of it. No one had the slightest inkling or it never occurred to us that we could have any role in it. We were fledglings, some of us very young, still students, and we had just graduated and started teaching in secondary schools. [...] We were liberalists and progressives. But we were not communists, not even socialists. [...] We didn't know exactly when he [i.e. Lukács] had joined the communist party, probably after the beating up of Béla Kun. The Sunday Circle had no political profile.⁹

In an unpublished interview Lukács also mentioned that his meeting with Dvořák had been arranged by Wilde.¹⁰ Though Wilde could rarely attend the Circle's Sunday afternoons, which went on until the small hours, because he stayed most of the time in Vienna, he came into closer contact with Lukács in the course of the events in Budapest in 1919. The occasion of this was the exhibition staged in his second home, his beloved Museum of Fine Arts in Budapest (Szépművészeti Múzeum), from art works temporarily expropriated from private collections. His participation in organizing the show ensued in the retaliations which eventually led to his life-long emigration.

When it comes to researching the interactions between the Sunday Circle, the Budapest Museum of Fine Arts and the Vienna School, it is worth taking a close look at the Wilde correspondence, from which I earlier cited passages related to Dvořák's death and the administration of his estate. In what follows I will concentrate on the period of 1915–1917, starting with the moment when young Wilde left Budapest, and the team of the Department of Drawings and Prints in the Szépművészeti Múzeum who knew Dvořák personally – Simon Meller, Frigyes Antal, Edith Hoffmann – and upon his director, Elek Petrovics, who encouraged him and sent him directly to study with Dvořák. Lengthy passages will be cited from the letters, since these weekly reports offer a direct insight into the life and daily routine of the Vienna School, particularly of the so-called Dvořák seminar, and into Dvořák's teaching methods.

After his university studies in Budapest, Wilde started work at the Department of Drawings and Prints in the Museum of Fine Arts, but by 1915 he was already in Vienna, at the age of 25. When Dvořák died, Wilde – then 32 – was

⁹ Vezér Erzsébet, *Megőrzött öreg hangok. Válogatott interjúk* [Old voices preserved. Selected interviews], Budapest: Petőfi Irodalmi Múzeum, 2004, 104. (Conversation with Arnold Hauser)

¹⁰ 'When I arrived in Vienna, my young friends – Wilde, Kálmán Pogány – acquainted me with a famous Austrian art historian of that time, Dvořák, who also knew my earlier things. The first thing he did was congratulate me on creating a national treasure of art works. He said it was one of the most beautiful collections in the world. If only things could be collected in Vienna like that! Dvořák was a conservative person politically. But he sympathized with this aspect of the developments.' Erzsébet Köves' interview with György Lukács on 29 Jan. 1970, Budapest, Lukács Archives. Cited: Karádi Éva, 'A Lukács-kör Bécsben' [The Lukács Circle in Vienna], *Magyar Filozófiai Szemle*, 31, 1987, 600.

already an authority on his academic field. The art historians of the Museum of Fine Arts were on a par with their Viennese colleagues; so much so that when in 1913 Simon Meller organized the exhibition 'Marcantonio Raimondi and Antecedents', a show introducing the history of Italian copperplate engraving, Dvořák was just holding a seminar in Vienna about the reproductive arts. In his study of the Vienna School Schlosser emphasized three themes that determined education at the department in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries: a knowledge of antique/decorative arts objects, the role of reproductive graphics, and source criticism. In addition to the apprenticeship close to the graphic works in the Museum of Fine Arts, it was probably the expectations of the Vienna School that helped Wilde choose the topic for his doctoral dissertation which he submitted to Dvořák in 1918 with the title *Die Anfänge der italienischen Radierung*.¹¹ In a letter from Vienna Wilde wrote about the origins of the dissertation:

Yesterday I had a busy day: [...] in the evening I went back to the Apparat where I managed to catch Dvořák and spend half an hour with him. He was extremely kind, there is no denying. He gave me advice on my studies; he thought it right for me to learn for another year and only choose a topic later which I could decently work out in the next year. He said I could pop in to see him any time. On Monday I'll get a table in the gentlemen's room (ladies are strictly separated) and a key, and then I can regularly come in. I'm terribly happy that there's at last someone who takes care of me, that's what I've been longing for and I'm in greater need of than anyone else.¹²

Then he went on to report about his fellow students at the Dvořák seminar:

Apart from the mentioned people there is another good man, Dr. Matejček, an official of the Zentralcommission and Dvořák's favourite, an infinitely clever and kind Czech lad who got to Vienna from the Czech university of Prague after similar antecedents than I, although, to say the least, he could hardly smatter in German at that time. (Without exception everyone pays tribute to my command of German.) I translated a Hungarian article he needed the other day, so now we are on good terms. Three of the students have started work so far: 1. a charming and intelligent first-year student, 2. the Instituts Mitglied (member of the institute), a glum boy from Brünn, who reprimanded me just yesterday for an awful large diploma¹³ because the

¹¹ Körber Ágnes, Aki megröntgenezte Giorgionét – Wilde János (1891–1970) [The man who X-rayed Giorgione – Johannes Wilde (1891–1970)], in 'Wilde János és a bécsi iskola I' [Johannes Wilde and the Vienna School], eds. Csilla Markója, István Bardoly, *Enigma*, 21, 83, 2015, 12.

¹² Wilde János családjának írt levelei 1915–1917 [Johannes Wilde's letters written to his family 1915–1917], in *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola I* [Johannes Wilde and the Vienna School], eds. Csilla Markója, István Bardoly, *Enigma*, 21, 83, 2015, 101.

¹³ This refers to a very large codex-sized document reporting that the Hungarians set fire to a German church. Wilde talks here about how, while researching sources, a student from Brno found such behaviour by the Hungarians in the Middle Ages very offensive. An amusing

Hungarians set fire to the church of a no-name German settlement back in 907, it was very amusing. 3. a bespectacled boy who is working on his dissertations – I'm on speaking terms with these chaps, I don't know yet the girls who are in a separate room, I only introduced myself to Madam Betty Kurth and forwarded Frici [Antal]'s greetings. Not everyone has arrived, as Dv[orák] only begins on the 3rd. – Tomorrow at 9 a.m. I'll have a lesson – archaeology – last night I listened to a lecture, just out of curiosity, in the philosophy of history.¹⁴

The close communication between the Budapest Museum of Fine Arts and the Dvořák department is aptly illustrated by the following letter:

I had a great surprise this morning. As I got to the Apparat – slightly later than usual, because I had something to do in the students' office and the dean's office – I found Meller's visiting card there informing me that he was in Vienna and where I would find him during the day. Of course I immediately ran after him and we were together until 16.25 when I rushed to have a bath (it was urgent, for I couldn't take a bath for three weeks owing to the vaccination).¹⁵

In addition to Dvořák, Wilde also attended Schlosser's lessons:

Today there was tutorial class again with Schlosser, the girls' number increased to 20,¹⁶ the boys' to 7. Kein Vergnügen [not much pleasure]. After the Dvořák class yesterday, I listened to a Urania lecture by the famous Thode, from which I only got home by 10 so that I had to have a wienie for supper on the way home.¹⁷ ...

... Nun heist es hart arbeiten! [now, that's what you call hard work] I have so much to do quickly that I'm quite snowed under. At the tutorial class (which participants of the *privatissimum* [exclusive tutorial] are also supposed to attend) Dvořák will discuss early Christian painting, so I'm going to present – as a charitable gift – the paintings of the Pécs burial chamber (the only early Christian relic in Hungary). All five of us have to prepare a paper for the *privatissimum* (this was the wartime tightening of the previous system), my topic was the beginnings of monumental portrait

anecdote about how Wilde managed to befriend the members of the seminar, recognising the already bad European reputation of the Hungarians.

¹⁴ 24 Oct. 1915, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola* I, 103.

¹⁵ 30 Oct. 1915, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola* I, 104.

¹⁶ In Hungary, too, there were more women than men among art history students, and between the two wars Professor Gerevich had almost exclusively female students, they were derisively called the Gerevich-girls – I think they thought at the time that this was still within the bounds of a lady's education. Typically these women did not stay in the field, while the men did.

¹⁷ 4 Nov. 1915, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola* I, 105.

sculpture, a theme that has never been elaborated in the literature. I wonder how I will manage,...¹⁸

However, the topic was changed with the consent of his professor:

Yesterday I and Dv[ořák] agreed to change my priv[atissimum] topic for another, more important and harder, but at the same time, more useful topic for me; this way I have two topics (of Pécs) for after Chr[istmas] for which I must prepare a lot. After the priv. he came up to me and inquired kindly. With yesterday's Schlosser class I already have 2 hours colloquium; I need another 6 (5 Dv + 1 Schl.) A.m. I was in the Albertina and I'll go tomorrow, too.¹⁹

Already in the first term in Vienna Wilde stood out among his peers and his privileged intellectual relationship with his professor began:

A.m. I took the rostrum again in the Schlosser class, I had to take over the object from a girl who put out a very poor performance. [...] Yesterday Dv[ořák] held a beautiful lecture again, I'm so glad that after it I could share at least with Swoboda my happiness I feel over the luck that I'm close to Dv[ořák] now. – It is sad that his own students do not understand his idioms. I'm proud that I can understand them so particularly well.²⁰

In 1915 Wilde had been called up for military service, but he was mustered out. During the official harassment and retaliations after the Republic of Councils his physician defended him with reference to his diagnosis of manic depression. Although this diagnosis was to serve his exemption from the army, Wilde does appear to be mildly maniacal in some letters. Dvořák, however, deemed his young student suitable for the task of informing the Austrian monument conservation authorities of the Hungarian situation:

Swob[oda] and Dv[ořák] acknowledged my discharging (from the military), no one else knew about it. In my absence, the secretary of the Austrian monuments commission called with the kind request to inform him about what the Hungarian legislation had done so far on the pertinent matters, for they were working on a new bill. I'm going to see him in his office tomorrow.²¹

He closed the first term in Vienna with the following report to his family:

The weather is still warm and dark, so I spend more time in the Apparat. Today, after a week's break, there is a Dv[ořák] lesson, which makes me very

¹⁸ 6 Nov. 1915, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola I*, 106–107.

¹⁹ 26 Nov. 1915, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola I*, 109.

²⁰ 2 Dec. 1915, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola I*, 110.

²¹ 7 Dec. 1915, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola I*, 111.

happy. No more tutorials with him or Schlosser next week, but instead on Wednesday morning we'll go with Dv[orák] to the Academy gallery to see the new arrangement.²²

Wilde went home for Christmas, and the first thing he did upon returning to Vienna was to visit Dvořák: 'I've slept an hour and then unpacked. I'm now off to Strzyg[owski]. Dv[orák] only begins on Wednesday, after 6 p.m. I'll drop in to see how he is.' On 18 January he wrote: 'At the end of his lecture yesterday Dv[orák] ventured into my hunting ground, Italian baroque painting. I'm watching intensely what's going to come next.'²³

Yesterday I was rather late for the practice class, which is no problem, I missed the embarrassment of the first 10 minutes. Dv[orák] would normally put a question right away, which is followed by a gloomy and unnerving silence before conversation begins, usually by Dv[orák]'s soliloquium. Yesterday, seeing me enter, he turned to me for help. Then, of course, he frequently made use of me up until 8 o'clock. I was in a good mood, answering went smoothly. – I don't know if this also exhilarated him, but when after class we went to his room, he handed me a copy of his new book that had come out the day before. (He only got 3 copies from the printer's so far, one he gave Swob[oda] who had shown it to me before the tutor[ial], and kept one for himself.) 'Katechismus der Denkmalflege', he wrote it on commission from the minister for the general public, with lots of illustrations. Of course, I accompanied him home out of gratitude, while telling anecdotes. – Now, I'm going to do this: I'll buy the book in the bookshop and have Dv[orák] write a dedication for Majovszky in my copy and send it to him by registered mail. I think that'll be very good. They certainly know already that the university is closed down for two weeks. Everybody is happy. Unfortunately, the Strzyg[owski] seminar is at a private house... there will be no break; I don't mind it, I want to get over it in this term at any cost.²⁴

Viennese–Hungarian relations rested on the foundation of several common matters and visits: 'Edith has written that Berchtold, the new intendant of museums visited Meller in Pest! Dv[orák], on the other side, can hardly wait to welcome Petro[vics]. Between ourselves, he told me why: a new trade agreement is being prepared with the Germans, he would like to discuss with him, the Hungarian brother, its section pertaining to art works.'²⁵ Wilde allowed himself harsher and harsher remarks as time passed: 'I don't let Benesch come close to, he must learn decency. Not that it's possible; you can't erase bad character in people. Just try to teach Mister Frici [Frederick Antal] to behave! All you can and must do in the face of such people is to

²² 11 Dec. 1915, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola* I, 111.

²³ 19 Jan. 1917, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola* I, 114.

²⁴ 9 Febr. 1917, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola* I, 116.

²⁵ 22 Mar. 1917, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola* I, 119–120.

protect yourself.’²⁶ He also began to lose faith in the Viennese department: ‘I must run to get in time for Dv[ořák]’s privatissimum (though I wouldn’t lose much, all is laden with a sort of indifference). Three more weeks of torture is the university. I hate it more than I can say.’²⁷ He consulted Dvořák again about the dissertation, but the remarks suggesting that he had outgrown the Vienna department intellectually, at least in the status of student, multiplied. He wrote in one of his last letters:

Dv[ořák] agrees with my decision to shorten again the material and leave off another 50 years from the end. Even so, I think, I will produce the required length, and will save a lot of time and photography costs. Of course, it hurts a bit that I can’t complete my original plan; what I’m doing now is tantamount to the original *Introduction*, so earlier I devoted less care to it. At the moment all that counts is to be ready by autumn, and then I’ll be free to make programs for decades.²⁸

History intervened and changed the program. However, Wilde could return to Vienna, to his beloved professor, who reached out a helping hand as to an equal, a colleague and friend. He ensured that the refugee from Hungary could have work and a loving environment. From then on, their relationship grew into a passionate, grateful and deepening friendship, with Wilde finding a real home in Vienna. From his youthful letters the Viennese Dvořák seminar emerges as an intimate community in which the hierarchy of the teacher–student relationship was not determined by preordained roles, but abilities and performances defined the ranks of doctoral candidates and their supervisors treated as colleagues. The small-group séances were enriched with museum visits and tutorial classes, and their assignments, be they mid-year papers or final dissertations, were discussed with Dvořák. Interest in each other was intense and reciprocal, far more lively than we experience it in our days, and therefore it cannot be excluded that the student did not only learn from his tutor. However, the sources and results of mutual inspiration will only be possible to explore after the meticulous collation of the texts.

²⁶ 24 Mar. 1917, *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola* I, Uo. 121.

²⁷ [16 Jun. 1917,] *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola* I, 129.

²⁸ [19 Jun. 1917,] *Wilde János és a bécsi iskola* I, 131.

Appendix

The Dvořák Verein

Regulations of the Association for the Support of the Vienna School of Art History, 1920²⁹

1 § The Aim of the Association for the Promotion of the Vienna School of Art History is to support the Vienna School of Art History, founded by Alois Riegl and Franz Wickhoff and carried forward by Max Dvořák.

2 § Its intention is to implement

1. the purchase of books and photography necessary for art history education and research,
2. to raise funds for other funding, such as scholarships, in accordance with the objectives of the Vienna School of Art History,
3. lectures, debates, leaderships, etc.

3 § The seat of the Association is in Vienna.

4 § The year of association shall be from 1 January to 31 December.

5 § Members of the Association

(a) founders who make a one-off contribution of at least 5000 korona (five thousand) korona and at least 1000 (thousand) korona per year,

(b) supporters who contribute at least 1000 (thousand) korona per year, and

(c) ordinary members who make contributions of at least 50 (fifty) korona per year are owed to pay.

6 § The new member shall be admitted with the consent of the Association's management by a two-thirds majority. In the event of rejection, there shall be no appeal.

²⁹ Originally published by Csilla Markója, István Bardoly, (Hessky Orsolya as translator to Hungarian). The German-language document on the founding of the Dvořák Verein was found by Csilla Markója in the estate of János (Johannes) Wilde in Budapest, and published for the first time in Hungarian in the second volume of the four-volume Wilde Source edition of the *Enigma Journal of Art History*, no. 84. 24-27. For more on the founding of the Dvořák Verein and the aristocrats who supported Dvořák, Counts Khuen-Belasi, Wilczek and Lanczkoronski, see Csilla Markója: 'János (Johannes) Wilde and Max Dvořák, or Can we speak of a Budapest school of art history?', *Journal of Art Historiography*, 2017, Dec. 17.

<https://arthistoriography.files.wordpress.com/2017/11/markoja.pdf>

The document is in the Hungarian National Gallery (MNG), Budapest, Repository, Inv. Nr. 20151/1979/32/8. On 15 February 1921, János Wilde wrote a letter to Ferenc Wilde and the obituary of Max Dvořák. At the top of the first page, John Wilde writes: "This is the foundation of Count Khuen. We already had the founding General Assembly, Verein will start operating in the autumn." Dvořák Verein was founded on June 25, 1920. Wilde also told his family about his first public meeting: "At the end of the week I will probably see him, because then there will be the first session of the Dvořák Verein (with Dv[orák] lecture of Dürer Apocalypse) – only Khuen will be there." Hungarian National Gallery (MNG), Budapest, Repository, Inv. Nr. 5/1979/32/20151.

7 § Friends and supporters of art may be admitted to the Association as founders and supporters under the conditions set out in § 6, art historians graduating from the Vienna School of Art History (§ 1) or art historians otherwise close to the Vienna School may be admitted as regular members.

8 § Members may have access to seats and words and have active and passive votes at association meetings.

9 § Each member shall be obliged to pay the following year's membership fee for the year in progress during the month of December.

10 § Leaving the Association may be made by notification to the management.

11 § The financial means necessary to achieve the objectives of the Association shall be obtained by means of the contributions provided for in Article 5 and by other extraordinary revenue.

12 § The management of the Association provides the Presidency of the association, which consists of the president, his deputy, the clerk, the treasurer and three members of the board. Three members of the board must be founders and supporters, and three members must be regular members. Due to his position as the current head of the Department of Art History of the Austrian Institute of History [Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung], he belongs to the Presidency. Such distribution of the terms of office of the Presidency shall be elected by the General Assembly for a term of one year. The Presidency has a quorum in the presence of three members, a simple majority or, in the case of admission, a two-thirds majority. In the event of a tie, the chairman shall have the casting vote.

13 § The General Assembly and other association meetings shall be convened by the Presidency, the decisions of which shall be observed and carried out and the affairs of the Association shall be carried out, in so far as they do not belong to the General Assembly .

14 § The Association shall be represented in public by a member of the Presidency. Contracts or other documents with legal obligations for the Association shall be signed by two members of the Presidency.

15 § The General Assembly normally takes place annually in November or December. Extraordinary General Assemblies may be convened by the Presidency at any time. If at least 10 of them request the convening of the General Assembly with appropriate reasons, it shall be complied with.

16 § The General Assembly shall be responsible for:

- (a) the election of the Presidency and two reviewers;
- (b) the approval of the annual accounts after the audit of the reviewers;
- (c) the preparation of a report on the activity;
- (d) the determination of the annual membership fee as a condition for the creation of the material resources necessary to achieve the objectives of the Association;
- (e) the change in the rules of the Association;
- (f) the decision to dissolve the Association;
- (g) the decision on the contracts to be concluded by the Association;
- (h) decision-making on other submissions by members.

17 § The use of the funds laid down in § 16 shall be decided by the Presidency on a proposal from Prof. Max Dvořák on the basis of the directives laid down in Article 2. In the absence of a proposal, the Presidency shall decide on its own use.

18 § The General Assembly shall have a quorum if at least 20 members are present. If the General Assembly is not a quorum, a new General Assembly shall be convened after half an hour, which shall in all circumstances have a quorum.

19 § Decisions of the General Assembly shall be decided by a simple majority. Changes to the Statute require a two-thirds majority.

20 § Members shall be notified in writing of the General Assembly and of the association meetings; the main items on the agenda shall be indicated here.

21 § When the Association is dissolved, the General Assembly decides on the fate of the association's assets and collections.

22 § Any disagreement which may be resolved as a matter of 22 May 2004 shall be settled by arbitration. Each of the bickering parties chooses an arbitrator, and they choose a judge. If the two arbitrating umpires disagree with the judge's opinion, fate will decide.

This Code was authorised by the Lower Austrian Provincial Government on 25 June 1920.

Csilla Markója is senior researcher, Eötvös Lorand Research Network, Research Centre for Humanities, Institute for Art History (former Hungarian Academy of Sciences, Institute for Art History), chief editor of *Enigma*, a journal with a philosophical and art historical profile; focus on the relationship between word and image. She studied aesthetics, literature and art history at Hamburg and Budapest Universities, she began her career as an art critic of contemporary art, and she has published two monographs (László Mednyánszky 2008, Péter Nádas 2016). Researcher of the art historiography, modernism, photography, Sunday Circle in Budapest (Georg Lukacs et al.), Vienna School of Art History. She edited a number of publications, e. g. vols I-V. 'Great Figures of Hungarian Art Historiography' and the Ernst Kállai's critical edition vols I-X. (Bauhaus), Methods of Art History- and Aby Warburg-, Deleuze-Readers, etc. She is equally interested in philosophy, especially French post-structuralism, critical theory and phenomenology.

markoja.csilla@gmail.com

Translated by Judit Pokoly



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