The Edgar Wind Journal

Volume 9

9/2025

ISSN 2785-2903

www.edgarwindjournal.eu

The Edgar Wind Journal

ISSN 2785-2903

Contacts

info@edgarwindjournal.eu
submissions@edgarwindjournal.eu

The Edgar Wind Journal is a biannual, peer-reviewed and international journal, in open access format.
Authors are invited to follow the instructions on the website:
https://www.edgarwindjournal.eu/submission/

Publisher

Bernardino Branca

Contact: Route de Verbier Station 11, 1936 Verbier, Switzerland

Phone: 0041 799318816

Email: publisher@edgarwindjournal.eu

Table of Contents

Alois Riegl and the Origins of 'Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte': Reconsidering Neo-Idealism in Viennese Art History[1]

Sabrina Raphaela Buebl

Abstract

This article reassesses the theoretical and methodological legacy of Alois Riegl (1858–1905) through his unfinished *Historische Grammatik der bildenden Künste* (1897–99) and his seminal study *Die spätrömische Kunstindustrie* (1901). Far from a merely formalist approach, Riegl developed a vision of art history inseparably tied to changing worldviews (*Weltanschauungen*). In the *Grammatik*, he outlined a systematic 'law of causality' linking artistic form to humanity's relation with nature, and in so doing distinguished three major epochs – antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the modern era – each shaped by its own spiritual outlook. In *Spätrömische Kunstindustrie*, he applied this framework to present late antique art not as an expression of decline but as that of a new, subjectively intensified worldview. This article further addresses the contested origins of the concept of *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*. While Max Dvořák's name has become indelibly associated with this model, it argues that Riegl was its true progenitor. Already in the 1890s, he advanced the historical relativity of artistic value, the dependence of style on worldview, and the unity of artistic and cultural *Wollen*. Dvořák's later writings, shaped by the Expressionist climate of the 1910s, elaborated and popularised this framework but did not invent it. By tracing these continuities, this article shows that the turn towards an intellectual history of art was not a sudden innovation of the 1920s but the outgrowth of ideas planted by Riegl three decades earlier. His vision of a humanistic art history – rigorous in form yet tied to intellectual life – remains a crucial reference point for the discipline today.

Keywords

Alois Riegl, Max Dvořák, Vienna School of Art History, *Geistesgeschichte*, art historiography

[1] The proof-reading of this article was generously supported by a grant from the Doctoral School of Historical and Cultural Studies at the University of Vienna.

The Edgar Wind Journal 9: 89-106, 2025
DOI: 10.53245/EWJ-000049

Introduction

Alois Riegl (1858–1905) occupies a central place in the intellectual lineage of the Vienna School of Art History.[2] He is widely credited with liberating the discipline from narratives of decline, forging instead an approach grounded in history and based on formal analysis. Although often described as a formalist attentive to psychological and perceptual factors, Riegl also advanced the concept of *Kunstwollen* which endowed the art of each epoch with an inner necessity and value relative to its historical context.[3] Alongside this, his writings reveal a distinctly neo-idealistic dimension that retrospectively appears to anticipate what would later be termed *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte*.

This article re-examines the theoretical programme of art history connected to the worldview outlined in Riegl's *Historische Grammatik* and its application in his *Die spätrömische Kunstindustrie*, concentrating on the shift from late Roman to early Christian art. In doing so, it reassesses the genealogy of *Geistesgeschichte* in art history, arguing that Riegl rather than Max Dvořák was its true progenitor. Riegl's emphasis on *Kunstwollen*, historical relativity, and on the interdependence of form and worldview provided the foundations on which Dvořák and others built.

In this context, the notion of 'Neo-Idealism' refers less to a direct philosophical school than to a *fin-de-siècle* intellectual climate.[4] In line with other cultural currents – such as philosophy (Rudolf Eucken), literature (Hermann Bahr), and contemporary art (Arnold Böcklin)[5] – art history sought to overcome positivist empiricism through a renewed attention to spiritual and intellectual factors. As a heuristic, 'expressionist art history', as labelled in recent historiography, highlights shared commitments to the expressivity of

[2] On his institutional background see Diana Reynolds Cordileone, *Alois Riegl in Vienna, 1879–1905: An Institutional Biography* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014); other important monographic studies are Sandro Scarrocchia, *Oltre la storia dell'arte: Alois Riegl vita e opere di un protagonista della cultura viennese* (Milan: Marinotti, 2006), and Georg Vasold, *Alois Riegl und die Kunstgeschichte als Kulturgeschichte: Überlegungen zum Frühwerk des Wiener Gelehrten* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach, 2004).

[3] Riegl's *Kunstwollen* is thoroughly discussed by Andrea Reichenberger, *Riegls 'Kunstwollen': Versuch einer Neubetrachtung* (Sankt Augustin: Academia, 2003) and Jaś Elsner, 'From Empirical Evidence to the Big Picture: Some Reflections on Riegl's Concept of "Kunstwollen"', *Critical Inquiry*, 32.4 (2006), pp. 741–66.

[4] For a description of *Neuidealismus* in German late nineteenth-century history, see Gerhard Lehmann, 'Neuidealismus', in *Geschichte der Philosophie, X, Die Philosophie im ersten Drittel des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. Teil 1* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1957), pp. 12–64; on the broader diagnosis of a structural tension between idealism and positivism around 1900 see Rüdiger vom Bruch et al. (eds.), *Kultur und Kulturwissenschaften um 1900: Idealismus und Positivismus*, II (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1997).

[5] On Eucken see, recently, Annelie Freese, *Rudolf Euckens Philosophie des Geisteslebens als eine Philosophie des Lebens* (PhD thesis: Universität Erfurt, 2019); on Bahr, the critical edition of his *Überwindung des Naturalismus*, ed. by Claus Pias (VDG: Weimar, 2004); on Böcklin, Muther's interpretation of his art in Richard Muther, *Geschichte der Malerei im XIX. Jahrhundert*, III (Munich: Hirth, 1894), pp. 603–21 (and 444–60 on *Neuidealismus*).

form and to an engaged beholder's capacity to infer broader cultural meanings from it.[6] In this sense, Riegl's emphasis on *Weltanschauung* (worldview) and the formative role of ideas resonates with a broader neo-idealist tendency in Central European thought around 1900.

I. Riegl's Theoretical Framework: Art, Nature, and Worldview

Riegl's *Historische Grammatik der bildenden Künste*, drafted between 1897 and 1899, was conceived as a system to grasp the main categories of art history.[7] Through an analogy with linguistic grammar, he sought universal principles to describe and compare artworks in terms of their 'artistic language'. The aim was no longer description or chronological placement, but investigation of what he called the *Kausalitätsgesetz* (law of causality): why monuments appear in a certain way and not otherwise.[8] Far from a mere handbook, the unfinished treatise functions as the theoretical ground of Riegl's whole understanding of art history: it articulates how epochal world view conditions perception, valuation, and form, and thus provides a genuinely *geistesgeschichtlich* architecture for explaining stylistic change – genetic yet also cultural.[9]

Riegl was active in a scholarly climate dominated on the one hand by positivism and on the other by speculative aesthetics. He distanced himself from prevailing theories of art's evolution: the German idealist tradition, which imposed classical beauty as an absolute norm; the materialist (Semper), which acknowledged non-classical arts but still measured them against an 'original' functional style; the psychological (Vischer, Fiedler, Herbart), which traced artistic creation back to *Einfühlung* (empathy) or memory-images; and the practical (Hildebrand), which explained style in terms of visual function.[10] In contrast, Riegl envisioned a strictly 'positivist' theory defined by *Kunstwollen*, observable

[6] In this context, 'Neo-Idealism' has been used to describe an anti-positivist, non-teleological model of cultural knowledge grounded in the Diltheyan division between the natural and the human sciences. See Kimberly A. Smith (ed.), *The Expressionist Turn in Art History. A Critical Anthology, Studies in Art Historiography* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014), pp. 3, 40; for an overview of the use in contemporary art see Jay A. Clarke, 'Neo-Idealism, Expressionism, and the Writing of Art History', *Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies*, 28.1 (2002), pp. 24–37, 107–8.

[7] Alois Riegl, *Historical Grammar of the Visual Arts*, ed. by Benjamin Binstock, trans. by Jacqueline E. Jung (New York: Zone Books, 2004), pp. 55, 301–03; originally, *Historische Grammatik der bildenden Künste*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda and Otto Pächt (Graz: Böhlau, 1966), pp. 23, 217–20. All quotations/references are cited from the English translation, with page numbers of the German original given in parallel. I would like to thank Rebeka Vidrih and Wojciech Bałus for pointing out the importance of these manuscripts for my argumentation.

[8] By *Kausalitätsgesetz*, a term adopted from the Lamprechtian historical sciences, Riegl refered to a causal nexus in which artistic forms stand in a linked sequence: each new configuration is conditioned by prior solutions and experiences.

[9] On the importance of *Grammatik* see Benjamin Binstock, 'Aloïs Riegl, Monumental Ruin. Why We Still Need to Read Historical Grammar of the Visual Arts', in Riegl, *Grammar*, pp. 11–36; and Andrea Pinotti, 'Introduzione all'edizione italiana', in Alois Riegl, *Grammatica storica delle arti figurative*, ed. by Andrea Pinotti, trans. by Carmela Armentano (Macerata: Quodlibet, 2020), pp. vii–lxv.

[10] Alois Riegl, 'Naturwerk und Kunstwerk. I', *Allgemeine Zeitung. Beilage*, 13 (16 January 1901), pp. 1–5.

developments, and historicity – yet without reducing art to mere material, technical, or perceptual factors.[11]

Underlying this system was a historical outlook: the conviction that art history is inseparably connected with worldview.[12] Each epoch, Riegl argued, develops its own *Weltanschauung* – the fundamental outlook or belief-structure of an age, comprising religious, political, and cultural attitudes – and from it arise distinct *Stilgesetze* (stylistic laws) governing its visual arts.[13] The basis of this programme was the assumption that all human art production (*Kunstschaffen*) basically consists in a contest (*Wettschaffen*) with nature.[14] Consequently, artistic production 'is but one cultural phenomenon among many' and 'its development derives from the same factor that drives the entire progress of human culture: the worldview of man, as expression of his need for comfort and contentment'.[15]

Riegl divided art history into three epochs: Antiquity (to 313), the Middle Ages and Renaissance (to 1520), and the Modern era, each marked by phases of becoming, flowering, and dissolution. What defined them was not form alone but the conception of humanity's relation to nature.

In the polytheistic age of Antiquity, religion, politics, and art were still, in Riegl's view, intimately connected, forming a single entity.[16] The gods themselves were conceived in corporeal perfection, and art strove to glorify ideal bodily beauty. Yet already in the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, new phenomena – portraiture, expressive physiognomy, even representations of suffering (as in the *Laocoön*) – signalled a deepening transformation of man's relation to nature. Abstract personifications and oriental deities revealed the breakdown of polytheism and the emergence of speculative religious concepts.

Christianity, with its monotheistic worldview, turned to spiritual beauty and social community, aiming to transcend the merely material. A single divine power, as source of all natural phenomena, was strictly speaking not representable. In contrast to God's perfection, all matter appeared imperfect and transient. Early Christian art therefore ceased to be a contest with nature on its own terms and instead elevated the imperfect, even the

---

[11] Ibid., p. 4.

[12] Riegl, *Grammar*, pp. 55, 301–03; *Grammatik*, pp. 23, 217–20.

[13] The term *Weltanschauung* is notoriously problematic in intellectual history and art historiography. Riegl distanced himself from speculative metaphysics, aligning instead with post-Herbartian psychology and a universal-historical orientation. Yet by grounding formal phenomena in shifting *Weltanschauungen*, he reintroduced an idealist horizon into an ostensibly positivist framework. Later commentators have problematised this category: Arnold Hauser criticised the collective psychology implied in *Geistesgeschichte* as a conflation of style with ideology (Arnold Hauser, 'Geschichtsphilosophie der Kunst: "Kunstgeschichte ohne Namen"', in *Philosophie der Kunstgeschichte* (Munich: Beck, 1958), pp. 127–306), while E. H. Gombrich warned against treating *Weltanschauung* as an explanatory given rather than a heuristic, since it tends to obscure the historical complexity of artistic production (Ernst H. Gombrich, 'In Search of Cultural History' (1967), in *Ideals and Idols: Essays on Values in History and in Art* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1979), pp. 24–59, here pp. 41–49).

[14] Riegl, *Grammar*, p. 51; *Grammatik*, p. 21.

[15] Riegl, *Grammar*, p. 301; *Grammatik*, pp. 217–18.

[16] Riegl, *Grammar*, p. 64; *Grammatik*, p. 29.

'ugly', as bearer of spiritual beauty. Christ as Redeemer gave form to the unrepresentable God and introduced a new social element: salvation, community. As Riegl put it, the 'future could only belong to a way of thinking that would set the contest with nature decisively onto a new basis, one that would […] transplant those improvements [of nature] firmly into the spiritual realm'.[17]

Riegl described the medieval epoch as consequently characterized by a persistent tension between naturalistic and idealistic tendencies. The contest with transient but spiritually animated nature was repeatedly interrupted by resurgences of the antique conception of corporeal perfection (renascences), especially in Italy. Greater progress, Riegl noted, occurred in the North, less burdened as it was by the legacy of antiquity. In his analysis, even technical phenomena, such as the emancipation of ground from motif in the fourth and fifth centuries, were conditioned by *Weltanschauung*: the recognition of the background reflected the Christian emancipation of the humble from the dominance of the strong. Similarly, the basilica embodied the tendency toward social levelling in the West, while Byzantium developed forms that served the absolutist needs of the cult of the Empire.

As a final stage of Riegl's schema, the modern epoch was determined by the rise of natural science and the decline of religious and metaphysical authority. Miracles were no longer admissible within the sphere of natural phenomena, and art mirrored this rationalisation. Freed from its former subordination to cult or state, art emerged as a relatively autonomous sphere, directed towards the reproduction of transient empirical appearances. Modern *Naturanschauung* (perception of nature) anchored art in a positive acceptance of the visible world but also subjected it to the ceaseless flux of perception, inaugurating a new contest with nature on the basis of scientific observation and individual experience.

To substantiate these claims, Riegl analysed a set of fundamental aesthetic categories – motif (organic versus inorganic), space, and surface (haptic versus optic vision), technique, material, and purpose – and demonstrated how each was conditioned by the prevailing worldview. Although trained in a positivist milieu and attentive to empirical observation and evolutionary models, Riegl's approach was at its core relativistic. He rejected a permanent canon of beauty or unilinear progression towards naturalism. Instead, he conceived of art's development as an alternating rhythm, a pendulum swinging between periods of *Harmonismus* (idealistic unity and abstract order) and *Organismus* (naturalistic multiplicity and vitality).[18] These cycles correspond broadly to alternations between spiritual and material orientations within a culture's worldview. The art of late antiquity and the Byzantine age, for instance, was reinterpreted not as a symptom of decline but as the

[17] Riegl, *Grammar*, p. 74; *Grammatik*, p. 37.

[18] Riegl used this dichotomy synonymously with idealism and naturalism as well as stylization (*Stilismus*) and illusionism. See Riegl, *Grammar*, p. 139; *Grammatik*, pp. 13, 88.

fruition of an idealistic *Weltanschauung* governed by its own aesthetic *Wollen* and value system.

Riegl even accounted for the 'standstill' of early medieval Western art through a *geistesgeschichtliche* explanation: the inability of Christian monotheism to give adequate visible form to its religious ideal.[19] The insignificance of all worldly organic and inorganic matter in early Christianity led to an art that was essentially unartistic, forced to resort to attributes and inscriptions to fulfil its representational aims.

This diagnosis encapsulates the paradox of the *Historische Grammatik*: though framed as a positivist endeavour, its explanation of both flourishing and stagnation ultimately rested on the shifting *Weltanschauungen* of entire epochs. The text posits a strict parallelism between the evolution of art and that of worldview: 'One must always seek to know them [the worldviews] if one wants to comprehend the art of those respective peoples and times in its deepest being'.[20] With this maxim, Riegl articulated the guiding idea of his *œuvre*: art history is, in the final analysis, also intellectual history. By rooting formal change in the shifting relation of human beings to nature and to one another, he redefined style as the expression of cultural and spiritual conditions. At the same time, he cautioned against dissolving art history into cultural history, insisting on the autonomy of artistic phenomena. This careful balance – between art's internal logic and its bond with a given worldview – defines the productive tension in the *Historische Grammatik* and anticipates later debates on *Geistesgeschichte*.

II. Late Antique Art as the Expression of a Worldview: A Case Study

Riegl's theoretical principles found practical demonstration in *Die spätrömische Kunstindustrie* (1901).[21] Primarily, it was a survey of artifacts from the third to the sixth centuries – textiles, ceramics, applied arts – discovered in Austria-Hungary. But its real ambition was to overturn the entrenched 'rooted prejudices' against late antique art as one of decline and regression from classical greatness.[22] From the outset, Riegl declared his intention to elucidate the 'laws governing the development of late Roman art industry', thereby demonstrating that its seemingly 'unclassical' forms obeyed a positive internal logic and so deserved equal status in the grand narrative of art history.[23]

---

[19] Riegl, *Grammar*, pp. 67, 245; *Grammatik*, pp. 31, 175.

[20] Riegl, *Grammar*, p. 301; *Grammatik*, p. 218.

[21] Alois Riegl, *Die spätrömische Kunst-Industrie nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn im Zusammenhange mit der Gesammtentwicklung der bildenden Künste bei den Mittelmeervölkern* (Vienna: k. k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1901); Riegl, *Late Roman Art Industry. Translated from the original Viennese edition with foreword and annotations*, ed. and trans. by Rolf Winkes (Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1985). The citations/references apply to the same principle as stated in footnote 7.

[22] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 6; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 2.

[23] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 6; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 1.

A few predecessors – most notably Jacob Burckhardt – had resisted the blanket dismissal of late Roman art, though they argued from a cultural-historical rather than an internal angle. Riegl built on such precedents but differentiated his approach through visual form and perception. The transformation of Roman art, he argued, stemmed from a shift in the *Empfindungsweise* – the 'way of feeling' or sensibility – of the late Roman world, i.e., a change in *Weltanschauung*.[24] He described it as a moment when inherited ideas about divinity and the visible world were 'shaken, abandoned and replaced by new ideas', leaving artworks that represent 'a faithful image of the disturbed spiritual conditions of the time.'[25]

Riegl situated late antique art in this milieu of epochal spiritual crisis – the waning of classical pagan polytheism and the rise of new religious worldviews (Christianity, but also Neoplatonism and other 'oriental' spiritual currents) that would shape the next era.

Crucially, Riegl did not reduce his explanation to Christian versus pagan iconography.[26] He warned against overestimating narrowly defined religious content in explaining stylistic change.[27] *Spätrömische Kunstindustrie* is not a study of symbols; it focused on formal developments – abstraction, flattening, pattern – and their perceptual underpinnings, cautioning that an iconography-driven reading distracts 'from the essentially *Bildkünstlerische* […] the appearance of objects as shapes and colour on the plane or in space'.[28] His approach challenged a purely formal-genetic account. The formal transformations (the loss of classical corporeal plasticity, the emergence of frontality and linear pattern, anti-naturalistic proportions) were consistently linked by Riegl to a changing attitude toward the material world.

A key observation is the rising weight of the subjective or spiritual element. Whereas Egyptian art avoided inner feelings or individuality (by static perfection), late Roman art increasingly sought to convey mental states (*geistige Affekte*) and to rely on a subjective consciousness in both image creation and reception.[29] Illustrated manuscripts adopted continuous narrative cycles and personifications that solicited imaginative participation or 'supporting subjective consciousness' in representation.[30] Sculpture often sacrificed anatomical realism for expressive summary. For Riegl, these were not technical failures but *deliberate* adaptations reflecting a new 'artistic will'. Art was becoming *subjektiv richtiger* (subjectively more correct) even as it grew *objektiv unklarer* (objectively less clear).[31]

---

[24] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 13; *Kunst-Industrie*, pp. 8–9.

[25] Riegl, *Art Industry*, pp. 16–17; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 12.

[26] He insisted on a 'clear separation between iconography and history of art'. Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 227; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 212.

[27] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 95; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 85.

[28] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 15 (see also pp. 127–28, 227); *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 11 (pp. 119–20, 212).

[29] Riegl, *Art Industry*, pp. 25–27; *Kunst-Industrie*, pp. 20–22.

[30] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 27; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 22.

[31] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 63; *Kunst-Industrie*, pp. 55–56.

This shift from the objective to the subjective culminated in Byzantine art, where a hieratic style renounced naturalism in favour of a transcendental ideal. Eastern Christian (Byzantine) and even Islamic artists, following Riegl, consciously aligned art with religion – so much so that true artistic reform would have implied doctrinal reform, something the Orthodox East resisted.

Although his scheme remained within the field of perceptual analysis, Riegl's explanatory asides reveal an explicitly intellectual-historical dimension. The vogue for richly carved sarcophagi in the second and third centuries, for instance, is linked to an underlying idea of *Unsterblichkeitsdrang* (desire for immortality) among Greco-Roman elites.[32] The rapid change in the proportional design of sarcophagus reliefs under Diocletian resonated with upheavals in other *Culturgebiete* (cultural spheres), like politics and religion.[33]

Riegl addressed the question of Christianity's impact on art, arguing in essence that a period divided in its ethical-religious *Wollen* (pagan/Christian) could not but yield 'different and even seemingly opposite phenomena' in artistic creation.[34]

In other words, the profound ethical-religious bifurcation in late antiquity caused an artistic divergence. However, he immediately nuanced this by noting that pagans and Christians in late antique Rome belonged to the same peoples and civilization, sharing a common 'strive toward redemption through a transcendental element.'[35] Outward religious change thus manifested a deeper shift towards otherworldliness already emergent within pagan culture.

Methodically, Riegl affirmed that 'each period has its own independent *Kunstwollen*, rooted in all the other contemporary aspects of civilization'.[36] This statement encapsulates the historicist and relativist ethos of his approach: Art is both autonomous in formal logic and 'rooted' in religion, ethics, social life, etc., and is, therefore, both a law unto itself *and* a part of a larger whole.

These remarks highlight a productive tension in Riegl's thought: he related formal change to ideas such as the 'will to immortality' or a society's ethical strivings, yet refrained from a full engagement with political, social, or theological history. This restraint was deliberate, as he insisted that art history delineates its own sphere (*Bildkunst*), separate from,

---

[32] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 82; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 72.

[33] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 94; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 84.

[34] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 95; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 85.

[35] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 95; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 85.

[36] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 101; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 92. This statement is made in the form of a question that (auto)critically examines his principle in relation to the argument surrounding the reuse of older art monuments in the fourth century. However, by confirming this reuse, Riegl didn't negate his principle, but explained it in comparison with 'modern antiquarianism', which characterised the entire nineteenth century and can hardly be interpreted as a 'symptom of barbarism'. Furthermore, he saw the ethical-dogmatic direction, the primarily transcendent content of art, not as a purely Christian expression, but as a view that was equally characteristic of the late pagans (Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 106; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 96).

though parallel to, political, religious, or literary histories. This method illuminated correlations between form and worldview, without fully theorising their causal mechanisms – a task that Riegl himself described as a 'future problem of art-historical research'.[37]

The final chapter, "The Leading Characteristics of Late Roman *Kunstwollen*", serves as methodological epilogue. The 'artistic will' of an epoch, Riegl argued, is illuminated by 'the comparative use of literary sources by the late Romans concerning *Kunstwollen* in artistic creation'.[38] Against Semper's materialist theory – which dismissed such evidence as 'speculative fantasies'[39] and refused to admit the existence of *Kunstwollen* as an expression of a worldview – Riegl argued for a 'new art history' by acknowledging the value of such evidence and synthesizing formal analysis with intellectual history.[40] Yet, he did not advocate a return to the 'speculative' aesthetics of nineteenth-century idealist philosophers. By studying, for example, Augustine's understanding of art, Riegl did not want to engage with an abstract aesthetic theory as modern philosophers had done but rather to focus on passages where concrete artworks or artistic practices were discussed. Thus, the study of *bildkünstlerisches Wollen* (pictorial/visual will) must be sharply distinguished from the study of 'poetic and religious *Wollen*',[41] though ultimately bridges between them can be built.

Despite this methodological caution, Riegl's climactic summation is unequivocal: the *Kunstwollen* of antiquity's final phase is 'practically identical with other major forms of expression of the human *Wollen* during the same period'.[42] All human *Wollen* is directed towards shaping a satisfying relationship of man to the world; the *bildende Kunstwollen* (plastic-art will) regulates mankind's relation to the sensually perceptible appearance of things, expressing the way in which a given time *wants to see* things shaped or coloured. 'The character of this *Wollen*', he added, 'is always determined by what may be termed the conception of the world at a given time (*Weltanschauung*) […], not only in religion, philosophy, science, but also in government and law'.[43] The dominant cultural expression (for example, a religious ideology or a philosophical paradigm) usually sets the tone for the era, but all expressions share the same fundamental orientation. Riegl closed his argument by justifying the study of late Roman art through its significance 'within the general history of civilization'.[44]

---

[37] Riegl used the term *Aufgabe* which is more likely to be translated as 'task'. Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 225; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 211.

[38] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 225; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 210.

[39] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 225; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 211.

[40] Alois Riegl, 'Eine neue Kunstgeschichte' (Review of Cornelius Gurlitt, *Geschichte der Kunst*), *Wiener Abendpost. Beilage zur Wiener Zeitung*, 15 (1902), pp. 7–8.

[41] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 227; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 212.

[42] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 231; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 215.

[43] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 231; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 215.

[44] Riegl, *Art Industry*, p. 231; *Kunst-Industrie*, p. 215. This is a strong endorsement of art history's contribution to universal history, a point he had already argued in his 1898 essay *Kunstgeschichte und Universalgeschichte* (in *Festgaben zu Ehren Max Büdingers von seinen Freunden und Schülern* (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1898), pp. 449–57), where he insisted that art history is an integral part of – and key to understanding – general history.

Thus, *Die spätrömische Kunstindustrie* operationalises his idea of a 'historical grammar' of art: formal change follows an inner logic, yet is inseparable from shifts in worldview and collective *Wollen*. The consistency with the theoretical principles of the *Grammatik* is striking: the historical relativity of artistic values to their time, the inner coherence of each period's style, and the primacy of an internal *Wollen* shaping art's evolution.

Any residual tension stems from Riegl's deliberate methodological restraint: he kept analysis of form 'pure', even as his findings pressed towards synthesis. Yet, as we have seen, he could not avoid engaging with intellectual history in substance – it was embedded in his notion of *Kunstwollen*.[45] This self-imposed limitation meant that Riegl's work remained a step away from a true practical *Geistesgeschichte* integration. He provided the theoretical reflections and identified the problems (e.g., how to reconcile art's autonomy with the context of its worldview) but left it to the next generation to deepen the synthesis.

As Otto Pächt later observed, Riegl's work offered 'the first adumbration of that often so hybrid type of enquiry which later became known under the programmatic title of art history as history of the spirit of the time', bridging pure formalism and cultural meaning.[46] At the time of his death in 1905, Riegl had furnished art history with a powerful new conceptual apparatus that challenged the formalist-genealogical approach to which he had himself contributed.

III. Riegl, Dvořák, and the Origins of *Geistesgeschichte*

In contemporary art historiography, Max Dvořák (1874–1921), Riegl's pupil and eventual successor in Vienna, is still widely regarded as the driving force behind the introduction of the model of art history as intellectual history. The phrase *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte* is indelibly associated with him, above all because of the posthumous anthology of his writings published under that title in 1924.[47] In those works, he interpreted art as an expression of the spiritual life of its age, reflecting philosophical, religious, and ethical ideas rather than merely a sequence of formal styles. His trajectory seemed to confirm the story of a decisive *Wende* (turning point): from an early career as a rigorous historian and stylistic analyst to a late phase devoted to the apocalyptic and mystical expressions of

[45] Riegl's subsequent work shows the same interplay of form, function, and idea. See, most notably, Alois Riegl, 'Das holländische Gruppenporträt', *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 23 (1902), pp. 71–278. Further reading: Michael Gubser, 'Riegl, Phenomenology, and the Ethics of Vision', *Umění/Art*, 66.3 (2018), pp. 146–57; Benjamin Binstock, 'Aloïs Riegl and the Riddle of Rembrandt's Staalmeesters: Vienna Schooling Dutch Art Scholarship', *Journal of Art Historiography*, 29.2 (2023), pp. 1–23.

[46] Otto Pächt, 'Art Historians and Art Critics – VI: Alois Riegl', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, 55.722 (1963), pp. 188–93, here p. 191.

[47] Max Dvořák, *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte. Studien zur abendländischen Kunstentwicklung*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda and Johannes Wilde (Munich: Piper, 1924).

Dürer, El Greco, and Brueghel. Against this received narrative, my reading of Riegl's texts, as set out before, locates the *geistesgeschichtliche* frame already around 1900.

In this sense, contemporary scholars also recognised that Dvořák's achievement was not born in isolation. In his obituary of 1921, Julius von Schlosser emphasised that although Dvořák had been personally close to Franz Wickhoff, 'there can be no doubt that Dvořák increasingly became the true successor of [Riegl].'[48] Dvořák himself acknowledged Riegl's role as a pioneer: in the obituary for his teacher, he praised him as a scholar who had overcome cultural antiquarianism and dogmatic aesthetics, founding instead a method that understood art history as both a historical and psychological phenomenon.[49] Together with Wickhoff, Riegl had rejected the 'absolute aesthetic' approach and disrupted the established order of Winckelmann and Burckhardt by elevating non-classical art to equal status.

In his methodological article of 1913, published in *Die Geisteswissenschaften*,[50] Dvořák reiterated that the questions occupying the discipline had been decisively shaped by his teachers. Their conviction, he explained, was that the essence of art history lay in a historical-genetic method, which eradicated the dogmatic aestheticism and dilettantism of earlier generations. By circumscribing the art-historical field, distinguishing it from both the natural sciences and speculative philosophy, and insisting that its focus may be trained on what 'is specific to a particular time and place, dependent on human *Wollen* and capacity, on cultural development and advances in intellectual life,'[51] Dvořák essentially embraced the theoretical foundations established by Riegl. Read alongside Riegl's manuscripts, this admission corroborates a sequence in which the conceptual architecture precedes its later, expressionist inflection.

Subsequent commentators have reinforced this genealogy. Hans Sedlmayr identified idealistic tendencies in Riegl's *œuvre*.[52] Similarly, Margaret Olin showed that Riegl's formal categories were inseparable from cultural and ethical meanings.[53] Willibald Sauerländer described Riegl's method as an 'aestheticized historic morphology of worldviews'.[54] Jörg

[48] Julius von Schlosser, 'Prof. Dr. Max Dvořák', *Almanach der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, 71 (1921), pp. 253–59, here p. 254. My translation.

[49] Max Dvořák, 'Alois Riegl', *Mitteilungen der k. k. Zentral-Kommission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst- und historischen Denkmale*, 3.4 (1905), pp. 255–76, here p. 268.

[50] Max Dvořák, 'Über die dringendsten methodischen Erfordernisse der Erziehung zur kunstgeschichtlichen Forschung', *Die Geisteswissenschaften. Wochenschrift für das gesamte Gebiet der Philosophie etc.*, 1.34/35 (1913), pp. 932–36, 958–61. The quotations refer to the reprint in *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 27 (1974), pp. 7–19.

[51] Max Dvořák, 'Methodische Erfordernisse', p. 10. My translation.

[52] Hans Sedlmayr, 'Einleitung. Die Quintessenz der Lehren Riegls', in Alois Riegl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda (Augsburg: Benno Filser, 1929), pp. xii–xxxiv, here p. xxxiii.

[53] Margaret Olin, 'Forms of Respect: Alois Riegl's Concept of Attentiveness', *The Art Bulletin*, 71.2 (1989), pp. 285–99.

[54] Willibald Sauerländer, 'Alois Riegl und die Entstehung der autonomen Kunstgeschichte am Fin de siècle', in *Fin de Siècle. Zu Literatur und Kunst der Jahrhundertwende*, ed. by Roger Bauer et al. (Frankfurt a. M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977), pp. 125–39, here p. 136. My translation.

Oberhaidacher underlined that Riegl's attention to *Stimmung* and optical impression marked a genuine break with dualistic aesthetics and opened the way to a historical understanding of art's 'spiritual experience.'[55] Julius von Schlosser, in his retrospective assessment of the Vienna School, even cast Riegl as a 'true "reversed prophet" of that artistic current of "Expressionism"',[56] whose 'nearly tragic intellectual struggle' marked the turning point 'between the impressionist-positivist thought of the 19th and the expressionist-idealist thought of the 20th century'.[57]

The comparison between teacher and student becomes sharper when set against the shifting intellectual environment noted by Schlosser. Riegl's framework emerged from the late nineteenth-century historicist tradition and the emergence of the *Geisteswissenschaften*. Following Wilhelm Dilthey, these disciplines – history, religion, philology, and the arts – claimed autonomy and equal standing alongside the natural sciences, grounded not in causal *Erklären* (explanation) but in hermeneutic *Verstehen* (understanding). Riegl, to my knowledge, did not explicitly adopt Dilthey's programme,[58] yet his search for a causal nexus in art reveals the same ambition to secure art history's scientific legitimacy while still understanding it as a product of human cultural striving. In this sense, the metaphor of historical *grammar* is particularly compelling: The *Historische Grammatik* was, in effect, an art-historical counterpart to the wider hermeneutic programme.

Both Riegl and Dvořák received a strict education in the historical and auxiliary sciences at the Institute of Austrian Historical Research under Theodor von Sickel, inspired by nineteenth-century historical scholarship (*Geschichtswissenschaft*). Thus, Dvořák inherited this framework, but his later approach resonated strongly with the Expressionist atmosphere of the 1910s and 1920s. While Hermann Bahr outlined that Riegl had made *Kunstwissenschaft* into a *Geisteswissenschaft*,[59] Riegl, however, clearly counted himself among those who fought for an autonomous 'positivist' art history.[60] This self-positioning is compatible with the theoretical frame reconstructed above: methodological rigour coexists with a *geistesgeschichtlich* account of development that is genetic rather than teleological.

---

[55] Jörg Oberhaidacher, 'Riegls Idee einer theoretischen Einheit von Gegenstand und Betrachter und ihre Folgen für die Kunstgeschichte', *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 38 (1985), pp. 199–218. My translation.

[56] Julius von Schlosser, 'Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte. Rückblick auf ein Säkulum deutscher Gelehrtenarbeit in Österreich', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung, Ergänzungsband* 13.2 (1934), pp. 145–228, here p. 189; 'The Vienna school of the history of art – review of a century of Austrian scholarship in German', trans. by Karl Johns, *Journal of Art Historiography*, 1 (2009), pp. 1–50, here p. 34.

[57] Schlosser, 'Die Wiener Schule', p. 192; 'The Vienna school', p. 36.

[58] Dvořák, instead, in his later works directly refered to him. See, Dvořák, *Kunstgeschichte*, pp. 5, 53, 111, 120.

[59] Hermann Bahr, *Expressionismus* (Munich: Delphin, 1920), p. 71. Bahr also drew attention to the 'memorable' final chapter of *Spätrömische Kunstindustrie*: 'Discoveries of such power that one would like to cry out are presented with the utmost composure, rather indifferently, almost carelessly, preferably in footnotes, as if they could be assumed to be already well known to everyone'. Bahr, *Expressionismus*, p. 74. My translation.

[60] Riegl, *Naturwerk*, p. 4; Sedlmayr, *Einleitung*, p. xxxiv.

The years surrounding the First World War represented the height of Expressionist art and thought, and Dvořák's later writings on El Greco and contemporary art were suffused with an almost expressionistic passion. Franz Theodor Csokor recalled conversations with Dvořák shortly before his death in which the art historian enthused about Expressionist drama (Ernst Toller's *Wandlung* and Georg Kaiser's *Gas*), redefined Shakespeare as a representative of Mannerism, and even entertained the idea of replacing Riegl's *Kunstwollen* with a more urgent *Kunstmüssen*, supplemented by *Sehnen* (yearning): 'All art', Dvořák remarked, 'is born of yearning and necessity'.[61] Such a testimony reveals how deeply his sensibility was attuned to expressionist intellectual currents, stimulated by former pupils like Csokor.

This contrast helps explain why Dvořák's role has so often eclipsed Riegl's. His rhetoric of spiritual crisis, his proximity to avant-garde sensibilities, and his alignment of historical interpretation with contemporary intellectual moods gave his writings a resonance that Riegl's more systematic and encompassing framework missed. Focusing on the conceptual architecture reconstructed from Riegl's texts, however, shifts precedence: it is Riegl – not Dvořák – who first articulated the *geistesgeschichtliche* orientation of Viennese art history;[62] Dvořák's contribution, though significant, then appears as elaboration and expansion rather than basic invention.

Conclusion

The discipline's historiography thus requires rectification. Dvořák's *Geistesgeschichte* should not be seen as a sudden innovation of the 1910s, but as the outgrowth of a line of thought established by Riegl in the 1890s. As Hans Tietze observed three decades after Riegl's death, many of his 'seeds' sprouted only later.[63] Dvořák was among the most important cultivators of those seeds, adapting them to a changed intellectual climate marked by Expressionism and the aftermath of the First World War.

This longer genealogy was already recognised in the interwar years. Robert Oertel identified Riegl as the first to build a systematic bridge between *Kunstwissenschaft* and *Geistesgeschichte* by relating early Christian art to Augustine,[64] while Walter Benjamin cast Riegl – not Wölfflin – as the pivotal figure who furnished the discipline with a rigorous yet

---

[61] Franz Theodor Csokor, 'In memoriam Max Dvořák', *Der Merker. Österreichische Zeitschrift für Musik und Theater*, 12.2 (1921), pp. 185–86, here p. 186. My translation.

[62] Riegl himself praised Cornelius Gurlitt's studies for their conviction that an *Einheitsprinzip* (unifying principle) existed in the evolution of art and other intellectual forms. See Riegl, *Neue Kunstgeschichte*, pp. 48–49. Other early examples of this approach can be found in the work of scholars such as Hermann Nohl, Ludwig Coellen, Wilhem Pinder, and Wilhem Worringer.

[63] Hans Tietze, 'Alois Riegl', *Neue Österreichische Biographie 1815–1918*, VIII (Amalthea, 1935), pp. 142–48, here p. 148.

[64] Robert Oertel, Review of Edgar Wind, 'Einleitung' in *Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliographie zum Nachleben der Antike* (1931), *Kritische Berichte zur kunstgeschichtlichen Literatur*, 5 (1932), pp. 33–40, here p. 36.

intellectually expansive foundation.[65] These reflections show that Riegl's pioneering role was not absent but simply overshadowed by Dvořák's more immediate resonance.

Seen in this light, the 'turn' toward intellectual history appears as a process rather than the achievement of a single figure. As Oertel suggested, before reaching a synthesis of art history/science and intellectual history, the historical sciences required prior differentiation into 'autonomous' disciplines;[66] nineteenth-century cultural history, positivist antiquarianism, and materialist/formalist approaches all are part of this prehistory. Within it, Riegl's manifold contributions – as stressed by Ján Bakoš – include dismantling the myth of 'continuous progress' in art (not by denying historical and 'genetic' development but by rejecting a positivist teleology that measures all art against a single normative ideal), disputing the equation of art with nature-mimesis, denying *a priori* stylistic norms, and insisting on the legitimacy of specifically art-historical 'problems'.[67] Dvořák openly adopted this historically grounded method and the conviction that, while artistic expression is bound to a period's socio-cultural manifestations, art history must retain its disciplinary autonomy.[68]

The *Historische Grammatik*, though unpublished in Riegl's lifetime, stands as his theoretical testament: a manifesto for a total history of human seeing and making, tied to the shifting ways humanity conceives its world. *Spätrömische Kunstindustrie* closes with a justification of late antiquity by its significance 'within the general history of civilization'. This sentiment encapsulates his legacy: not an antiquarian chronicle of styles nor a purely technical study of forms, but a humanistic project in which art history is inseparable from intellectual history.

The afterlife of these ideas confirms the point. Otto Pächt's work extends Riegl's unfinished project toward a systematic *art history of vision*. In this sense, the *Grammatik* is both a culmination of nineteenth-century historicism and the seedbed of twentieth-century *Geistesgeschichte*. Today, as the field seeks interdisciplinary resonance, Riegl's vision of art as an expression of worldviews appears more topical than ever.

---

[65] Walter Benjamin, 'Strenge Kunstwissenschaft. Zum ersten Bande der "Kunstwissenschaftlichen Forschungen"', *Frankfurter Zeitung. Morgenblatt. Literaturblatt*, 78.561/31 (30 July 1931), p. 5.

[66] Oertel, Review of Wind, p. 36.

[67] Ján Bakoš, 'The Vienna School's Views of the Structure of the Art Historical Process', in *Wien und die Entwicklung der kunsthistorischen Methode. Akten des XXV. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte. 4–10 September 1983*, I, ed. by Stefan Krenn and Martina Pippal (Vienna: Böhlau, 1984), pp. 117–22.

[68] This argument can be supported by having a closer look at Dvořák's university lectures on Italian Renaissance art. While an interest in cultural and religious factors is undoubtedly present, Dvořák's attention is still dedicated to formal problems in an equal manner. See Max Dvořák, *Geschichte der italienischen Kunst im Zeitalter der Renaissance. Akademische Vorlesungen*, I, *Das 14. und 15. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda and Johannes Wilde (Munich: Piper, 1927).

Bibliography

Bahr, Hermann, *Expressionismus* (Munich: Delphin, 1920).

——, *Überwindung des Naturalismus*, ed. by Claus Pias (VDG: Weimar, 2004).

Bakoš, Ján, 'The Vienna School's Views of the Structure of the Art Historical Process', in *Wien und die Entwicklung der kunsthistorischen Methode. Akten des XXV. Internationalen Kongresses für Kunstgeschichte. 4–10 September 1983*, I, ed. by Stefan Krenn and Martina Pippal (Vienna: Böhlau, 1984), pp. 117–22.

Benjamin, Walter, 'Strenge Kunstwissenschaft. Zum ersten Bande der "Kunstwissenschaftlichen Forschungen"', *Frankfurter Zeitung. Morgenblatt. Literaturblatt*, 78.561/31 (1931), p. 5; repr. in *Gesammelte Schriften*, III (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1982), pp. 363–74; Eng. trans. 'Rigorous Study of Art', trans. by Thomas Y. Levin, *October*, 47.4 (1988), pp. 84–90.

Binstock, Benjamin, 'Aloïs Riegl and the Riddle of Rembrandt's Staalmeesters: Vienna Schooling Dutch Art Scholarship', *Journal of Art Historiography*, 29.2 (2023), pp. 1–23.

——, 'Aloïs Riegl, Monumental Ruin. Why We Still Need to Read Historical Grammar of the Visual Arts', in Alois Riegl, *Historical Grammar of the Visual Arts*, ed. by Benjamin Binstock, trans. by Jacqueline E. Jung (New York: Zone Books, 2004).

Clarke, Jay A., 'Neo-Idealism, Expressionism, and the Writing of Art History', *Art Institute of Chicago Museum Studies*, 28.1 (2002), pp. 24–37, 107–8.

Csokor, Franz Theodor, 'In memoriam Max Dvořák', *Der Merker. Österreichische Zeitschrift für Musik und Theater*, 12.2 (1921), pp. 185–86.

Dvořák, Max, *Geschichte der italienischen Kunst im Zeitalter der Renaissance. Akademische Vorlesungen*, I, *Das 14. und 15. Jahrhundert*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda and Johannes Wilde (Munich: Piper, 1927).

——, *Kunstgeschichte als Geistesgeschichte. Studien zur abendländischen Kunstentwicklung*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda and Johannes Wilde (Munich: Piper, 1924).

——, 'Über die dringendsten methodischen Erfordernisse der Erziehung zur kunstgeschichtlichen Forschung', *Die Geisteswissenschaften. Wochenschrift für das gesamte Gebiet der Philosophie etc.*, 1.34/35 (1913), pp. 932–36, 958–61: repr. in *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 27 (1974), pp. 7–19.

——, 'Alois Riegl', *Mitteilungen der k. k. Zentral-Kommission zur Erforschung und Erhaltung der Kunst- und historischen Denkmale*, 3.4 (1905), pp. 255–76; repr. in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kunstgeschichte*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda and Johannes Wilde (Munich: Piper, 1929), pp. 279–98.

Elsner, Jaś, 'From Empirical Evidence to the Big Picture: Some Reflections on Riegl's Concept of "Kunstwollen"', *Critical Inquiry*, 32.4 (2006), pp. 741–66.

Freese, Annelie, *Rudolf Euckens Philosophie des Geisteslebens als eine Philosophie des Lebens* (PhD thesis: Universität Erfurt, 2019).

Gombrich, Ernst H., 'In Search of Cultural History' (1967), in *Ideals and Idols: Essays on Values in History and in Art* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1979), pp. 24–59.

Gubser, Michael, 'Riegl, Phenomenology, and the Ethics of Vision', *Umění/Art*, 66.3 (2018), pp. 146–57.

Hauser, Arnold, 'Geschichtsphilosophie der Kunst: "Kunstgeschichte ohne Namen"', in *Philosophie der Kunstgeschichte* (Munich: Beck, 1958), pp. 127–306; Eng. trans. 'The Philosophical Implications of Art History: "Art History Without Names"', in *The Philosophy of Art History* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1959), pp. 117–276.

Lehmann, Gerhard, 'Neuidealismus', in *Geschichte der Philosophie, X, Die Philosophie im ersten Drittel des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts. Teil 1* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1957), pp. 12–64.

Muther, Richard, *Geschichte der Malerei im XIX. Jahrhundert*, III (Munich: Hirth, 1894).

Oberhaidacher, Jörg, 'Riegls Idee einer theoretischen Einheit von Gegenstand und Betrachter und ihre Folgen für die Kunstgeschichte', *Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte*, 38 (1985), pp. 199–218.

Oertel, Robert, Review of Edgar Wind, 'Einleitung' in *Kulturwissenschaftliche Bibliographie zum Nachleben der Antike* (1931), *Kritische Berichte zur kunstgeschichtlichen Literatur*, 5 (1932), pp. 33–40.

Olin, Margaret, 'Forms of Respect: Alois Riegl's Concept of Attentiveness', *The Art Bulletin*, 71.2 (1989), pp. 285–99.

Pächt, Otto, 'Art Historians and Art Critics – VI: Alois Riegl', *The Burlington Magazine for Connoisseurs*, 55.722 (1963), pp. 188–93.

Pinotti, Andrea, 'Introduzione all'edizione italiana', in Alois Riegl, *Grammatica storica delle arti figurative*, ed. by Andrea Pinotti, trans. by Carmela Armentano (Macerata: Quodlibet, 2020), pp. vii–lxv.

Reichenberger, Andrea, *Riegls 'Kunstwollen': Versuch einer Neubetrachtung* (Sankt Augustin: Academia, 2003).

Reynolds Cordileone, Diana, *Alois Riegl in Vienna, 1879–1905: An Institutional Biography* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

Riegl, Alois, *Historische Grammatik der bildenden Künste*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda and Otto Pächt (Graz: Böhlau, 1966); Eng. trans. *Historical Grammar of the Visual Arts*, ed. by Benjamin Binstock, trans. by Jacqueline E. Jung (New York: Zone Books, 2004).

——, 'Das holländische Gruppenporträt', *Jahrbuch der kunsthistorischen Sammlungen des Allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses*, 23 (1902), pp. 71–278; repr. by Karl Maria Swoboda (Vienna: Österreichische Staatsdruckerei, 1931); Eng. trans. *The Group Portraiture of Holland*, ed. by Wolfgang Kemp, trans. by Evelyn M. Kain (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, 1999).

——, 'Eine neue Kunstgeschichte' (Review of Cornelius Gurlitt, 'Geschichte der Kunst'), *Wiener Abendpost. Beilage zur Wiener Zeitung*, 15 (1902), pp. 7–8; repr. in *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda (Augsburg: Benno Filser, 1929), pp. 43–50.

——, *Die spätrömische Kunst-Industrie nach den Funden in Österreich-Ungarn im Zusammenhange mit der Gesammtentwicklung der bildenden Künste bei den Mittelmeervölkern* (Vienna: k. k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1901); Eng. trans. *Late Roman Art Industry. Translated from the original Viennese edition with foreword and annotations*, ed. and trans. by Rolf Winkes (Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider, 1985).

——, 'Naturwerk und Kunstwerk', *Allgemeine Zeitung. Beilage*, 13/48 (16 January/27 February 1901), pp. 1–5, 1–3; repr. in *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda (Augsburg: Benno Filser, 1929), pp. 51–64; Eng. trans. 'Work of nature, work of art', trans. by Benjamin Anderson (March 2019). <https://bunyaminanderson.com/Naturwerk-und-Kunstwerk> [accessed 6 September 2025]

——, 'Kunstgeschichte und Universalgeschichte', in *Festgaben zu Ehren Max Büdingers von seinen Freunden und Schülern* (Innsbruck: Wagner, 1898), pp. 449–57; repr. in *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda (Augsburg: Benno Filser, 1929), pp. 4–9.

Sauerländer, Willibald, 'Alois Riegl und die Entstehung der autonomen Kunstgeschichte am Fin de siècle', in *Fin de Siècle. Zu Literatur und Kunst der Jahrhundertwende*, ed. by Roger Bauer et al. (Frankfurt a. M.: Vittorio Klostermann, 1977), pp. 125–39.

Scarrocchia, Sandro, *Oltre la storia dell'arte: Alois Riegl vita e opere di un protagonista della cultura viennese* (Milan: Marinotti, 2006).

Schlosser, Julius von, 'Die Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte. Rückblick auf ein Säkulum deutscher Gelehrtenarbeit in Österreich', *Mitteilungen des Instituts für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung*, Ergänzungsband 13.2 (1934), pp. 145–228; Eng. trans. 'The Vienna School of the History of Art – Review of a Century of Austrian Scholarship in German', trans. by Karl Johns, *Journal of Art Historiography*, 1 (2009), pp. 1–50.

——, 'Prof. Dr. Max Dvořák', *Almanach der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien*, 71 (1921), pp. 253–59.

Sedlmayr, Hans, 'Einleitung. Die Quintessenz der Lehren Riegls', in Alois Riegl, *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, ed. by Karl Maria Swoboda (Augsburg: Benno Filser, 1929), pp. xii–xxxiv.

Smith, Kimberly A. (ed.), *The Expressionist Turn in Art History. A Critical Anthology, Studies in Art Historiography* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2014).

Tietze, Hans, 'Alois Riegl', *Neue österreichische Biographie 1815–1918*, VIII (Zürich: Amalthea, 1935), pp. 142–48.

Vasold, Georg, *Alois Riegl und die Kunstgeschichte als Kulturgeschichte: Überlegungen zum Frühwerk des Wiener Gelehrten* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach, 2004).

Vom Bruch, Rüdiger, et al. (eds.), *Kultur und Kulturwissenschaften um 1900: Idealismus und Positivismus*, II (Stuttgart: Steiner, 1997).