

**Thomas Wallnig, Johannes Frimmel,  
Werner Telesko (Eds.)**

# **18<sup>th</sup> Century Studies in Austria 1945–2010**



**Leseprobe**

**The Eighteenth Century And The Habsburg Monarchy  
International Series, Vol. 4**

# Contents

<u>JOHANNES FRIMMEL, WERNER TELESKO, THOMAS WALLNIG</u> <u>Introduction .....</u>	<u>7</u>
<u>MICHAEL HOCHEDLINGER</u> <u>Political History .....</u>	<u>13</u>
<u>THOMAS WALLNIG</u> <u>Approaches to the “Aufklärung” in Austrian Historiography after 1945 .....</u>	<u>33</u>
<u>MARIANNE KLEMUN</u> <u>History of Science .....</u>	<u>51</u>
<u>ELKE HAMMER-LUZA</u> <u>Economic and Social History .....</u>	<u>71</u>
<u>ANDREA GRIESEBNER</u> <u>History, Universities, and Professors: Women and Gender in Early Modern Historiography in Austria .....</u>	<u>91</u>
<u>MARTIN SCHEUTZ</u> <u>Unchristian Violence, Bestial Sexuality, Werewolves and Compassion in a Crisis. Historical Criminology in Austria since 1945 .....</u>	<u>111</u>
<u>WERNER TELESKO</u> <u>Visual Arts and Iconography .....</u>	<u>131</u>
<u>HERBERT KARNER</u> <u>Approaches and Tendencies in Architectural History .....</u>	<u>149</u>
<u>THOMAS HOCHRADNER</u> <u>Trends and Perspectives in Musicology .....</u>	<u>167</u>
<u>WERNER MICHLER</u> <u>Austrian Literature of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century .....</u>	<u>187</u>
<u>BEATE HOCHHOLDINGER-REITERER</u> <u>Theatre History .....</u>	<u>207</u>

<u>JOHANNES FRIMMEL</u> <u>History of Books .....</u>	<u>227</u>
<u>MARTIN GASTEINER, JOSEF KÖSTLBAUER</u> <u>How Digital Media Challenge Research on the Eighteenth Century .....</u>	<u>245</u>
<u>MARION ROMBERG</u> <u>The Austrian Society for Eighteenth Century Studies. A Brief Historical</u> <u>Overview .....</u>	<u>261</u>
Authors .....	281

## Introduction

JOHANNES FRIMMEL, WERNER TELESKO, THOMAS WALLNIG

The process of critical self-reflection among professional historians is currently as fashionable<sup>1</sup> as tracking down the “Master Narratives” of historiographical representation.<sup>2</sup> The potential interdependency of the two developments is obvious. In this process comparatively little attention has been paid – in Austria and elsewhere – to the 18<sup>th</sup> century, perhaps because, at least in Western Europe, it has less frequently been required to function as a projection screen for national and/or totalitarian images of history. Perhaps it is also because one of its main narratives – “Enlightenment” – is one of the few monumental historical concepts that are only now starting to be gradually subjected to the comprehensive process of deconstruction that result from the postmodern philosophy of history. In this it is appropriate to make a precise distinction between philosophical deconstruction and philosophical relativization.<sup>3</sup>

Surprisingly “writing about the 18<sup>th</sup> century” has, in the past, rarely been a subject of historiographic interest, and the World Congress of the “International Society for 18<sup>th</sup> Century Studies” in Graz in 2011 is, on the one hand, a

- 
- 1 For example: MARGARETHE GRANDNER/GERNOT HEISS/OLIVER RATHKOLB (Hg.), *Zukunft mit Altlasten. Die Universität Wien 1945-1955*. Innsbruck – Wien 2005; KAREL HRUZA, *Österreichische Historiker 1900-1945. Lebensläufe und Karrieren in Österreich, Deutschland und der Tschechoslowakei in wissenschaftsgeschichtlichen Portraits*. Wien 2008; HORST FUHRMANN, “Sind eben alles Menschen gewesen.” *Gelehrtenleben im 19. und 20. Jahrhundert, dargestellt am Beispiel der Monumenta Germaniae Historica und ihrer Mitarbeiter*. München 1996; HARTMUT LEHMANN/JAMES VAN HORN MELTON (Hg.), *Paths of Continuity. Central European Historiography from the 1930s to the 1950s*. Cambridge – New York 1994; MARTIN SCHEUTZ/ARNO STROHMEYER (Hg.), *Was heißt und wozu “österreichische” Geschichte?* Innsbruck 2008; WOLFGANG WEBER, *Priester der Klio. Historisch-sozialwissenschaftliche Studien zur Herkunft und Karriere deutscher Historiker und zur Geschichte der Geschichtswissenschaft 1800–1970*. Frankfurt a.M. 1984. The collection *Geisteswissenschaften im Nationalsozialismus* that is relevant to the questions considered here was only published during the editorial stages of the present volume and so could not be considered by all contributors to this book; MITCHELL G. ASH/WOLFRAM NIESS/RAMON PILS (Hg.), *Geisteswissenschaften im Nationalsozialismus. Das Beispiel der Universität Wien*. Göttingen 2010.
  - 2 For instance, for the Middle Ages: FRANK REXROTH (Hg.), *Meistererzählungen vom Mittelalter: Epochenimaginationen und Verlaufsmuster in der Praxis mediävistischer Disziplinen*. München 2007; for national narratives: HANS PETER HYE/BRIGITTE MAZOHL/JAN PAUL NIEDERKORN, (Hg.), *Nationalgeschichte als Artefakt. Zum Paradigma “Nationalstaat” in den Historiographien Deutschlands, Italiens und Österreichs*. Wien 2009.
  - 3 THEODOR W. ADORNO/MAX HORKHEIMER, *Philosophische Fragmente*. New York 1944 [subsequent editions under the title *Dialektik der Aufklärung*]. JONATHAN I. ISRAEL, *Enlightenment Contested. Philosophy, Modernity, and the Emancipation of Man 1670-1752*. Oxford u.a. 2006.

welcome opportunity for the editors of this volume to give an overview of the current Austrian research landscape and its traditions, and, on the other hand, to set in motion a process of reflection within Austrian research on the 18<sup>th</sup> century. For this reason, the great majority of the contributions in this volume have been produced by researchers who belong to the younger generation. As a result, an awareness of the institutional arbitrariness and thematic transitoriness of research developments can be integrated together with the kind of structure-perceiving view that makes it possible to construct interrelationships. The choice of contributors was also subject to a process of selection by the editors, as each of the research developments in question had to be commented upon from a particular point of view. Different interests would have resulted in different emphases in which such subjects and research paradigms as Ethnology, Global History, Church History, History, Legal History, various Philologies, and many others could and would have required much more space than could be provided in the present volume.

The single contributions follow a common scheme of content and precise quantitative parameters. They are intended, on the one hand, to give an overview of the most important research approaches and achievements; on the other hand, they present some of the most prominent researchers and institutions as well as giving an account of the main methodological discussions in the field. Depending on the discipline and research direction under discussion, it was both possible and necessary to formulate this concept as flexibly as possible.

For various reasons that may readily be understood – including the absence of any complete overview of Austrian writing either from within the subjects treated here, or from external sources – it is not possible to achieve a complete bibliography. It seemed more expedient to treat the “major works” of each discipline alongside with a series of supplementary contributions, and these together would provide a convincing overall picture. In this sense a particular paper monograph or article cited frequently may represent *pars pro toto* a whole series of similarly oriented works by a particular author. This is also appropriately argued in the papers themselves. The present publication, for reasons of content, deals not only with writings in the strictly academic sense, but also with other significant genres of the period under consideration – in particular textual and catalogue contributions in exhibition catalogues, which played an important role after 1945 in the scholarly and popular transmission of historical information. In addition, attention is paid to the networking of Austrian research in the international context, with corresponding bibliographical illustration.

The critical representation of research history was a major challenge for every author in this volume – not least because of the fact that many of the scholars mentioned in the text are colleagues (and teachers) of the authors in the book. The desire for an appropriate contextualization within the “scientific community” had to be combined here with the essential sensitivity of judgment. The

focus, however, is not only on research *history*, but simultaneously – because of an awareness of both the historical and the contemporary situation – there is an attempt to formulate research desiderata that will direct our attention to a possible further development of the disciplines in question.

The design for the content of the book is derived from the present-day borders of the Republic of Austria, and it seeks – having regard to all the unavoidable limitations – to cover as broad a spectrum of disciplines as possible. In all of the papers it is fundamentally striking that personal, institutional and intellectual continuities from the inter-war years and the age of National Socialism continued to have an effect far into the following decades. On this basis we may perceive, in many respects, a largely conservative academic climate, and, in the face of striking fears of contact, this has evidenced more intensively conducted methodological discourses of a social historical character since the 1970s. This volume, however, also depicts more recent research approaches that have grown out of these very discourses. What would therefore be rewarding, in a future comprehensive project, would be a fuller assessment of the totality of the Austrian research landscape.

History is without doubt the subject which, as far as research on the 18<sup>th</sup> century in Austria is concerned, has the greatest degree of diversity. This is true both from the institutional point of view, in respect of the large number of professorial chairs and academic approaches, and also of the number of publications. Accordingly, the subject of History is represented by several contributions: Michael Hochedlinger outlines a kind of Political History that has increasingly gone on the defensive, and that to a large extent has been shaped by research outside Austria. Thomas Wallnig tries to historicize the traditional “Geistesgeschichte” approach to the Austrian “Aufklärung” by shedding light on the corresponding historical, theological and philosophical research contexts. He traces ideas from the histories of the Humanities, Philosophy and Theology and the History of Ideas on the topic of “Enlightenment”. Marianne Klemun’s contribution is concerned with the development of the History of Science paradigm, particularly fruitful in relation to the 18<sup>th</sup> century, in the tension between “internalist” and “externalist” approaches. Elke Hammer-Luza presents an overview of Economic and Social History rooted in the inter-war years, stressing in particular its origins in Regional History. Two more recent trends that have developed in this field, and grown beyond it, are dealt with by Andrea Griesebner and Martin Scheutz: Women’s and Gender History in Early Modern times is presented from the perspective of the presence of women in Austrian tertiary institutions; and the History of Crime is examined in its many related fields in Legal and Social History.

The “Baroque splendour” of the Austrian Counter-Reformation, traditionally the subject of vigorous research in the History of Art, is presented by Werner Telesko (Visual Arts and Iconography) and Herbert Karner (History of Architecture). In his contribution Werner Telesko notes, on the one hand, a pro-

gressive tendency towards isolated individual studies and, on the other, the search for a genuine “Austrianness” in art. Only recently, these individual studies have been supplemented by survey treatments and by new questions such as the significance of the representation of rulers in art. With regard to the History of Architecture similar discourse levels may be pursued, although in the present context with a more distinct personal focus, on the one hand, on the name of Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, and, on the other hand, on the emancipation of an “Austrian” architecture from an originally dominant Italian cultural environment. The editors of this book have tried to stress this importance of 18<sup>th</sup> century art for the construction of an Austrian identity by choosing two posters of regional exhibitions for the book cover; the corresponding exhibition catalogues, however, have also turned out to be cited in most of the contributions in this collection.

A similar degree of importance as in the History of Art is to be found in the History of Music, as presented by Thomas Hochradner. Here the 18<sup>th</sup> century is the era of the Vienna Classical School that is associated with the names of Mozart and Haydn, which even today give Austria its “national” identity. The History of Austrian Literature, described here by Werner Michler, is comparatively little investigated and has no names to compare with those of Art History. It is, however, highly attractive, particularly in respect of the defining of such literary forms as Satire and Folk Theatre, which were continued in the 19<sup>th</sup> century by such canonized authors as Grillparzer, Nestroy or Raimund. The growth of the highly influential tradition of Folk Theatre in the 18<sup>th</sup> century has long been of interest in Theatre History: Beate Hochholdingner-Reiterer portrays the lasting “people’s” ideologizing of the subject in the National Socialist period, but also documents the new orientation of the discipline since the 1970s. The History of the Book, as documented by Johannes Frimmel, is a transdisciplinary subject that has enjoyed an increased interest amongst researchers of the younger generation despite the absence of any institutional link. This is also the result of an increased awareness of the radical cultural effects of book printing which are becoming recognizable because of current changes in the means of communication. The new possibilities that have resulted from the use of digital media for the study of the 18<sup>th</sup> century are analysed by Martin Gasteiner and Josef Köstlbauer in their contribution. Finally, Marion Romberg reports on the history and activities of the “Austrian Society for 18<sup>th</sup> Century Studies” from an inner perspective.

This “Society” was not only responsible for stimulating the production of the present volume. It is also among the principal academic institutions promoting the dialogue between the various academic disciplines that are concerned with the 18<sup>th</sup> century. It is precisely this task that our book seeks to fulfil: to bring together, in a shared discussion, and across the subject boundaries that often separate them, those researchers who are linked by a fascination for the ambiguous “Age of the Baroque and the Enlightenment”, and who have agreed, in this

book, to contribute to a critical re-consideration of its historiographical parameters.

The editors wish to thank all those who have participated in the production of this book, in particular our translators Bryan Jenner, Helen Stringer and Tim Juckes. As the reader will notice, each contribution has gone through an individual linguistic process: some texts were written in English; most texts were written in German and underwent one, sometimes two or more phases of translation and proofreading. It is obvious that this has resulted in a heterogeneous picture in terms of style. Some German terms have not been translated because of their particular semantics within the corresponding disciplinary contexts; in such cases, analogous terms or paraphrases in English have been provided. The most important Austrian research Institutions are usually cited by their English name, minor institutions are cited in German with the English equivalent or a brief English description; the same holds true for book and project titles. The relevant pieces of academic writing “Diplomarbeit”, “Dissertation” and “Habilitation” are, with all respect to the resulting difficulties, usually rendered as “M.A. thesis”, “Ph.D. thesis” and “habilitation” / “*venia legendi*”.

The large bibliographical sections of each chapter are also intended to provide “prosopographical” overviews of the individual research fields. For obvious reasons, in each contribution the main text and its (short) references are strongly interwoven with the bibliographical section, which made it practically impossible to define a clear borderline for an index. Moreover, each single contributor had the difficult task not only of selecting the names and publications to be mentioned explicitly, but also of finding wordings that to some extent do justice to those that are missing. Also for this reason – that authors are usually implicitly addressed more often than they are explicitly cited, and that any “quantifying” measure in this context would thus have distorted the picture – it was a deliberate decision of the editors of this volume to abstain from an index.

The editors also wish to thank the sponsors of this book: the Federal Ministry of Science and Research, the Dean’s Office of the Historical-Cultural Faculty of at the University of Vienna, the Commission for Art History of the Austrian Academy of Sciences and the Start-Project “Monastic Enlightenment and the Benedictine Republic of Letters”, as well as our publishers, the Verlag Dieter Winkler, and the Austrian Society for 18<sup>th</sup> Century Studies, that has agreed to accept the book in the new series entitled *Internationale Beihefte*.



# Political History

MICHAEL HOCHEDLINGER

## *I The Historiographical Context*

### I.1 What is Political History?

Many historians have racked their brains over this question, and thanks to the pressure of constant, if sometimes unfair, criticism levelled at the rather narrow way in which Political History used to be written in its heyday, our answers have become much more subtle and reflective. If “everything is politics”, then, inevitably, Political History is much more than the history of kings and statesmen. “Political history”, English historian Ronald Hutton wrote some 20 years ago, “is the study of the organisation and operation of power in past societies.”<sup>1</sup>

Such a broad definition no longer allows practitioners of Political History to content themselves with “high-political” history, the account of political action and intrigues at top-level. A modernized Political History, on the contrary, needs to integrate aspects of almost all other sub-disciplines into which, much to the detriment of the overall picture, our craft has fallen over the past decades: Economic History, especially the history of state finance, Social History, Ecclesiastical History or even Intellectual History, to name but a few examples.

Furthermore, Political History can no longer be equated with “histoire événementielle”, the arch-enemy of all the historiographical revolts and revolutions that have changed the face of History over the past century. Considerably enriched by the findings of Sociology and Political Science, Political History is now much more interested in structures than in mere surface events.

Despite this revolutionary transformation of its very nature Political History still has a bad image in academic circles and, in the eyes of many a colleague, remains a prisoner of allegedly fuddy-duddy approaches such as Diplomatic History, Military History, Constitutional and Administrative History or, Heaven forbid, the biographies of “great men” (and women) who shaped or “made” history. It is only with the sweeping success of the “cultural turn” that a sophisticated “Cultural History of Politics”, very close to the postmodern discourse, has begun to flourish, notably among German academic historians. While the impact of this recent trend upon Austrian historiography is still unclear, the disastrous consequences of the unjustified contempt in which the classic fields of research have been held over decades become obvious in the shocking bibliographical *lacunae* which the following pages will be lamenting.

---

1 HUTTON, Political History, 21.

## I.2 The Decline of Early-Modern Political History in post-1945 Austria

The shadowy existence of Early-Modern Political History in Austria is not only due to the dictates of globalized historiographical fashion, but also to Austrian particularities, both professional and political.

First, from the mid-nineteenth century, a dangerous headlock has traditionally been put on Early Modern history at large by the institutional predominance of Austrian medievalists and the “Institute for Austrian Historical Research” (“Institut für Österreichische Geschichtsforschung”, est. 1854; IÖG).

Second, the break-up of the Habsburg Monarchy in 1918, traumatizing as it was for many German Austrians, shifted the focus of much research and writing on to the more recent past, the last decades of the moribund Danubian commonwealth and World War I, thus leaving relatively few resources for the more remote centuries.

After World War II the massive trend towards Contemporary History (“Zeitgeschichte”) was reinforced by Austria’s inglorious involvement in the Nazi crimes and the painful endeavour to come to terms with a stained past. Early-modernists were becoming an ever more endangered minority.

Thematically, the loss of the former great power status in 1918 and the acceptance, after 1945, of Austria’s position as a mini-state without much political influence abroad significantly reduced academic interest in power politics in general and in the *Making of the Habsburg Monarchy* during the Early Modern period in particular. With the glaring instrumentalization of history by the Nazi regime in mind, diplomatic and military history as well as the great-men-approach appeared particularly prone to abuse and were condemned to the rubbish dump of history.

The deep fall of Nazi-sympathizer Heinrich von Srbik, Austria’s token historian during the interwar-period and after the “Anschluss”, symbolized the end of an era. From his compromised oeuvre and legacy his pupils and, *a fortiori*, the younger – post-war – generation would only pick the cultural and intellectual aspects, while Social and Economic History continued to follow the separate course on which it had begun under the aegis of its Austrian founding father Alphons Dopsch in the 1920s.

*A la recherche d’une identité perdue*, Alphons Lhotsky, a prominent figure in post-1945 Austrian historiography, even propagated – strangely not without success – the concentration upon Late-Medieval Austria (whose territorial configuration seemed more or less identical with that of the Republic of Austria after 1945) and the deliberate omission of the power political aspects of the Monarchy’s “Großmachtzeit” after 1526. Such parochialism was greatly helped by, and in turn contributed to, the ongoing success of “Landesgeschichte”, the history of alpine Austria’s individual provinces (“Länder”) which boast an extraordinary continuity from the Middle Ages onward, both in terms of territorial stability and political influence.

# Approaches to the “Aufklärung” in Austrian Historiography after 1945

THOMAS WALLNIG

## *I Position of the Problem*

*Was ist Aufklärung?* The assignability and affinity of the complex of historical topics addressed in this contribution to a variety of historiographic traditions reflects its diversity, its connectedness and connectivity with a wide range of philosophical, religious, political and social expressions of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, and also mirrors the still ongoing epistemological controversies surrounding that complex's central term: “Aufklärung”.<sup>1</sup>

For the same reason, it is not easy to assign a coherent terminology to the aspects mentioned, as adjectives such as “cultural”, “intellectual”, “philosophical”, “religious” and especially “geistig”<sup>2</sup> themselves reflect perspectives and period-specific approaches. The central question regarding the “social” or “intellectual” nature of the “Aufklärung” may, however, be confidently answered in the sense of an interconnectedness of both dimensions.<sup>3</sup>

This contribution therefore also deals with the usage of the above-mentioned terms in Austrian post-war historiography, their methodical implications, and the institutional and ideological affiliations of their proponents. The focus is on the historical disciplines, supplemented by short digressions on Theology, Philosophy and Pedagogy.

- 
- 1 In order to highlight its shifts in meaning and application during the period discussed, the term “Aufklärung” is not translated throughout this contribution. The most usual translation is, of course, “Enlightenment”. – The author thanks Thomas Stockinger for his accurate and critical revision of both the German and, especially, the English manuscript.
  - 2 Most frequently rendered “intellectual”, the German term frequently embraced a wider range of “cultural” and “mental” phenomena than are suggested by this translation. It derives from “Geist”, the “spirit” of an age, group or movement – roughly related more recent notions being, perhaps, “mindset” or “mentality”. Due to its connection with idealist and organic conceptions of the sphere it designated, it has become increasingly rare in recent decades. “Geistesgeschichte” refers to the history of phenomena subsumed under the label “geistig”.
  - 3 ISRAEL, *Enlightenment Contested V.* – In this contribution, a highly selective attempt is made to sketch lines of development based on the methodological approaches of individual works and on teacher-pupil relationships. A great deal that would have been worth mentioning has necessarily been omitted; in particular, the biographic and institutional circumstances of the persons discussed are examined cursorily at best. For these see FELLNER / CORRADINI, *Geschichtswissenschaft*.

The topics held to be adjacent to the subject of “Aufklärung” likewise vary depending on the standpoint of the respective approach. They include History of Science, where Early Modern philosophy and the disciplines of natural science are addressed; Political and Social History, dealing with the concrete implementation of ideas of the “Aufklärung”; Literary Studies, where emphasis is on the aspects of mediality of knowledge, education and publicity; and finally Art History, which investigates artistic realisations of ideas of the “Aufklärung”.

With this in mind, documentation of the bibliography on phenomena explicitly labelled “Aufklärung” (or, closely connected with this, “Josephinismus”) will be purposely restricted in this contribution,<sup>4</sup> in favour of the integration of other lines of historiography which also dealt with the structural conditions underlying these phenomena, but in other contexts and using other concepts. The fact that these same conditions have received a great deal more attention for the Habsburg Monarchy of the adjoining centuries, viewed as “extending into” the 18<sup>th</sup>, should constantly be kept in mind here; the labels then applied being “spirit (“Geist”) of the Baroque” or “of Modernity” respectively.

## II Traditions up to 1945

When historical overviews of the late 19<sup>th</sup> and early 20<sup>th</sup> centuries discussed the 18<sup>th</sup> century, they did so with regard to dynastic and foreign policy on the one hand, to the “reform” and “interior” development of the state on the other.<sup>5</sup> “Aufklärung” only occurs – if at all – as a narrow term for strictly philosophical positions.<sup>6</sup> What will later come to be subsumed under this term appears under such headings as “geistige Kulturverhältnisse”<sup>7</sup>. Outside of academic specialist historiography, however, the term “Aufklärung” was already used in the 19<sup>th</sup> century in a much broader sense, for example (with positive connotation) by the journalist Willibald Müller<sup>8</sup> and (with negative connotation) by the ultramontane priest Sebastian Brunner.<sup>9</sup>

Within academic historiography during the decades around the Second World War, three historians in particular were of importance for the concept of “Aufklärung” and its gradual semantic diversification: Heinrich Srbik, Fritz Valjavec and Eduard Winter.

---

4 For surveys, see BARTON, Jesuiten, 137-199; BODI, Literatur, 298-320; EVANS, Ursprünge; KOVÁCS, Katholische Aufklärung; VOCELKA, Glanz, 368-371.

5 Oswald Redlich's *Werden einer Großmacht* was explicitly conceived as a history of military events and (foreign) politics – Redlich was not able to realise a planned “account of the inward shaping of Austria and of its culture” in a separate book; see REDLICH, *Werden V* (translated from German).

6 UHLIRZ, *Handbuch* 2/1, 363, 380 (as opposed to “doctrines of Natural Law”).

7 KRONES, *Geschichte* 4, 463-472.

8 MÜLLER, *Sonnenfels*.

9 BRUNNER, *Mysterien*.

# History of Science

MARIANNE KLEMUN

There are different conceptions of what is included under the heading of History of Science. And so diversity of content may be understood as a characteristic of a heterogeneous field, however it is conceived, or of a “labyrinth of the new obscurity [Unübersichtlichkeit]”<sup>1</sup>. The idea of a particular History of Science is, in general terms, dependent upon a *Historical Epistemology*<sup>2</sup>, its specific disciplinary areas of reference and their different methodological approaches. In spite of this, tendencies may be defined if, in what follows, we are to portray the events of Austrian research over the course of the last 60 years. This analysis will be conducted with reference to three different structural aspects: (1) Based on the location of the History of Science in the Austrian academic landscape, the thematic emphases and methodological directions will be shown in relation to the institutions in which they are found. (2) We shall also focus upon the relationship between History *tout court* and the History of Science, together with the significance of the 18<sup>th</sup> century in the History of Science, because these will permit the presentation of essential research emphases. (3) In addition a variety of “scientific approaches in a process of transition” will be discussed.

## I *Institutions and Orientations*

In general we may identify two opposing statements concerning the conduct of research in Austria in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century: on the one hand, with reference to international developments, research into the History of Science may be considered as deficient<sup>3</sup> because of the long-term absence of any explicit university structure supporting it. On the other hand – given the capacity of such a small state – its output could be viewed as considerable. In the first argument reference must be made to the fact that it was only in 2008 that Vienna acquired a professorship in the “History and Philosophy of Science”<sup>4</sup>, the name of which refers especially to the History of Science. It is shared between the Departments of History and Philosophy, which in turn belong to two different faculties.<sup>5</sup> In Graz in 2010 the first chair in the “History of Science” was advertised in the

---

1 HAGNER / THOMÄ / VISMANN, Einführung, 5 (translated from German).

2 RHEINBERGER, Epistemologie.

3 HÖFLECHNER, Wissenschaftsgeschichte, 82.

4 The present incumbent is Friedrich STADLER, a contemporary historian and expert on the “Wiener Kreis”.

5 In 2010 a jointly designed Master's Programme was also established.

trans-faculty “Centre for the History of Science” (founded in 2005), with explicit reference to the History of the Natural Sciences. Although it was only in 2008 or 2010 that chairs were founded, the History of Science in Vienna and Graz can claim a rich tradition before 1938 and after 1955.

The institutionalization of the History of Science at a university would already have had a tangible opportunity in Vienna after the war when Josef Gicklhorn,<sup>6</sup> associate professor of Biology at Prague University, had given special lectures in this area as an honorary professor between 1954 to 1957. Scepticism on the part of the colleagues in the Natural Sciences prevented the establishment of a permanent professorship, although Gicklhorn had aroused great interest, and in the short period of his appointment had supervised 17 doctoral dissertations.<sup>7</sup> A trend was beginning to emerge that was already typical of the German scientific landscape: “Wissenschaftsgeschichte” was conceived in analogy to the English term “science” as exclusively referring to the history of the Natural Sciences. The historian Günther Hamann, in the context of his chair at the University of Vienna in “General History of the Modern Period” (from 1971), argued for a *Wissenschaftsgeschichte*<sup>8</sup> that would be shaped programmatically in the sense of a comprehensive overview of achievements. He himself was concerned with the History of Science at the interface between the history of Astronomy, Geography, Cartography (Early Modern period) and research expeditions.<sup>9</sup> Three of his research students who had gained a “*venia legendi*”, namely Johannes Dörflinger<sup>10</sup> (esp. history of Cartography in the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries and working on a totally unresearched area concerning the production of maps in Austria), Helmuth Grössing<sup>11</sup> (esp. history of Astronomy in the Early Modern period) and Marianne Klemun<sup>12</sup> (descriptive sciences in the cultural context of the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> centuries), broadened the basis for a university History of Science. The “History of Science Working Group” (“Arbeitsgemeinschaft Wissenschaftsgeschichte”) in the Department of History – founded in 1992 and still running – formed the starting point for the faculty’s “research focus” (“Fakultätsschwerpunkt”), initiated in 2006, and now pursued by Hamann’s successor Mitchell Ash and other representatives of the subject in the Department of Contemporary History.

The “Centre for the History of Science” in the University of Graz likewise has a history of relevant preparatory work: the “Division of the History of Sci-

---

6 For a biography, see TAUZ, Gicklhorn.

7 For example, HOFER, Born.

8 HAMANN, *Wissenschaftsgeschichte*; ID., *Wissenschaften*.

9 Cf. in particular HAMANN, *Welt begreifen*.

10 Particularly noteworthy: DÖRFLINGER, *Karten*; DÖRFLINGER / WAGNER / WAWRIK, *Descriptio*.

11 Cf. GRÖSSING, *Perspektiven*. This series of publications initiated by Helmuth Grössing appeared, in all, in 12 volumes (1988-1996).

12 KLEMUN, *Großglockner*.

# Economic and Social History

ELKE HAMMER-LUZA

Every description of Austrian research in Economic and Social History since 1945 must begin with a reservation: here we can neither deal with all the component and peripheral areas of Economic and Social History that have developed independently in recent decades,<sup>1</sup> nor is it possible to do justice in detail to the wealth of publications or theoretical discussions. The survey which follows will concentrate, on the one hand, on sketching the research situation in Austria since 1945, with the development of various research institutions, directions and methodologies, and on the other hand – and predominantly – on the evolution of individual disciplines within Economic and Social History.

## *I Tradition and a New Start*

Austrian Economic and Social History in the 20<sup>th</sup> century is inseparably linked to the name Alfons Dopsch. Under him, in 1922, the first institutionalization of the subject took place, in the Philosophical Faculty of the University of Vienna, as the “Seminar for Economic and Cultural History”. Without referring to National Economy, which had developed very early in Austria, his research focussed strongly on Regional History. In his *Methodologie der Wirtschaftsgeschichte* (“Methodology of Economic History”) he favoured empirical observations based on sources, with an increased involvement of Auxiliary Sciences of History and neighbouring disciplines.<sup>2</sup> The closure of the Seminar in 1936 not only marked the end of the Dopsch era, but also his further influence – in the sense of the development of a school – is frequently doubted.<sup>3</sup> The decisive voice in Vienna was henceforth Otto Brunner, who was head of the Economic History Seminar as a division of the History Seminar, and practised Social History in his view as an interdisciplinary “Political National History”. Although Brunner was stripped of his office in 1945, many of his approaches continued to have an influence in Austria. His idea of “Structural History” and his theory of the “Whole House” (“*Ganzes Haus*”) as the basic form of social and economic life remained highly influential. After the Second World War the “Seminar for Economic and Cultural History”

---

1 For reasons of space certain areas, such as the economics of forestry and alpine grazing, maritime trade, the history of finance and some aspects of taxation, as well as the history of settlement and Social Geography, have had to be omitted from this account.

2 Cf. HOFFMANN, Dopsch, 9-15.

3 Cf. KNITTLER, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 335-339; conversely: EHMER / MÜLLER, *Sozialgeschichte*, 113f.

was indeed re-established at the University of Vienna under Erna Patzelt, former assistant to Alfons Dopsch, but initially it did not play a major role. The multiple new beginnings and interruptions in staffing in the universities meant that Economic and Social History after 1945 strongly oriented itself towards Regional History in terms of both methodology and content.<sup>4</sup> In close connection with the provincial archives, the provincial museums and other corresponding institutions of the “Länder”, a start was made, within this tradition, to develop primarily the history of regional trade, agrarian and commercial history, without looking for any coherent research design or conducting any basic scientific discussion.<sup>5</sup> Communication of results took place not only in monographs and regional periodicals but also through comprehensive regional exhibitions. The appointment in 1961 of the director of the Upper Austrian Provincial Archives, Alfred Hoffmann, to the chair of Economic and Social History at the University of Vienna was a reflection of this trend.

The institutional location of Economic and Social History in the universities after 1945 is an expression of a further split in the discipline. It was only in Vienna that a separate Department was set up in the Faculty of Humanities: in Graz, Salzburg and Innsbruck the subject was represented through its own professorships within the existing framework of the Departments of History. At the same time, Economic and Social History was a research domain within Economics and the Social Sciences, and as such was to be found in Departments at the Vienna University of Economics and Business (Wirtschaftsuniversität) and also in the corresponding Faculties of the Universities of Vienna, Graz, Innsbruck and Linz. Not least, there are also departments of Social and Economic History in various faculties of law.<sup>6</sup> This tendency – on the one hand historical and on the other hand national-economic or legal – brought about various methodological orientations which, in the course of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, gradually drifted apart. Decidedly hermeneutic-descriptive studies were in blatant contrast with analytic-explanatory investigations. The gradual decrease in national-economic, but also sociologically oriented research activities, in the field of Economic and Social History,<sup>7</sup> is particularly noticeable for the period before the 19<sup>th</sup> century.

It was only in the 1970s that it became possible to overcome many of the traditional structures. Particularly at the University of Vienna there came about a real atmosphere of innovation within Economic and Social History, the questions and methods of which began to inspire historical research. There was a desire to overcome the provincialism of Austrian historical research and to achieve results that would be comparable on an international level. New publications series were

---

4 SANDGRUBER, *Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 107-122.

5 Cf. HASSINGER, *Anfänge*, 111-129.

6 VALENTINITSCH, *Standort*, 281f.

7 MATIS, *Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, 85f.



# History, Universities, and Professors: Women and Gender in Early Modern Historiography in Austria

ANDREA GRIESEBNER

*“Ich wollte eigentlich immer eine akademische Karriere machen. Ich war ja auch Assistentin am Institut für Wirtschafts- und Kulturgeschichte. Ich bin nicht in die Politik gegangen, ich bin gegangen worden.”*  
Hertha Firnberg, 1975<sup>1</sup>

The questions that historians ask about the past, the presuppositions upon which they base their research, the sources that they consider, and the methods and theories that they favour depend upon well-known various and often intertwining elements. The fact that the sex of the researcher is usually of central importance is just as banal as it is significant. Since the professionalization of historiography in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, men predominantly have been the ones to determine which parts of history were deemed worthy of further research, and whose explanation of the past has been acknowledged as historiography. As recently as 1988, the US American science historian Donna Haraway referred to “history”, with good reason, as “a story Western culture buffs tell each other”<sup>2</sup>

Due to the political history of the State in general and of the academic sphere specifically, men, or rather, bourgeois-conservative men, were able to dominate historiography in Austria until the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Until the enacting of the “Universitätsorganisationsgesetz” (UOG 1975), the full professors determined the entire staffing policy and thus also dictated the topical orientation of the different disciplines. Anyone whose areas of interest they judged “irrelevant” or “unscientific” had no chance to pursue an academic career. In Austria, criticism of the male perspective of the past was therefore mainly expressed by female students and junior researchers related to second-wave feminism. The proposition of equality between women and men, and the political program of women’s emancipation had changed their view of and their questions about the past.

---

1 “I had always wanted to pursue an academic career. I was also an assistant at the Department of Economic and Cultural History. I did not go into politics, I was gotten into them.” Hertha Firnberg in an interview with Helga Stadler, *Kurier* 2. November 1975, quoted in BERNOLD / BLIMLINGER / ELLMEIER, Hertha Firnberg, 17-51. I would like to thank Brigitte Rath, Margareth Lanzinger, Christina Lutter and Susanne Hehenberger for their help in writing this piece, and Hannah Elmer and Kate Oppenheimer for proofreading the English translation.

2 HARAWAY, *Situated Knowledges*, 575-599.

Even if the male sex does not exclude the adoption of a feminist perspective and even if the female sex does not necessarily result in a perspective of this kind, Women's History and Gender History were primarily written and developed by women. Therefore, an overview of the research done in Austria within the field of Early Modern Women's and Gender History since 1945 must first consider whether there are any female historians in the departments. After a brief sketch of the gender relations among the teaching staff in the departments of history and of the political as well as the historiographical contexts, I will ask which specific historical topics came to the attention of feminist historians.

### *I Female Historians at Austrian Universities*

Before 1945, only three Austrian female historians held the "venia legendi" (habilitation), and all three had ties to the Nazi Party.<sup>3</sup> After the unconditional surrender of the Third Reich and the "restarting" of the Austrian universities, only one of the three, Erna Patzelt, could continue her academic career. Classified as non-National-Socialist ("unbelastet") by the Special Commission of the Ministry of Education, she was entrusted with rebuilding the Department of Economic and Cultural History at the University of Vienna. Hedwig Fleischhacker and Mathilde Uhlirz were dismissed from their universities. Having been hired by Hans Übersberger as a research assistant at the Department of Eastern European History in Vienna in 1929, Hedwig Fleischhacker had followed her teacher and later husband to the Third Reich in 1934. Employed as an assistant professor in the Department of History at the University of Berlin from 1935 onward, she was awarded the "venia legendi" in 1938. Mathilde Uhlirz, appointed as an associate professor in Graz in 1939, was dismissed without benefits. Additionally, her "venia legendi" was withdrawn, as there was no guarantee – to quote the wording in the dismissal procedure (Enthebungsverfahren) – "that she will always stand up for an independent Austria".

The first of these female historians, Erna Patzelt, gained an academic position in the First Republic when Alphons Dopsch appointed his disciple as a research assistant and, in 1924, as an assistant professor. Already a year later, in 1925, she was awarded the "venia legendi" for Medieval and Economic History. Despite the intervention and petitions of various parties – from the dean of the university and the National Socialist Student Organization to the National Socialist Teachers' Association – in 1939, the university at first refused to extend her contract. In 1941, she was finally appointed as an associate professor after all. The extent to which Patzelt adhered not only to a Pan-German, but also to the National Socialist ideology is still disputed among Austrian historians.

Although Mathilde Uhlirz was the daughter of the archivist and professor of Austrian History Karl Uhlirz, her academic career did not advance very

---

3 On the first female historians in more detail, cf. GRIESEBNER, Einführung.

# Unchristian Violence, Bestial Sexuality, Werewolves and Compassion in a Crisis Historical Criminology in Austria since 1945

MARTIN SCHEUTZ

Ten years ago, an overview of Austrian research on the History of Crime would have needed to explain in some detail what is actually meant by the discipline; today, by contrast, this special field within Medieval and Modern research, “de-layed” in Austria as in other countries, can be considered established. University theses (at M.A. and Ph.D. level), a relatively large number of relevant monographs on the subject, as well as contributions by individuals with an interest in history, have now been published.<sup>1</sup> Within a broader public, the history of crime is often seen as a type of barely analytical collection of *Moritat*-style criminal deeds, where a lengthy and overdetailed retelling of the criminal *exemplum* is intended to illustrate the difference from the “less gruesome” present. The Modern History of crime regards itself as intersecting History, Cultural Studies and Legal History, and attempts to clarify the connections between rulership, society and culture in the Later Middle Ages and the Early Modern era. The distinction between Historical Criminology and Legal History, which is often normatively oriented, also emerged due to a clearer Social- and Cultural-Historical perspective on criminality. The History of Crime – which for a long time was a field competed for by different research disciplines claiming sole representation – focuses on the various sources on criminality<sup>2</sup> and the formal preconditions for their existence (printed forms, written court records).<sup>3</sup> The History of Crime as a sub-discipline of Social History deals with a wide spectrum of topics ranging from witch research to social protest and sexual offences, but also, for example, public order offences (such as begging). By circumventing the manifold difficulties in defining Historical Criminology, it is possible to describe the field of this interdisciplinary branch of research: “Whilst the triangle of laws, divergent behaviour and sanctions forms the core of an imaginary scientific map of Historical Criminology, the diversity of the landscapes recorded there has meanwhile become far

- 
- 1 As research overviews primarily of the close to Austria connected German research landscape: SCHWERHOFF, *Kriminalitätsforschung*; EIBACH, *Recht – Kultur – Diskurs*; HÄRTER, *Von der “Entstehung”*; HABERMAS, *Recht und Kriminalität*; KRISCHER, *Neue Forschungen*.
  - 2 VALENTINITSCH, *Strafvollzugsakten*; SCHEUTZ, *Gerichtsakten*; GRIESEBNER, *Konkurrierende Wahrheiten*, 107-143; SCHWERHOFF, *Gerichtsakten*.
  - 3 BECKER, “Recht schreiben”.

richer"<sup>4</sup>: the History of Communication, Gender History, Linguistics, Legal History, the Philologies etc. are all interested in the source material of Historical Criminology.

While older Regional Historical research concentrated on criminal-legal monuments (such as the pillory, the gallows), Historical Criminology attempts to evaluate the framework conditions under which violence, honour and gender were negotiated in villages and cities, and their legal "reflection" in court records, penal books and court receipts. For a long time, an insurmountable disciplinary rift gaped between Legal History, which was oriented towards material criminal law and the penal system, and History Studies (focusing from a Cultural-Historical perspective on penal practice) or European Ethnology. In Austria too, this rift was slowly filled through interdisciplinary discussion forums, such as the "Arbeitskreis historische Kriminalitätsforschung" (founded by Andreas Blauert, Gerd Schwerhoff, Dieter Bauer), which has existed at the "Akademie der Diözese Rottenburg-Stuttgart" in Stuttgart-Hohenheim since 1990 (till 2010). Put simply, and without elaborating on the differing concepts of Gender History, Sociology or Cultural Studies, Criminology<sup>5</sup> with its almost ethnological interests was concerned with portraying the social environment of the Pre-Modern era, the development of the monopoly on violence, and local governance, or rather uncovering rulership's mode of action. Unlike Legal History research, Historical Criminology examined the connection between criminality, prosecution and criminal justice. Through the evaluation of court records, classic fields of Legal History such as the emergence of public criminal law and the institutionalisation of the state (for example, through a nascent police organisation) attained a new dimension, since these processes were no longer investigated from the perspective of central government, but micro-historically "bottom up". The examination of petty crime in particular shows how flexibly the law was handled in the Pre-Modern era. The standard texts favoured by Legal History tell us little about how these were interpreted in practice – the examination of the numerous instances of theft reveals, for example, that besides the use of corporal and capital punishment,<sup>6</sup> a diverse spectrum of damages and compensatory payments was also applied. The court adjusted its financial resources in relation to the specific person accused and his/her network; reacting sensitively to such circumstances, it imposed punishments or subtly revealed the possibility of mercy.<sup>7</sup> However, the court records also show that "Justiznutzung" or the "use of justice" (Martin Dinges) greatly varied. In the 18<sup>th</sup> century too, many people af-

---

4 SCHWERHOFF, Aktenkundig, 13 (translated from German).

5 For the 16<sup>th</sup> century, see HEIDEGGER, Soziale Dramen.

6 AMMERER, Ende.

7 GRIESEBNER, "In via gratiae".

# Visual Arts and Iconography

WERNER TELESKO

In this paper, a description of research activities between 1945 and 2010 is subdivided according to four central points, which are closely interrelated thematically: under *Approaches and Methodology* a brief characterization of the most important approaches to academic research will be provided. The section *Research Fields* introduces the main fields of academic work. In close connection with this, the most essential *Exhibitions* that have dealt with matters concerning the visual arts in Austria in the 18<sup>th</sup> century will be examined in the third part. In conclusion, the academic establishments and museums where research has been carried out are described under the heading *Institutions*.

## *I Approaches and Methodology*

It is characteristic of the historical research situation in the Visual Arts and Iconography that academic works are often organized in terms of artist monographs, that they were developed within the framework of inventories and registers of monuments and that they are connected with endeavours or exhibitions related to monument preservation.<sup>1</sup> This orientation, which to a large extent excludes broader research questions, in some respects meant a continuation of pre-war academic research.

A further striking aspect is the presentation of Austrian Baroque art – mostly in exhibitions – as a “period of splendour” (“Glanzzeit”), occasionally with particular emphasis on the independent and competitive achievement of Austrian art in the framework of the European art development, an emphasis that can only be understood as a consequence of an initially defensive attitude. This focus, hence, is also to be understood in view of the necessity, in cultural life after 1945, of creating the genuinely “Austrian”, as related to the idea of the Austrian state. The strikingly rigorous “concentration on the single work of art”<sup>2</sup> essentially reflects the methodological orientation of the “New Vienna School of Art History” (“Jüngere Wiener Schule der Kunstgeschichte”) developed from the early 1930s onwards, particularly in the wake of Hans Sedlmayr and Otto Pächt.<sup>3</sup> Regarding research on 18<sup>th</sup> century art, the methodological tension between a

---

1 This tradition was preserved until very recently, cf. e.g. SCHEMPER-SPARHOLZ, Hagenauer.

2 ROSENAUER, Schule, 74 (translated from German).

3 For the continuity of the Viennese Art Historical research after 1945: AURENHAMMER, Institut, 183.

historical and a philosophical orientation,<sup>4</sup> characteristic of the “Vienna School”, was clearly resolved in favour of historical and therefore source-based argumentation patterns.

It can be stated in view of the Austrian as well as of the European research situation that, from the 1980s and 1990s onwards, there was an increasing interest in the conception and realization of overview works. Regarding the Austrian situation, this was above all due to the fact that, after the work *Barock in Österreich*,<sup>5</sup> which had appeared in 1962 as a part of a multi-volume series, no new summary was published until the end of the 1990s.<sup>6</sup> The early 1960s work is in turn based on the multi-volume overview *Die bildende Kunst in Österreich* by Karl Ginhart, of which the volume *Barock und Rokoko*, published in 1939, displays a strongly regional structure.<sup>7</sup> The publication by Grimschitz, Feuchtmüller and Mrazek (1962) is divided into individual chapters and, after an introduction on architecture by Bruno Grimschitz, aims to demonstrate the purportedly genuine achievements of Austrian art: “These perspectives correlate with the European function of Austrian Baroque art. Its historical role was the same as that of Pan-German [‘gesamtddeutsch’] Baroque: to absorb and to amalgamate the worlds of artistic forms [‘Formenwelten’] from Italy in the south, France in the west and Holland in the north into a new and indigenous [‘eigenwüchsig’] art, into an incomparable artistic self-representation of man in the Austrian orbit.”<sup>8</sup> In the opinion of Grimschitz, the result of this perspective is a quasi-linear sequence of “penetration” of foreign “Formenwelten” in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, their “processing” in the 17<sup>th</sup> century and “liberation from them” at the turn of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. The first half of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, he asserts, brings with it “the greatest revelation of Austrian creative power [‘Schöpferkraft’]”, while in the second half “the productive flow gradually declines and runs dry”<sup>9</sup>. For an assessment of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the recurrent (but unhistorical) formulation that contrasted the “Glanzzeit” of the first half of the century with a reputed decline in the second half of the century, has developed on the basis of this evaluation. The emphasis throughout this publication is clearly on the characterization of important artists; in some cases, individual regional ensembles are also described, together with their peculiarities. The overall portrayal of the “universal triumphal attitude to life [‘Lebensgefühl’]”<sup>10</sup>, which was taken as characteristic of the Austrian Baroque, corresponds to the frequent occurrence of emotive formulations. The close connection between political viewpoint and Art History is again docu-

---

4 *IBID.*, 186.

5 GRIMSCHITZ / FEUCHTMÜLLER / MRAZEK, *Barock*.

6 LORENZ, *Barock*.

7 GINHART, *Kunst*.

8 GRIMSCHITZ / FEUCHTMÜLLER / MRAZEK, *Barock*, 5 (translated from German).

9 *IBID.*, 6.

10 *IBID.*, 79.

# Approaches and Tendencies in Architectural History

HERBERT KARNER

## *I 1930-1960: The Search for Authentically “Austrian” Architecture*

At the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, when Albert Ilg laid the groundstone for research on Austrian Baroque architecture with his book on the Fischers von Erlach, national criteria were still unimportant.<sup>1</sup> During those decades, Austrian architectural events were largely perceived within the framework of German architecture, albeit closely tied up with developments in Bohemia and Moravia. Roughly coinciding with the beginning of the First Republic and in clear connection with the political climate of the time, the question of the “Austrian” in Baroque architecture started to become urgent in this young research discipline. It was now perceived as a *sui generis* phenomenon, without however taking sufficient account of dramatic changes in “Austrian” topography. On the research radar appeared almost exclusively developments in Vienna, the “Donauländer” (Upper and Lower Austria) and Salzburg (which only came to the Austrian Empire in 1805). Important for defining autochthonously “Austrian” architectural elements was the question of their relationship to Italian architecture. If Hans Riehl, in 1930, still clearly emphasised Austria’s forerunner role in the reception of Italian form,<sup>2</sup> then the “Austro-Italian” component of Austrian Baroque architecture – which seems so fundamental from a present-day perspective – was entirely excluded in the reconstruction of the “Austrian” undertaken contemporaneously by Hans Sedlmayr.<sup>3</sup> The formative role of Italian artists in the 17<sup>th</sup> century was not denied here. But their exclusion from the period considered in the present essay was, for Sedlmayr, a question of the “genetic-historical definition” of the essence of Austrian Baroque architecture. He saw the latter as distinguishing itself less through rigid characteristics than by means of a pure and absolutely new synthesis of French pre-classical and the “Borrominesque”. This process, according to Sedlmayr, began around 1690 with the appearance of the “genius”, Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach: “Austria is the area in which this art was created; Hungary, Silesia, then Moravia, Bohemia and Franconia are the areas into which it spread.”<sup>4</sup> Sedlmayr construed the essence of Austrian Baroque as an “idea”, which opened up the possibility of its embracing works “that never lay within the

---

1 ILG, Fischer von Erlach.

2 RIEHL, Baukunst.

3 SEDLMAYR, Barockarchitektur; on Sedlmayr, see AURENHAMMER, Sedlmayr.

4 SEDLMAYR, Barockarchitektur, 25 (translated from German).

boundaries of Austria (core-Austria)<sup>5</sup>; at the same time, however, this definition enabled works to be excluded “that were raised on Austrian territory but which – in terms of their inner structure and mostly also of their creators – belong to other, foreign groups”<sup>6</sup>. This idealistic conception makes it possible to marginalise as non-Austrian (and thus non-German) all architectural works lacking such an autochthonous character. 17<sup>th</sup>-century monuments that decisively bear the imprint of transalpine artistic transfer do not, by this reckoning, pertain to Austrian Baroque architecture. This arbitrary pruning of developmental-historically complex processes was extended by Sedlmayr a few years later (1938) with what he called “Reichstil” (“empire style”)<sup>7</sup> – a concept that has proved surprisingly enduring and continues to be a cause for discussion today. The synthesis achieved by Fischer von Erlach with the first design for Schönbrunn was, for Sedlmayr, the starting point for a uniform German architectural style within the Roman-German Empire: the German here was interpreted as a higher unity of extremes.<sup>8</sup>

Renate Wagner-Rieger, doyenne of more recent Viennese Architectural History, described Sedlmayr’s “Austrian” interpretive model, in 1964, as a “particularist stance of the inter-war period”, which was to be quickly surpassed after 1945.<sup>9</sup> Although research began again to perceive Baroque architecture in its references to Italian art, in its connections to Bohemian-Moravian, Hungarian, as well as Silesian, architecture (up to 1740),<sup>10</sup> it remained strongly influenced by the Sedlmayrian dicta. Bruno Grimschitz, whose 1939 account of *Baukunst in Wien und Niederdonau von etwa 1690 bis um 1780* loyally followed Sedlmayr’s schema,<sup>11</sup> had still not overcome this in 1962. If also in somewhat more measured terms, he repeats solemnly the Sedlmayrian cornerstones in designating the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century as that point in time when “the decisive hour for the dawning of creative strength” had struck, and in speaking of the “national rising”

---

5 IBID.

6 IBID.

7 SEDLMAYR, *Bedeutung*.

8 On the question of the “Reichstil”, see LORENZ, *Reichstil*; AURENHAMMER, *Zäsur*; also ENGELBERG, *Reichsstil*; KARNER, *Reichsstil*.

9 WAGNER-RIEGER, *Literaturbericht*, 248: “[einen] partikularistischen Standpunkt der Zwischenkriegszeit”. The *Literaturbericht Barockarchitektur Österreichs* (“Report on Secondary Literature on Austrian Baroque Architecture”) of 1964 remains today an important basis for engaging with the best known architects and their works. The three periods identified in the development of research on Baroque architecture from the late 19<sup>th</sup> century up to 1960 are also followed in the developmental model presented here.

10 In general, scholarly literature in the 1960s took the form of survey works, for the most part written by non-Austrian authors such as Ernst Bachmann (BACHMANN, *Architektur*), Günther Grundmann (GRUNDMANN, *Richtung*) and, fundamentally, Heinrich Gerhard Franz (FRANZ, *Böhmen*), who had already published much on Bohemian and Moravian architecture in the 1940s.

11 GRIMSCHITZ, *Baukunst* 1.



# Trends and Perspectives in Musicology

THOMAS HOCHRADNER

Austria's reputation as a "land of music" is based on the period of the Viennese classical style, usually also including the works of Franz Schubert. One result of this is the high public esteem and the valuing of "classical" music as part of an Austrian identity; some other consequences will be dealt with in an introductory chapter entitled *Austria as a Cornucopia of Music History*. This will be followed by an overview of the *History of Research*, closely linked to particular institutions, before rounding off with a final section on *Status and Desiderata*, where tasks for the future will also be clarified.

## I *Austria as a Cornucopia of Music History*

When Musicological research started again in Austria immediately after the Second World War and gradually grew in quantity, it was possible to build on lasting traditions, in particular represented by the chairs of Musicology at the Universities of Vienna (established in 1856), Innsbruck (1920) and Graz (1940), and also on a range of comprehensive and seminal publications, particularly from the inter-war years. In this context we might mention examples such as Guido Adler's *Handbuch der Musikgeschichte*, or the monographs on W.A. Mozart by Hermann Albert and Bernhard Paumgartner,<sup>1</sup> or Joseph Haydn by Karl Geiringer,<sup>2</sup> the Beethoven studies by Willy Heß, Erich Schenk, Arnold Schering and Arnold Schmitz<sup>3</sup> or the rich bundle of music history papers that were published in *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft*.<sup>4</sup> Volumes of the series *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich*<sup>5</sup> ("Monuments of Music in Austria") had developed a vast, if by no means exemplary repertoire of scholarly based editions of music, and had also directed attention to composers of lesser prominence than Joseph Haydn, Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart<sup>6</sup> and Ludwig van Beethoven; and the compositions of these were only accessible in a full critical edition in the case of Mozart – produced in the 19<sup>th</sup> century and now superseded in terms of both methodology and content. But the life-story of Alfred Einstein – the musicologist who after

---

1 ABERT, W.A. Mozart; PAUMGARTNER, Mozart.

2 GEIRINGER, Joseph Haydn (1932, many subsequent new editions).

3 For instance SCHENK, Beethoven; SCHERING, Beethoven, ID., Zur Erkenntnis; SCHMITZ, Beethovenbild.

4 *Studien zur Musikwissenschaft*. Beihefte der *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich*, initially edited by Guido Adler. First volume Vienna 1913.

5 *Denkmäler der Tonkunst in Österreich*, initially edited by Guido Adler. First volume Vienna 1894.

6 Mozart himself only used 'Amadeo' or 'Amadé' as his first name.

graduation worked first as a journalist before emigrating in 1933 – shows in an exemplary way how the paths of Musicological research branch out in multiple directions into the non-German-speaking world: after difficult negotiations Einstein's pioneering revision of the Köchel catalogue was still published in Germany in 1937, but a 1947 supplement was already published in the USA.<sup>7</sup> The surfeit of subjects and materials with an Austrian background encouraged researchers' interest wherever Musicology was established as a university discipline. Particularly in the case of the Viennese classical style, a wide range of studies appeared, which broadened the angle of vision in that they added analytical and typological views to the existing fundamentally biographical orientation, and, above all, stylistically and philologically marked approaches. Yet they were lacking in historical depth, and in insights into and comparisons of the lives and works of composers such as Martinez, Adlgasser, Albrechtsberger, Bonno, Dittersdorf, Eberlin, Eybler, Hafeneder, Michael Haydn, Monn, Leopold Mozart, Ordenez, Salieri, Süßmayr, Tuma, Vanhal, Wagenseil, Werner, and many others, not to mention representatives of earlier generations such as Fux, Caldara, and Georg Reutter (the Younger).

David Wyn Jones, in his introduction to the anthology *Music in Eighteenth-century Austria*, observes that gaps criticized in 1969 by Jens Peter Larsen were still to be found, *mutatis mutandis*, in 1991: "But it [i.e. research up to then] is only a beginning, and the output of many composers still remains fully or partially uncatalogued."<sup>8</sup> Jones is equally astonished by the geographical fixation of the "Viennese" School, since only "Beethoven and Schubert lived and worked in the city for most of their creative lives, and can therefore be said to be Viennese"<sup>9</sup>, but Haydn and Mozart did not. Hidden behind this kind of criticism is the question of the advantages and disadvantages of value judgements and the search for scientific standards, a question which, from the outset in the second half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, had accompanied and frequently disturbed this comparatively young academic discipline. After the Second World War there were additional hazards and challenges; on the one hand it was necessary to break with the writing style of the immediate past, conform to National Socialism; on the other hand there was a need to catch up in terms of methodology. Beyond that, international comparisons brought pressure to compete. Choosing an approach based on "Volksbildung" (in the sense of "education of the masses") as characterized by Eberhard Preußner in his *Musikgeschichte des Abendlandes* ("History of Music in the West"), may also be regarded as a result of the search for a productive escape. For the process of reviewing and making accessible mu-

---

7 LUDWIG RITTER VON KÖCHEL, Chronologisch-thematisches Verzeichnis sämtlicher Tonwerke Wolfgang Amadé Mozarts. Wiesbaden – Leipzig – Paris <sup>8</sup>(unchanged after <sup>6</sup>) 1983. Preface to the 6<sup>th</sup> edition, LV.

8 JONES, Music 1f. (quotation 2). Jones refers to LARSEN, Viennese Classical School.

9 IBID. 5.

# Austrian Literature of the 18<sup>th</sup> Century

WERNER MICHLER

There are several peculiarities in the research on Austrian literature of the 18<sup>th</sup> century. These peculiarities are connected with the specificity of the topic, and with fundamental cultural and institutional conditions. Only when several of these peculiarities have been explained (I), the central research paradigms since 1945 can be stated, in a diachronic perspective (II), the state of research in various subfields can be characterized (III) and, with due caution, several desiderata can be outlined (IV).

## *I*

Difficulties begin with the definition of the topic. Generally, the research field of Austrian German-language literature is first defined within the borders of modern-day Austria, then in a broader perspective, as the German-speaking literature of the Habsburg Monarchy of the late 19<sup>th</sup> century. The criterion “German-language literature” is used for the reason that most researchers in this field are Germanists and hence certain perspectives are already predefined. From an institutional viewpoint, this literature appears as part and parcel of a larger field of literature; which is how, traditionally, questions arise concerning the connections between “German” and “Austrian” literature in the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the degree of autonomy of Austrian literature, and questions of literary judgement. The national-philological paradigm with its traditional teleologies, long since criticised, deconstructed and rejected from a theoretical perspective, proves its unbroken significance, not least because of the institutional dominance of these national philologies. Other questions, particularly those concerning interrelations that are comparative in a broader sense, but also questions concerning an Austrian literary “polysystem” (Itamar Even-Zohar) in several languages and cultures, are accordingly posed less often, sometimes simply for reasons of competence. In addition, the Austrian 18<sup>th</sup> century is a difficult epoch of “uneven developments”, of failed attempts, of the complex superimpositions of manifold cultural fault lines. It is well known that the kind of successful interdisciplinarity, which the topic demands, requires time, work, money, opportunities and lucky chances, within the constraints of academic disciplinary requirements, which in practice, despite reassurances to the contrary, become increasingly rigid – in other words, rare commodities.

Furthermore, Austrian literature in the century of the “Aufklärung” is a “small” (or “minor”?) literature, lacking great names and great texts. It can also

be attributed to the notorious Austrian memory loss in view of the “Aufklärung(en)” that not a single author of 18<sup>th</sup> century Austria can be said to be part of the active cultural memory today, and no text is available as a cheap edition. Therefore, this literature is also difficult to hand down in academic teaching, not to mention secondary education. In any case, the question does not arise from the viewpoint of German Literary Historiography; Austrian literature of this period is usually not represented there. For young Germanists, the study of 18<sup>th</sup> century Austrian literature is not a completely risk-free option, and this is also evident in the fact that – as a cursory review demonstrates – literature on the “Aufklärung” has in recent decades again become a domain of the lower academic orders (M.A. instead of Ph.D. theses). Accordingly the degree of institutionalization is also weak: there are no special periodicals and no literary societies focussing on Austrian 18<sup>th</sup> century literature.

Ultimately, the epoch in question is itself directly affected by the teleologies pertaining to the creation of the German and Austrian nations, as the rivalries (Austria/the Empire vs. Prussia) were on the one hand given expression by military means, on the other hand by means of cultural concepts, which have since burdened and dominated the field: Protestant vs. Catholic, Northern vs. Southern German culture, “Berlin” vs. “Viennese” “Aufklärung”, as they arose for the first time in the Blumauer-Nicolai debate.<sup>1</sup>

All of this may explain why the literature of the Austrian “Aufklärung” – with the exception of the so-called “Alt-Wiener Volkstheater” (cf. B. Hochholdinger-Reiterer in this volume) – was and has remained a domain of Austrian German Studies, and at the same time owes a lot to the many – in fact particularly important – research contributions of the so-called “German Studies abroad” (first of all those of emigrés from the Central European catastrophes of the 20<sup>th</sup> century). From an outside perspective, the internal differences within the – no less imaginary – unit “German literature” become more visible. Among more recent literary historiography, it was indeed the *Camden House History of German Literature* alone that provided a substantial contribution to Austrian literature in its volume on the “Enlightenment”.<sup>2</sup>

## II

The research period under review can be divided easily into blocks of 20 years: a post-war phase, a second phase where a research field of its own right was established (1970s and 1980s), and a third phase, stretching right up to the present day, witnessing first a waning of interest in “Aufklärung” topics, and then revived

1 See WOLF, Blumauer-Nicolai, and, with a different emphasis, PUCHALSKI, Imaginärer Name.

2 EYBL, Enlightenment. A certain exception here is the collected edition *Deutsche Literatur – eine Sozialgeschichte* published by Horst Albert Glaser, in which volumes 4 and 5 contain one chapter each on “Alt-Wiener Volkskomödie” by H. Zeman (Frankfurt a. M. 1980).

## Theatre History

### BEATE HOCHHOLDINGER-REITERER

In Manfred Brauneck's theatre history *Die Welt als Bühne* ("The World as a Stage"), the Austrian theatre of the 18<sup>th</sup> century is presented on the basis of the imperial court theatre, the Josephine theatre reform, and the "venues of the Wiener Volkstheater" ("Viennese popular theatre").<sup>1</sup> The monastic theatres of the Jesuits and the Benedictines are dealt with in Brauneck's book in the chapters on the 17<sup>th</sup> century according to the focal points he himself has set, which relate primarily to the respective "innovative developments"<sup>2</sup> in the individual epochs. This kind of antipodal structure in Theatre Historiography – court and educational versus popular theatre, with a general exclusion of monastic and other theatre forms – does have a tradition; however, in making this comparison it misrepresents those types of theatre which in practice are interrelated. In the age of the touring theatre companies, Vienna enjoyed a "special status",<sup>3</sup> since in addition to the theatre at court for ballet and opera that was solely accessible to an aristocratic audience, already at the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century the city had its own establishment for public German-language professional theatre in the shape of the Kärtnerthortheater. In 1741, under Maria Theresa, Vienna was given a second public theatre, the Burgtheater in the Michaelerplatz, where initially both German and French spoken theatre and also music theatre were performed.

While earlier Theatre Research traditionally aligned its divisions according to the acting personalities of the age (such as Stranitzky, Prehauser, Kurz-Bernardon), the elevation of the Burgtheater to the status of "k.k. Hof- und Nationaltheater" ("Imperial and Royal Court and National Theatre") by Joseph II in 1776 has been chiefly treated as a significant change for the court and educational theatre. Brauneck, although he stresses that his orientation is "in accordance with current research",<sup>4</sup> relies on Heinz Kindermann's *Theatergeschichte Europas* (1957-1974) and repeatedly cites it in the margins with the intention of

- 
- 1 BRAUNECK, *Welt 2*, XIII (translated from German as all of the following quotations unless indicated). – I wish to thank Edda Fuhrich, Hilde Haider-Pregler, Johann Hüttner, Stefan Hulfeld, Friedemann Kreuder, Birgit Peter, Peter Roessler, and Veronika Zangl for stimulating conversations and helpful information. Because of the unexpected death of Otto G. Schindler in December 2008, I was unfortunately unable to benefit from his wealth of knowledge in a personal conversation while preparing this chapter. I also wish to thank Edita Nosowa for the thorough revision of the English text.
  - 2 BRAUNECK, *Welt 1*, XIX.
  - 3 HAIDER-PREGLER, *Entwicklungen*, 704.
  - 4 BRAUNECK, *Welt 1*, XIX.

supplying an “accompanying level of commentary and reflection”.<sup>5</sup> For want of a critical discussion of the literature used, these kinds of major projects pass on historiographic continuities concerning the theatre and consolidate canonized knowledge.<sup>6</sup> For this reason one cannot avoid relating publications on the history of Austrian theatre that have appeared since 1945 to those that appeared in the era of National Socialism, particularly since leading figures in the historiography of the theatre had published continuously and successfully since the first decades of the twentieth century.

Moreover, this kind of reference shows that research on the theatre of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, in the sense of a “conception of heritage”, has always been highly ideological in its design, since it is recognized that the theatre had always been given an eminent position in proposals for a future “German (cultural) nation”. The Austrian Baroque popular theatre also offered possibilities of connecting with the most diverse ideologies, according to whether the focus was on the dimension relating to the “bodenständig [‘indigenous’] Volkhafte”, as an early version of the “Völkisch” (“racial”/“national”),<sup>7</sup> or on the Baroque as something genuinely Austrian.<sup>8</sup> And the latter was a reference to the idea of the Baroque as a typical art form of the Bavarian-Austrian “tribe” as established by Josef Nadler in his *Literaturgeschichte der deutschen Stämme und Landschaften* (“Literary History of the German Tribes and Landscapes”) (1912-1918).

### *I On the Status of Research around 1945*

The establishment of Theatre Studies as a University Department in Vienna took place in 1943, and this was politically significant. The first professor was Heinz Kindermann – born in Vienna, but then working in Münster. He was stripped of his office in 1945, but reinstated as chair of the department in 1954 and held this position until his retirement in 1966.<sup>9</sup>

This personal continuity also implied an academic one. Cautious to protect his career, in 1939 Kindermann chose as an illustration of his “politically and ideologically based theatre history” a “historiographically formulated account of the Burgtheater”, which proceeded “from the basic values of ‘Rasse, Volk, Reich’ [‘race’, ‘nation’, ‘empire’]”.<sup>10</sup> This approach was to be applied in many scholarly and semi-scholarly publications until 1945.<sup>11</sup>

Even after the ban on publication was lifted, the history of the theatre in the 18<sup>th</sup> century remained a fixed component of Kindermann’s research interests.

5 IBID.

6 Cf. HULFELD, *Theatergeschichtsschreibung*.

7 Cf. KINDERMANN, *Commedia*.

8 Cf. GREGOR, *Geschichte*.

9 Cf. PETER / PAYR, *Gründung*.

10 KINDERMANN, *Burgtheater*, 6.

11 Cf. Kindermann bibliography in PETER / PAYR, *Gründung*, 260-269.

# History of Books

JOHANNES FRIMMEL

## *I On the Status of the History of Books in Austria*

In many Cultural Studies disciplines one can observe in recent years an increasing interest in the history of the book, as the most important means of communication of the Modern era. The current media shifts in particular illustrate the predominant role that printing has thus far played in our culture. Book History, which Robert Darnton referred to in an article published for the first time in 1982 as “the social and cultural history of communication by print”,<sup>1</sup> has since established itself as a growing and varied research field. At the same time, however, a lack of specialist knowledge and of fundamental studies in the areas of bibliography and the History of Books often becomes apparent. 18<sup>th</sup> century Austria is no exception here. Although a significant amount of research has already been done, an overview of book production and of the total number of enterprises has yet to be written. Up to now, methodical approaches, such as those developed by the French and Anglo-Saxon research, have also barely been discussed and adopted.

The History of Books has no institutional basis at Austrian universities. Therefore, a continuous academic research tradition cannot be identified. Contributions in this field emerged in disciplines such as German Studies and History, but often beyond any connection with universities, on the initiative of libraries, collectors and private scholars. The Austrian-Hungarian “Buchhändlerverband” (“book sellers’ union”) had an important book trade historian in its secretary Carl Junker, whose collected writings are now also available.<sup>2</sup> However, in contrast to the German “Börsenverein”, the Austrian association, just like its successor, the “Hauptverband des Österreichischen Buchhandels”, had no Historical Commission to systematically investigate its significant cultural heritage.

This article therefore reports above all on individual achievements and not on institutions and the formation of academic “schools”. Despite the institutional deficits mentioned, it can be shown here, particularly for recent years, that Austrian research has produced a range of well-founded individual studies and surveys. The article first cites historical overviews and monographs on individual publishers, then contributions concerning reading and censorship. In a short final section, research gaps are broached and methodological questions are raised.

---

1 DARNTON, *History*, 9.

2 HALL, *Junker*.

## II *History of Books and History of Publishing Houses*

A recent standard work is the account of Austrian book trade history by the Viennese comparatist Norbert Bachleitner, the Viennese Germanist Franz M. Eybl and the Mainz book historian Ernst Fischer.<sup>3</sup> The authors purposely confine their research to the borders of modern-day Austria, which is often problematic from a historical perspective – a recurrent dilemma of Austrian historiography. The varied transnational connections of the Habsburg book trade, as embodied exemplarily in the 18<sup>th</sup> century by printers such as Johann Thomas Trattner, thus cannot be brought into focus.

The “History of the Austrian Book Trade” is characterised by a clear concept. It follows a communication circuit of the book as described, for example, by Robert Darnton and by the Social History-oriented German Literature Studies. For each epoch,<sup>4</sup> sections are dedicated to the general historical situation, the state’s measures concerning book trade, the production and distribution of books, as well as to the authors and to the reading public. The methodical coherence and clarity are the strength of this book, which is an indispensable foundation for any further studies on the history of the book trade.

Anton Durstmüller’s three-volume study on the history of Austrian printing,<sup>5</sup> which demonstrates an impressive level of expertise, is above all oriented towards company histories. For Vienna he strongly invokes the monumental account of Viennese printing history by Anton Mayer,<sup>6</sup> which has so far remained unreplaced. Monographs also exist for other Austrian cities, such as Klagenfurt,<sup>7</sup> Krems,<sup>8</sup> Linz<sup>9</sup> and Steyr,<sup>10</sup> and the towns of Burgenland,<sup>11</sup> as well as small studies for Feldkirch,<sup>12</sup> Graz<sup>13</sup> and Salzburg,<sup>14</sup> among others. With his evaluation of Graz book trade advertisements, Andreas Golob presented a pioneer work that is still to be achieved for other periodicals, above all the *Wiener Zeitung/Wienerisches Diarium*.<sup>15</sup> His monumental work offers an impressive abundance of material about the book trade of Graz and Styria in the period from 1787 until 1811.

---

3 BACHLEITNER/EYBL/FISCHER, *Geschichte*.

4 There are three chapters dealing with the 18<sup>th</sup> century: *Der Buchhandel im Barockzeitalter 1648-1740* and *Der Buchhandel im Umbruch 1740-1790* by Franz M. Eybl, *Von den Franzosenkriegen bis zum Neoabsolutismus 1790-1860* by Norbert Bachleitner.

5 Volume 1 on the 18<sup>th</sup> century: DURSTMÜLLER, *500 Jahre*.

6 MAYER, *Buchdruckergeschichte*.

7 LIEGL, *Buchhandel*.

8 MÜLLER, *Buchdrucker*.

9 HENKE, *Geschichte*.

10 HESS, *Steyr*.

11 SEMMELWEIS, *Buchdruck*.

12 SCHNETZER, *Buchdruckgeschichte*, SOMWEBER, *Buchdrucker*, VALLASTER, *Buchhandel*.

13 KELBITSCH, *Graz*.

14 GLASER, *Buchdrucker*.

15 GOLOB, *Grundlagen*. For Vienna cf. GAYER, *Realzeitung*, BOBROWSKY, *Intelligenzwesen*.



# How Digital Media Challenge Research on the Eighteenth Century

MARTIN GASTEINER, JOSEF KÖSTLBAUER

*“De computo vel loquelo digitorum”*  
(Bede, eighth century)

*“digiti sunt 123456789”*  
(anonymous, fourteenth century)

*“Digiti heissen bei einigen die Zahlen von 1. bis 9. oder die simplen Einheiten in der decadischen Rechnung, weil man solche gemeiniglich an Fingern abzuzählen pflegt.“*  
(Zedlers Universallexion, eighteenth century)

*“we might define digital history as anything (research method, journal article, monograph, blog, classroom exercise) that uses digital technologies in creating, enhancing, or distributing historical research and scholarship.”*  
(The Journal of American History, 2008)<sup>1</sup>

This article differs from the other contributions in this volume in several instances: most obviously it ignores the timeframe 1945-2010, since digital media only started to have a profound impact on historiography and the processes of scholarly work when personal computers became widely used tools for writing and storing information in the 1980s and with the rapid growth of the world wide web in the 1990s. Even though the difference between digital and analog was mentioned before the onset of the digital age, it would be naïve simply to project the digital paradigm into the past of historiography.

Digital technology made early inroads into the sphere of the humanities, but it long remained a speciality of subdisciplines like cliometrics, which, influenced by the Social Sciences, focused on quantitative methodologies. Only with the advent of an ever more tightly integrating digital media environment has historiography been drawn into the transformative processes, which are fundamentally changing our cultural techniques and social practices. These deep transformations have been termed “Medienbruch” in German Media Studies, a term without equivalent in English. It denotes the far reaching changes in working processes and in interactions between persons and machines, the advent of new interfaces in interpersonal and person-machine relations, and also changing modes of generating, expressing and storing knowledge.

---

1 JAH Interchange: The Promise of Digital History.

### I *About Digital Media*

What is the nature of digital technology and media configurations, what is changing, what has changed and what does it mean for the humanities, especially for historiography? “Digital” nowadays is a ubiquitously used adjective, maybe an overused one. It appears in many, sometimes very different contexts; therefore it can be understood in almost as many ways. Nevertheless the importance of the term has remained undiminished and indisputable, and it has become a major signifier in innovation. It is relentlessly used by the electronic industry’s marketing divisions and is firmly embedded in everyday language. This complicates the term’s usage in scientific discourse since its meanings are constantly being rewritten and reshaped.

“Digital” has seemingly succeeded the “E-“, standing for Electronic, a result of the steadily diminishing visibility of hardware, as opposed to software applications, and the attendant representations and social and economical practices: the hack has been pushed aside by the user.

This is true within and outside of the Humanities and Social Sciences. The discrete conditions of machine and technology are disappearing, there are no more blue screens, no more command lines flashing across the magical, luminous sea of black or green screens. The disruptions, errors and rifts, which used to expose unexpectedly the technological aspect of media, have become lost in suggestive and faultless virtual worlds. Consequently it becomes harder and harder to realize the medialized character of our environs, our world. The history of such disruptions, as is being sketched in the arts and architecture, is foreign to many, or most, historians. At the same time the loss of the disruptive element marks the disappearance of singular media or key media (“Leitmedien”) positions once ascribed to the radio, TV, or newspapers. Maybe this will make it easier to speak of “media-systems”, and to open up ways towards a more systemic and more complex understanding of media phenomena, fusing social practices, cultural techniques, and technology.

In Media Historiography the digital represents one of two antithetic states of the discipline’s subject matter: the fundamental nature of the rift between analog and digital is acknowledged by all protagonists, even though its place and time are keenly debated, and even more so its consequences.<sup>2</sup> This dichotomy became a matter of scientific inquiry only after Shannon, Turing, Neumann and Wiener had formulated its mathematical expression, which allowed the creation of the computer; and after computers came to be understood as media. Once it was established in scientific discourse, the analog-digital dichotomy was identified also in the 19<sup>th</sup>, 18<sup>th</sup> and 17<sup>th</sup> centuries.<sup>3</sup> Of course a simple projection of contemporary terms into history will not produce satisfying results. One can

---

2 SCHRÖTER, *Analog/Digital*, 1-24.

3 SIEGERT, *Passagen*.

# The Austrian Society for Eighteenth Century Studies

## A Brief Historical Overview

MARION ROMBERG

*“Eine Plattform [...], auf welcher die einzelnen Forscher und Interessenten sich finden und begegnen können”*

(Moritz Csáky 1982/83)<sup>1</sup>

*“Vielfalt wissenschaftlicher Zugänge zum 18. Jahrhundert wie auch die Möglichkeiten interdisziplinärer Forschungen sichtbar machen”*

(Gunnar Hering 1990/91)<sup>2</sup>

*“nicht nur Interessens-, sondern auch Aktionsgemeinschaft”*

(Harald Heppner 1994)<sup>3</sup>

*“Ein Abbild des Kosmopolitismus des 18. Jahrhunderts“*

(Wolfgang Schmale 2010)

In 2012 the “Austrian Society for Eighteenth Century Studies” (ÖGE 18) turns thirty. One year before its jubilee the Society is for the first time in its history host of the international Congress for Eighteenth Century Studies in Graz. This mega event is organized by the umbrella association of 34<sup>4</sup> national Societies, the “International Society for Eighteenth Century Studies” (ISECS), and takes place every four years in a different country around the world. The 13<sup>th</sup> World Congress in Graz is realized in cooperation with ISECS, the University of Graz, and the University for Music and Dramatic Arts of Graz.<sup>5</sup> On the occasion of this mega event the ÖGE 18 publishes an anthology of essays which aims to give an insight into the progress and status quo of the Eighteenth Century Studies in various disciplines since 1945. This enterprise prompted the wish to look back on the history of the ÖGE 18. Its activities of three decades are characterized by interdisciplinarity, multilingualism, and a great variety of themes as well as methods presented and discussed on various occasions. Additional to the 18<sup>th</sup> century in the broader European sense it dedicated its work as a national Society especially to a better understanding of the heritable territory of the Habsburgs and its neighbouring countries. Its main achievements lay firstly in its endeavours to

---

1 CSÁKY, Gesellschaft, 5.

2 HERING, Vorwort, 5.

3 Internal paper *Gedanken zur Tätigkeit der Österreichischen Gesellschaft zur Erforschung des 18. Jahrhunderts* by Harald Heppner in Graz on December 27<sup>th</sup>, 1994.

4 This number includes also the associated national Societies in Brazil, and Serbia.

5 The website of the Congress is online in French, German, and English: [www.18thcenturycongress-graz2011.at/index.html](http://www.18thcenturycongress-graz2011.at/index.html) [01.02.2011].

revive and promote national and international scientific exchange between disciplines as well as cooperation in the Eighteenth Century Studies and Habsburg Research. Secondly through its interdisciplinary working, it contributed fundamentally to a scientific re-evaluation of this period of time and made the research results accessible to a broader public. Thirdly by striking new paths online as well as financially, the Society encouraged young academics to work in this field.

This article represents a first attempt to give a brief insight into the history and workings of the ÖGE 18 from its beginnings in 1982 to the present date. Owing to the limited space of this paper I would like to refer to the ÖGE 18 website for more detailed information on most of the activities and an extended version of the Society's history.<sup>6</sup> The Society does not possess a complete and orderly archive of its entire history. The sources consist mainly of the yearbook, various newsletters, event specific correspondence, and interviews. In the course of this article three aspects will be more closely presented: the founding of the Society and its objectives; its scientific activities as well as international relationships, and lastly its web offensive.

### *I 1982: The Goal and Idea behind the Foundation of the Society*

The idea of creating a scientific society dedicated exclusively to the study of the Eighteenth Century originated in 1981/1982 when, in Vienna, four people, who had a common interest in problems concerned with the literature, history, art, music, politics and society of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, came together informally. The participants were Moritz Csáky, Edith Rosenstrauch, Irène Montjoye, and Horst Haselsteiner.<sup>7</sup> During these meetings two considerations manifested themselves: first, the declining interest in the study of the Eighteenth Century in Austria; second, the need to find out "Who, where, how scholars work and research on the Eighteenth century?" and thus to consolidate research in various disciplines as well as private and public endeavours.<sup>8</sup>

Soon it became apparent that a more public setting for private debates had to be established outside the institutional sphere. The solution was the foundation of a scientific society with the aim of being firstly a place of debates and networking within the Austrian scientific community as well as the interested public. A second aim was to shape a common awareness among Eighteenth Century researchers, and finally to coordinate and promote research in this field nationally and internationally. The last goal refers especially to the problem that existed up to 1982, that owing to the lack of a national society for Eighteenth Century Studies scholars were forced to join foreign societies. Although this

---

6 See [www.oege18.org](http://www.oege18.org) [01.02.2011]. The extended version of this article, published on the website, also touches the field of the geographical distribution and growth of its members from 1982 till 2009.

7 See MÜLLER-KAMPEL, *Lebensstationen*, 73f.

8 See CSÁKY, *Gesellschaft*, 1.