

## Article

# Silesian Painters and Sculptors at the Vienna Academy of Fine Arts in the Years 1726–1780. A Contribution to the History of Academism in the Early Modern Period

Artur Kolbiarz 

Institute of Arts Studies, University of Silesia in Katowice, 40-007 Katowice, Poland; artur.kolbiarz@us.edu.pl

**Abstract:** The Vienna Academy was the most important art academy for German-speaking artists in the Baroque period. It shaped the development of art in the capital of the Habsburg monarchy as well as on its periphery, including in Silesia, yet the relationships between Silesian sculptors and painters and the Vienna Academy have been overlooked by scholars. Research in the Academy archives sheds light on a number of important issues related to the social, economic, and artistic aspects of the education and the subsequent activities of Vienna Academy alumni. Surviving student registers record the names of Silesian painters and sculptors studying in Vienna and offer insights into other aspects of education at the Academy.

**Keywords:** Vienna; academy; Baroque; Silesia



**Citation:** Kolbiarz, Artur. 2021. Silesian Painters and Sculptors at the Vienna Academy of Fine Arts in the Years 1726–1780. A Contribution to the History of Academism in the Early Modern Period. *Arts* 10: 86. <https://doi.org/10.3390/arts10040086>

Academic Editor: Thor J. Mednick

Received: 14 November 2021

Accepted: 7 December 2021

Published: 15 December 2021

**Publisher's Note:** MDPI stays neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.



**Copyright:** © 2021 by the author. Licensee MDPI, Basel, Switzerland. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

In the hierarchy of the institutions that shaped the modern art school, the Vienna Academy of Fine Arts (k.k. Hof-Akademie der Maler, Bildhauer und Baukunst. Later known as: k. k. Akademie der bildenden Künste) may not be in first position, an accolade which might rather be accorded to the Accademia di San Luca in Rome or the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture in Paris. Nevertheless, the Vienna Academy was the pre-eminent institution in the hierarchy of the German-speaking countries. Compared to those operating, with varying fortunes, in Nuremberg, Augsburg, Dresden, and Berlin, the Vienna Academy exerted the most significant influence on the shaping of tastes within the territory of the Habsburg Monarchy and the lands linked to it by artistic traditions. It also strengthened Vienna's position as an artistic centre (Pevsner 1940, pp. 121–22; Chmelinová 2017, p. 93). The Silesian centres of art cannot be compared with Vienna, but they nevertheless left a permanent traces on Central European art. Above all, they exerted a dominating influence on art at the frontiers of the Habsburg Monarchy, the Polish–Lithuanian Commonwealth, and the Kingdom of Prussia (Sito 1998, pp. 151–52, 162–63; Wardzyński 2011, pp. 122–27, 133–48; Migasiewicz 2012b, pp. 381–401; Sito 2016, pp. 416–21). Differences in the status of artistic centres make Vienna–Silesia a model of centre–periphery relations, where one can examine how artistic trends generated in the capital radiated out to neighbouring territories. One such understudied relationship is the impact that Silesian students at the Vienna Academy had on the development of Central European art.

The initial timeframe for this article begins with the reopening of the Vienna Academy in 1726 on the initiative of Jakob van Schuppen. It continued the tradition of the first art academy there, led by Peter Strudel from 1692 to 1714. The first academy had the character of a private enterprise but was transformed into a public institution by Emperor Joseph I in 1705 (Pevsner 1940, p. 120; Wagner 1967, pp. 18–19). With a curriculum formed in accordance with the French academy, it initiated a more rigorous approach to art education (Wagner 1967, p. 19). Unfortunately, little information remains about the students of Strudel's academy (Koller 1970, passim; 1993, pp. 107–11), which makes it impossible to carry out systematic research on the potential participation of Silesian artists in those classes, and automatically establishes 1726 as the starting point for our considerations.

Deciding upon the end date for the period considered here is a more complicated task. It is impossible to set a date for when Neoclassicist modes replaced late Baroque and Rococo ones, as this process extended over a period of time. It may be arbitrarily assumed that the changes began with the reorganisation of the Vienna Academy, which was introduced in 1772; most of the suggestions were introduced by Anton von Maron, a former student of the Vienna Academy and a member of Accademia di San Luca in Rome. Maron was mainly influenced by the neoclassical ideas of Raphael Mengs and Johann Joachim Winckelmann, two artists active in Rome at that time (Lützow 1877, pp. 53–55; Wagner 1967, pp. 41–42). The publication of Winckelmann's magnum opus, *History of Ancient Art* (*Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums*), published in 1776 by the Vienna Academy (Lützow 1877, pp. 62–63) was another signal that the new epoch had started. The climax in stylistic changes marked the turn of the 1780s. It was reflected in the institution's staffing policy, which more and more visibly favoured teachers familiar with the latest trends (Lützow 1877, pp. 66–67; Wagner 1967, p. 47; Jávör 2016, p. 13). The 1780s saw the ultimate triumph of Neoclassicism at the Vienna Academy, which is why we adopt 1780 as the end date for the period under consideration. In 1780 Empress Maria Therese died, which symbolically ended the early modern age in the history of the Habsburg Empire; it was also the period in which the stylistic movements that form the topic of this study were waning. Of course, even after this date there were still artists who had trained at the Vienna Academy and continued to follow the spirit of the late Baroque and Rococo. Such individuals reacted to the changes in style to varying degrees, but these adaptations resulted from their further artistic development. This article does not discuss the Engraving Academy (k. k. Kupferstecher-Academie), which was established in Vienna in 1766 and competed with the academy under scrutiny here. In 1772 both institutions were united as the United Imperial and Royal Academy of Fine Arts (k. k. vereingten Akademie der bildenden Künste) (regarding the Engraving Academy and the fusion of the two institutions, see Wagner 1967, pp. 29–45). The Appendix A contains archival information on Silesian artists studying at the Vienna Academy, forming an important supplement to the topics discussed.

Silesia and Vienna enjoyed strong relations based on both their geographical proximity and on their political conditions. During this period, Silesia belonged to the Bohemian Crown and thus the Habsburg Monarchy. Its dependence began with the succession that followed the death of King Louis II of Hungary in 1526 and ended when much of Silesia was annexed by King Frederick the Great in 1740–1741. As a result, despite Austria's attempts to regain the lands lost in the three wars fought between 1741 and 1763, most Silesian territories came under Prussian rule. Only its southernmost parts remained under Habsburg rule: this was the case with the Duchy of Cieszyn and parts of the duchies of Nysa, Krnov, and Opava, and with some smaller independent states (Wereszycki 1972, pp. 134–41; Czapliński et al. 2002, pp. 187–248; Wyrzykowska 2010, p. 71; Koziół 2018, pp. 300–6).

The beginnings of the Vienna Academy coincided with a particularly favourable time for the development of art in Silesia. For almost a century—from the mid-17th century until the 1740s—the ongoing wars fortunately bypassed the region, allowing it to recover economically from the devastation of the Thirty Years' War. At the turn of the 18th century, Silesia became one of the wealthiest countries of the Bohemian Crown. The activities of the Catholic Church, openly supported by the imperial authorities, were particularly vigorous during this period. The Church actively promoted the re-Catholicization of the Protestants, who were particularly prevalent in Lower Silesia. At the end of the 17th century, financial prosperity and the wide-ranging Counter-reformation activity stimulated art production in the region. In addition, the restoration of some religious freedoms in Silesia under the 1707 Convention of Altranstädt activated the Lutheran community. Ideological rivalry between the two confessions produced an increased demand for art. As a result, Silesia became an attractive place for new artists, mainly those from Central European countries. The apogee of the Silesian Baroque art occurred in the first third of the 18th century when Wrocław [German: Breslau] regained its primacy among the local artistic centres

after an earlier, temporary crisis. Alongside Wrocław, as the capital, other centres for the region included Świdnica [Schweidnitz], Nysa [Neisse], Legnica [Liegnitz], Jelenia Góra [Hirschberg], Głogów [Gross Glogau], and Opava [Troppau] (Königer 1938, pp. 27–55; Dziurla 1967, pp. 265–67; Kalinowski 1986, pp. 19–21, 39–41, 115–18, 235–37; Schenková and Olšovský 2001, pp. 11–29; Brzezina 2004, pp. 29–32; Schenková and Olšovský 2004, pp. 14–25; Gorzelik 2009a, pp. 121–70; Kozieł 2017c, p. 7; 2018, pp. 298–300).

The painters and sculptors who moved to Silesia from various parts of Europe created a mosaic of diverse artistic trends. However, reflections on academicism—if they appear at all—are relegated to the margins of numerous publications concerning the art of the region. Art academies appear only briefly and only in the context of discussing specific academic painters and sculptors active in Silesia (for example, Schultz 1882, pp. 40, 49, 115, 146; Indra 1990, p. 45; Gumiński 1995, p. 135; Schenková 1994, passim; Brzezina 2004, pp. 57–59, 105; Lejman 2008, pp. 187–88; Hołuszka 2009a, p. 348; Lejman 2009, p. 365; Wyrzykowska 2010, p. 171; Migasiewicz 2012c, p. 64; 2012a, passim; Wardzyński 2017, pp. 119–23; Wardzyński 2020, pp. 231–32).

The cursory nature, or complete absence, of academism as a topic emerges in most studies of Silesian Baroque painting and sculpture. The most comprehensive coverage of the Vienna Academy and the art emanating from it appears in a chapter in Gorzelik's history of Upper Silesian art and culture, where he highlights the numerous formal dependencies of Silesian art on that of Vienna. However, his research is hampered by a lack of archival investigation. (Gorzelik 2009b). In two existing monographs on Baroque painting and the sculpture of the Bohemian Silesia, references to the Vienna Academy are more sparse (Schenková and Olšovský 2001, pp. 33, 38; 2004, pp. 24, 54–57, 113, 134, 141–42). There are a few valuable references in a monograph on the relations between the modern art of the Lesser Poland region and today's Slovakia (Chmelinová 2017), but Silesian artists are only mentioned in passing, due to the study's different geographic scope (the archival information given in that publication regarding artists studying at the Vienna Academy was based on research by myself, not published at the time; see Chmelinová (2017), p. 112, footnote 55). The only monograph discussing Baroque and Rococo sculpture in Silesia does not mention the topic of academies at all (Kalinowski 1986). A monograph on sculpture and small church architecture in the Duchies of Krnov and Opava only contains short paragraphs on academism in the context of education and models of activity among Baroque sculptors. It does mention two Silesian graduates of the Vienna Academy: Anton Stanetti and Johann Ludwig Gode (even though Johann Ludwig is mistaken for Ludwig, the supposed father of Johann Ludwig) (Brzezina 2004, pp. 57–58). A major work recently published on Silesian Baroque painting discusses academies only in passing, which is surprising given it includes an erudite and well-written essay on the diverse social, economic, and artistic contexts in which 17th- and 18th-century Silesian painters operated (Kozieł 2017c). It includes a study of the possible careers of Baroque painters, providing particularly detailed analysis of the paths of a guild artist, a servitor, a court artist employed at the service of a prince or aristocratic family, and an artist endowed by the emperor with the privilege of "court liberty". There is a valuable, albeit brief, summary of the activities of academic artists, which mentions that in the 18th century, studying at the Vienna Academy became a substitute for the previously desirable education in Italy; it also notes that the academic artists of Silesia were members of the artistic elite. The monograph lists seven 18th-century students of the Vienna Academy in Silesia: Johan Franz Felder, Karl Felder, Johann Georg Frömmel (the Vienna education of this artist took place in 1787 and thus exceeds the scope of this article), Johann Franz Greipel, Felix Ivo Leicher, Karl Joseph Wolf, and (mistakenly) Bernhard Krause (Kozieł 2017c, pp. 30, 220–22). Information on the academic education of these artists is complemented by notes on each of them, contributed by various specialists, included in the second part of the book (Macura 2017a, 2017b, 2017c; Schenková 2017a, 2017b, 2017d, 2017e; Szelać 2017).

There is therefore great scope to expand on the current research, beginning with archival investigations in search of previously unexamined Silesian artists. The documen-

tary archives of Vienna Academy reveal a great deal, and the importance of this information for understanding the art of this period is immediately apparent. Simply examining the number of students in Silesia—figures found in the matriculas of the Vienna Academy—reveals that between 1726 and 1780, there were no fewer than 46 painters and 6 sculptors there. As such, there are clearly many important gaps in our knowledge of the academic movement in Silesia: for example, on how many such artists there were and at which institutions they studied, what the socio-economic aspects of their activities in the region were, and their significance for the development of local art.

The register of students is kept in the University Archives of the Vienna Academy of Fine Arts. The period in question is covered in four matriculas, some of which overlap in terms of the time they cover. Although its title is misleading, the first book covers 1726–1753 ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#)), the second 1754–1772 ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1b](#)), the third 1738–1765 ([Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#)), and the fourth 1765–1795 ([Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 2](#)). Other scholars' research is also invaluable in reconstructing the list of Silesian artists. Before the Second World War, Herbert August Mansfeld published an almost complete roll of students in 1726–1739, excluding single omissions ([Mansfeld 1938](#)). In 2016, Enikő Buzási published a long matricula which included artists at the Vienna Academy in 1726–1810 who were active in the former kingdom of Hungary and included the names of a few Silesian artists ([Buzási 2016a](#)). These sources are complemented by archival material included in Simon Marz's unpublished MA thesis ([Marz 2007](#)).

The archival material poses several research dilemmas: even though the matriculas cover the whole period in question, they lack a uniform system of inscription and detail. The brief information noted in a matricula typically included the first and last name of a student, their profession, the region and town they came from, the date of enrollment, and where they resided in Vienna. Occasionally, information about the father's profession and the name of the course taken at the Academy is included. Initially, matricula included no references to the date of enrollment; instead, artists were assigned to one of two periods: 1726–1728 or 1728–1730. The records for 1730–1733 give only the year of enrollment; entries that include the day of enrollment only appear beginning in October 1733. Further difficulties are posed by the fact that no professions were recorded from 1726 to 1729. In the period from 1730 to 1737, this information appeared only irregularly. For these reasons, the present study can only estimate the number of painters and sculptors from Silesia who attended the Vienna Academy. Therefore, among the 23 Silesians enrolled in the Academy whose profession was not given, we cannot rule out the possibility that some were artists who were not recognised as such.

The matriculas only cover details pertaining to enrollment, providing information on the length of stay only in exceptional cases. They do not inform us about end results. Consequently, the number of Silesian artists who successfully finished their studies at the Vienna Academy in the period up to 1780 remains unknown. Completion certificates were not issued until Emperor Joseph's educational reforms of 1783 were introduced in Austria ([Buzási 2016b](#), p. 62). It may be assumed that individuals whose names appear multiple times in the archives within a specific period were likely to have been more successful, but it is not possible to ascertain whether such students frequented classes regularly between the two entries in question, since artists were sometimes forced to abandon their studies due to professional obligations to their employers. Another reason a student may have been noted several times in the Academy's records would be if he participated in various courses offered ([Buzási 2016b](#), p. 62). For example, in 1744, Johann Franz Greipel participated in the course on ancient art, and in 1752 he took the model drawing class ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), pp. 252, 333; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 87 recto). This information has previously been incorrectly interpreted to mean that Greipel initially participated in the beginners' course (see [Schenkova 2017b](#), p. 415), when in fact both these courses were advanced (see [Wagner 1967](#), p. 27; [Buzási 2016b](#), p. 43). Another Silesian artist with multiple entries in the matricula is the sculptor Ignaz Kessler (Kössler), whose name

appears once in 1753 and twice in 1758 ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 355; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 165 verso; [Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1b](#), p. 146. See also: [Buzási \(2016a\)](#), p. 162). The following painters were noted twice: Johann Depée (Depie), twice in 1754 ([Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 141 verso; [Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1b](#), p. 51); Bernard Fridrig, in 1744 and 1749 ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 255, 277; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 87 verso); Johann Caspar Grübler, in 1749 and 1753 ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), pp. 277, 352); Bonifatius Hamer, twice in 1740 ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 190; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 51 verso); Kaspar Franz Sambach, in 1740 and 1744 ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), pp. 197, 260; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 49 recto. See also: [Buzási 2016a](#), p. 232) and Anton Stulz (Stultz), twice in 1745 ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 268; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 89 recto). Furthermore, there is an exceptional note under 1769 and the name of Johann Franz Felder, which contains information on his participation in various classes over the course of five years ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1b](#), p. 73; [Macura \(2017b\)](#), p. 399).

The matriculas are not the only documents that provide information on the Silesian students' relationship with the Academy. When the prospect of war over the Austrian succession loomed, this institution, similar to the others, was subject to mobilisation, and a military unit was created for it (Frey-Compagnie der k. freyen Hof-Akademie der Mahlerey, Bildhauerey und Bau-Kunst. See [Wagner \(1967\)](#), p. 24). The preserved list of its members includes Gottfried Wolf from Silesia, who enrolled in 1733 ([Lützow 1877](#), p. 147). An even more interesting document was produced in March 1745 and updated in August 1745, on suspending activities of the Vienna Academy as a result of the quarters that were taken away from it. Jacob van Schuppen set out to remedy the crisis. He created a list of academic painters, sculptors, and architects which he submitted to the marshal at the court to gain legal protection for the artists in question ([Marz 2007](#), pp. 143–46; [Jávor 2016](#), p. 10). The list was divided into first- and second-class academics. In the latter category, he mentioned the following Silesian painters: Johann Franz Greipel (enrolled for the first time in 1744), Karl Lazel (enrolled in 1744), Franz Karl Palko (enrolled in 1738), and Franz Zumb (enrolled in 1744) (see [Marz 2007](#), pp. 144–46).

Another source on artists' education can be found in the lists of prizes they were awarded, in the form of gold and silver medals, granted annually at the Vienna Academy starting from 1731 ([Lützow 1877](#), p. 23; [Wagner 1967](#), p. 24). One of the Silesian artists, Christoph Wilhelm Seidel (enrolled in 1732), received a silver medal in 1735 for the painting *Sacrifice of Abraham* and a year later won a golden medal for *Isaak blessed Jacob* ([Weinkopf 1875](#), p. 29). Franz Karl Palko (enrolled in 1738) in 1745 received a gold medal for the painting *Judith with the head of Holofernes* ([Weinkopf 1875](#), p. 30). Felix Ivo Leicher (enrolled in 1751) was awarded a silver medal in 1754 for *Prophet Samuel anointing Saul as king* ([Weinkopf 1875](#), p. 31).

After their education was complete, graduates could apply to join the elite group of Vienna Academy members, based on their work; these applications had to be approved by the academy counsel. Usually, the whole procedure took place some time after the artist finished his studies ([Jávor 2016](#), p. 10). Of the newcomers from Silesia, we know that two artists were accepted to this honourable group: Kaspar Sambach, in 1759 ([Weinkopf 1875](#), pp. 11, 81) and Johann Franz Greipel, in 1765 (the artist presented his work, *The Beheading of John the Baptist*; [Weinkopf \(1875\)](#), pp. 11, 81; [Indra \(1997\)](#), p. 66).

The information presented above indicates that students usually attended the classes for a few years. The first statute of the Vienna Academy, from 1726, did not include any information on the required length of studies required for completion. For almost the entirety of the 18th century, this question was not approached systematically ([Buzási 2016b](#), p. 62). However, during the conflict with town guilds in 1734–1735, van Schuppen mentioned the two-year length of studies, after which inadequately gifted youths could be transferred to the town organisation ([Marz 2007](#), p. 97). However, there is no evidence to indicate that this rule was put into practice. We can only deduce that promotion depended on individual students' predisposition and progress. The regularity with which students

frequented classes was not without consequence. The examples of three Silesian artists, Greiper, Lazel, and Zumb, indicate that students did not necessarily have to train for many years in order to achieve promotion: in 1745, all three of them were included by van Schuppen in the list of academic artists after only a few months' study.

The matriculas of the Vienna Academy include not only artists but also many representatives of non-artistic professions. Among the newcomers from Silesia, we can find students from the University of Vienna, lawyers, priests, clerks, gardeners, cartwrights, cantors, and builders of mathematical tools. About 30 such people appear in the period in question, suggesting that their presence was not incidental. Even though the phenomenon of non-artistic professionals attending the Vienna Academy was widespread (and not limited to newcomers from Silesia), it is often overlooked in the literature, which has the potential to distort the image of education in this institution. Enikő Buzási recently took up the subject in her comprehensive study on those who graduated from the Vienna Academy and came from or worked in the kingdom of Hungary (Buzási 2016b, pp. 43–47).

The education of amateurs was possible thanks to the beginners' course (Wagner 1967, p. 27; Buzási 2016b, p. 43). The provision of such a course is mirrored in the courses offered by the Royal Prussian Academy of the Arts and Mechanical Sciences in Berlin (Königlich-Preußische Akademie der Künste und mechanischen Wissenschaften) (Pevsner 1940, p. 120). In Vienna, one of the advantages of adopting this solution was the education of gifted youths even before they finished the lowest level of art education. Buzási provides the example of over 30 students at the Vienna Academy in the 18th century who began their education before they turned 12, and over 40 students aged 13 to 14 (Buzási 2016b, pp. 43–44). It also opened up the possibility of obtaining an education in art to those who were not artists and did not intend to become one. Such students may have treated education at the Academy as a complementary extension to education in their chosen craft. The classes were particularly popular with students at the University of Vienna (Universität Wien), especially among those from the Department of Philosophy (Buzási 2016b, pp. 46–47). This trend is also confirmed when analysing notes on the newcomers from Silesia. In Vienna, students who were not artists constituted an important part of the academic community, but they did not predominate. Anton Weinkopf cites a list from 1783 detailing a class of beginners, probably mainly representatives of non-artistic professions, with 40 students—more or less one-fifth of all the students studying there at the time (Weinkopf 1875, p. 14). At the same time, it is important to remember that the beginners' course was not reserved for representatives of non-artistic professions.

Educating representatives of various non-artistic professions was a part of the Vienna Academy's mission from the outset. Jacob van Schuppen emphasised that the functioning of this institution had a fundamental role not only in the development of art in the Habsburg Monarchy, but also in the proper education of representatives of various professions and in stimulating trade. He made this point at least twice: in 1726, when trying to restore the Academy, and in 1745, when attempting to prevent it from being closed down (Wagner 1967, p. 21; Marz 2007, pp. 76, 104). The later protector of the Vienna Academy, Prince Wenzel Anton von Kaunitz, stated this even more emphatically (on Kaunitz's importance for the development of Austrian art see Kroupa (1996), *passim*). In 1770 he wrote about the omnipresent benefits from academic education, including drawing, composition, and the study of nature and classical art. He observed that the education provided by the academy enabled students to rise beyond the unreflective copying of someone else's ideas and had a positive effect in terms of stimulating invention, industry, and craftsmanship. He pointed towards France as a model to emulate, arguing that, in the long run, the country benefited from the activities of the Academy in Paris, which raised the level of education and the consciousness of French society. This, in his opinion, benefitted France more than the victories of its famous generals (Wagner 1967, pp. 37–38).

It has to be underlined that, despite its more egalitarian attitude, the Vienna Academy did not differ from other institutions of the kind in terms of its academic ethos. It focused on studies of the human body and ancient culture. A hierarchy of academic topics was

observed, with Academy members and former students singled out above the guild, the court, and the University of Vienna's artists (van Schuppen underlined this in the severe conflict with the Vienna guilds in 1734–1735; see [Marz \(2007\)](#), p. 99). The rudimentary techniques of visual arts were not taught. The Academy focused on developing the skills acquired during the traditional learning process that took place in workshops ([Jávor 2016](#), pp. 21–22). At least when van Schuppen was a director, even in the case of introductory courses, it was assumed that representatives of non-artistic professions should already be familiar with the elementary skills involved in making a drawing ([Marz 2007](#), p. 100).

The syllabus of classes at the Vienna Academy evolved, but from the outset its curriculum included teaching topics related to painting, sculpture, architecture, and engraving ([Lützow 1877](#), p. 15; [Wagner 1967](#), p. 22). Under van Schuppen's management, a division into the basic directions in education crystallised: a beginners' course, which involved studying drawing, perspective, and architecture; and advanced classes, which included drawing from a model and ancient art ([Wagner 1967](#), p. 27; [Buzási 2016b](#), p. 43). The general division into courses was similar at the end of the period in question, in 1783, with a beginners' course, a course in architecture, a course in landscape painting, a course in drawing living model, and a course in ancient art ([Weinkopf 1875](#), p. 14). The detailed offer was extended; for example, in 1727, courses in drawing and engraving were introduced, and in 1739 anatomy classes were initiated ([Lützow 1877](#), pp. 19, 21; [Wagner 1967](#), p. 23). The following years brought other ways of complementing the syllabus.

The classes were free and widely available. According to the 1751 statute, the classes took place daily in winter and three times a week in summer. We know that, since Paul Strudel led the Academy, evening classes were preferred ([Lützow 1877](#), p. 31; [Wagner 1967](#), pp. 19, 27, 38; [Jávor 2016](#), pp. 11, 19). That preference, as well as the changing intensity of classes with the seasons, were dictated by the need to accommodate the professional situation of students. Although the courses were free, most students needed to work for a living, usually in their professions, hence the phrase *in condito[ne]*, which means “working in somebody's workshop”, appears frequently in the matriculas. The reduced intensity of professional work in late autumn and winter also explains why most entries in academic matriculas occur at these times of year (see: Appendix A).

Even though the system of combining studying with professional work appeared to be optimal, it sometimes generated problems. An example of this is illustrated in van Schuppen's letter to Count Gundacker Ludwig Joseph von Althan, which discusses Johann Ludwig Gode. Born in Wrocław, Gode enrolled in the Vienna Academy in 1732 while working professionally in the workshop of Georg Raphael Donner, the leading representative of the classicising movement in the middle of the 18th century (for more information about Gode, see [Keleti 1983](#), p. 175; [Malíková 1993](#); [Chmelinová 2017](#), pp. 87, 114, 119–20). In October 1740, Gode and three other students hired by Donner submitted sketches to a cyclical competition (this did not concern the aforementioned gold and silver medals, but less prestigious awards granted for sketches) and left for Carinthia to fulfil an urgent contract signed by their master. As a consequence, they were not able to see what happened to their work, which was not subject to any consideration by van Schuppen. After they returned, their protests were ignored, and they were not able to arrange a meeting with the director. Consequently, Gode, probably acting as their informal leader, criticised the conditions they had encountered while studying at the Academy. He raised the issue of a particularly unfortunate arrangement of ancient statues which did not allow the students to study them appropriately, and the improper teaching of drawing from a model. Van Schuppen, who reported the whole incident, bitterly remarked in his letter that sculptors always caused him a great deal of trouble ([Marz 2007](#), pp. 102–3). This story may act as an excellent anecdote, but at the same time, it also provides information that cannot be tracked down in the notes on Gode in the matriculas: based on the arguments he raised, we can assume, with a high degree of certainty, that he attended the courses on model drawing and ancient art. Indeed, there are further cases in the history of the Vienna Academy in which working and studying collided, but they rarely took such a

spectacular course. The regulations of the Academy were clear about insubordination among the students, who could be expelled for unworthy conduct ([Marz 2007](#), p. 81).

The data collected reveal some information about these artists' patterns of migration. We know the place of birth of 48 of the recognised Silesian painters and sculptors who studied at the Vienna Academy in the period in question. However, it should be remembered that hometowns were not necessarily the same as places of apprenticeship, especially in the case of small towns. Most of the artists (31) came from Lower Silesia, and almost half of them (14) were born in Wrocław, the region's biggest town and artistic centre. The remaining cities were home to two representatives each, with a striking lack of newcomers from Legnica and Świdnica, despite these being artistic centres of local importance.

The case of Ząbkowice Śląskie [Germ. Frankenstein] is unusual, in that there were as many as four artists from there studying in Vienna—an exceptional number for such a small provincial town. The local popularity of the Vienna Academy is also evidenced by the presence of eight artists born in the Duchy of Ziębice (where Ząbkowice Śląskie was situated) enrolled at the Academy—almost half the total number of students from Upper Silesia. It is not surprising that Bernhard Krause, the most outstanding artist from Ząbkowice Śląskie, followed in the footsteps of other artists and made Vienna one of his places of education. The fact that he had previously visited Dresden, where he studied with Franz Karl Palko, an alumnus of the Vienna academy, is also significant. There are no traces of Krause's enrollment in the Academy, but he studied in the workshop of one of its professors, Martin van Meytens ([Szeląg 2017](#), p. 496).

In addition to urban centres, it is worth noting the presence of students from villages or small towns belonging to wealthy monasteries, namely, Lubiąż [Germ. Leubus], Henryków [Heinrichau], Kamieniec Ząbkowicki [Kamenz], and Lubomierz [Liebenthal]. Thanks to the artistic investments made around the turn of the 18th century, these places played an important role in developing Silesian Baroque art. However, it should be noted that it was not typically the children of artists who were involved in these ventures. Emmanuel Jörck (Jörg), son of Anton Jörg—a sculptor active in Kamieniec Ząbkowicki and Nysa—was an exception to this rule (for more about Anton Jörg, see [Kalinowski 1986](#), pp. 198–200; [Kolbiarz 2010](#), pp. 156–57). Apparently, these monasteries' extensive and long-lasting artistic endeavours made a limited contribution to popularizing the art profession among local citizens.

In Upper Silesia, the general ratio between the whole region (17) and Opava, the dominant settlement there (7), were similar to those in Lower Silesia. Bilovec [Germ. Wagstadt] (3) stands out from other towns in the region. Poor representation from the vast Prussian part of Upper Silesia is notable, with only three students, all of whom were born in the Western part of the region, relatively close to the border with Lower Silesia. Among them, we know that at least Ignaz Kessler (Kössler) came from an artistic family: he was the grandson or son of Michael, a sculptor from Swabia, who was active at first in Wrocław and then in Kłodzko [Glatz]; in the 1720s, he ultimately settled down in Niemodlin [Falkenberg] (for more about Michael Kössler, see [Kalinowski 1986](#), pp. 194–96).

The wars over Silesia and the Prussian usurpation of most of the region in 1740–1741 did not stop the influx of Silesian artists to the Vienna Academy. The border artificially divided the region into two countries, but it did not have such disastrous consequences for the art market as it did for the economy. The latest research confirms that, particularly in the regions close to the border, artists still worked successfully on either side of it ([Kozieł 2018](#), *passim*; [Kolbiarz 2018](#), pp. 47–55). The Academy's matriculas demonstrate that even Vienna, despite being more remote, did not cease to be attractive to Silesian artists. Between 1726 and November 1740, before the annexation of Silesia, as many as ten artists came to the Academy from the region that was then lost in 1740/41. Between December 1740 and February 1763, during the wars over Silesia, there were 15 newcomers from the lost region. Furthermore, there were eight newcomers between the time the fighting stopped and the end of the period in question (February 1763–1780). The differences in numbers in these periods do not themselves speak of much, since their duration is not equal (14,

22, and 17 years, respectively). Taking this into account, the changes in migration cannot be described as drastic, despite the radically changing geopolitical conditions. Only the last period is characterised by lower migration in comparison with the previous periods. However, the picture is slightly different when we consider those regions of Silesia that remained in Austrian hands. There were three such artists in the first period, eight artists in the second, and only two in the third period.

In the current state of research, only just over half of the Silesian painters and sculptors who studied in Vienna are known for their late, at least partially recognised professional activities. Others await discovery, while some did not work as independent artists. Despite the fragmentary nature of the record, it is possible to observe patterns suggesting that migrations related to studying in Vienna were by no means uniform. Some artists did not return to Silesia after their studies, but instead chose a career in various parts of Europe, mainly in Austria, Moravia, and the kingdom of Hungary. This group includes Augustin Aust (Buzási 2016b, p. 48), Johann Ignaz Cimbäl (Jávor 1998, passim; Ariječuk 2011, passim; Chmelinová 2017, p. 101), Karl Felder (Macura 2017a, p. 393), Johann Ludwig Gode (Keleti 1983, pp. 175–77; Malíková 1993, pp. 67–69; Chmelinová 2017, pp. 87, 114, 119–20), Johann Franz Greipel (Indra 1997, pp. 66–67; Schenková and Olšovský 2001, p. 38; Schenková 2017b, passim), Ignaz Kessler (Buzási 2016b, p. 49), Felix Ivo Leicher (Schenková and Olšovský 2001, pp. 55–56, 90–92; 2004, pp. 54–57; Schenková 2017d, passim), Franz Xaver Palcko (Preiss 1989, passim; Prange 2001, passim; Chmelinová 2017, p. 101), Wenzel Pohl (Schöny 1970, p. 134), and Kaspar Franz Sambach (Lützwow 1877, pp. 34, 54, 59; Schenková and Olšovský 2001, p. 33).

However, a comparable group chose to return to Silesia (at least for a while), including Johann Heinrich Depée (Krause 1933, p. 175), Franz Eitner (Andrzejewska 2010, pp. 47–75, Andrzejewska 2012, passim; Migasiewicz 2012b, pp. 383–89), Johann Franz Felder (Lejman 2009, passim; Macura 2017b, passim), Ignaz Hirschig (Indra 1999, p. 100), Johann Karl Kynast (Kozieł 2017a, passim), Joseph Lux (Schenková 1982, passim; Schenková and Olšovský 2001, pp. 17, 56–58; Gorzelik 2004, passim; 2009b, pp. 166–67; Kozieł 2017c, p. 223, 2017b, passim), Christoph Wilhelm Seidel (Hołuszka 2009a, p. 348; Macura 2017c, passim), Anton Stanetti (Brzezina 2004, pp. 57–58; Schenková and Olšovský 2004, pp. 22–23; Gorzelik 2010, pp. 370–71, 375), Gottfried Wolf (Schenková and Olšovský 2004, p. 161), Joseph Wolf (Schenková and Olšovský 2001, p. 73; Kozieł 2017c, p. 30; Schenková 2017e, passim), and possibly also Franz Henel (Indra 1998, p. 125; Schenková and Olšovský 2001, p. 17), Karl Benjamin Lion (Hołuszka 2009b, p. 389), and Joseph Steiner (Kozieł 2017c, p. 40).

The relatively large number of artists who returned to Silesia provokes the question of how they might have profited from the studies they had completed at the Academy upon their return. This is not a question that can be easily answered. There is a persistent conviction in the literature that, in general, an academic education guaranteed privileges that facilitated an artistic career, such as exemption from membership of the city guilds and the associated possibility of an above-standard expansion of workshop staff, as well as the ability to demand higher prices compared to city artists (Brzezina 2004, p. 58; Suchánek 2011, p. 44). However, the problem was that the statutes of 18th-century European art institutions differed from one another. Even if all of them, to some extent, were related to the laws granted to the Académie royale de peinture et de sculpture in Paris or the Accademia di San Luca in Rome, their statutes evolved with time. Another important aspect was that in 1740 Silesia was divided into two conflicting states, and these states had different motivations when it came to recognising an academic education obtained in Vienna.

In 1726, Jacob van Schuppen prepared the first statutes of the Vienna Academy and modelled them on the Paris Academy; he tried to achieve a broadly conceived emancipation of his institution and its students from traditional arts organisations. He assumed complete independence from the regulations and payments imposed by the guilds, obliged the court servitors to obey his authority, and demanded a monopoly on drawing from a model and

running public debates about art (Lützow 1877, p. 16; Wagner 1967, pp. 22–23; Marz 2007, pp. 78–82). However, the document submitted to Emperor Karl VI was thought to be too revolutionary by Austrian standards and to be too strongly directed against the existing order and was thus not approved. As a result, the statutes were only observed within the Academy and did not particularly affect external organisations. Van Schuppen's second attempt to get the statutes approved, and his subsequent battle with the city guilds in 1734–1735, also failed. As a result, the Academy functioned without statutory approval for the entire period of his directorship (Wagner 1967, p. 23; Marz 2007, pp. 88–103). Van Schuppen complained that, in light of this, he could not issue adequate diplomas to the students that would have protected them legally (Marz 2007, p. 80). As a consequence, artists associated with the Vienna Academy could not count on automatic exclusion from the guilds' jurisdiction in Vienna, not to mention other towns of the Habsburg Monarchy. Possible exemption from the customary duties involved taking individual action on each case, as is confirmed by the list mentioned above, prepared by van Schuppen in March 1745, in which he asked for administrative protection of the indicated academic artists.

The situation did not change in the later period of the rectorate. In fact, it persisted until 1783—a date beyond the scope of this article—when Emperor Joseph II introduced radical reforms to the system of education. The Academy was then given the right to grant Master's degrees to artists, including those active in guilds. Until then, the abolition of personal quotas in workshops led by masters with a degree from the Academy was also legally sanctioned (Wagner 1967, p. 49). Even though the changes were favourable for those who had completed their education at the Academy, separate registers of artists covered by the complete protection were first made. Anton Weinkopf, an adjunct to the Academy's secretary, reprinted the lists from 1783 and 1790. The rolls are surprisingly brief, covering only 20 and 14 names, respectively. Both lists mention two Silesian artists, Christian Sambach and Felix Ivon Leicher (Weinkopf 1875, pp. 13–14, 84–85). It is important to note that the reforms introduced were observed in the hereditary territories of the Habsburg Monarchy; hence, they did not cover most of Silesia, which was ruled by Prussia at that time.

What prospects, then, did artists trained in European academies of fine arts in 1726–1780 have when they arrived in Silesia? The current research cannot adequately describe the activities of those artists; however, the existing data allow us to present an approximate idea of their social and professional status, which can act as a point of departure for further discussions.

The best example was the career of Philipp Sauerland from Gdańsk [Germ. Danzig], who was mainly a painter of portraits and still nature. He was one of two artists (the other being Friedrich Jachmann) who were active in Wrocław and who, in the 18th century, gained the privilege of “court liberty”, which meant free activity under theegis of the emperor, without being dependent on guilds or the town authorities. What is particularly important is how Sauerland gained this privilege. In his 1716 application, directed to the royal office in Prague, the artist cited the skills that he gained during his studies at the Royal Prussian Academy of the Arts and Mechanical Sciences in Berlin in 1709. Despite vehement protests from Wrocław's town council, Sauerland was granted the desired privilege and was allowed to work in Wrocław as a free artist, provided he paid the annual tax. The artist successfully operated in this town until his death. Contract providers and collectors valued his paintings, and his work was noted in 18th-century publications (Oszczanowski 1999, passim; Sobiecka 2008, pp. 46–48; Pierzchała 2009, pp. 11–12; Kozieł 2017c, pp. 31–32, 111, 213; Kwaśny 2017, p. 642).

Another successful academic painter in Wrocław was Christoph Wilhelm Seidel. He was noticed, while still a youth, by Bishop Franz Ludwig von der Pfalz-Neuburg, and in 1732 he was sent to study at the Vienna Academy. His studies were very successful, and he was awarded both gold and silver medals in the Academy's annual contests. After returning to Silesia, and despite the death of his protector, he managed to find his place in the local art market, mainly by painting portraits of burghers and members of the

clergy. He became wealthy from the numerous commissions he received and divided his wealth among his children in his testament (Kozieł 2017c, pp. 31, 112, 219; Macura 2017c, pp. 680–81).

Johann Franz Felder was another academic who built a lucrative career after returning to the capital of Lower Silesia from Vienna. In contrast to Sauerland and Seidel, he had an easier professional start in Wrocław due to the prior activities of his father, Franz Xaver Anton. When we compare Johann Franz's career with that of his father, it is possible to see how he profited from his academic education and the respect he received from the local community. On his return from Vienna, Johann Franz became the lead assistant in his father's workshop and took over the atelier after his father's death. Franz Xaver Anton already ran a very profitable workshop, but its activity was limited to commissions for religious art. The younger Felder continued with the sacral art, but also enlarged the workshop's range to painting portraits. He quickly succeeded in this, with clients including the Catholic church elites of the time, as well as eminent Protestants. Felder took on an additional job as a drawing teacher in the Wrocław gymnasium at St Magdalen's church. He also oversaw Ernst Wilhelm von Haubrig's valuable collection, which was in deposit in the art cabinet of the church library (Macura 2015, pp. 161–62; Kozieł 2017c, p. 220; Macura 2017a, p. 394; 2017b, pp. 398–99).

There are records available which testify that academically educated artists could achieve considerable success in Upper Silesia. Anton Stanetti is the best example of this, although until recently his association with the Vienna Academy was largely unknown, apart from a brief reference made by Katarzyna Brzezina (Brzezina 2004, pp. 57–58). Stanetti was a sculptor from Silesia, but his place of birth remains unknown. He finished his apprenticeship with his relative, Johann Stanetti, an important Vienna sculptor, also of Silesian origin, who also taught the later leading representatives of the Vienna classicising trend, Jakob Schetterer and Christoph Mader, among others. It was probably after Johann's death, in 1726, that Anton enrolled in the Vienna Academy. After his return to Silesia, he settled down in Cieszyn [Germ. Teschen], where he first appears in the documentary record in the 1730s. Despite a general lack of analysis regarding his activities, we know he held a high professional status as the court sculptor of the Marshal of the Duchy of Cieszyn, Karl František Skrbeňský. Apart from the works he created for his protector, Stanetti's clientele included representatives of the numerous local noble families (Mansfeld 1938, p. 124; Schenková and Olšovský 2004, pp. 22–23; Olšovský 2011, pp. 102–4).

Unfortunately, records referencing Vienna's academic artists in Upper Silesia are scarce, but there are two of note. Ignaz Hirschig from Vindava [Germ. Weydenau] enrolled in the Academy in 1775 and was professionally active in his hometown three years later. Two of his works indicate that he took up commissions that involved both painting and embellishing. In Hirschig's case, the high social position he achieved is important: after 1800, he was granted the post of mayor of Vindava. Further investigation would be required to ascertain whether this resulted from his education and professional activities or his marriage to a town councillor's daughter (Indra 1999, p. 100). Franz Hanel from Opava was noted in the Academy's records in 1777; he was probably the same person as Franz Martin Hanel, born in this town on 1 January 1757 and professionally active there from 1784. His artistic career remains completely undiscussed, but he must have been successful to have purchased a house in the town (Indra 1998, p. 125; Schenková and Olšovský 2001, p. 17).

However, studying at an art academy did not automatically open up the possibility of a great career. Joseph Lux, one of the most interesting painters of the Upper Silesian region in the last quarter of the 18th century, was very clear about this. The artist has not been associated with academic education in the literature to date, although numerous connections between his works and Vienna painting have been pointed out. Lux was noted at the Academy in 1766; a few years later he settled in Opava, where he married and, around 1772, started a career as a town painter. Despite his intensive activities, he suffered from financial problems, which in 1785 led him to sell the tenant house that he

had received from his wife a few years earlier. However, before this happened, in 1781 he suffered a negative—and from today’s perspective perhaps unfair—opinion of his talent when he bid for a lucrative commission for side altars paintings for the Church of the Assumption in Opava. The church patron and commander of the Order of the Teutonic Knights, Count von Riedheim, disparagingly called Lux “a minor painter”. This patron’s excessively high expectations are evident in the fact that he also rejected a proposal from Johann Franz Greipel, who had not only graduated from Vienna Academy, but was also a full member. In the end, Felix Ivon Leicher, another former student of the Academy from Silesia who was active in Vienna, won the commission ([Nahmen = Register \[...\]](#), [Signature 1b](#), p. 168; [Schenkova and Olšovský 2001](#), pp. 17, 56–58; [Schenkova 2002](#), p. 259; [Gorzelik 2004](#), passim; [2009b](#), pp. 166–67; [Kozielec 2017c](#), p. 223, [2017b](#), pp. 568–69; [Schenkova 2017b](#), p. 415).

The examples above show that there were opportunities for artists to be financially successful with an academic education in 18th-century Silesia, provided they had a bit of luck. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the opportunities were usually not much better than those of guild artists with some traditional education. It was not possible to graft the “free artist” model onto Silesia, due to the lack of legal conditions and few academic artists in the region. Philipp Sauerland was a notable exception to this, as someone who deployed his academic education successfully. It should also be emphasised that both Sauerland and Johann Franz Felder had additional jobs as drawing teachers. The former taught members of the nobility, while the latter was employed in the most important gymnasium in the region. The mission of art education carried out by former students of art academies was in line with academic assumptions and coincided with the educational reforms later introduced by Emperor Joseph II ([Wagner 1967](#), p. 49). Felder also had responsibility for looking after an art collection, a function customarily given to local authorities on art ([Macura 2015](#), p. 162).

The dynamically changing number of European art academies in the 18th century cannot be overlooked when considering various socio-economic and artistic problems. In 1720 there were only 19 academies, but towards end of the century, in 1790, there were over 100 ([Pevsner 1940](#), pp. 140–41). As the number of academies grew, the number of former students also increased. The accomplishments of Anton Stanetti and Philipp Sauerland must therefore be seen differently from those of Johann Franz Felder or Ignaz Hirschig. It appears that until the end of the 18th century, only a relatively small number of academically educated artists settled in Silesia. The situation changed around 1800, when the general accessibility of higher education institutions and the changes in vocational education led to the near downfall of the guild system.

It is important to remember that academic artworks in Silesia were not only created by native artists. Particularly in Upper Silesia, a considerable number were by artists who normally worked and resided outside Silesia. The scope of this article does not allow for discussion of this vast topic, even though a general perspective on the academic movement in Silesia is incomplete without such considerations. However, it is worth highlighting that the artists who were given such commissions were usually eminent former students of the Vienna Academy, such as Johann Franz Greipel ([Schenkova 1994](#), pp. 124–27; [Arijčuk 2000](#), p. 37; [Schenkova 2017b](#), pp. 415–18), Johann Lucas Kracker ([Schenkova and Olšovský 2001](#), pp. 51–52, 89; [Schenkova 2017c](#), passim), Felix Ivo Leicher ([Schenkova and Olšovský 2001](#), pp. 55–56, 90–92; [2004](#), pp. 54–57; [Slaviček 2007](#), passim; [Schenkova 2017d](#), passim), Wenzel Böhm ([Wardzyński 2017](#), passim), and Andreas Schweigel ([Indra 1981](#), passim; [Stehlík 2003](#), passim), although on occasion works were commissioned from artists educated at other art academies, for example, Joseph Ignaz Sadler, a former student of Accademia di San Luca in Rome ([Kozielec 2017d](#), passim).

The last topic worth discussing here is the question of the style observed in the Vienna Academy. One of the most distinguished Polish researchers of early modern art, Mariusz Karpowicz, recently made the following statement when he introduced the anti-academic movement in the Polish rococo art: “Between 1741 and 1770 the primary importance of

content was abolished, the *decorum* principle, till then so popular, was departed from, and *imaginatio* replaced the *imitatio* of Renaissance origin. Briefly speaking, the road to the artist's imagination was made open. Not all countries and nations could use this freedom fully [ . . . ] Academies always murdered any freedom. The old Italian and French ones were joined in the 18th century by a host of new academies. In Poland, unfortunately, or perhaps rather fortunately, the Academy was not [ . . . ]" (Karpowicz 2012, pp. 23–24). Despite the sharpness of judgment, the opinion above conformed with the widespread idea that academic education had a negative influence on individual talent. There were those who felt that academic education imposed a "classical damper" (This term is taken from: Organisty 2006, p. 231) resulting from the over-emphasis of formal patterns based on works and ideas from Antiquity and the Renaissance. It is difficult to argue against such statements on the general level, but it is valuable to discuss the nuances that stemmed from individual conditioning.

Education at the Vienna Academy—similar to the entire system of training artists in the early modern era—focused on the assimilation of already existing models which were held in high esteem. Both painters and sculptors studied the works of their teachers, graphics, and sculptures—usually antique copies. The education process culminated in the practice of drawing from a living model (Schemper-Sparholz 1993, p. 238; Slaviček 2003, pp. 247, 255; Hladík 2016, p. 113). Although the principles of learning were eminently retrospective, they did not mean unreflective imitation. Pavel Suchánek has made some valuable observations in his analysis of Baroque academic education practices, based on the example of the sculptor Wolfgang Träger, a former student of the Vienna Academy. Suchánek noted a considerable margin of individualism in the shaping artistic personality of the young art students. This individualism stemmed from the requirement that students should be able to interpret the classical academic *modi*. The skill of interpretation was key to many questions asked of the students and the subject of further judgment and discussion. This approach provided a space for the creation of one's individual style or manner through emulation (Suchánek 2011, pp. 45–46). Not only was the student's individual style shaped by the classical ideas of art, but it was also, sometimes primarily, shaped by the tastes and preferences of teachers and the trends observed in art at the time.

This practice explains the surprising range of styles among the artists who studied at the Vienna Academy, despite the academic modes that connected them. The level of academic learning that a particular artist achieved was also potentially relevant. In painting, Joseph Lux's art was located within the radical and expressive trend, which developed selected aspects of art once created by the Vienna masters, Paul Troger, and, in particular, Franz Anton Maulbertsch (Schenkova 1982, pp. 147–50; Gorzelik 2002, p. 265). Although Johann Franz Felder referred to similar formal patterns, his work was characterised by a more moderate manner (Kozieł 2017c, p. 220). A more subdued expression also characterises the work of Felix Ivon Leicher. Apart from references to the Vienna painting of his time, with Michelangelo Unterberger at the forefront, he drew on Italian and Flemish patterns (Schenkova 2017d, p. 536). Similarly, Johann Lucas Kracker's preferred manner resulted from a synthesis of Italian influences with Vienna artistic tradition (Schenkova 2017c, p. 494). The work of Johann Karl Kynast is also an interesting example. Until now, he has been perceived only as an epigone of his father, Johann Heinrich (Kozieł 2017a, p. 518). However, thanks to his studies at the Vienna Academy in 1779 (Aufnehmens [ . . . ], Signature 2, p. 48 verso), some of Johann Karl's works were superficially influenced by more classical modes than his father's paintings (For example, *Resurrection of Christ* from the parish church in Sośnica [Germ. Schosnitz]). The younger Kynast's work displays a synthesis of traditional late Baroque patterns common in Silesia at the time, with elements of current trends drawn from Vienna.

The sculptors who studied at the Academy also drew on a more diverse formal repertoire. In their case, the role of teachers is more often highlighted. The classical modes in Johann Ludwig Gode's work were not the same as in Anton Stanetti's work, even though they studied at the Vienna Academy almost concurrently. Their respective masters, Georg

Raphael Donner and Johann Stanetti, greatly influenced these young artists' development. Although classicising sculptors dominate among former students of the Vienna Academy, there were also those whose work negated the mimetic conventions which were so strongly associated with academic education. The most notable example of this was the sculptor Anton Gegenbaur (Gegenpauer). He was not active in Silesia; however, he is considered the most important representative of the South German expressive movement in the visual arts of Cracow in the latter half of the 18th century, and his work was juxtaposed with the Moravia-Vienna movement (Dettloff 2013, pp. 175–94). In January 1750, before he reached the capital city of Lesser Poland, Gegenbaur enrolled in classes at the Vienna Academy (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1a, p. 297; Chmelinová 2017, p. 114). Ironically, Karpowicz included Gegenbaur among artists whose work was characterised by “solutions so radical that they would fill any academic artists with dread” (Karpowicz 2012, p. 41).

Among Silesian students at the Academy, Franz Eitner's work represents different poetics from classicising baroque. However, the lack of such references in his work can be attributed to the sculptor's very brief and superficial contact with the Vienna Academy. Eitner enrolled on 7 October 1751 (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1a, p. 311), but by the beginning of 1752 at the latest, he was already working in the territory of Poland, in Kalisz [Germ. Kalisch]. In the meantime, he had managed to visit his hometown of Głogów (the exact date is not known, but due to the artist's stay in Vienna we know it is not very likely he came to Kalisz again in 1751; see Andrzejewska 2010, pp. 47–48; Andrzejewska 2012, p. 346). It is hard to imagine he had much time for an in-depth academic education. His works are also far removed from the style of Jacob Christoph Schletterer, the master under whom the artist from Głogów was employed during his stay in Vienna. Probably Eitner—an average artist at best, due to his insufficient education—was not able to assimilate the sublime style of the master he encountered in Vienna.

These examples show the broad spectrum of stylistic nuances present in the work of students of the Vienna Academy at the end of the modern era. Their stories suggest it may be worth judging the influence of academic education on the formal language that the former students of art academies used more carefully and less doctrinally. General statements—so attractive because of the power of communication resulting from simplification—should not obscure the need for an individual approach to each of the artists under consideration.

The above study raises only selected issues related to the academic movement in Silesian art of the modern period in art. It does not claim to provide a complete picture of this fascinating artistic phenomenon, since it analyses relations with only one academy. However, this article is intended as a pretext for further scientific initiatives. It supplements the existing research into Silesian painting and sculpture of the Baroque and Rococo periods, but it also allows for a useful comparison with phenomena occurring in the art of neighbouring regions and at other artistic academies. In this context, the 17th- and 18th-century academies of Central Europe seem to have been particularly marginalised. Lying in the deep shadow cast by the leading academies in Italy and France, they still await the attention they deserve. That they are worthy of closer attention is proven by the example of 18th-century Silesian art, where it was not the Academy in Rome or Paris that made its mark, but the Vienna Academy of Fine Arts.

**Funding:** Publication funded by the University of Silesia in Katowice. This article was made possible thanks to a Lanckoronski Foundation scholarship to Vienna, as well as funding from a grant awarded by the National Science Centre under decision No. UMO-2012/07/B/HS2/01466.

**Institutional Review Board Statement:** Not applicable.

**Informed Consent Statement:** Not applicable.

**Data Availability Statement:** Not applicable.

**Conflicts of Interest:** The author declares no conflict of interest.

## Appendix A

Silesian sculptors and painters frequented classes in the Vienna Academy in 1726–1780, as reflected in the documents kept in the University Archives of the Vienna Academy of Fine Arts.

The correct names of buildings were verified according to (Löper 1780; Weiskern 1770). All the Names are provided in German.

### Appendix A.1. Sculptors

**Berger** Simon—a sculptor from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 25 August 1735. In Vienna, he resided in Mariahilf in the neighbourhood of Windmühle, at Goldene Hirsch. (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1a, p. 73).

**Eitner** (Eytner) Franz—a sculptor from Głogów [Germ. Gross Glogau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 7 October 1751. In Vienna, he worked for [Jacob Christoph] Schletterer (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1a, p. 313).

**Gode** Johann Ludwig—a sculptor from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 1732 (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1a, p. 40. See also: Buzási 2016a, p. 134).

**Kessler** (Kössler) Ignaz—a sculptor from Niemodlin [Germ. Falkenberg]. In the archival records, he was noted three times: first under 2 October 1753. (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1a, p. 355. See also: Buzási 2016a, p. 162, p. 162), second under 4 April 1758, when he resided in Neubau, a district of Dreye Bauren (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1b, p. 146. See also: Buzási 2016a, p. 162), and third under 6 April 1758 (Aufnahmens [...], Signature 1, p. 165 verso. See also: Buzási 2016a, p. 162).

**Klein** Joseph—a sculptor from Zabkowice Śląskie [Germ. Frankenstein]. In the archival records, he was noted under 23 July 1752. In Vienna, he worked for Vogel (probably a relatively unknown representative of the sculptor dynasty, which was active in 18th-century Vienna). He lived in Neubau, Spitalberg (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1a, p. 337; Aufnahmens [...], Signature 1, p. 123 recto).

**Stanetti** Anton—in the archival records, he is described as a newcomer from Silesia and noted under 1726–1728, without any specific dates (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1a, p. 21; See also: Mansfeld 1938, p. 124; Buzási 2016a, p. 255). Even though his profession was not given in the archives, beyond all doubt, he is the same Stanetti as the one noted in the literature (Brzezina 2004, pp. 57–58, 150–51; Buzási 2016a, p. 255).

### Appendix A.2. Painters

**Aust** (Augst) [Johann] Augustin—a painter from Henryków [Germ. Heinrichau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 12 November 1738. He worked for Carl Beschinger. He resided in the Neubau district at St Ulrich's church, at Goldnen Pellican (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1a, p. 151; Aufnahmens [...], Signature 1, p. 15 verso. See also: Mansfeld 1938, p. 100; Buzási 2016a, p. 90).

**Buertig** (Buerdig) Daniel—a painter from Brzeg [Germ. Brieg]. In the archival records, he was noted under 1 December 1741. He worked for [Johann] Baptista Glunk. He resided at Weisse Löwe, in the Innere Stadt at Salzgies (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1a, p. 202; Aufnahmens [...], Signature 1, p. 61 verso).

**Buschmann** Karl—a painter from Głogów [Germ. Gross Glogau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 5 October 1772. He resided in Innere Stadt at Naglergasse. The archives differ on the number of the house where he resided. The first archive states no. 140, the other no. 184 (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1b, p. 29; Aufnahmens [...], Signature 2, p. 20 verso).

**Buya** (Boyack) Johann Stephan—in the archival records, he is described as a newcomer from Silesia and noted under 7 October 1737 (Nahmen = Register [...], Signature 1a, p. 129. See also: Mansfeld (1938), p. 102; Buzási (2016b), p. 100). There is no profession noted in the archives, but the note undoubtedly refers to the Wrocław painter recognised in the literature (Buzási 2016a, p. 100).

**Cimbal** Johann (Ignaz)—in the archival records, he is described as a newcomer from Bílovec [Germ. Wagstadt], the son of a carpenter and noted under 13 October 1742 ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 220. See also: [Buzási \(2016b\)](#), p. 106). In the note about his son Jakob's access to the Academy, there is information about his profession, and it states that he acquired the title of an academic painter ([Protokoll \[...\], Signature 7](#), p. 425. See also: [Buzási 2016b](#), p. 106).

**Depée** (Depie) Johann—a painter from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 6 December 1754 and 7 December 1754. In Vienna, he worked for [Joseph] Fazal (Vasal, Pfasal). He resided at Braune Adler in the Mariahilf district ([Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 141 verso; [Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1b](#), p. 51).

**Felder** Karl—a painter from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 18 August 1769, as a brother of Johann Franz and as someone who enrolled in the Academy ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1b](#), p. 73).

**Felder** Johann Franz—a painter from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 19 August 1769 with an annotation that states he attended classes at the Academy for five years ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1b](#), p. 73).

**Fridrig** Bernhard—a painter from Lubomierz [Germ. Liebthal]. In the archival records, he was noted twice, under 26 October 1744 and 22 October 1749. In both cases, he resided with an unnamed Unterweger on Hutsteppergasse ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), pp. 255, 277; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 87 verso).

**Greipel** Johann [Franz]—a painter from Horní Benešov [Germ. Benisch]. In the archival records, he was noted twice: first under 19 October 1744 as enrolled in the classical art course; second under 5 October 1752 as enrolled in the living model drawing course. At the time, he lived at Drey Kugeln, in the Neubau district, Spitalberg. He is also listed in the list of academic artists made by Jacob van Schüppen ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), pp. 252, 333; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 87 recto; [Marz \(2007\)](#), p. 145).

**Grübler** Johann Caspar—a painter from Silesia, from the unrecognised village of Hack. In the archival records, he was noted twice, under 23 October 1749. and 2 January 1753. He lived in the Mariahilf district during his first stint, and during the second in Neubau, at Maria Trost Church ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), pp. 277, 352).

**Hablock** Johann Georg—a painter from Nowa Cerkiew [Germ. Deutsch Neukirch]. In the archival records, he was noted under 19 November 1753. He resided at Binderisch Haus in the Neubau district ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 354).

**Hamer** Bonifatius—a painter from Lubiąż [Germ. Leubus]. In the archival records, he was noted under 6 October 1740 and 26 October 1740. He resided at the Maria Trost Church in the Nuebau district, at Schwarzwalterische Haus of the goldsmith Georg Mäyiss (Max) ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 190; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 51 verso).

**Hanel** Franz—a painter from Opava [Germ. Troppau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 19 November 1777. He resided in the Wieden district, no. 4 ([Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 2](#), p. 43 verso).

**Hirschig** Ignaz—a painter from Vindava [Germ. Weydenau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 29 May 1775. He resided in the Leopoldstadt district, at Schönen Laterne No 385 ([Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 2](#), p. 34 verso).

**Jockwit** Johann Joseph—a painter from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 26 January 1741. In Vienna he worked for Mrs Zehrtnerin, a widow. He resided at Klein Kulmaynerisches(?) Haus, in Innere Stadt at Alten Fleischmarkt ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 207; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 55 verso).

**Jörck** (Jörg, Georg) [Johann, Maximilian] Emmanuel—a painter from Kamieniec Ząbkowicki [Germ. Kamenz]. In the archival records, he was noted under 20 December 1743. He resided at Schullerischen Haus in the Leopoldstadt district ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 234; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 81 recto).

**Kurzmann** Franz—a painter from Dobromierz [Germ. Hohenfriedeberg]. In the archival records, he was noted under 17 October 1756. In Vienna, he worked for an

unnamed Wissenregner (Weissenriner) ([Aufnahmens \[...\] , Signature 1](#), p. 156 verso; [Nahmen = Register \[...\] , Signature 1b](#), p. 143).

**Kynast** (Kinast) Johann Carl—a painter from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 8 July 1779. He resided at englischen Gruss no. 1181, Innere Stadt, Kohlmarkt ([Aufnahmens \[...\] , Signature 2](#), p. 48 verso).

**Lazl** (Lazel) Karl—a painter from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 12 October 1744. In 26 August 1745 his name was included in the list of academic artists made by Jacob van Schüppen. He resided at Winterische Haus in Inner Stadt, close to Tuchlauben ([Nahmen = Register \[...\] , Signature 1a](#), p. 255; [Marz \(2007\)](#), p. 146).

**Leicher** Felix [Ivo]—a painter from Bílovec [Germ. Wagstadt]. In the archival records, he was noted under 3 December 1751. In Vienna, he worked for Mrs Zehnerin (Zehrtnerin?). He resided at Witrischen Haus ([Nahmen = Register \[...\] , Signature 1a](#), p. 319. See also: [Buzási 2016a](#), p. 182).

**Lion** Karl Benjamin—a painter from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 27 November 1743. He resided in Innere Stadt at Alten Bauernmarkt, at Goldne Wagen, with someone named Kummer ([Nahmen = Register \[...\] , Signature 1a](#), p. 240; [Aufnahmens \[...\] , Signature 1](#), p. 79 verso).

**Lux** Joseph—a painter from Małolno [Germ. Maifritzdorf]. In the archival records, he was noted under: 22 August 1766. He resided at Goldne Stern in Leopoldstadt ([Nahmen = Register \[...\] , Signature 1b](#), p. 168).

**Müller** Franz—a painter from Město Albrechtice [Germ. Obersdorf]. In the archival records, he was noted under: 16 June 1755. He resided at Zum Klagbaum ([Nahmen = Register \[...\] , Signature 1b](#), p. 180).

**Nitz** (Nitsch?) Valentin—a painter from Opava [Germ. Troppau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 29 September 1767. He resided in the Neubau district, Schottenfeld, Goldnen Lampel ([Aufnahmens \[...\] , Signature 2](#), p. 7 recto).

**Palcko** (Balko) Franz [Xaver Karl]—a painter from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 23 April 1738. On 22 February 1745, he was included in the list of academic artists made by Jacob van Schüppen ([Aufnahmens \[...\] , Signature 1](#), p. 3 verso; [Marz 2007](#), p. 144. See also: [Mansfeld \(1938\)](#), p. 117; [Buzási \(2016a\)](#), p. 211).

**Pelcke** Joseph—a painter from Ziębice [Germ. Münsterberg]. In the archival records, he was noted under 24 October 1769. He resided in the Neubau district at Spitalbergu, at Küss den Pfennig ([Aufnahmens \[...\] , Signature 2](#), p. 13 verso).

**Plasch** Anton—a painter from Bílovec [Germ. Wagstadt]. In the archival records, he was noted under 6 January 1771. He resided with someone named Zimbal (Probably Johann Ignaz Cimbal, an academic painter, also from Bílovec who was living in Leopoldstadt) in the Leopoldstadt district ([Nahmen = Register \[...\] , Signature 1b](#), p. 227).

**Pocter** Johann—a painter from Nysa [Germ. Neisse]. In the archival records, he was noted under 12 October 1744. He resided at Winterische Haus. ([Nahmen = Register \[...\] , Signature 1a](#), p. 258; [Aufnahmens \[...\] , Signature 1](#), p. 87 recto).

**Pohl** Wenzeslaus—a painter from Opava [Germ. Troppau]. In the archival records, he was noted under: 9 July 1754. He resided in the Neubau district at Spitalberg ([Aufnahmens \[...\] , Signature 1](#), p. 137 verso; [Nahmen = Register \[...\] , Signature 1b](#), p. 219).

**Pülcke** Franz Joseph—a painter from Brzeg [Germ. Brieg]. In the archival records, he was noted under 26 May 1755 as the son of a town juror and *Bauschreiber* ([Nahmen = Register \[...\] , Signature 1b](#), p. 220).

**Richter** Anton—a painter from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 14 October 1738 as the son of a musician. He resided at Graf Gatterburg Haus. ([Nahmen = Register \[...\] , Signature 1a](#), p. 161; [Aufnahmens \[...\] , Signature 1](#), p. 10 verso. See also: [Mansfeld \(1938\)](#), p. 119).

**Sambach** Kaspar Franz—a painter from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 3 October 1740 and 13 October 1744. During his first stay, he worked for Mrs Besserin(?) and lived in the Neubau district at Spitalberg. Then he resided at Neustift, at Schöne Latern, and he frequented the classical art course at

the Academy ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), pp. 197, 260; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 49 recto. See also: [Buzási \(2016a\)](#), p. 232).

**Seidel** Christoph Wilhelm—a painter from Wrocław [Germ. Breslau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 1732 ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 58. See also: [Mansfeld 1938](#), p. 123). Although Seidl's occupation is not given, beyond any doubt, he is the same as the painter recognised in the literature ([Schultz 1882](#), pp. 146–47; [Macura 2017c](#)).

**Steiner** Joseph—a painter from Zabkowice Śląskie [Germ. Frankenstein]. In the archival records, he was noted under 25 May 1768. He resided in Innere Stadt, Dorotheergasse, at Pilgramischen Haus, with someone named Albert ([Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 2](#), p. 9 recto).

**Stephan** (Steppan) Anton—a painter. In the archival records, he was described as a newcomer from Silesia and noted under 6 October 1738. ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 163. See also: [Mansfeld 1938](#), p. 124).

**Stephan** (Steppan) Johann Christoph—a painter. In the archival records, he was described as a newcomer from Silesia and noted under 15 October 1736. ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 143). In the note that refers to his brother Anton, he is specified as a painter who resides in Rossau ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 163. See also: [Mansfeld \(1938\)](#), p. 124).

**Stör** Joseph—a painter from Zabkowice Śląskie [Germ. Frankenstein]. In the archival records, he was noted under 7 November 1765. He resided in the Leopoldstadt district at Rothen Stern Gasse, at Zeugmacherisch Haus ([Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 2](#), p. 1 verso).

**Straube** Karl—a painter working for the miniature painter Meyer. From Zagrodno(?) [Germ. Adelsdorf] in Silesia. He was noted under 15 January 1770. He resided in Innere Stadt, Kärntner Strasse, at Goldnen Einhorn ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1b](#), p. 295; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 2](#), p. 14 recto).

**Stulz** (Stultz) Anton—a painter from Niemodlin [Germ. Falkenberg]. In the archival records, he was noted under 20 January 1745. and 20 February 1745. He resided in the Mariahilf district, Laimgrube, at Freyhaus ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 268; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 89 recto).

**Wolf** Gottfried—in the archival records, he was described as a newcomer from Silesia and noted under 23 September 1733. Wolf's profession was not mentioned in the archives, but he is identified with a painter from Opava [Germ. Troppau] in the literature ([Buzási 2016b](#), s. 50; [Buzási 2016a](#), p. 281). He resided in the Mariahilf district at Laimgrube, at Grüne Stiefel. In 1741 he was a member of the armed forces (Frey-Compagnie der k. freyen Hof-Akademie) in the company formed by the staff and students at the Academy ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 120. See also: [Lützow \(1877\)](#), p. 147; [Mansfeld \(1938\)](#), p. 128; [Marz \(2007\)](#), p. 132; [Buzási \(2016a\)](#), p. 281).

**Wolf** [Karl] Joseph—from Opava [Troppau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 3 November 1751. He resided in the Leopoldstadt district at Gross Schumacherischen Haus ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 326). Wolf's profession was not mentioned in the archives, but he is identified with a painter from Opava (see [Schenkova and Olšovský 2001](#), p. 73; [Kozieł 2017c](#), p. 30; [Schenkova 2017e](#), pp. 759–760).

**Zipfl** (Zibffel) Christian Gottfried—a painter from Jelenia Góra [Germ. Hirschberg]. In the archival records, he was noted under 26 October 1740. He resided in the Landstrasse district close to Schumacherischen Haus ([Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 199; [Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 51 verso).

**Zips** (Zipps) Augustin—a painter from Opava [Germ. Troppau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 2 September 1759. He resided in Innere Stadt at Grossen Weintrauben, on the third floor ([Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 170 recto; [Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1b](#), p. 373).

**Zirbs** (Zips?) Johann—a painter from Opava [Germ. Troppau]. In the archival records, he was noted under 7 October 1738. He resided in Innere Stadt at Johannesgasse ([Aufnahmens \[...\], Signature 1](#), p. 9 verso; [Nahmen = Register \[...\], Signature 1a](#), p. 165. See also: [Mansfeld \(1938\)](#), p. 128).

**Zumb** (Zump) Franz—a painter from Zabkowice Śląskie [Germ. Frankenstein]. In the archival records, he was noted under 5 October 1744. The matriculas differ on the place where he lived. The first entry mentions Innere Stadt at Albrechtsburg Haus, then it is Weisen Löwen at Salzgries in the same district. On 26 August 1745, he was included in the list of academic artists made by Jacob van Schüppen ([Nahmen = Register \[...\]](#), [Signature 1a](#), p. 264; [Aufnehmens \[...\]](#), [Signature 1](#), p. 86 recto; [Marz \(2007\)](#), p. 145).

## References

- Andrzejewska, Ewa. 2010. *Ks. Stanisław Józef Klossowski (1726–1798). Kustosz Sanktuarium św. Józefa w Kaliszu*. Kalisz: Edytor.
- Andrzejewska, Ewa. 2012. Frantz Eytner, śląski rzeźbiarz osiadły w Kaliszu. Najnowsze ustalenia. In *Splendor i Fantazja. Studia nad Rzeźbą Rokokową w Dawnej Rzeczypospolitej i na Śląsku*. Edited by Paweł Migasiewicz. Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Historyków Sztuki i Instytut Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 345–77.
- Arijčuk, Petr. 2000. Neznámá díla Johanna Wenzela Bergla ve Východních Čechách. *Opuscula Historiae Artium* 44: 23–40.
- Arijčuk, Petr. 2011. Johann Ignaz Cimbäl a malíři pracující pro řád milosrdných bratří na Moravě v druhé polovině 18. století. *Opuscula Historiae Artium* 60: 2–19.
- Aufnehmens = Protocoll für die academischen Schüler vom Jänner 1738 bis Juli 1765, [Signature 1](#), Archiv der Akademie der bildenden Künste Wien.
- Aufnehmens = Protocoll für die academischen Schüler vom Juli 1765 bis Juli 1795, [Signature 2](#), Archiv der Akademie der bildenden Künste Wien.
- Brzezina, Katarzyna. 2004. *Rzeźba i Mała Architektura Sakralna Księstw Opatawskiego i Karniowskiego w XVIII Wieku*. Kraków: Universitas.
- Buzási, Enikő, ed. 2016a. Adattár. Matrikeleinträge mit Literatur- und Künstlerangaben. In *Források a Magyarországi, Erdélyi, Valamint Magyar Megrendelésre Dolgozó Külföldi Művészek Bécsi Akadémiai Tanulmányaihoz (1726–1810)*. Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Művészettörténeti Intézet, pp. 75–321.
- Buzási, Enikő, ed. 2016b. “Ein Jung will zeichnen lernen” A bécsi akadémiai tanulmányok szociológiai háttere. In *Források a Magyarországi, Erdélyi, Valamint Magyar Megrendelésre Dolgozó Külföldi Művészek Bécsi Akadémiai Tanulmányaihoz (1726–1810)*. Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Művészettörténeti Intézet, pp. 41–73.
- Chmelinová, Katarína. 2017. *Skarby Baroku Między Bratysławą i Krakowem*. Kraków: Muzeum Narodowe w Krakowie.
- Czapliński, Marek, Elżbieta Kaszuba, Gabriela Waś, and Rościśław Żerlik. 2002. *Historia Śląska*. Edited by Marek Czapliński. Wrocław: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego.
- Dettloff, Anna. 2013. *Rzeźba krakowska drugiej połowy XVIII w. Twórcy, nurty i tendencje*. Kraków: Krakowskie Towarzystwo Edukacyjne sp. z o.o.—Oficyna Wydawnicza AFM.
- Dziurla, Henryk. 1967. Ogólne warunki rozwoju wrocławskiego baroku. In *Sztuka Wrocławia*. Wrocław, Warszawa and Kraków: Wydawnictwo Zakładu Narodowego Imienia Ossolińskich, pp. 264–68.
- Gorzeliński, Jerzy. 2002. Franz Anton Sebastian—Zbiorowy bohater sztuki górnośląskiej. In *Willmann i Inni. Malarstwo, Rysunek i Grafika na Śląsku i w Krajach Ościennych w XVII i XVIII Wieku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł and Beata Lejman. Wrocław: Instytut Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego i Wrocławski Oddział Stowarzyszenia Historyków Sztuki, pp. 262–69.
- Gorzeliński, Jerzy. 2004. Opatowski malarz Josef Lux. *Roczniki Muzeum w Gliwicach* 19: 262–76.
- Gorzeliński, Jerzy. 2009a. Pod skrzydłami habsburskiego orła (1660–1740). In *Sztuka Górnego Śląska od Średniowiecza do Końca XX Wieku*. Edited by Ewa Chojecka. Katowice: Muzeum Śląskie, pp. 121–56.
- Gorzeliński, Jerzy. 2009b. Powolne wygasanie baroku (1740–około 1800). In *Sztuka Górnego Śląska od Średniowiecza do Końca XX Wieku*. Edited by Ewa Chojecka. Katowice: Muzeum Śląskie, pp. 157–70.
- Gorzeliński, Jerzy. 2010. Sztuka Cieszyńska 1528–1800. In *Dzieje Cieszyńska od Pradziejów do Czasów Współczesnych, II, Cieszyń w Czasach Nowożytnych*. Edited by Waclaw Gójniczek and Irena Kwaśny. Cieszyń: Dimograf, pp. 359–76.
- Gumiński, Samuel. 1995. Jan Riedel i francuskie wątki w snycerze śląskiej przełomu XVII/XVIII wieku. In *Michał Klahr Starszy i Jego Środowisko Kulturowe*. Edited by Jan Wrabec. Wrocław: Poligraf, pp. 133–41.
- Hladík, Tomáš. 2016. *Tomáš. 2016. Sochařská Dílna Období Baroka ve Střední Evropě. Od Návrhu k Provedení*. Praha: Národní galerie v Praze.
- Hołuszka, Ewa. 2009a. Christoph Wilhelm Seidel. In *Malarstwo Śląskie 1520–1800. Katalog Zbiorów*. Edited by Marek Pierzchała, Ewa Hołuszka, Beata Lejman and Piotr Łukaszewicz. Wrocław: Muzeum Narodowe we Wrocławiu, p. 348.
- Hołuszka, Ewa. 2009b. Portret dziecka z niezapominajką. In *Malarstwo Śląskie 1520–1800. Katalog Zbiorów*. Edited by Marek Pierzchała, Ewa Hołuszka, Beata Lejman and Piotr Łukaszewicz. Wrocław: Muzeum Narodowe we Wrocławiu, p. 389.
- Indra, Bohumír. 1981. Schweiglův Návrh Hlavního Oltáře Farního Kostela v Javorníku a Jeho Stavba v Letech 1772–1773. *Časopis Slezského Zemského Muzea, Seria B* 39: 285–88.
- Indra, Bohumír. 1990. Barokní sochy Ferdinanda Grosse, Conrada Spindlera a sochařské dílo Václava Böhma v Lipníku nad Bečvou a Hranicích. *Časopis Slezského Zemského Muzea, Seria B* 39: 40–51, 97–98.
- Indra, Bohumír. 1997. Příspěvky k biografickému slovníku výtvarných umělců na Moravě a ve Slezsku v 16. až 19. Století “F” (dodatek). *Časopis Slezského Zemského Muzea, Seria B* 46: 40–84.
- Indra, Bohumír. 1998. Příspěvky k biografickému slovníku výtvarných umělců na Moravě a ve Slezsku v 16. až 19. Století „H”. *Časopis Slezského Zemského Muzea, Seria B* 47: 122–63.

- Indra, Bohumír. 1999. Příspěvky k biografickému slovníku výtvarných umělců na Moravě a ve Slezsku v 16. až 19. Století „H“ (dodatky). *Časopis Slezského Zemského Muzea, Seria B* 48: 97–122.
- Jávor, Anna. 1998. Johann Ignaz Cimbäl. In *Saur Allgemeines Künstler-Lexikon. Die Bildende Künstler Aller Zeiten und Völker*, 19. Edited by Günther Meissner, Andreas Beyer, Bénédicte Savoy and Wolf Tegerhoff. München and Leipzig: K. G. Saur, pp. 228–29.
- Jávor, Anna. 2016. Művésznövendékek Bécsben. Az akadémiai képzés lehetőségei, gyakorlata és rangja a 18. században. In *Források a Magyarországi, Erdélyi, Valamint Magyar Megrendelésre Dolgozó Külföldi Művészek Bécsi Akadémiai Tanulmányaihoz (1726–1810)*. Edited by Enikő Buzási. Budapest: MTA Bölcsészettudományi Kutatóközpont Művészettörténeti Intézet, pp. 9–34.
- Kalinowski, Konstanty. 1986. *Rzeźba Barokowa na Śląsku*. Warszawa: Państwowe Wydawnictwo Naukowe.
- Karpowicz, Mariusz. 2012. Nurt antyakademicki w sztuce polskiej doby rokoka. In *Splendor i Fantazja. Studia nad Rzeźbą Rokokową w Dawnej Rzeczypospolitej i na Śląsku*. Edited by Paweł Migasiewicz. Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Historyków Sztuki, Instytut Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 23–45.
- Keleti, Magda. 1983. *Neskorá Renesancia, Manierizmus, Barok v Zbierkach SNG*. Bratislava: Tatran.
- Kolbiarz, Artur. 2010. Kwestia autorstwa rzeźb ołtarza głównego w kościele św. Jerzego w Ziębicach. In *Ziębice—Miasto św. Jerzego. Dzieje i Kultura Dawnej Stolicy Książęcej*. Edited by Bogusław Czechowicz. Wrocław: Quaestio, pp. 161–70.
- Kolbiarz, Artur. 2018. Nie tylko Praga. Udział śląskich rzeźbiarzy barokowych w dekorowaniu benedyktyńskich kościołów na Broumovsku. In *Barok na Broumovsku ze Śląskiej Perspektywy—Historia i Współczesność*. Edited by Arkadiusz Wojtyła and Małgorzata Wyrzykowska. Wrocław: Wydział Nauk Humanistycznych i Pedagogicznych Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego, pp. 43–55, 135–43.
- Koller, Manfred. 1970. Die Akademie Peter Strudels in Wien (1688 bis 1714). *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Galerie* 14: 5–74.
- Koller, Manfred. 1993. *Die Brüder Strudel. Hofkünstler und Gründer der Wiener Kunstakademie*. Innsbruck: Tyrolia.
- Königer, Ernst. 1938. *Kunst in Oberschlesien*. Breslau: Verlag Priebatschs Buchhandlung.
- Kozieł, Andrzej. 2017a. Kynast (Kinast) Johann Carl. In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 517–19.
- Kozieł, Andrzej. 2017b. Lux (Lugs) Joseph. In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 568–71.
- Kozieł, Andrzej. 2017c. Malarstwo barokowe na Śląsku w społeczno-ekonomicznym i artystycznym kontekście. In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 21–269.
- Kozieł, Andrzej. 2017d. Sadler (Sattler) Joseph Ignaz (Josef Ignác). In *Malarstwo barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 636–39.
- Kozieł, Andrzej. 2018. Czy granice państwowe mogą zatrzymać artystów? Wojny śląskie (1740–1763), nowe granice Śląska i artyści. In *Sztuka Pograniczy. Studia z Historii Sztuki*. Edited by Lechosław Lamiński, Elżbieta Błotnicka-Mazur and Marcin Pastwa. Lublin and Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego, pp. 287–313.
- Krause, Walter. 1933. *Grundriss Einen Lexikons Bildender Künstler und Kunsthandwerker in Oberschlesien von den Anfängen bis zur Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts*. Oppeln: Der Oberschlesier.
- Kroupa, Jiří. 1996. Wenzel Anton, Prince Kaunitz-Rietberg. From “Curiosité” to criticism of Art. *Opuscula Historiae Artium* 40: 7–58.
- Kwaśny, Marek. 2017. Sauerland (Saurland, Saurant, Surland, Shurland, Sauerländer) Philipp (Philips). In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 642–45.
- Lejman, Beata. 2008. *Philip Christian Bentum, Malarz Śląskiego Baroku*. Warszawa: Neriton.
- Lejman, Beata. 2009. Johann Franz Felder. In *Malarstwo Śląskie 1520–1800. Katalog Zbiorów*. Edited by Marek Pierzchała, Ewa Hołuszka, Beata Lejman and Piotr Łukaszewicz. Wrocław: Muzeum Narodowe we Wrocławiu, pp. 365–66.
- Löper, Christian. 1780. *Der Kaiser = Königlichen Residenzstadt Wien Kommerzialschema. Nebst Beschreibung Aller Werkwürdigkeiten Derselben, Insbesondere Ihrer Schulen, Fabriken, Manufakturen Kommerzialprofessionisten, dem Handelstande, der Akademischen Bürger, Künstler, u. f. w.*. Wien: Joseph Gerold Verlag.
- Lützow, Carl von. 1877. *Geschichte der Kais. Kön. Akademie der Bildenden Künste. Festschrift zur Eröffnung des Neuen Akademie-Gebäudes*. Wien: Carl Gerold's Sohn Verlag.
- Macura, Małgorzata. 2015. Johann Franz Felder. In *Barokowi Malarze i Rzeźbiarze w Dawnym Opactwie Augustianów w Żaganiu*. Zielona Góra: Wojewódzki Urząd Ochrony Zabytków w Zielonej Górze, pp. 161–89.
- Macura, Małgorzata. 2017a. Felder (Feldner) Franz Xaver Anton. In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 393–98.
- Macura, Małgorzata. 2017b. Felder (Feldner) Johann Franz. In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 398–401.
- Macura, Małgorzata. 2017c. Seydel (Sejdel, Seydel, Seitel) Christoph Wilhelm. In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 680–83.
- Malíková, Mária. 1993. *Juraj Rafael Donner a Bratislava*. Bratislava: Pallas.
- Mansfeld, Herbert August. 1938. Die Matrikel der Akademie der Bildenden Künste in Wien 1726–1739. *Archiv für Sippenforschung und alle Verwandten Gebiete* 15: 97–128.
- Marz, Simon. 2007. Die Geschichte der Akademie der Bildenden Künste in den 30er und 40er Jahren des 18. Jahrhunderts unter Besonderer Berücksichtigung des Internationalen, Politischen und Künstlerisch-Organisatorischen Umfelds. Master's thesis, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria.

- Migasiewicz, Paweł. 2012a. Inspiracje francuskie w rzeźbie figuralnej Johanna Riedla. Zarys problemu. In *Silesia Jesuitica. Kultura i Sztuka Zakonu Jezuitów na Śląsku i w Hrabstwie Kłodzkim 1580–1776*. Edited by Dariusz Galewski and Anna Jezierska. Wrocław: Totem, pp. 217–25.
- Migasiewicz, Paweł. 2012b. Rzeźba rokokowa na dawnych ziemiach łęczyckiej, sieradzkiej i wieluńskiej. In *Splendor i Fantazja. Studia nad Rzeźbą Rokokową w Dawnej Rzeczypospolitej i na Śląsku*. Edited by Paweł Migasiewicz. Warszawa: Stowarzyszenie Historyków Sztuki i Instytut Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Warszawskiego, pp. 379–401.
- Migasiewicz, Paweł. 2012c. Życiorys własny Johanna Riedla. Źródło historyczne do badań nad praktyką zawodową i kondycją społeczną rzeźbiarzy w dobie nowożytnej. *Roczniki Sztuki Śląskiej* 21: 59–72.
- Nahmen = Register Aller deren, Welche die von Ihro Röm: Kai: Und Kön: Cath: Mai: CARLO SEXTO Anno 1725 aufgerichtete Anno 1726 den 20 Aprilis aber das erste Mahl eröffnele Freye Hof = Academie der Mahlerey, Bildhauerey und Baukunst Frequentiert haben: Zusam getragen von Leopold Adam Wasserberg: Der Academie Secretario und 1740 angefangen, signature 1a, Archiv der Akademie der bildenden Künste Wien.
- Nahmen = Register aller derjenigen, welche von 1 January 1754, die K: K: Academie der Mahler = Bildhauer = und Baukunst zu Frequentieren, eingeschriben worden, signature 1b, Archiv der Akademie der bildenden Künste Wien. January 1.
- Olšovský, Jaromír. 2011. Franz Zachariáš Schwabe von Schwabenheim, Salomon Steinhof, Antonio Stanetti a další sochařské osobnosti v kontextu bjednavatelských vztahů. K dějinám barokního sochařství na území Těšínského Knížecví. *Acta Historica Universitas Silesianae Opavensis* 4: 93–105.
- Organisty, Adam. 2006. Z Norwegii na Śląsk. Problem genezy artystycznej Thomasa Weissfeldta (1671–1721). In *Po obu Stronach Bałtyku. Wzajemne Relacje Między Skandynawią a Europą Środkową*. Edited by Jan Harasimowicz, Piotr Oszczanowski and Marcin Wisłocki. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 225–39.
- Oszczanowski, Piotr. 1999. Philipp Sauerland—Zapomniany malarz gdańskiego i wrocławskiego baroku. *Porta Aurea* 6: 127–46.
- Pevsner, Nikolaus. 1940. *Academies of Art. Past and Present*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Pierzchała, Marek. 2009. O wrocławskim kolekcjonerstwie i historii muzealnych zbiorów. In *Malarstwo Śląskie 1520–1800. Katalog Zbiorów*. Edited by Marek Pierzchała, Ewa Hołuszka, Beata Lejman and Piotr Łukaszewicz. Wrocław: Muzeum Narodowe we Wrocławiu, pp. 9–40.
- Prange, Peter. 2001. Palko, Franz Xaver Karl. In *Neue Deutsche Biographie*. Edited by Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Historische Kommission, Bd. 20. Berlin: Duncker, pp. 12–13.
- Preiss, Pavel. 1989. *Franz Karl Palko (1724–1767). Ölskizzen, Zeichnungen und Druckgraphik*. Salzburg: Salzburger Barockmuseum.
- Protokoll den die k: k: Akademie der bildende Künste in Wien frequentirenden Schüler vom Jahre 1797 bis 1850, Signature 7, Archiv der Akademie der bildenden Künste Wien.
- Schemper-Sparholz, Ingeborg. 1993. Der Bildhauer Jakob Christoph Schletterer als Lehrer an der Wiener Akademie. In *Barock: Regional: International*. Edited by Pochat Götz and Wagner Brigitte. Graz: Institut für Kunstgeschichte der Karl-Franzens-Universität Graz, pp. 230–50.
- Schenkova, Marie. 1982. Dílo opavského malíře Josefa Luxe. *Časopis Slezského zemského muzea, Série B—Vědy historické* 31: 147–50.
- Schenkova, Marie. 1994. Malířství 18. století v západní části českého Slezska. Katalog autorsky určených děl. *Časopis Slezského zemského muzea, Série B—Vědy historické* 43: 49–70, 117–244.
- Schenkova, Marie. 2002. K vzájemných vztahům mezi pruským a rakouským Slezskem v oblasti výtvarného umění v 18. století. In *Willmann i Inni. Malarstwo, Rysunek i Grafika na Śląsku i w Krajach Ościennych w XVII i XVIII Wieku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł and Beata Lejman. Wrocław: Instytut Historii Sztuki Uniwersytetu Wrocławskiego i Wrocławski Oddział Stowarzyszenia Historyków Sztuki, pp. 255–61.
- Schenkova, Marie. 2017a. Frömel (Foemel, Frömmel, Froemmel, Frümel) Johann Georg. In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 411–13.
- Schenkova, Marie. 2017b. Greipel (Greippel) Johann Franz. In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 415–18.
- Schenkova, Marie. 2017c. Kracker (Kraker, Krocker, Krackner, Krachner) Johann Lucas. In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 493–95.
- Schenkova, Marie. 2017d. Leicher (Leichert, Leichter) Felix Ivo. In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 536–39.
- Schenkova, Marie. 2017e. Wolf Karl Joseph (Karel Josef). In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 759–61.
- Schenkova, Marie, and Jaromír Olšovský. 2001. *Barokní Malířství a Sochařství ve Západní Části Českého Slezska*. Opava: Slezské Zemské Muzeum.
- Schenkova, Marie, and Jaromír Olšovský. 2004. *Barokní Malířství a Sochařství ve Východní Části Českého Slezska*. Opava: Slezské Zemské Muzeum.
- Schöny, Heinz. 1970. *Wiener Künstler-Ahnen. Genealogische Daten und Ahnenlisten Wiener Maler. 1. Mittelalter bis Romantik*. Wien: Adler.
- Schultz, Alwin. 1882. *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Schlesischen Maler (1500–1800). Verfasst im Namen des Vereins für Geschichte der bildenden Künste zu Breslau*. Breslau: Wilhelm Gottlieb Korn Verlag.
- Sito, Jakub. 1998. Rzeźba śląskiego pogranicza Wielkopolski w XVIII wieku. In *Sztuka Pograniczy Rzeczypospolitej w Okresie Nowożytnym od XVI do XVIII Wieku*. Edited by Andrzej Józef Baranowski. Warszawa: Arx Regia, pp. 151–67.

- Sito, Jakub. 2016. Rzeźba figuralna. In *Sztuka polska. Późny Barok, Rokoko, Klasycyzm (XVIII Wiek)*. Edited by Jerzy Kowalczyk. Warszawa: Arkady, pp. 353–421.
- Slaviček, Lubomír. 2003. "La prima Achatemia". In *V zrcadle Stínů 1670–1790. Morava v Době Baroka*. Edited by Kroupa Jiří. Brno: Moravská galerie v Brně, pp. 247–55.
- Slaviček, Lubomír. 2007. Felix Ivo Leicher, ein Maler ohne Eigenschaften? Versuch einer Stildefinition seines Oeuvres. In *Franz Anton Maulbertsch und Mitteleuropa. Festschrift zum 30-jährigen Bestehen des Museums Lendenargen*. Edited by Eduard Hindelang and Lubomír Slaviček. Brno: Museum Langenargen, pp. 221–44.
- Sobecka, Anna. 2008. Nieznane obrazy Philippa Sauerlanda. *Quart* 1: 45–57.
- Stehlík, Miloš. 2003. Ondřej Schweigl (1735–1812): Sochař a "učený umělec". In *V zrcadle Stínů 1670–1790. Morava v Době Baroka*. Edited by Kroupa Jiří. Brno: Moravská galerie v Brně, pp. 325–35.
- Suchánek, Pavel. 2011. Měšťanští a akademičtí sochaři v 18. století. Případ Wolfganga Trägers. *Opuscula Historiae Artium* 60: 42–49.
- Szeląg, Adam. 2017. Krause Bernhard. In *Malarstwo Barokowe na Śląsku*. Edited by Andrzej Kozieł. Wrocław: Via Nova, pp. 495–506.
- Wagner, Walter. 1967. *Die Geschichte der Akademie der Bildenden Künste in Wien*. Wien: Rosenbaum.
- Wardzyński, Michał. 2011. Nowe uwagi na temat twórczości rzeźbiarskiej Franza Josepha Mangoldta na Śląsku i w Rzeczypospolitej. Wrocław, Trzebnica, Jawoj, Jasna Góra, Kraków-Skałka, Kościelna Wieś, Tyniec. *Roczniki Sztuki Śląskiej* 20: 117–54.
- Wardzyński, Michał. 2017. Zespół rokokowych ołtarzy kolegiaty opolskiej—Nieznane dzieło Wenzla Johanna Böhma. Przyczynek do twórczości rzeźbiarza na drodze z Lipnika nad Bečvou do Poznania. In *Sztuka Dawnego Opola*. Edited by Bogusław Czechowicz, Joanna Filipczyk and Andrzej Kozieł. Opole: Muzeum Śląska Opolskiego, pp. 115–29.
- Wardzyński, Michał. 2020. A Witness to the catastrophe—An analysis of art patronage in Greater Poland in the period of partitions of the Polish-Lithuanian Commonwealth as exemplified by the life of Vienna academic Wenzel Johann Böhm. In *Mecenstwo umienia około roku 1800*. Edited by Katarina Beňova and Katarin Kolbiar-Chmelinová. Bratislava: Stimul, pp. 228–59.
- Weinkopf, Anton. 1875. *Beschreibung der k. k. Akademie der Bildenden Künste. 1783 und 1790*. Wien: Verlag der k. k. Akademie der bildende Künste.
- Weiskern, Friedrich Wilhelm. 1770. *Beschreibung der k. k. Haupt und Residenzstadt Wien, als Dritte Theil zur Österreichischen Topographie*. Wien: Joseph Kurzböcken, k. k. illyrischen und orientalischen Hof- und N. Oe. Landschaftsbuchdruckern.
- Wereszycki, Henryk. 1972. *Historia Austrii*. Wrocław, Warszawa, Kraków and Gdańsk: Wydawnictwo Zakładu Narodowego Imienia Ossolińskich.
- Wyrzykowska, Małgorzata. 2010. *Śląsk w Orbiacie Wiednia. Artystyczne Związki Śląska z Arcyksięstwem Austriackim w Lat 1648–1741*. Wrocław: Oficyna Wydawnicza Atut.