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Abstract

This dissertation examines Viennese Japonismus and modern allegory in the work of Gustav Klimt. One of the paradoxical ambitions of Vienna’s early visual modernists was the creation of a new art that would, nevertheless, revive the essence of tradition, creating a collective aesthetic that crossed national and historical boundaries. Klimt and his close collaborators, like Josef Hoffmann, and artists engaged in the broader context of central Europe, like Emil Orlik, believed that Japanese art presented a viable path toward a universal, modern visual language. This conception arose from layers of exoticism, primitivism, Orientalism, and genuine encounter with old and new Japanese art. The questions I address are: How did the historical cultural problem of the fracturing Habsburg Empire inform the aims of artistic reformers from the 1860s through the foundations of the Secession and Wiener Werkstätte? How did the inescapable question of Austrian identity in the arts encourage eclecticism and the emergence of new paradigms like Japonismus? How did the multifaceted layers of international Japonism inform Viennese artists’ mindful selections and emulative reinventions of Japanese aesthetic principles? In the particular case of Klimt, how did the visual tradition of allegory, which was foundational and persistent in his oeuvre, shape his pursuit of a truly modern art for and of his age? Lastly, how did Klimt’s serious and lengthy engagement with the arts of Japan inform his modernization of allegory? Building on institutional histories, historiographies, critical reexaminations of Austrian visual modernism, the
model of “Vienna 1900,” and the works of Klimt, I argue that Klimt did not simply adorn allegory in the new cloak of Japonismus, he aimed for coalescence and a unity that would establish a new modern paradigm. This examination engages with areas of inquiry opened by German/Austrian-Asian studies, scholarship on cultural transfer and exchange, and new explorations into world's fairs, international Japonism, and the Meiji arts. It is the first monograph to study the inter-relation of Japonismus and allegory in Klimt’s art.
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Chapter One: Introduction

In this study, I examine the influence of Japonismus within the “stylistic pluralism and eclecticism” of Viennese visual modernism through the works of the Austrian painter Gustav Klimt (1862-1918). \(^1\) Two continuous threads are discernable within the artist’s heterogeneous approach to modernism: his investigations into the “fertile” “age-old art form” of allegory and his investment in the visual language of Japonismus. \(^2\) These two engagements can be seen in some of his earliest and latest creations, as in the allegorically titled *The Times of Day* (1882) and *Death and Life* (1908-11, 1915-16) and in his works that manifestly incorporate Japanese elements like his 1892 Design for a Ball-gift referencing Gilbert and Sullivan’s *Mikado*, a fan inscribed and illustrated for Sonja Knips in 1895, and *The Bride* (1917-18) (Fig. 1.1-4). \(^3\) Although drawn from separate traditions, these two threads played an interconnected role in his oeuvre. Klimt’s path “forward” into modernism led him back into the tradition of allegory, and his Secessionist pursuit of a visual language that would transcend national and linguistic

\(^1\) Matthew Rampley, *The Viennese School of Art History: Empire and the Politics of Scholarship, 1847-1918* (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2013), 142.
\(^3\) Several historians have pointed to the oval shape face in *The Bride* and its resemblance to a Noh mask that was part of Klimt’s personal collection. Peter Pantzer and Johannes Wieninger eds., *Verborgene Impressionen* (Vienna: Österreichisches Museum für angewandte Kunst, 1990), 102.
limitations led him to the foreign model of Japan. In this project, I highlight the proximity and coexistence of Klimt’s styles, the continuities of his works, and his lasting investments in allegory and Japanese aesthetics as a model for artistic rebirth.

1) Viennese Modernism, the Tradition of Allegory, and Japonismus

As the imperial capital of the Habsburg monarchy and Austro-Hungarian Empire, Klimt’s Vienna was an epicenter of cultural innovation. In a brief but dense period, revolutionary figures like Otto Wagner (1841-1918), Arnold Schoenberg (1874-1951), and Gustav Mahler (1860-1911) reshaped artistic practices; scientists pioneered new fields of discovery; and art historians and museum directors like Rudolf Eitelberger (1817-1885) and Alois Riegl (1858-1905) left indelible marks on concepts of style. Simultaneously, there were heated debates concerning the future of the many nationalities of the empire, and political leaders vied for intensely different futures. At the heart of the city’s burgeoning salons and cultural circles was Gustav Klimt, the first president and undisputed leader of the Vienna Secession, a group of like-minded artists who broke with the conservative, court-funded artists’ society in 1897 (Fig. 1.5).

4 Considered the father of Viennese architectural modernism, Otto Wagner (1841-1918), was an important founder of the Secession and mentored many of the movement’s artists. He called upon his contemporaries to move away from past styles and move “forward” into modernism. Wagner’s Die Baukunst was first published as Moderne Architektur in 1896. Otto Wagner, Die Baukunst unserer Zeit: dem Baukunstjünger ein Führer auf diesem Kunstgebiete (Vienna: Kunstverlag Anton Schroll, 1914), 47.

5 In the sciences, Josef Breuer (1842-1925) and Sigmund Freud (1856-1923) pioneered new fields in the biological and social sciences. The scientists of the Exner family — Sigmund Exner (1846-1926), Franz Serafin Exner (1849-1926), Felix Exner (1876-1930), and Karl Frisch (1886-1982) — made substantial contributions to physiology, biology, ethnology, meteorology, geology, and medicine. During the same period, Carl von Rokitansky (1804-1878) modernized the practice and discipline of medicine.

6 For an account of the period’s political complexity, see Carl E. Schorske, “Politics in a New Key: An Austrian Trio,” in Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture (New York: Knopf, 1979), 116-81.

7 The Vereinigung bildender Künstler Österreichs (1897) will be referred to as the Vienna Secession. In the vibrant culture of the period, Klimt’s social circle can be mapped in his portraits, for example, Portrait of Margaret Stonborough-Wittgenstein (1905) and Portrait of Amalie Zuckerkandl (1918).
Admired and distinguished in his own time, Klimt has long held his place as an icon of Viennese art. Few within or outside of the field of Art History would fail to recognize The Kiss (1907-8). Here, I introduce the artist not with his most frequently reproduced work that has been on permanent display for decades but with Nuda Veritas (1899), a celebrated and controversial painting in its time that brings together the three essential elements of my argument, Viennese modernism, the tradition of allegory, and Japonismus (Fig. 1.6). A prized possession of Hermann Bahr (1863-1934), the avant-garde leader of Young Vienna (Jung-Wien, f. 1891), Klimt’s Nuda Veritas is a modern proclamation of the aims of the Secession (Fig. 1.7). As such, it is a work that I reexamine throughout this dissertation. In this monumental painting, the viewer is confronted by the towering figure of “Naked Truth,” who peers directly out from a mass of wild red hair. As described by Carl Schorske, the unabashedly naked figure holds a mirror to the viewer challenging us to look at the visceral, lascivious “truth about modern man.” The personification brazenly offers us an empty reflection, a mirror image of the uncertainty and relativism of the modern era. Painted at a significant moment in Klimt’s artistic development, the work is indubitably modern and illuminates the particular struggles and concerns of early Viennese visual modernism and Klimt’s artistic practice (the material and physical execution of his drawings and paintings) and his creative

8 Zuckerkandl references Klimt’s Nuda Veritas in her descriptions of the aims of European modernists. Berta Zuckerkandl, My Life and History (New York: Knopf, 1939), 182-83.  
9 Klimt made a drawing of Nuda Veritas for the first edition of Ver Sacrum (1898). Both versions will be discussed in this dissertation. In 2012, the Austrian Theater Museum held an exhibition, Gegen Klimt: Die “Nuda Veritas” und ihr Verteidiger Hermann Bahr (May 10-November 26, 2012), contextualizing this important painting in their collection. Unfortunately, no catalog was produced. For a general introduction to the formation and aims of the Secession see, Marian Bisanz-Prakken, Nuda Veritas: Gustav Klimt and the Origins of the Vienna Secession 1895-1905 (Budapest: Museum of Fine Arts, Budapest, 2010).  
10 Schorske, Fin-de-siècle Vienna, 215.  
11 Ibid., 217-18.
process (his reading, wandering, and visual cultivation of his eidetic memory). In the
traditional format of an emblem, Nuda Veritas unites text with an anthropomorphic
metaphor to symbolize a concept. Although the unidealized personification scandalized
its first viewers, the painting’s emblematic structure and vernal symbols of rebirth are in
keeping with the tradition of pictorial allegory that permeated the façades and canvases of

With its elongated vertical format, flattening of perspectival space, and
juxtaposition of figuration and decorative detail Nuda Veritas also serves as a persuasive
element of Klimt’s Japonismus. The golden spiral pattern that suffuses the background
borrows from Japanese aesthetics in its simplicity, its distillation of natural form, and its
centrality in the composition (Fig. 1.8-10). Beyond mere decorative penchant, this
spiraling tendril appears so consistently throughout Klimt’s works that it becomes a
second signature (Fig. 1.11). Although it has been plausibly traced to numerous sources,
in my argument, this pattern is a quintessential example of his adoption and adaptation of
Japanese aesthetic principles.\footnote{Warlick traces Klimt’s spiral pattern to Egyptian art. M.E. Warlick, “Mythic Rebirth in Gustav Klimt’s Stoclet Frieze: New Considerations of Its Egyptianizing Form and Content,” *The Art Bulletin* vol. 74, no. 1 (1992), 115-34. It also has been discussed in terms of the tradition of the arabesque and the development of abstraction via ornament, see Markus Brüderlin and Ernst Beyeler, *Ornament and Abstraction: The Dialogue between Non-Western Modern and Contemporary Art* (Basel: Fondation Beyeler, 2001).}

My project elucidates the synthesis and dialogue of three elements: modernism,
allegory, and Japonismus in Klimt’s oeuvre. While both the allegorical tradition and
Japanese artistic influence were familiar aspects of the visual fabric of late nineteenth-
century Europe and, in particular, that of Vienna, the unification of these visual devices is a remarkable aspect of Klimt’s approach to modern art. Figures 1.12 through 1.14 demonstrate the continued practice of allegory among Klimt’s contemporaries from the printed page to the stage portraiture of the national theater (Burgtheater) and the monumental decorative programs of the Ringstrasse. Figure 1.13 shows a portrait of the actress Katharina Schratt (1853-1940) in the title role of Hans Sachs’ Pre-Lent carnival play *Nobody Wants to Accommodate Lady Truth* (*Frau Wahrheit will niemand beherbergen*, 1894). Produced by Klimt’s close associate Franz Matsch (1861-1942), the painting is a very different, albeit equally complicated allegory of truth contemporary to *Nuda Veritas*. Prominent actors of the Burgtheater like Schratt, Charlotte Wolter (1834-1897), and Josef Lewinsky (1835-1907) — who was painted by Klimt as *Don Carlos in Clavigo* (1895) — enjoyed a high social status and cult-like stardom and were known beyond national borders in the German-speaking theatrical world. In *Lady Truth*, Schratt, who was the confidant and companion of Emperor Franz Joseph (1830-1916), embodies the realities of the imperial marriage. In figures 1.15 through 1.17 we see the typical manifestation of Japanese aesthetic influence in European painting and printmaking. The formal elements commonly associated with international Japonism are scroll-like compositions, compressed perspective, dramatic asymmetry, simplified representations of nature, emphasis on color and line, and brilliant ornamentation combining geometric and organic, floral design. Figure 1.15 and 1.16 illustrate these visual qualities as well as the common motif of a European model in the guise of a
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Japanese beauty contemplating prints, surrounded by screens and porcelains, and wrapped in a kimono. This Japonist trope will be addressed in detail in Chapter Six.

Figure 1.17 shows a replication of a Japanese pattern produced by Koloman Moser (1868-1918) in 1902. From the outset, Japonism studies have considered the popularity and impact of ukiyo-e prints in European modern art. As the illustrations in this dissertation demonstrate, Japanese stencils (katagami) were an equally significant resource in Vienna. In Klimt’s art, there is an original pairing of allegory with the visual language of Japonismus. Rather than examining these threads separately, I argue that it is only when they are considered together that we fully understand the nature of Klimt’s approach to artistic modernism.

This is not to say that Klimt simply appropriated the visual language of Japanese art, presuming it to be empty, pure form devoid of intrinsic meaning. The Viennese engagement with Japanese art was not a crystalline, linear development, nor was interest and exchange unidirectional. Japanese art and culture permeated Vienna in a variety of ways from Japanese festivals and traveling performers to private and public collections. In his groundbreaking work of 1978, Edward Said drew on the philological tradition of humanism and the social theories of Antonio Gramsci and Michel Foucault to investigate western concepts of “the Orient” in literature, historical scholarship, nineteenth-century travel books, and colonial politics. From the invasion of Egypt and Syria by Napoleon (1798-1801) through the near-complete colonization of eastern lands by nineteenth-century imperialists, a set of quasi-scientific ideas developed about “the East” and “the Orient.” According to Said, “the East” was set in violent opposition to “the West” and defined by a set of clichés — i.e., “The East” is a backward, despotic, unchanging,
unchangeable land separate and distinct from western civilization and in need of the “enlightening” mission of imperialism. The “Oriental” (whether from the Middle East, North Africa, or the regions of Asia) is characterized as sensual, passive, decadent, irrational, effeminate, and degenerate. Said’s definition of this dialectic sustains tensions and resists totalizing structures. As he demonstrated:

The Orient is not merely there, just as the Occident itself is not just there either, as much as the West itself, the Orient is an idea that has a history and a tradition of thought, imagery, and vocabulary that have given it reality and presence in and for the West. The two geographical realities thus support and to an extent reflect each other.¹⁵

A similar Saidian line of reasoning can be applied to Viennese perceptions of Japanese art and culture. Viennese Japonismus was a result of cultural transfer, a term that emphasizes the agencies, interactivity, translation, and concrete materiality of artistic exchange between cultures.¹⁶ The art of Viennese Japonists reflects this in its mixture of genuine emulation resulting from intensive study and unaffected appreciation along with the authoritative fashioning of another (other) culture based on primitivism, exoticism, and Orientalism.

2) Japonisme-Japonism-Japonismus

Commonly known as “Japonisme” among Parisians, “the cult of Japan” or “Japonism” among British aesthetes, and “Japonismus” in the German-speaking context, this late nineteenth-century phenomenon had a different character in each of its socio-cultural environs. Styled by the French art critic Phillipe Burty (1830-1890) in 1875 as “the study of the art and genius of Japan,” the neologism is challenging to define.\(^\text{17}\) In part, this problem arises out of the frequent interchangeable and inconsistent historical use of related terms like “Japonaiserie,” “Japonerie,” and Japonism’s various cognates.\(^\text{18}\) This difficulty is exacerbated by the interplay of correlated forms of exoticism in art such as Orientalism, Chinoiserie, and Asianism. In each there is a problematic, built-in idea of cultural specificity that does not conform to the mixing and mistaking of origins apparent in early western collections, studies, and artistic references.\(^\text{19}\) In the eighteenth century, “Japan Mode,” “China Mode,” “Turkish fashion,” “things Indian,” and “Chinoserie” were used interchangeably.\(^\text{20}\) At the same time, there were discerning connoisseurs. During Japan’s isolationist era, Arita porcelain was known and valued for its superior craftsmanship and was exported in large quantities, making its way into Rococo and
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\(^{17}\) Phillipe Burty, “Japonism,” The Academy (1875), 150.


\(^{19}\) Portuguese traders were the first Europeans to arrive in Japan in 1543. The Spanish soon followed in 1587, and the Dutch in 1609.

Baroque interiors across Europe. Astute collectors were aware not only of the country but the region of its origin. Despite knowledge, educated specialists used inadequate and generic terms to describe their engagement with the arts of eastern countries. Further complications arise from the impossibility of delineating boundaries or beginning and end dates for these connected western art forms inspired by East-Asian cultures. Chinoiserie, for example, still informed European art during the height of Japonism.

In its initial conception, the nineteenth-century neologism referred to the study of Japanese art undertaken by self-proclaimed “Japonists” — western enthusiasts who collected all manner of objects from Japan, organized exhibitions highlighting the artistic diversity of the East-Asian country and wrote histories and surveys praising the refinement of Japanese craftsmanship. In the 1860s and 1870s, several interrelated terms were invented. “Japonaiserie” was coined by Edmond (1822-1896) and Jules Goncourt (1830-1870) to distinguish their interests from “Chinoiserie.” Similarly, “Japonerie” was created to denote western artworks that specifically imitated Japanese art. Both “Japonaiserie” and “Japonerie” have pejorative connotations, and it has been debated whether this negative tint was intended from their first use. In Japonism scholarship, these terms commonly refer to works where Japanese themes are deployed as a form of exoticism or where there is an unimaginative transposition of Japanese designs. “Japonisme” and its cognates have held more approbatory connotations referring
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to the in-depth study of Japanese sources going beyond surface appearance to ascertain fundamentals.\textsuperscript{24} At its deepest level, Japonism was an intensive study — a “seeking out … of formative principles, new materials, and the techniques that underlay Japanese artistry, as well as the aesthetics and sense of beauty behind them.”\textsuperscript{25} However, even the most committed engagements within Japonism were shaped by a mixture of sources and complicated by the difficulties of translation and recontextualization. “Japonismus,” the Germanized term, is not included in standard language dictionaries. The first use that I have encountered is an 1899 essay by Woldemar von Seidlitz (1850-1922), a German “Gründerzeit” museum director and art historian who wrote on European classical tradition, contemporary art, and Japanese prints.\textsuperscript{26} Seidlitz notes the variety of meanings associated with the word, defining “Japanismus” in three parts as “the scientific study of the products of Japanese art,” “the imitation of Japanese art by our own artists,” and “as a certain aesthetic creed that is drawn from looking at Japanese works.”\textsuperscript{27} In this dissertation, I use Japonismus to refer to the Viennese engagement with Japanese art — in its broadest sense — and Japonism to indicate the international context of this

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 71.
\item \textsuperscript{26} Udo Kultermann, \textit{The History of Art History} (New York: Abaris, 1993), 138. Kultermann characterizes Seidlitz as a Gründerzeit museum director, referring to the rapid economic development, expansion of industrial production, and foundation of many new institutions in the 1870s.
\item \textsuperscript{27} Woldemar von Seidlitz, “Japanismus,” \textit{Deutsche Revue} vol. 24 (1899), 205–11, 205. Seidlitz writes about “the scientific study of the products of Japanese art” (die wissenschaftliche Beschäftigung mit den Erzeugnissen japanischer Kunst), “the imitation of Japanese art by our own artists” (die Nachahmung japanischer Kunstweise durch unsere eigenen Künstler), and “a certain aesthetic creed that is drawn from looking at Japanese works” (ästhetisches Glaubensbekenntnis, das aus der Betrachtung japanischer Werke gezogen wird). The whole passage reads as follows: “Das Wort Japanismus wird in den verschiedensten Bedeutungen verwendet. Die einen verstehen darunter die wissenschaftliche Beschäftigung mit den Erzeugnissen japanischer Kunst, die anderen die Nachahmung japanischer Kunstweise durch unsere eigenen Künstler, dritte wiederum ein bestimmtes ästhetisches Glaubensbekenntnis, das aus der Betrachtung japanischer Werke gezogen wird.”
\end{itemize}
phenomenon, pushing against the view of this cultural meeting as a predominately Parisian affair and the characterization of Japanese artistic influence in Vienna as secondary, exclusively mediated by French sources, or of minor historical significance. While artists in Vienna were influenced by Paris and Parisian Japonisme, the sources of Viennese Japonismus were diverse and by no means limited to French publications, collections, and art dealers. As I will argue, Japanese art permeated Vienna in many ways and played a significant role in early pursuits of visual modernism in the Habsburg imperial capital.

3) Japonism Scholarship

Although noted by many contemporary artists and writers, the west’s re-imagination of Japan as “pure aesthetic fancy” at the end of the nineteenth century has only gradually come into art historical focus. As Toshio Watanabe has demonstrated, after the flourishing of Japonism across Europe in the last decades of the nineteenth century the phenomenon was overlooked by subsequent historians. It was not until the critical reassessment of the foundational binaries in the art historical canon in the 1960s — East-West, primitive-modern, native-foreign, craft-fine art — that the terms “Japonisme,” “Japanism,” and “Japonismus” appeared with any frequency in the titles of scholarly publications. By the 1980s historians had begun to rediscover the prevalence and

29 In his account of Victorian Japonisme, Watanabe has argued that the influence of Japonisme on western modernism was dismissively forgotten in the years between its peak in the early 1900s and the appearance of the first scholarly considerations of the 1940s. Watanabe, High Victorian Japonisme, 38-48. The scholarly exchange between European, U.S American and Japanese concerning this cultural exchange began in the 1980s with historians like Yamada Chisaburō.
diversity of Japan’s aesthetic influence in Europe and the United States. Early scholarship gave preference to the Parisian context. As the French origin of the term suggests, the burgeoning of interest began in France, and many of the most industrious individuals in this history were active in Paris. Fueled by the expanding international art market, the popularity and influence of the world’s fairs, and the increasing audience and circulation of publications like Siegfried Bing’s *Artistic Japan* (1888-1891), what began as a largely Parisian affair spread rapidly throughout continental Europe, Britain, and the United States. Scholars have considered Japonism in painting, the graphic arts, sculpture, literature, music, theater, architecture, and interior, clothing, and garden design. The list of artists who collected, studied, and embraced Japanese aesthetics in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century is almost inexhaustible.

Research from the 1990s to the present has provided an increasingly detailed view of the broader phenomenon of Japonism, its permutations in popular and high culture,
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30 The prominent names of Parisian Japonisme are Edmond de Goncourt, Philippe Burty, Siegfried Bing, Hayashi Tadamasa, Félix Bracquemond, and Louis Gonse. Bracquemond is often cited as the first European to discover ukiyo-e prints. Gonse published the first complete survey of Japanese art in Europe, *L'art japonais* (1883), and Hayashi was a prominent dealer in Paris.

31 Siegfried (or Samuel) Bing used “S. Bing” or simply “Bing” for his publications. Art historians generally refer to him as S. Bing or Siegfried Bing. In his biography, Henry van de Velde refers to him as Samuel and that was the name that he used in his daily and private life. Julius Meier-Graefe, who was a close friend and collaborator, described Bing as speaking and writing classical French and avoiding any attention drawn to his personal life (rather like Klimt). Meier-Graefe said that most people would not have thought that he was a brilliant researcher and collector, but he was both. Gabriel P. Weisberg, who has been researching Bing and Japonisme for four decades attributes Bing’s discretion and reluctance to being in the public eye to the climate and necessities created by the Dreyfus affair (1894). This negotiation of Jewish identity in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was also used by publishers like S. Fischer (Berlin). Henry van de Velde, *Geschichte meines Lebens* (München: Piper Verlag, 1962), 102. Julius Meier-Graefe *Geschichten neben der Kunst* (Berlin: S. Fischer Verlag, 1933), 95. Gabriel P. Weisberg, “Lost and found: S. Bing’s merchandising of Japonisme and Art Nouveau,” accessed November 27, 2023, [http://www.19theartworldwide.org/summer_05/articles/weis.html](http://www.19theartworldwide.org/summer_05/articles/weis.html).

and its regional contexts. Examinations of early publications by the Goncourt brothers, Philippe Burty, Louis Gonse (1846-1921), and Ernest Fenollosa (1853-1908), and studies considering Japanese connoisseurs and dealers, such as Okakura Kakuzō (1863-1913) and Hayashi Tadamasa (1853-1906), have provided a deeper understanding of what drove the international interest in Japanese art and the formulation of collections outside of Japan. As the field has grown, the range of Japonism’s influence and its implications for examinations of European, U.S. American, and Japanese art have become increasingly apparent.

Important scholarship on Viennese Japonismus has been carried out by curators and historians working with the extensive collection of the Austrian Museum for Applied Arts (Museum für angewandte Kunst, MAK). Impressive exhibitions have been mounted exploring the artistic impact of Japan in Vienna beginning with the 1873 World’s Fair. Curators have employed formal comparison to draw out the vibrancy of this cultural encounter, but the survey nature of these undertakings has necessarily precluded detailed investigations into the role of Japanese art in singular œuvres or its place in the eclectic visual fabric of Viennese modernism.

---

34 Ono, Japonisme in Britain; Kreiner, “Some Remarks on Japanese Collections in Europe” in Japanese Collections in European Museums vol. I, 3-52. Fenollosa’s history of Japanese art was in Klimt’s library and will be addressed in Chapter Four.
In the case of Klimt, the Japonist elements of his works have long been noted by scholars, for example, his flattening of perspectival space, his approach to the figurative and decorative, his use of square and elongated vertical formats, and his employment of Japanese patterns. The painter has been included in many surveys, albeit briefly, and several art historians have considered a single work or an aspect of his oeuvre in terms of Japonismus. Marian Bisanz-Prakken and Manu von Miller made early note of Japanese influence in Klimt’s 1898 Portrait of Sonja Knips, for example, and Svitlana Shiells has recently built on their scholarship arguing that Japanese art played a pivotal role in this foray into modernist painting (Fig. 1.18). Through close visual analysis, Akiko Mabuchi has traced Klimt’s patterns, including his spiraling tendril to Japanese textile designs. Despite the frequency of scholarly remark, work is needed to uncover the context and development of his engagement with Japanese models and the role of Japonismus in his oeuvre. In the early 1980s, Klaus Berger, one of the first to note the artist’s place in Japonism studies, made a still pertinent claim: “in general terms, the extensive literature on his work sometimes acknowledges the existence of a Far Eastern

‘stimulus,’ but this has yet to be traced in detail.” In the following chapters, I build upon prior scholarship, situating Klimt’s Japonismus and emulation of Japanese pattern within the larger context of his allegorical approach to visual modernism. I argue that he found an unlikely kinship between contemporary concepts of artistic revival, the potential of modern allegory, and the foreign artistic tradition of Japan.

4) Klimt Scholarship

Despite the high visibility of Klimt in studies of early visual modernism in Vienna, art historical interpretations of the painter’s oeuvre encounter a very particular set of difficulties. From the aerial vantage point of the era to the myopic view of his biography, analyses of his artistic production seem more than usually challenged by what Franz Kafka named “the living, changing face of truth” and history. This is not to say that the basic facts of Klimt’s biography are unknown. On the contrary, the details of his private life have elicited speculation among his contemporaries and subsequent historians, and many attempts have been made to reveal the truth of the artist’s private life (Fig. 1.19). Several of his works, like his early commissions on the Ringstrasse (1886-1890) and Faculty Paintings (1894-1907), either occupy or were intended to occupy very public spaces in Vienna (Fig. 1.20-21). Although now no longer extant, Klimt’s notorious
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40 Berger, *Japonisme in Western Painting*, 211.
41 Kafka’s letter from November 1920 is quoted in the original German in Hannah Arendt and Jerome Kohn, *Essays in Understanding 1930-1954: Formation, Exile, and Totalitarianism* (New York: Schocken Books, 1994), 307. “It is difficult to speak the truth, because there is only one; but it is living and has a changing face.” (Es ist schwer die Wahrheit zu sagen, denn es gibt zwar nur eine; aber sie ist lebendig und hat daher ein lebendig wechselndes Gesicht).
42 “Up close and personal” is the title of a 2012 exhibition and catalogue. It is one of the many monographs that question and attempt to reveal the truth of commonly held views, e.g., the nature of his relationship with Emilie Flöge. Natter, Franz Smola and Peter Weinhäupl eds., *Klimt: Up Close and Personal: Paintings, Letters, Insights* (Vienna: Brandstätter, 2012).
allegories commissioned for the university elicited one of the most highly publicized and heated disputes of Austrian art history. Despite, or perhaps due to, the well-known and rumored aspects of his life and debates concerning his works, Klimt’s creative intentions, and his definition of the “art of his age” have remained somewhat elusive.\footnote{Above the entrance of the Secession building (designed by Joseph Maria Olbrich, 1897), the inscribed motto reads: “Der Zeit ihre Kunst. Der Kunst ihre Freiheit.” (To every age its art. To art its freedom.)}

In contrast to the verbosity of his protégé Oskar Kokoschka (1886-1980), Klimt was famously reticent. His studio practice was intensely private, and his library and collection were never fully documented.\footnote{For the partial documentation of Klimt’s art collection and library, see Christian M. Nebehay, \textit{Gustav Klimt: Dokumentation} (Vienna: Nebehay, 1969).} Of the many extant photographs of Klimt and the Secessionist circles taken by Moritz Nähr (1859-1945), few show the interiors of the painter’s three studios.\footnote{Nähr was a friend of the Secessionists known for his photographic portraits. He produced several family albums for the industrialist Karl Wittgenstein, an early patron of Viennese modernism and Klimt, and his documentation of Klimt’s art and the exhibitions of the Secession have played a notable role in scholarship.} None capture Klimt at work. The only image that depicts Klimt painting is a caricature produced by Remigius Geyling in 1902. Several of the most significant and controversial paintings of his oeuvre were destroyed during the Second World War, and the chronology of his extant works has engendered debate. The dating of the university panel \textit{Jurisprudence} and the later large-scale painting \textit{Death and Life} is complicated by the fact that Klimt was a perfectionist who produced hundreds of preparatory sketches and labored over a single canvas for many years. The written materials that traditionally would serve as the backbone of historical analysis leave many things open. Other than annotations on sketches, scribbles on postcards, brief and quotidian letters, and the recollections of his social circle, the statements attributable to the painter are either highly suggestive (“Anyone who wants to know anything about me...”)}
as an artist – and this is the only thing that matters — should look attentively at my pictures.”) or they are generalized introductions rather than expressions of individual intentions, as in his speeches at the fourteenth Secession exhibition honoring Beethoven and the 1908 collective exhibition of the Klimt-Group.  

In response to this “living, changing face,” five major works have been used to narrate the artist’s œuvre: the Ringstrasse murals at the Burgtheater (1886-88) and Kunsthistorisches Museum (1891), the Faculty Paintings for the University of Vienna (1898-1907), the Beethoven Frieze (1902), and the mosaic murals at the Palais Stoclet (1905-11). Many scholars have adhered to a historical model of stylistic progression and regression in which these prominent works serve as markers of Klimt’s trajectory from a rising historicist painter to a modern Secessionist rebel to an artist in retreat from public confrontation. In Klimt scholarship, the foundations of this narrative arc are rooted most firmly in Carl Schorske’s influential publication *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (1979). Historians have since reevaluated this period and questioned aspects of his analysis, and his account plays a minor role in Austrian research. Nevertheless, his interpretation has set a distinctive lens for the international perception of Klimt’s art and life, and his Freudian account of the painter’s œuvre has left an indelible mark on scholarship. Schorske’s analysis set a precedent for psycho-biographical readings that playfully hint at or blatantly speculate about the real revelations of “naked truth,”
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obfuscating Klimt’s serious and intellectually complex aspirations.\textsuperscript{47} As Lisa Florman has argued, Klimt’s art was respected by multiple generations of Viennese modernists. However, “critical appraisals are more reserved, if anything underestimating the sophistication of the artist’s interest and aims.”\textsuperscript{48}

Beyond Schorske, Klimt is frequently portrayed as an artist between tradition and modernity and his œuvre is divided by chronology, intended audience, or medium. His monumental murals on the Ringstrasse are not often discussed alongside his censored Secessionist posters, and his public works seem to have little connection to his sketches, commissioned portraiture, and prolific landscapes. Interestingly, contemporary detractors like art critic Wilhelm Hausenstein (1882-1957), who dismissed Klimt’s paintings as a “pathological psychology of ornamental paraphrases,” saw value in his erotic drawings, setting a precedent for dividing Klimt’s modernism from works that were pejoratively viewed as decorative canvases.\textsuperscript{49} However, Klimt’s supporters saw his various modes as related. Ludwig Hevesi (1843-1910), whose belief in an art for and of the age is inscribed above the entryway of the Secession, saw in \textit{Nuda Veritas} a new Isis, relating this


\textsuperscript{48} In Florman’s view, Schorske only finds intellectual depth in a few of Klimt’s paintings. Florman’s seeks to extend Schorske’s interpretation of Klimt’s \textit{Philosophy} to the artist’s œuvre more broadly. Florman also argues that the stylistic continuities of Klimt’s works are too easily overlooked by Schorske. See Lisa Florman, “Gustav Klimt and the Precedent of Ancient Greece,” \textit{The Art Bulletin} vol. 72, no. 2 (1990), 310-26, 310, 314.

\textsuperscript{49} Wilhelm Hausenstein, \textit{Die Bildende Kunst der Gegenwart: Malerei, Plastik, Zeichnung} (Stuttgart–Berlin: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1914), 236. He writes of “the pathological psychology of ornamental paraphrases” (die krankhafte Psychologie ornamentierender Paraphrasen) of Klimts’ art. The whole passage reads as follows: “Weder das philosophische Pathos noch der Mythus, weder die altmeisterliche Seelendraperie noch die altmeisterliche Technik, weder die krankhafte Psychologie ornamentierender Paraphrasen Klimt; noch das elegante hantieren mit Stilmustern, weder das Kunstgewerbliche noch die Kalligraphie, weder der Kult des Biceps noch die Hysterie der Nerven, die sich in gezogenen Lineaturen zärtlich registriert, bringt Stil hervor. Er erwächst nur aus der genialen Einfalt der großen, ganz von geradem Instinkt erfüllten Begabungen und Epochen.” Hausenstein positively reviewed an exhibiton of Klimt’s drawings in 1914.
modernist proclamation to Klimt’s depiction of Ancient Egypt at the public home of the imperial collection (Kunsthistorisches Museum) (Fig. 1.22-23).50 Furthermore, the painter’s varied oeuvre was presented side-by-side in the exhibitions of the Secession and in the pages of Ver Sacrum (1898-1903). The continuities, similarities, and overlapping timelines of Klimt’s art deserve closer attention.

Another gap in scholarship that I address in this dissertation is the role of allegory in Klimt’s modernism. Although allegory was an important mode of representation in early modern visual culture, and in the case of Klimt, his education and development were informed by the allegorical tradition of the Austrian Baroque and Historicist revivals — e.g., the neo-Renaissance architecture of Gottfried Semper (1803-1879) and the Venetian-inspired paintings of Hans Makart (1840-1884) — it has not been a focal point in art historical accounts of Viennese modernism, which have focused on the expressionist works of Oskar Kokoschka, Richard Gerstl (1883-1908), Max Oppenheimer (1885-1954), Egon Schiele (1890-1918), and Herbert Boeckl (1894-1966).51 Before post-modern scholarship reevaluated the rhetorical configuration of modernity, modern art was frequently aligned with ideas of rebellion, rupture, and a rejection of the past, an interpretation supported by the Vienna Secessionists’ objective to break free from mindless “imitation” and the “spell of tradition” in order to “create anew.”52 However, defining Viennese visual modernism simply as a break from tradition

52 Otto Wagner, Die Baukunst unserer Zeit: dem Baukunstjünger ein Führer auf diesem Kunstdgebiete (Vienna: Kunstverlag Anton Schroll, 1914), 37, 17. One unifying aim of the Secession was to produce an art for and of their age. Wagner writes of “imitation” (Nachäffen), the “spell of tradition” (Bann der Tradition), and the desire to “create anew” (Neuschaffen). The whole passage read as follows: “Im Suchen
or as beginning with Expressionism does not allow for the multifaceted ideas of rebirth at the heart of the Secessionists’ objectives nor for the inter-generational connections between artists in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. The Secessionists, the arts and crafts collective of the Wiener Werkstätte, and later “Klimt-Group” (also known as the Stylists) were supported by their historicist mentors and made concerted efforts to promote younger artists. As committee president for the Klimt-Group’s large-scale exhibitions (Kunstschau Wien 1908 and 1909), Klimt exerted his influence to have the works of Kokoschka and Schiele included among the Stylists’ progressive, internationally oriented displays. (Fig. 1.24). The Austrian art historian Otto Benesch described Klimt’s relationship to the younger artists as follows: “He inspired them deeply, lent to their slender, fragile figures spiritual sublimity, encouraging them to raise their pictorial representations from the plane of daily life to the level of meaning.”

Klimt continued to support this next generation of Viennese modernists even after the violent sexual content of Kokoschka’s *The Dreaming Youths*, which was dedicated to the
older painter and debuted in 1908, created enough public outrage to prompt the young painter’s dismissal from the School of Design (Fig. 1.25).

The simultaneity and continuity of Klimt’s artistic production make it difficult to divide his oeuvre in terms of chronology, style, medium, or audience. This is particularly true of the works cited as pivotal moments of transition. In the following chapters, I emphasize the proximity and coexistence of his modes and his lasting investments in allegory and Japonismus. This view goes against the grain of Schorskean interpretations, in which Klimt’s increasing use of pattern is viewed as a decline into the merely decorative and a departure from his early modernist aims. I trace the interwoven threads of his creative output, uncovering a more layered, if paradoxical, definition of modernity in his works. From his earliest education through the length of his career, Klimt was encouraged, mentored, and in partnership with individuals who strongly believed in the necessity of renewal in the modern era and felt that the future of Austrian craft and culture lay in the revival of the best models of the past. As this study will show, Klimt’s ideas of artistic rebirth were rooted in the potential of modernizing allegory and the model of natural ornament and unified craftmanship provided by the arts of Japan.

5) Methodology

56 Schorske, Fin-de-siècle Vienna.
57 One important example of this is Rudolf Eitelberger, who will be addressed in Chapter Two. On Eitelberger’s reform efforts, see Rampley, “Design Reform in the Habsburg Empire: Technology, Aesthetics, and Ideology,” Journal of Design History vol. 23, no. 3 (2010), 247-64.
The five core chapters of this dissertation address ideas of aesthetic unity in cultural heterogeneity, the amalgamate nature of Viennese Japonismus, visual adoptions and adaptations of Japanese aesthetics by members of the Secession and Wiener Werkstätte, Klimt’s allegorical approach to modernism, and the role of Japonismus in the painter’s allegories. Mirroring my subject matter, my methodological approach is eclectic. The analysis of each chapter draws support from the critical voices and witnesses of the period, in particular the author Hermann Bahr and the art critics Ludwig Hevesi and Berta Zuckerkandl (1864-1945). My interpretations of this period’s art, art criticism, and innovative practices of art history also owe much to prior scholarship.

The backbone of this examination is my understanding of Austrian history, which is drawn from the works of Carl Schorske, Pieter M. Judson, and Steven Beller.58 While I disagree with Schorske’s interpretation of Klimt, his seminal scholarship destabilized the hegemonic position of Paris in histories of modernism, opening research into the place of Austrian art in the European avant-garde and scholarship that moves beyond center-periphery models. My examinations of the ideological and political context surrounding the emergence of visual modernism in the Habsburg capital are founded on the institutional histories, historiographies, and studies of artistic reform written by Matthew Rampley, Diana Reynolds-Cordileone, and Margaret Iversen.59 In terms of cultural exchange, my recuperation of Klimt’s eclecticism is indebted to Holly Shaffer’s theory of artistic mixture and Toshio Watanabe’s interdisciplinary exploration of Victorian Japonisme, which has been a productive model for my approach to the Viennese

My knowledge of the history of artistic exchange between Japan and Europe and its impact in Vienna has been informed by the works of Chisaburō Yamada, Ellen P. Conant, Johannes Wieninger, Peter Pantzer, and Akiko Mabuchi. Dōshin Satō’s seminal study of Japanese art and the Meiji era underpins my definition of the amalgamate nature of Viennese Japonismus. Studies of Austrian modern art and the works of Klimt are diverse, and numerous scholars have shaped my research. My arguments build most on Christian Nebehay’s documentation of Klimt’s life and art, Alice Strobl’s and Marian Bisanz-Prakken’s meticulous dating of his drawings, Verena Traeger’s continued exploration of his estate, Lisa Florman’s considerations of continuity in Klimt’s art, Tobias G. Natter’s detailed catalogue of his complete paintings, and Alfred Weidinger’s research on the Palais Stoclet.

6) Chapter Overviews

Chapter Two begins with a concise socio-political history of the challenges that shaped the cultural life of late nineteenth-century Vienna and the aims of artistic reformers from the 1860s through the foundations of the Secession (1897) and Wiener Werkstätte (1903). Outlining the discords following the Habsburg 1848 revolutions, this chapter examines the subsequent transformations of the imperial capital, the city’s platforms for debate and display, and concepts of “Austrian” style that informed visual modernism and the works

of Klimt. I argue that the question of Austrian identity in the arts encouraged eclecticism and the emergence of new paradigms like Japonismus.

In Chapter Three, I lay the foundations for my subsequent arguments through a critical account of the pervasive and varied images of “Japan” that permeated Klimt’s Vienna. Both cultures in this encounter shaped Viennese Japonismus. In the Meiji era, Japanese aesthetic traditions were reformulated and re-envisioned with an outward-looking view of the international political and economic landscape. A curated mixture of Pre-Meiji and Meiji art was exported to meet the demands of museums and private collectors abroad. Simultaneously, in the Habsburg capital engagements with the arts of Japan were propelled by European popular culture and externally fabricated representations and reproductions of Japanese crafts and culture. These amalgamated sources fostered interpretations of Japanese craftsmanship as a pure, pre-industrial tradition, Japanese ornament as intrinsically linked to the natural world, and Japanese art as a viable model for modern renewal. These evaluations were based on inseparable layers of exoticism, primitivism, and Orientalism; productive misinterpretation and failed translation; and genuine encounter with old and new Japanese art.62

In Chapter Four, I critically examine adoptions and adaptations of Japanese aesthetic principles in Viennese visual modernism, recuperating eclecticism as a creative process in which multiple, distinct traditions intersect and converge to create something new. I define “adoption” as a mindful, artistic selection and “adaptation” as an emulation

------------------------------------------------------------------------

of a source intended to create the essence of the model anew. Viennese Japonismus impacted modernist reevaluations of visual representation and nature, woodblock printing and graphic line, and craftsmanship as a unifying principal of the arts. I explore these influences through the works of Emil Orlik (1870-1932), the “wandering apostle of modern woodcut,” and the art of the Secessionist and Wiener Werkstätte leader Josef Hoffmann (1870-1956). Like Klimt, these artists adopted and adapted from sources that they believed to be a fundamental, cross-cultural path. I conclude the chapter with an exploration of Klimt as a reader and the known contents of his personal library. I argue that the volumes that he owned offer a window into his encounter with Japanese aesthetics and his engagement with contemporary scholarship and the history of art.

Chapter Five analyzes Klimt’s contributions to Martin Gerlach’s *Allegorien und Embleme* (1882-84) and *Allegorien: Neue Folge* (1886-1900). Pointing to the artistic community and ideas revealed within these volumes, I offer a reinterpretation of the relative importance of Klimt’s early endeavors and the foundations of his approach to visual modernism. I destabilize interpretations of the painter’s oeuvre as a rise and decline or as divided by changing ambitions. Allegory was not simply an early pictorial concept that he discarded in his artistic development. From his early training through his last, unfinished paintings, this visual tradition remained central to his pursuit of a truly modern art for and of his age.

Uniting my arguments, Chapter Six culminates in a close reading of the Stoclet Frieze and the role of Japonismus in Klimt’s revival of the allegorical tradition. Klimt’s
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art was neither strictly allegorical nor was his ornamental development simply Japonist. The two engagements, nevertheless, spanned the entirety of his oeuvre, crossing any divisive lines of medium, style, and audience. I argue that in the Stoclet Frieze Klimt adopted and adapted Japanese forms as a universal language and unifying principle to his eclecticism. Juxtaposing accentuated flatness with brief moments of pictorial depth, the frieze plays with the proximity between the art object and beholder, inviting the viewer to complete this modern allegory of art and life.

My objective is to offer a reevaluation of the ambitions, achievements, and limitations of Klimt’s art. Prior scholarship has attended to the presence of allegory and Japonismus in the painter’s oeuvre. These interwoven threads have yet to be considered in detail and in dialogue. In the following chapters, I aim to situate Klimt’s Japonismus within its historical context, offering a new understanding of his works, the eclectic visual fabric of late-nineteenth and early twentieth-century Vienna, and the role of Japonismus in Viennese modern art.
Chapter Two: The Search for Aesthetic Unity in Cultural Heterogeneity

The period between the 1848 revolutions and the end of the Dual Monarchy in 1918 was a time of political instability in which the position of the Habsburg empire, both internally and internationally, was tenuous. Amid this uncertainty, government officials and cultural leaders looked to the arts as a means of creating a cohesive identity among the empire’s disparate peoples. It was a time of competing visions, as the economic, political, and aesthetic roles of design engendered divergent opinions and efforts to transform the arts of the imperial capital and, more broadly, the empire. The Viennese reform movements and “Renaissance debates” of the historicist era considered the role of tradition in modern life, the relationship between art and industry, and the definitions and intersections between the arts, folk traditions, nation, and empire. For clarity, this analysis focuses on a single idea within this multifaceted dialogue: aesthetic unity within cultural heterogeneity. From the conception of art as the element that could
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66 Diana Reynolds-Cordileone, *Alois Riegl in Vienna 1875-1905: An Institutional Biography* (Farnham, Surrey: Ashgate, 2014), 152. The defining points of division in the reform debates were Kunstindustrie (art industry), Hausindustrie (home industry), angewandte Kunst (applied art), Kunstgewerbe (arts and crafts/handicrafts), and Volkkunst (folk art).
“unite the peoples” to the promotion of a uniquely Austrian artistic tradition that would be a “crystallization of the best of many cultures,” this aspect of the reform debates was a determinate factor in the stylistic plurality and international spirit of Viennese visual modernism.67

Beginning with a brief history of the divides that grew in the wake of the 1848 revolutions, in this chapter I examine Viennese platforms for debate and display and concepts of unity in heterogeneity threaded through the reform debates, focusing on the ideas of Rudolf von Eitelberger, Albert Ilg (1847-1896), and Berta Zuckerkandl. Despite their differing aims and audiences, these individuals are addressed together not only for the resonances between their views on “Austrian” art but for their impact on the artistic circles of the Secession, Wiener Werkstätte, and Gustav Klimt. Their shared call for aesthetic unity and the differences between their conceptions and pursuits of this aim reflect the generational links as well as the shifting cultural landscape of the imperial capital. The chapter concludes with an examination of the Secession’s 1903 exhibition The Development of Impressionism in Painting and Sculpture. Designed by the German art critic and dealer, Julius Meier-Graefe (1867-1935), the exhibition created an origin story for the emergence of impressionism and modernism that included an entire section dedicated to Japanese prints. The exhibition was indicative of both the internationalism of the Vienna Secession and significantly traced a fundamental, cross-cultural basis for modern art.

I) Political Landscape: From Habsburg Empire to Dual Monarchy

Long divided by socio-economic, linguistic, and cultural differences, the Habsburg territories knit together under centralized Austrian rule began to unravel amid the European-wide unrest of the late 1840s (Fig. 2.1). As republican calls for constitutionalism intensified across Europe, discontent among the peoples of the crownlands grew in reaction to the rigidity of the Metternich era (1815-48) and the conservatism of absolutist rule. Incited by the new social strains and economic fluctuations of industrialization, the intensification of nationalist and separatist movements within the empire, and the harvest failures and subsequent food shortages that affected the whole continent between 1845 and 1847, revolutionary activity mounted across the Habsburg empire rising to a crescendo with the revolutions of 1848-49.

On March 13, 1848, Viennese progressives rioted in the name of political and civil freedoms, rejecting the conservative domestic policies of Habsburg rule and the restrictive jurisdiction of the Catholic Church. Echoing the Declaration of the Rights of Man, they called for the creation of a new constitutional government ensuring universal


suffrage, peasant emancipation, religious freedom, the secularization of education, and the end of state censorship.\(^{71}\) As occurred in cities across Europe during the springtime of the peoples, demonstrations in Vienna resulted in a series of violent confrontations between the imperial military and the revolting populace. The capital remained in flux between revolution and counterrevolution, as Habsburg authorities attempted to restore order, and the resigning foreign minister Klemens von Metternich (1773-1859), an unpopular symbol of the absolutist regime, was forced into exile. With the Habsburg capital in turmoil, rebellions spread throughout the empire. However, the ambitions of the 1848ers varied as emergent nationalisms grew amongst the German, Magyar, Czech, Italian, Polish, Slovak, Rumanian, and Slavic peoples of the empire, and as revolutionaries included the crownland nobilities, members of the peasant and working classes, educated bourgeois urbanites, religious minorities (in particular, assimilated Jews), students, academics, and radical writers.

The Habsburg revolutionary movements encountered a central difficulty: regional heterogeneity. In his ethnographic studies of the 1850s, the Austrian statistician Karl von Czörnig (1804-1889) demonstrated that each of the crownlands was a patchwork of the empire’s many peoples (Fig. 2.2).\(^{72}\) Within the nationalist movements, “the precise territorial, linguistic, or orthographic definition” of nation differed between various activist groups.\(^{73}\) Pan-Slavism, for example, manifested itself in contrasting ways in

\(^{71}\) Schorske noted the importance of France as the “birthplace of democracy” and model for the 1848 revolutions. Schorske, *Fin -de-siècle Vienna*, 5.
Bohemia, Moravia, and Silesia. Likewise, in 1848 Vienna, conflicting views emerged concerning the role of the German language in the identities of Austria and the empire. From the uprising of 1848 through the culminating period of Austrian liberalism (1867-1879) to the end of the Dual Monarchy (1918), progressive visions of the future frequently excluded the laboring classes and the non-German peoples of the crownlands. The proposed reforms of 1848 contained unequal policies in which minority populations remained underrepresented, germinating discontent that in later years would lead to the devastating rise of anti-Semitism and pan-Germanism.

Although predominately middle-class and German-speaking, the 1848ers of the imperial capital were divided, and “the life of the capital came to be dominated by an ever-increasing number of revolutionary clubs and associations, which, according to one contemporary satirist, were ‘formed for the sole purpose of disorganization.’”

On March 7, 1849, Emperor Franz Joseph, who had ascended the throne amid the revolutions, dissolved the first Austrian Reichstag before the newly drafted constitution could be brought into effect. This rejected reform proposed new civil liberties and distinct

74 Louis Levine, “Pan-Slavism and European Politics,” *Political Science Quarterly* vol. 29, no. 4 (1914), 664–86.
districts based on nationality to quell the ethnic discords of the heterogeneous empire.⁷⁸

Under reinstated centralized absolutist rule (1849–60), the crownland peasantry was emancipated, and various legal concessions were made to bolster the economy, infrastructure, trade, and educational systems.⁷⁹ Civil liberties, the power of the crownland aristocracies, and regional governments were curtailed, and the rights of the empire’s Jewish population were diminished, a fact that surprisingly had little effect on the popularity of the young monarch within this minority population.⁸⁰

The constitutional government of the 1860s was divided between centralists, who represented largely German bourgeois interests, and federalists, who came from the nobility of Hungary, Poland, and Bohemia.⁸¹ With increased pressures from neighboring European powers and crises, including the Schleswig Wars (1848-51, 1864), the Crimean War (1853-56), the Austro-Prussian War (1866), and the wars in the Italian states (1848-66), the ratification of imperial rule was deemed imperative, and Franz Joseph became the Emperor and King of the Austro-Hungarian Dual Monarchy (Ausgleich, 1867). The challenging heterogeneity of the Austro-Hungarian peoples, in terms of nation, ethnicity, religion, class, language, and degree of modernity, remained a foreboding issue. Writing in 1904, the French historian L. Eisenmann described the Dual Monarchy as a “regime

---


⁸⁰ Judson, *Habsburg Empire, 219.*

woven of contradictions, with its unity which is a duality, with its parity which means inequality, with its constitutionalism which implies absolutism.”

Although quickly suppressed, the 1848 revolutions influenced the cultural landscape of the imperial capital until the end of the Dual Monarchy in 1918. Among the crownlands’ heterogeneous peoples, the uprisings gave birth to conflicting visions of empire, nation, and citizenship, and, as Pieter M. Judson has argued, continuous efforts were made to “sell the dynasty” and “visualize the liberal empire.” From tours of state and dynastic celebrations to the press promotions of Franz Joseph as the head of an “domestic idyll,” exertions to legitimize Habsburg rule focused on the idea of a unified Austria that embraced the differences of the crownlands’ peoples. Through photographs and painted portraits, the public image of Empress Elisabeth, the celebrated Sisi (1837-1898), was utilized to fashion a cohesive image of the Dual Monarchy (Fig. 2.3). Similar harmonizing efforts were made during celebrations of the sixtieth year of Franz Joseph’s reign in the 1908 Kaiserhuldigungsfestzug, which included a procession of dynastic historical figures and a costumed parade of the crownlands’ many peoples (Nationalitätenfestzug) (Fig. 2.4-5). Drawing on Baroque courtly tradition (Fest der Nationen, Erdteile, etc.), the symbolic festival united quasi-personifications of the Dual
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Monarchy’s peoples, and the public (Agnostics, Christians, and Jews alike) were brought together to watch and celebrate the Holy Roman Empire, which had already been lost for 200 years.⁸⁶ In Vienna, the imperial capital and primary residence of the Austrian Emperor and Hungarian King, the arts, in terms of production, education, display, and historical inquiry, became an evocative means of formulating and promoting a unified vision of the Dual Monarchy.

This relationship between art and state was not ruptured by the advent of visual modernism in Vienna, where art unions were funded by the Ministry of Culture and Education.⁸⁷ Reformers, like the directors of the Museum of Art and Industry, tied the arts and crafts to the cultural identity of the empire, believing that the formulation of a supranational aesthetic would secure the place of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy in the “peaceful contests” between European nations.⁸⁸ The young artists of the Vienna Secession were supported by the Interior Ministry in their efforts to establish an exhibition space for modern art in the capital, and their break was from the conservative Austrian Artists’ Society (Künstlerhausgenossenschaft) rather than the state.⁸⁹ As
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⁸⁶ On unifying pageants, public spectacles, the role of the Catholic Church, and the long afterlife of these public events as Habsburg nostalgia, see Christiane Hertel, “‘Fernbild:’ On Otto Friedlaender Writing ‘Vienna 1900 in Vienna 1938–1942/45,’” *Journal of Austrian Studies* vol. 47, no. 2 (2014), 37-82.
illustrated in painting and print, Franz Joseph visited the Secession’s first exhibition in the k. k. Gartenbausälen on April 6, 1898 (Fig. 2.6). He was greeted by first president Gustav Klimt, honorary president Rudolf Alt (1812-1905) and the group’s founding members Eugen Jettel (1848-1901), Carl Moll (1861-1945), Hans Tichy (1861-1925), Carl Müller (1862-1938), Josef Engelhart (1864-1941), Franz Hohenberger (1867-1941), and Joseph M. Olbrich (1867-1908). This unique relationship between the imperial court and contemporary art continued into the twentieth century, as evident in the support offered to the Secession by the head of the Ministry of Culture, Wilhelm von Hartel (1839-1907), the Austrian Ministry’s appointment of Secessionists to the central committee for the Paris Universal Exposition of 1900, the immediate purchase of Gustav Klimt’s *The Kiss* by the Ministry of Education in 1908, and the Secessionist’s participation in the 1908 Kaiserhuldigungsfestzug (Fig 2.7-8).^{90}

For many nineteenth-century scholars in the Habsburg territories, Austria’s distinctive character was rooted in the linguistic and cultural differences of its peoples; the multilingualism of the empire was viewed as “a measure of the distinctive way that Austria promoted unity” over “subordination.”^{91} However, tensions existed within these attempts to embrace heterogeneity, including the contradictions inherent within the idea of a supranational yet specifically Austrian identity, conflicting visions of what constituted a unifying element within the diverse traditions of the crownlands, and the
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^{90} Heerde, *Staat und Kunst*, 160.
^{91} Judson, *Habsburg Empire*, 239, 241-42. Judson addresses the works of the liberal newspaper editor and former 1848er Ernst von Schwarzer (1808-1860), the historian Joseph Hammer Purgstall (1774-1856), and Karl von Czörnig, another former 1848er who became a civil servant, ethnographer, and statistician. Judson also addresses the problematic pro-Germanism within these authors’ works.
complicated history of Jewish assimilation and difference with regard to the cultural identity of the empire and the imperial capital.  

2) The Ringstrasse, the Museum of Art and Industry, and the School of Design

The second half of the nineteenth century was a period of accelerated economic growth, industrialization, and urban transformation in the Habsburg lands. The imperial capital was already one of the largest cities of nineteenth-century Europe. With improvements to interregional transportation and infrastructure and the growth of free trade in the Gründerzeit (1848-73), the population and density of Vienna swelled, and the urban landscape of the city changed dramatically. At the heart of these transformations was a rising, progressive middle-class that shaped the intellectual landscape of the capital beyond the turn of the century and until the fall of the empire in 1918.  

As described by Carl Schorske, during the prosperous years of “cosmopolitan capitalism,” the thick fortress walls of the medieval city center were torn down to make way for a “great circular artery,” a “meeting ground for the old aristocratic and new bourgeois elites” (Fig. 2.9). The development of the Ringstrasse (1861-65 and 1868-73) was symbolic of the city’s shifting identity from baroque imperial capital to historicist, bourgeois metropolis to modernist city. Initially conceived in 1857 as part of
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94 Schorske, Fin -de-siècle, 5.

95 Ibid., 41. For Schorske, the old aristocratic center of Vienna represented the Baroque imperial capital. The constitutional government buildings (parliament, city hall, and university) were symbols of the
the “beautification” of the imperial capital, the boulevard was intended to be a military space that reaffirmed the reign and authority of Emperor Franz Joseph (1848-1916). After the war with Prussia (1866) and the compromise of 1867, the Ringstrasse program shifted. No longer a symbol of “imperial Macht,” the Ringstrasse became the frontispiece for the “triumphant middle class” and the home of Vienna’s intellectual and cultural life (Fig. 2.10). As monumental centers for Viennese art, politics, and sciences were designed and constructed, including Heinrich von Ferstel’s Florentine-Renaissance Museum of Art and Industry (1864-71) and Baroque-Renaissance style University Building (1871-4) and Friedrich von Schmidt’s neo-Gothic City Hall (1872-83) (Fig. 2.11-13), the Ringstrasse became a prominent platform for debates concerning the state of the arts and the role of design in imperial and civic identity.

Nineteenth-century reform movements in Europe were largely based on the idea of resuscitating past traditions. As Diana Reynolds-Cordileone’s scholarship has demonstrated, this notion was explored enthusiastically in the case of Austria-Hungary. However, there were contentious debates, which frequently became “entangled in nationalist rhetoric,” as to which historical style would best represent the heterogeneous Dual Monarchy. In the Ringstrasse era of artistic revivalism, Viennese theorists, architects, and artists struggled to envision a “representative historical style for a multi-national empire” that would proclaim Austria’s distinct identity along the capital’s

96 Schorske, Fin-de-siècle, 30.
97 Ibid., 31, 36.
98 Reynolds-Cordileone, Alois Riegl, 153
circular boulevard and, more broadly, on the increasingly global stage of art and industry.\(^9\) Among would-be reformers, there was a powerful sense of the interconnection between art and politics, as many participants in the cultural debates of the late nineteenth century had taken part in the 1848 revolutions. The art historian, professor, and museum director Rudolf von Eitelberger expressed his progressive views as editor of the \textit{Wiener Zeitung} during the Habsburg uprisings and heralded 1848 as the year of artistic liberation in his treatise on art education and reform.\(^10\) In another example, the architect Gottfried Semper was exiled for his participation in Dresden’s May Uprising (1849).\(^11\) Although he was a German expatriate living in London, Semper influenced Viennese architecture, the reformatory efforts of the second half of the nineteenth century, and the development of museums in the Habsburg capital.\(^12\)


\(^10\) Eitelberger, \textit{Die Reform des Kunstunterrichts und Professor Waldmüller’s Lehrmethode} (Vienna: Volke, 1848), 1.


The Museum of Art and Industry was one of the first cultural institutions to be constructed along the Ringstrasse.103 From the date of its opening through the reformatory efforts of subsequent decades, the museum played a dynamic role in Vienna’s artistic landscape. Institutional directors, curators, and professors sought to improve the aesthetic quality and economic competitiveness of the arts of Austria-Hungary through the museum’s programs, publications, exhibitions, and affiliated School of Design. In success and failure, these institutions were stages for debate concerning the state of the empire’s art industries and the nature and viability of a distinctly Austrian style.104

As apprehensions concerning craftsmanship in the industrial age swept across Europe, new reforms in Britain inspired revitalization efforts in continental capitals. Dedicated to the applied arts, London’s South Kensington Museum (1857), now known as the Victoria & Albert Museum, was the first of its kind and quickly became a prototype for many nineteenth-century reform movements. The paradigm of this museum as well as the international publication and wide-circulation of works by John Ruskin (1819-1900), William Morris (1834-1896), and Hermann Muthesius (1861-1927) helped to popularize the ideas of British reformers and the tenets of the arts and crafts movement, i.e., the importance of the applied arts, the necessary preservation of quality and craftsmanship in the machine-age, and the view of aesthetic education as essential to

104 The reform efforts and success of the museum and school were viewed critically, particularly in the early twentieth century. See Alois Riegl, Volkskunst, Hausfleiß und Hausindustrie (Berlin: Georg Siemens, 1894); Adolf Loos, Trotzdem (Innsbruck: Brenner Verlag, 1931), 79-82, and Zuckerkandl, “Die Kunstgewerbeschule,” in Zeitkunst Wien 1901-1907 (Vienna: Hugo Heller, 1908), 26-33.
both producers and consumers. Muthesius was a German diplomat, architect, and author, whose admiration of the English arts and crafts movement within Germany also impacted the development of architectural modernism in Vienna. Otto Wagner noted the influence of Muthesius on numerous occasions and both he and Fritz Wärndorfer (1868-1939), the financier and cofounder of the Wiener Werkstätte, directly corresponded with the German architect. Notably, the chief aspect of the English arts and crafts movement that inspired Muthesius was the development of a unique indigenous, middle-class aesthetic. In Muthesius’ case, his reform efforts included several years working with Ende & Beckmann in Tokyo, providing another link between European arts and crafts reform and Japan.

As implied in Eitelberger’s appraisal of the displays of the 1862 World’s Fair, the arts of Austria-Hungary were considered to be in a state of decay. The museum director felt that the frenetic productivity of his age had disturbed mental acuity, causing rushed contemplation and the hindered maturation of aesthetic sensibility and the


development of good taste.\textsuperscript{109} He believed that these challenges could be overcome by following Britain’s lead.\textsuperscript{110} Upon returning from London, Eitelberger worked with the Prime Minister, Archduke Rainer, to found a British-style museum in the imperial capital. As described by the cultural critic Berta Zuckerkandl, Archduke Rainer grasped the political significance of international competition via the art industries at the world fairs and “recognized the urgent need to find swift remedies.”\textsuperscript{111} The establishment of the museum and affiliate school was part of a shift in the tradition of imperial patronage from royal commissions and the formation of princely collections to more generalized efforts to bolster the empire’s art industries.

In 1864, the Museum of Art and Industry opened its doors at its first provisional location (Ballhaus). The aims of this institution soon were expanded with the establishment of the School of Design in 1867, the same year that the empire became a dual monarchy. Both were the first of their kind in continental Europe and provided an important example of the intricate ties that existed between the arts and imperial politics in late nineteenth-century Vienna. Like its South Kensington model, Eitelberger’s museum promoted public education, offering free admission, inaugurating public lectures on art, history, and design, and encouraging scholarship and debate through the establishment of its widely circulated journals, \textit{Mittheilungen des k. k. Österreichischen}

\textsuperscript{109} Eitelberger, “Ein Wort über Kunstkritik,” \textit{Wiener Zeitung}, January 2, 1848, 5-6
\textsuperscript{111} Zuckerkandl, “Decorative Kunst und Kunstgewerbe,” in \textit{Die Pflege der Kunst in Österreich} (Vienna: Moritz Perles, 1900), 86-103, 91. Zuckerkandl writes that the Archduke Rainer “recognized the urgent need to find swift remedies” (erkannte die dringende Nothwendigkeit, rasche Abhilfe zu scharen). The whole passage reads as follows: “Erzherzog Rainer, welcher zur Zeit der englischen Weltausstellung 1862 österreichischer Ministerpräsident war und längere Zeit in London verweilte, erfasste mit klarem Blicke die Situation und erkannte die dringende Nothwendigkeit, rasche Abhilfe zu scharen.”
Museums für Kunst und Industrie (1865-1897) and Kunst und Kunsthandwerk (1898-1921). Likewise, professors and administrators at the School of Design published magazines like Blätter für Kunstgewerbe (1872-1897) and established associations like the Vienna arts and Crafts Association (f. 1884) that engaged in contemporary debates. As the institution’s first director, Eitelberger worked in close collaboration with his deputies and eventual successors, Jakob von Falke (1825-1897) and Bruno Bucher (1826-1899), who shared his belief that the applied arts were powerfully connected to politics. Drawing inspiration from the theories of Gottfried Semper and the English positivists, Eitelberger sought to establish a collection of the best examples of “authentic and viable traditions.”
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112 The Wiener Kunstgewerbeverein was founded within the context of the Museum of Applied Arts and Industry. Many of its members were students and professors at the School of Design. See, Wiener Kunstgewerbe-Verein, Blätter für Kunstgewerbe (Vienna: Verlag von B. V. Waldheim). On Valentin Teirich, a reformer who taught at the School of Design and led the Kunstgewerbeverein, see Eva Ottlinger and Irene Zedlacher, “The ‘Dionysus Centerpiece’ by Valentin Teirich and Decorative Arts Reform in Late Nineteenth-Century Vienna,” Studies in the Decorative Arts 4, no. 1 (1996), 41–59.
113 Jakob von Falke was working in the collections and libraries of Prince Liechtenstein when he was recruited by Eitelberger in 1864. He was the second director of the museum from 1885 to 1895. Falke wrote and gave lectures at the Museum für Kunst und Industrie on contemporary artistic concerns and debates, e.g. the World’s Fairs, the decorative arts and the Hausindustrie, and the Folk arts. Ottlinger, “Jacob von Falke (1825-1897) und die Theorie des Kunstgewerbes,” Wiener Jahrbuch für Kunstgeschichte, 42 (1989), 205-33, 221. Bruno Bucher, “Die Ausstellungsfuth,” Mittheilungen des österreichischen Museums für Kunst und Industrie, no. 5 (1894-95), 145-59.
In his analysis of the Kunstgewerbe movements, Stefan Muthesius has argued that reformers held a common conviction that art encompassed all “Gewerbe, i.e., art could be applied to all production processes, to machine and mechanized processes, as well as to hand processes.” Among Viennese theorists, this shared belief translated into the idea that the rejuvenation of art and industry could best be achieved through “a better understanding of ornament” and the cultivation of “good taste (‘Geschmack’).”

Eitelberger, Falke, Bucher, and the director of the School of Design, Josef von Storck (1830-1902), favored the Italian Renaissance as a model for the future of the Austrian arts. However, a significant aspect of the historicist styles promoted through the Museum of Art and Industry and affiliate school was the idea of artistic freedom and the non-derivative, creative adaptation of proper models to meet the needs of the moment. Drawing on historical and regional folk traditions of the empire as well as the arts of foreign cultures, these institutions were intended to revitalize aesthetic sense and design in the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

Supported by imperial and aristocratic patronage, the Museum of Art and Industry and the School of Design had undeniable political ties to the empire, as did the successive
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115 Stefan Muthesius, “Craft, Modernism and Modernity,” Journal of Design History 11, no. 1 (1998), 85-95, 87. Discussing the shifting definitions of Handwerk, Kunsthandwerk, and Gewerbe, Muthesius argues that “[the] art in applied arts was largely understood as ‘applied’ ornament.”

116 Ibid., 88. On the different ideas of reform in Vienna, see Rampley, “Design Reform in the Habsburg Empire.”


museums and schools established throughout the crownlands. Remarkably, institutions modeled after the prototypes of the imperial capital were established in Budapest, Brno, Zagreb, Krakow, Lviv, Chernivtsi, Prague, and Eitelberger’s hometown of Olmütz (now, Olomouc) between 1872 and 1884. From its foundation in 1867 until 1897, Archduke Rainer’s role as patron and protector of the Museum of Art and Industry manifested the institution’s connection to the Habsburgs. Furthermore, in the pedagogical methods developed at the School of Design (and later disseminated in similar institutions throughout the crownlands), students were taught to draw from various folk arts, abstracting the ornamental patterns of traditional crafts to forge a common visual language of Austrian ornament. Eitelberger believed that improvements in the competitiveness of the Austrian arts in the 1870s were due, at least in part, to the preservation of rural traditions, and Falke viewed the empire’s regional crafts as “a rich wealth of original forms” to ameliorate the overabundance of derivative historicisms. This idea of a unifying Austrian aesthetic remained as a continuous thread in Vienna’s cultural landscape throughout the reformatory era and the subsequent transformations of the 1890s and early twentieth century.

121 Ibid., x.
With the rise of visual modernism, the Museum of Art and Industry and the School of Design continued to inform developments in Vienna. As will be addressed in Chapter Five, Eitelberger was influential to Gustav Klimt’s education and the success of his early career. Under the directorship of Arthur von Scala (1845-1909), Secessionists like Otto Wagner, Koloman Moser, Josef Hoffmann, Felician von Myrbach (1853-1940), Arthur Strasser (1854-1927), and Alfred Roller (1864-1935) filled the board and professorships of the museum and its affiliated school. Additionally, these institutions shaped Austria-Hungary’s contributions to the international exhibitions, which in turn fueled the expansion of museum collections, international artistic competition, and contemporary debates concerning the role of the arts in the formation of cultural, civic, and imperial identities.

3) Aesthetic Ideas of Unity in Heterogeneity: Eitelberger and Ilg

From his contributions to journals to his foundational explorations into museology, cultural policy, and the scientific discipline of art history, Rudolf von Eitelberger’s endeavors were rooted in the politics of his time and place. We can hear reflections of the tense atmosphere of the Dual Monarchy in many of his writings, as concerns for “drawing and color” are followed by fears of the “strengthening of the linguistic conflict” amongst the Habsburg peoples. 124 His governmental ties were as extensive as his circle of

In addition to his commitments at the Museum of Art and Industry and the University of Vienna, he was active in the affairs of the Ministry of State Education Council, the Academy of Sciences Central Commission for the Study and Conservation of Art and Historical Monuments, the Viennese Antiquities Association, and the Institute for Austrian Historical Research. First highlighted in Julius Schlosser’s germinal account of the Vienna School of art history, Eitelberger’s patriotic loyalty to Austria deeply influenced his theoretical undertakings. As current scholarship has demonstrated, the art historian constructed “narratives that would legitimize Habsburg rule,” a politicization of intellectual inquiry which seemed imperative as “emerging nationalist historiographies … challenged official versions of the history of the monarchy.” Prominent academic debates, including historical research concerning the late Roman Empire, were politically motivated and linked to contemporary discussions concerning the state and potential future of Austria-Hungary.

For Eitelberger, the arts alone could unite the crownlands and, therefore, had a distinct political function. He believed the cultivation of good taste and a healthy sense of ornamentation “would overcome both the boundaries of historicism and the regionalisms and fragmentations caused by the national identity problem.”

---

127 Rampley, Vienna School of Art History: Empire and the Politics of Scholarship 1847-1918 (University Park: Penn State Univ Press, 2015), 17-18.
129 Rampley, Vienna School of Art History. Eitelberger privileged the visual arts.
imperial, patriotic objective is threaded through his art historical writings.\textsuperscript{131}

Disconcerted with the increasing number of national styles fracturing the aesthetic identity of the empire, he asserted that the artist of his moment “[belonged] to the world just as much as to his nation” and that it was necessary to have an inclusive view toward “the global market and the demands of educated taste of the world.”\textsuperscript{132} He believed in art’s potential to achieve “universality” and in its ability to transcend the divisions of class and nationality.\textsuperscript{133} His vision of an Austrian aesthetic drawn from the heterogenous traditions of the empire, nevertheless, privileged Austria within the Dual Monarchy and the role of German-Austria in the culture of the empire and imperial capital.\textsuperscript{134} In his

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{132} Ibid., “Die Kunstbestrebungen Oesterreichs,” 177. Eitelberger writes that the artist “[belonged] to the world just as much as to his nation” (Künstler gehört heute der Welt ebensogut an, wie seiner Nation), urging an inclusive view toward “the global market and the demands of educated taste of the world” (den Weltmarkt und die Anforderungen des gebildeten Geschmackes der Welt vor Augen haben). The whole passage reads as follows: “Die Zeiten sind vorüber, wo gebildete Völker und gebildete Menschen glauben können, sich von ihren Nachbarmenschen und Nachbarvölkern abschließen zu können. Am allerwenigsten ist dies auf dem Gebiete der Kunst und Kunst-Industrie, am wenigsten in Oesterreich möglich. Der Künstler gehört heute der Welt ebensogut an, wie seiner Nation, und der Industrielle muss immer den Weltmarkt und die Anforderungen des gebildeten Geschmackes der Welt vor Augen haben. Das Rufen nach Prohibitivmaßregeln, nach Ausschließung der Ausländer, erinnert an die Zeiten, wo man statt zur Selbsthilfe zu greifen, nach Polizei und Censur gerufen hat.”
\item \textsuperscript{133} Ibid., “Die Kunstsammlung des Hrn Direktors J. D. Böhm in Wien,” \textit{Österreichische Blätter für Literatur, Kunst, Geschichte, Geografie, Statistik und Naturkunde} vol. 4, no. 250 (1847), 993–95, 993. Eitelberger writes: “The universal (Allseitigkeit) lies in the fact that all art eras and all art forms are represented, the completeness in the fact that all stages of development and masters are present within these art eras and forms.” (Die Allseitigkeit besteht darin, daß alle Kunstepochen und alle Kunstformen vertreten sind, die Vollständigkeit darin, daß innerhalb dieser Kunstepochen und Formen alle Entwicklungsstufen und Meister vorhanden sind.)
\item \textsuperscript{134} Ibid., “Der Deutsch-französische Krieg und sein Einfluss auf die Kunstdindustrie Österreichs,” in \textit{Gesammelte kunsthistorische Schriften} vol. II, 316–43, 334. Eitelberger writes: “The entire art industry of Austria rests in the hands of the German-Austrians, with the exception of that small fraction of Italian labor in Trieste and South Tyrol, which is Italian in direction.” (Die ganze Kunst-Industrie Oesterreichs ruht in den Händen der Deutschösterreichischer, mit Ausnahme jenes geringen Bruchtheiles italienischer Arbeitskraft in Triest und Südtirol, die ihrer Richtung nach italienisch ist.)
\end{itemize}
consideration of Hungarian artistic traditions, Eitelberger appraised their value in terms of the neighboring German crownlands. More generally, his definitions of Austrian and German-culture were blended and without clear boundaries. One example of the many voices in the reform debates, his writings reflect the limitations of Austrian liberalism and cosmopolitan visions of the empire. Despite the tensions and contradictions within his views, reflections and revisions of his ideas permeated the cultural landscape of Vienna and, more broadly, the Dual Monarchy, from the historicist era through the development of visual modernism. Of principal importance here, Eitelberger believed that universal forms could be drawn from heterogenous sources to create a unified and culturally specific language of ornament.

Albert Ilg, who was a pupil of Eitelberger, began his career assisting with the organization of the Museum of Art and Industry in its new building on the Ringstrasse in 1871. In 1876, he became the curator of the imperial collections. Despite this move, he remained within Eitelberger’s circle via the Central Commission for the Study and Conservation of Art and Historical Monuments and the Viennese Antiquities Association.

He continued his mentor’s work after Eitelberger’s death in 1885 and shared the older scholar’s concerns for the revitalization of regional traditions, the establishment of applied art schools throughout the empire, and the formation of a distinct Austrian identity within the visual arts. With ties to the literary group “Against the Grain” and the imperial household, as tutor to the daughters of Archduchess Marie Valerie (1868-1924) and the liberal journalist Moriz Szeps (1835-1902), Ilg was aware of the politics of art and its history in the Dual Monarchy. He believed that Austria-Hungary, “with its remarkable and important position between Occident and Orient, between cheerful Italy and serious Germany,” had a vital mission to draw and “overall picture of spiritual life” from “the diverse” traditions of the imperial crownlands.

In contrast to Eitelberger, Ilg believed that the future of the Dual Monarchy’s arts lay in a Baroque revival. For many years, Baroque art had been seen as a decadent parody

---


141 Ilg, “Schlusswort,” in Kunsthistorische Charakterbilder aus Österreich-Ungarn (Prague-Vienna: Tempsky und Freitag, 1893), 400-6, 400. Notably, Ilg references the disturbances of the 1848 revolutions in his description of Austria-Hungary’s “remarkable and important position between Occident and Orient, between cheerful Italy and serious Germany” (merkwürdigen und wichtigen Stellung zwischen Occident und Orient, zwischen dem heitern Italien und dem ernsten Deutschland) and the need for an “overall picture of spiritual life” (Gesamtbild geistigen Lebens) drawn from “the diverse” (verschiedensten) traditions. The whole passage reads as follows: “Die Geschichte hat Österreich-Ungarn mit seiner merkwürdigen und wichtigen Stellung zwischen Occident und Orient, zwischen dem heitern Italien und dem ernsten Deutschland, eine so bedeutsame Großartige Rolle ertheilt, eine Mission von so hohem Werthe für die gesamte Welt, dass ein geistreicher Mann mit Recht sagen dürfte: wenn dieses Österreich nicht schon bestände, so müsse man es schaffen. Naturgemäß müssen in einem solchen Staatswesen die mannigfachen geistigen Elemente, welche hier inbegriffen sind, aufeinander wirken und kann dadurch nur ein Gesamtbild geistigen Lebens entstehen, welches von so verschiedenen Elementen berührt, die interessantesten Seiten darbietet. Wohl mag da zuweilen jene friedsame Ruhe der Entwicklung fehlen, wie sie unter anderen Umständen im Culturleben gediehen kann; wohl mag hier von Störungen, Unterbrechungen, Kämpfen und unerreichten Zielen oftmals die Rede sein, aber gerade diese stete Gärung der verschiedensten geistigen Gewalten gibt dem heimatlichen Cultur-gemälde eben auch den ureigensten Reiz.”
of Renaissance ideals. In the mid-nineteenth century, Viennese historians began to consider the global nature of art and to reevaluate previously denigrated periods, laying the foundations for Ilg’s recuperation of the Baroque in the 1880s and 90s.142 In his *Die Zukunft des Barockstils*, he argued that the Austrian Baroque emerged during a time of simultaneous “flowering” of state and art.143 As such, its derivation was aristocratic and cosmopolitan rather than based on language or ethnicity, providing the grounds for a unifying aesthetic capable of ameliorating the nationalist divides fracturing the Dual Monarchy. Austria’s essence was “the bodily Baroque façade; lively, fresh, and always laughing, never boring, full of caprice and good aspects, a complete nest of surprises.”144 (Fig. 2.14) It was a style that spoke a variety of “artistic languages” uniting them into its own “indigenous” character, providing a “native, homely element” within “a mosaic of the most colorful composition.”145 Without definitive national connotations, the Baroque

---

144 Ilg, *Die Zukunft des Barockstils*, 42. Ilg writes of “the bodily Baroque façade; lively, fresh, and always laughing, never boring, full of caprice and good aspects, a complete nest of surprises” (leibhaftige Barockfaçade: lustig und frisch und immer lächelnd, nirgends langweilig, voller Capricien und guter Dinge, ein ganzes Nest an Überraschungen). The whole passage reads as follows: “Das österreichische Wesen ist die leibhaftige Barockfaçade: lustig und frisch und immer lächelnd, nirgends langweilig, voller Capricien und guter Dinge, ein ganzes Nest an Überraschungen. Wo der ruhige Deutsche jetzt zweifelsohne die regelrechte Gerade einhalten würde, da springt dieß warme Blut in zehn Brüchen und Winkelchen zurück, versteckt sich neckisch in Nischen, hüpf in den verkröpften Gesimsen hervor oder schwingt sich sorglos in tolem Volutenberg über die ganze Geschichte hinweg. Doch du kannst ihm nicht böse sein darob … der ist gerade so, wie man ihn allein liebhaben kann.”
145 Ibid., “Das neue Hofburgtheater,” *Die Presse Zeitung* October 9, 1888, 1-3, 1. Ilg writes of “artistic languages” (Kunstsprachen), “indigenous” character (autochthonen), and a “native, homely element”
was adaptable and cosmopolitan, which Ilg considered an essential feature for the art of his time. He believed that a Baroque renaissance would “provide continuity with the past” while “[embodying] the imperial cosmopolitanism of the present.”

Like Eitelberger’s vision of a unified Austrian aesthetic, Ilg’s revival of the Baroque was motivated by the identity politics of the empire and constrained by clear biases. He defined the Baroque as the Catholic, imperial language of Austria against the “straight lines” of Protestant German art. His championship of the cosmopolitan Baroque called for the unification of the heterogenous crownlands under the rule of the House of Habsburg-Lorraine, the Catholic Church, and the dominion of German-speaking Austria-Hungary. While Ilg is mentioned infrequently in art historical accounts of this period and his views were often discounted by his contemporaries for a variety of reasons (e.g., the brazenness of his writing as well as his personal attacks and contentious relationships with peers), he held an important position as curator of the imperial collections, wrote voluminously, had ties to influential institutions and circles, and, as

(Eingeborene, Heimatliche). The whole passage reads as follows: “Der Geist jener Kunstepoche ist glücklich wiedergekommen … Endlich ist die Wiener Architektur über das Stadium der stilistischen Schulpensa hinausgekommen, sie besitzt Geschick und Fähigkeit, die verschiedensten fremden Kunstsprachen zu reden, aber sie beherrscht diese Formen mit eigenem, charakteristischem Gedankenstoffe, mit autochthonen Wesen. … Dieses Eingeborene, Heimatliche ist das Moment des Fröhlichen und Reichen, der Pracht und der Heiterkeit, und darum sage ich: die Barocke hat sich ihre Wiener Kinder wieder gewonnen.” Ilg also described the Austria Baroque as “a mosaic of the most colorful composition” (ein Mosaik von bunter Zusammensetzung). Ibid., “Die Barocke,” 267.


148 Ilg, *Die Zukunft des Barockstils*, 42.
will be discussed in Chapter Five, had direct interactions with Gustav Klimt.\footnote{On the criticism of Ilg’s contemporaries, see Stachel, “Vollkommen Passende,” 273-274. Stachel gives the example of an official obituary of Ilg, which was mixed in its praise of the deceased court official. Böheim, “Albert Ilg Nekrolog,” 358.} Notably, his argument for an essential relationship between the Baroque and Austrian identity held sway well into the twentieth century.\footnote{Stachel, “Albert Ilg und die ‘Erfindung’ des Barocks als österreichische ‘Nationalstil’,” in Barock ein Ort des Gedächtnisses: Interpretament der Moderne, ed. Sherri Jones (Vienna: Böhlau, 2007), 101-52, 137-38.} As Peter Stachel has noted, it can be divined from Ilg’s writing that he would have disagreed with the course of Viennese art after his death in 1896.\footnote{Stachel, “Vollkommen Passende.”} However, his views of the Baroque and its ability to provide a supranational aesthetic to the multiethnic Dual Monarchy helped guide visual modernism toward the internationalism and eclecticism of the Secession and Wiener Werkstätte.

4) Zuckerkandl’s Cosmopolitanism and the Internationalism of the Vienna Secession

Viennese modernism emerged during a period of Austro-Hungarian history in which “the social differentiation and fragmentation of modernity” was mirrored by “stylistic pluralism and eclecticism” in the visual culture of the imperial capital.\footnote{Rampley, The Vienna School of Art History, 142; Ibid., “Design Reform.”} Promoting internationalism as a defining feature of Viennese modern art, the leaders of the Secession were unrestricted in their approach to creative rebirth and gathered inspiration from the past as well as from foreign cultures in their efforts to “create anew.”\footnote{Otto Wagner, Die Baukunst unserer Zeit: dem Baukunstjünger ein Führer auf diesem Kunstgebiete (Vienna: Kunstverlag Anton Schroll, 1914), 42.} As declared by Hermann Bahr, a prominent advocate of visual modernism and leader of the literary movement Young Vienna, the Secessionists intended to “stand upon … the old
work of their ancestors” directing these traditions towards “their new age.” Bahr’s proclamation encapsulates the contradiction and dilemma posed by contemporary calls for an Austrian art that would unify but maintain multiplicity, modernize but be distinct from the past, and emulate but not derivatively imitate aesthetic models.

The eclecticism and internationalism of the Secession were continued in the Wiener Werkstätte. Founded in 1903, this artistic organization sought to reinvigorate Viennese craft through non-hierarchical unity and revitalization of all mediums. There was no singular style among its members, and the group employed artists and designers from around the Dual Monarchy. The unifying principle of their stylistic plurality was craftsmanship. Many Wiener Werkstätte contributors were trained or employed by the School of Design. Hence, the institutional objective of establishing a distinctly Austrian identity informed these artists pursuits of modern craftsmanship. Echoes of Eitelberger’s conception of art as the element that could “unite the peoples” can be heard in the writings of these artists as well in those of their avid supporters.

As the daughter of Amalie Schlesinger (1869-1942), the sister of two renowned feuilletonists, and the already mentioned journalist Moriz Szeps, the founder and publisher of the Wiener Tagblatt (1886-1894), Neues Wiener Tagblatt (1867-

---

1886), and the first popular science journal Das Wissen für Alle (1901), Berta Zuckerkandl occupied a unique position within Viennese culture from the beginning of her life. Through family ties, she became part of a multi-generational international cultural dialogue. Her elder sister, Sophie (1862-1937), was married to Paul Clemenceau (1857-1946), the brother of the French politician Georges Clemenceau (1841-1929), and during Zuckerkandl’s frequent visits to Paris, she became acquainted with French artists like Eugène Carrière (1849-1906) and Auguste Rodin (1840-1917). She also served as an interpreter and liaison for foreign visitors in Vienna. Her family proves the dynamic role that Viennese assimilated Jews played in the realms of art, science, politics, and culture in the imperial capital in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

After her marriage in 1886 to Emil Zuckerkandl (1849-1910), a university professor of medicine, she built a career as a journalist following in the footsteps of her father and brother Julius Szeps (1867-1924), the editor of the liberal newspaper Fremden-Blatt. Engaged in all aspects of Viennese public life, she wrote cultural criticism for Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung (1900-1922) and later Bühne, Neue Wiener Journal, Volkszeitung, and Wiener Tag, contributed to the Secessionist journal Ver Sacrum, translated modern French plays for the Viennese stage, facilitated international diplomacy under the new political and economic circumstances of Austria after 1918, and compiled her memoirs in the last years of her life. In her writing, she promoted

---

155 On Szeps and the promotion of science, see Ulrike Felt, “Science and its Public: Popularization of Science in Vienna 1900-1938,” Institute for Theory and Social Studies of Science University of Vienna, Austria accessed April 24, 2023, DOL.1310a6556d15516562cf204e6a66bb5421b0f7.
157 Beller, Wien und die Juden; Ibid., “Was bedeutet es, ‘Wien 1900’ als eine jüdische Stadt zu bezeichnen?.”
international cultural exchange introducing Viennese readers to “the torchbearers of a
new artistic ideal.” From 1889 to 1938, she also hosted a salon in the imperial capital
that has been described as “Austria itself,” as its attendees included multiple generations
of prominent composers, artists, writers, liberal politicians, and medical and scientific
researchers. A close friend of Gustav Klimt, Hermann Bahr, and fellow art critic
Ludwig Hevesi, she was one of the most prominent and vocal proponents of Viennese
visual modernism and Austrian arts in Europe. It was through her advocacy, for example,
that her brother-in-law Viktor Zuckerkandl (1851-1927), the industrialist and founding
member of the State Gallery Association for the Lower Belvedere’s Moderne Galerie
(1903), gave the Wiener Werkstätte their first substantial commission, Purkersdorf
Sanatorium (1904-5). He and his wife Paula (1860-1927), who was painted by Klimt in
1912, also supported the Secessionists and collected Japanese art (Fig. 2.15). Although

Gechmacklosigkeit, “Ver Sacrum” vol. 1 (1898), 4-5. Ibid., “Gutenberg Denkmal,” “Ver Sacrum” vol. 3
(1898), 3-6. Ibid., Österreich Intim; Erinnerungen 1892-1942, ed. Reinhard Federmann (Frankfurt:
Propyläen, 1970).

Zuckerkandl described the impressionists as “the torchbearers of a new artistic ideal” (die Fackelträger
eines neuen Kunstideals). The whole passage reads as follows: “Die großen, wichtigen
Entwicklungsresultate des Impressionismus, die Fackelträger eines neuen Kunstileides, Gauguin und van
Gogh, hat Carl Moll bei Miethke uns gebracht. Und ihm ist auch zu danken, dass eine überragende Gestalt,
wie die Daumiers, oder eine seltene Erscheinung, wie die von Toulouse-Lautrec, als Kostbarkeit lehrreich

Zuckerkandl’s political engagements were curtailed under the fascist Federal State of Austria (1934).


The Modern Gallery, renamed Österreichische Staatstgalerie in 1912, was the first state museum created
separately from the imperial collections. On Purkersdorf, see Leslie Topp, “The Purkersdorf Sanatorium
and the appearance of science,” in Architecture and Truth in fin-de-siècle Vienna (Cambridge: Cambridge

On Berta Zuckerkandl’s promotion of Josef Hoffmann and the Wiener Werkstätte and her role in the
sanatorium contract, see Zuckerkandl, “Josef Hoffmann,” Dekorative Kunst vol. 7 (1903), 1-17; and Gunter
Breckner, Josef Hoffmann: Sanatorium Purkersdorf (New York: Galerie Metropol, 1985), 162. Victor and
Paula Zuckerkandl were important collectors of Klimt’s paintings. See, Tobias G. Natter, Gustav Klimt:
The Complete Paintings (Cologne: Taschen, 2002), 618-19. The Zuckerkandls contributed to the Museum
the focus of Zuckerandl’s writing shifted from the visual arts towards politics and theater around 1910, the idea of a cosmopolitan Austria allied with liberal Europe remained as a persistent thread. Following the annexation of Austria in March 1938, Zuckerandl moved to Paris where she continued her cultural salon, fighting for the liberation of Austria in exile and remaining politically active until her death in 1945.\footnote{With the occupation of France in May 1940, Zuckerandl fled to Algiers. She returned to Paris and reporting after the liberation of Algeria in late 1942.}

Her early life was shaped by the connections and political engagements of her father, who advocated for liberal reform and was a close advisor and friend to Crown Prince Rudolf (1858-1889).\footnote{Kurt Paupié, \textit{Handbuch der Österreichischen Pressegeschichte 1848-1959} vol. 1 (Vienna: W. Braumüller, 1960), 109, 240.} Known for his liberal and anti-clerical views, the Crown Prince dedicated much of his efforts to the nationalities-problem of Austria-Hungary, as can be seen in his 1884 initiative to chronicle in pictures and words the diverse arts, traditions, and landscapes of the crownlands (Fig. 2.16).\footnote{The \textit{Österreich-ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild} project, commonly referred to as the “Kronprinzenwerk,” was undertaken between 1884 and 1902. It was a dual-language (German and Hungarian) multi-volume publication that brought together 587 articles by writers and politicians and 4,500 illustrations by 264 different artists. Josef Rudolf, ed., \textit{Die Österreichisch-Ungarische Monarchie in Wort und Bild}, trans. Ludwig Hevesi (Vienna: k.k. Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1886-1902).} Szeps was involved in the political debates of the Dual Monarchy and broadly supported the cultural endeavors of his contemporaries. One such beneficiary was Albert Ilg, who was Zuckerandl’s tutor. Although Ilg clearly influenced the future critic, their relationship did not prevent her from formulating a more inclusive approach and more truly cosmopolitan definition of an Austrian national style. As Reynolds-Cordileone has argued, Zuckerandl’s ideas were
reflective of those expressed by her friends in the Association for Austrian Folklore, which advocated for “a universal and cosmopolitan Austrian idea.”

Zuckerkandl believed that the definition and strength of Austrian culture were rooted in heterogeneity, an idea she expressed frequently and in numerous forums. In her essays and biography, she wrote that “multiplicity in Austria should be preserved as the strongest principle of art, not reduced to a singularity.” There was “enormous value and significance” in having many peoples “grouped around one throne.”

Acknowledging contemporary nationalists divisions, she insisted that this multi-ethnic “idea of Austria” was vital “to the civilization of the world.” In alignment with her espoused views, she supported the preservation of Austria-Hungary’s many folk traditions. Zuckerkandl also advocated for modernist developments that negotiated between ideas of native tradition and universalism. The idea of Austrian cosmopolitanism was central to her enthusiasm for the artistic programs of the Secession and Wiener Werkstätte. As she recounts:

Enraptured by the motto “To the Age its Art; to Art its Freedom,” I joined in the struggle. It was a matter of defining the pure Austrian culture, a culture that was proud to acknowledge its relationship to the many nationalities gathered under the banner of Austria. To be merely German did not mean the same thing as to be

---

166 Reynolds-Cordileone, Alois Riegl, 139. On Riegl’s ties to Zuckerkandl’s circle between 1894 and 1896 and his potential influences among the artists of the Secession, Ibid., 243.
168 Ibid., My Life and History, 25
169 Ibid.
170 Ibid., “Jung-Polen,” in Zeitkunst Wien, 140-146, 146.
Austrian. Austria was proud of its multiplicity which had begun to crystallize into a congenial uniqueness.171

Carl Moll’s 1905 depiction of Zuckerkandl at home in her Döbling apartment, the space of her first salon, gives us a view of this “congenial uniqueness” (Fig. 2.17). White Interior shows the journalist in a flowing reform-like dress, her back turned to the viewer as she arranges yellow flowers in a black vase. Her presence is the focal point of the unusual and striking composition. The soft light of the painting emphasizes the geometric line and pristine contrast of the black and white Wiener Werkstätte designed interior. The moments of color in the painting come in Moll’s precise depiction of the Zuckerkandls’ collection of art. At the far left of the composition, we see Japanese porcelains and a Chinese stoneware figure of the god of long life arranged in the white grid of a Hoffmann designed cabinet (Fig. 2.18).172 The long wall of the room is decorated with three hanging scrolls similar to the works of Utagawa Hiroshige (1797-1858) (Fig. 2.19). The painting inspired by French impressionism depicts the arts of East Asia “gathered together under the banner” of Viennese visual modernism with the journalist at the center.

Zuckerkandl’s conception of Austrian heterogeneity was decidedly more open than those of Eitelberger or Ilg, who were more culturally conservative and privileged the place of German-Austria within the Dual Monarchy. It is probable that the inclusivity of her ideas emanated from her unique position as a pioneering female journalist who made significant contributions to the Viennese press while frequently opposing popular opinion and negotiating the identity politics of her Jewish background. While Zuckerkandl’s

---

171 Ibid., My Life and History, 178. This translation comes from Reynolds-Cordileone, Alois Riegl, 242.
writings do not address her Jewish heritage, contemporary antisemitism and the
limitations placed on the Jewish population of the Dual Monarchy inevitably affected the
journalist. Her father, for example, was accused of slander in 1884 for his criticism of the
pro-German antisemite Georg Ritter von Schönerer (1842-1921). In 1885 Schönerer’s
platform called for the Jews to be expelled from public life and positions of influence as a
necessary step toward political reform.\textsuperscript{173} Zuckerkandl’s Hungarian-born husband also
supported the Viennese People’s House (Wiener Volksheim), an institution established to
educate working-class Viennese in popular science and medicine.\textsuperscript{174} Cosmopolitanism in
terms of religion, nationality, and class held personal significance for Zuckerkandl,
whose closest ties reflected the diversity of Austria and Vienna.

Her views were shared by her colleagues and fellow advocates of Viennese
artistic modernism like Ludwig Hevesi, who believed that Austria needed “a truly living
national art.”\textsuperscript{175} The older journalist greatly admired Zuckerkandl’s work, and their
relationship was one of mutual respect and shared interest. Likewise, the Wiener
Werkstätte co-founder Josef Hoffmann was vested in the idea of a uniquely Austrian
style developed on its own terms that could speak “an open, intelligent language.”\textsuperscript{176}

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{173} Oskar Karbach, “The Founder of Modern Political Antisemitism,” \textit{Jewish Social Studies} vol. 7 (1945), 15.
\textsuperscript{174} The organization’s publications were printed in Moriz Szeps’ weekly \textit{Das Wissen für Alle}.
\textsuperscript{175} Hevesi, “Ver Sacrum,” in \textit{Die Wiener Moderne: Literatur, Kunst und Musik zwischen 1890 und 1910},
Hevesi wrote in hope of “a truly living national art” (eine wirklich lebendige, wirklich nationale Kunst).
The whole passage reads as follows: “Das Gesamtbild ist das einer höchst künstlerischen Zeitschrift. Sie
ist, wie wir hoffen wollen, ein Zeichen, daß auch in Österreich eine wirklich lebendige, wirklich nationale
Kunst erwacht.” Hevesi repeats this idea of a living national art in \textit{Acht Jahre Sezession: (März 1897 - Juni
1905): Kritik, Polemik, Chronik} (Vienna: Carl Konegen, 1906), 7-11 and 36-8. He returns to ideas of
national art in his forward to Berta Zuckerkandl’s \textit{Zeitkunst Wien}.
\textsuperscript{176} Josef Hoffmann, “Architektonisches von der Insel Capri: Ein Beitrag für malerische
Architekturempfindungen,” \textit{Der Architekt: Wiener Monatshefte für Bauwesen und Decorative Kunst} vol. 3
(Vienna: Verlag von Anton Schroll, 1897), 13. Hoffmann writes of a language of craft that speaks for
“everyone an open, intelligent language” (spricht für jedermann eine offene,verständige Sprache). The
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushleft}
Lastly, the author Hermann Bahr penned an open letter to the young artists of his time calling for “a truly Austrian art” drawn from the “tremendous resources” of the moment that would “express our home” for “our whole people.”

As Bahr articulated, Viennese modernists were not in search of a singular “style”; rather, they were in pursuit of individual, native form based on fundamental, unalterable aesthetic principles of craftsmanship. They wanted to find a visual language that would speak “to all” unrestricted by “difference in status and wealth” and with “no distinction between ‘high Art’ and ‘small art.’” Through this lens, the arts of Japan became an

whole passage reads as follows: “Dort stimmt der malerisch bewegte Baugedanke in seiner glatten Einfachheit, frei von künstlicher Überhäufung mit schlechten Decorationen, noch herzerfrischend in die glühende Landschaft und spricht für jedermann eine offene, verständige Sprache.”

177 Bahr, “An die Secession, Ein Brief,” Ver Sacrum vol. 5 (1898), 5. Bahr writes of “a truly Austrian art” (eine österreichische Kunst), “tremendous resources” (ungeheure Mittel), and the aim to “express our home” (unserer Heimat auszudrücken) for “our whole people” (unserem ganzen Volke). The whole passage reads as follows: “Ihr müsst schaffen, was noch nicht dagewesen ist: Ihr müsst uns eine österreichische Kunst schaffen. (...) Jeder von Euch fühlt, was ich meine. (...) Die moderne Kunst hat ungeheure Mittel in eure Hand gegeben; nehmt sie, um durch sie die Seele unserer Heimat auszudrücken. (...) Eine österreichische Kunst werden wir erst haben, wenn sie unter uns allen in unserer täglichen Existenz lebendig geworden ist. (...) einer Kunst, die durch ihre Linien und ihre Farben mir das sagt, was ich in seligen Stunden des Wiener Frühlings bei mir empfunden habe. Diese müßt Ihr uns geben, nicht mir, nicht diesem oder jenem Kenner, sondern unserem ganzen Volke. Hüllt unser Volk in eine österreichische Schönheit ein!”


179 Bahr and Max Burckhard, “Weshalb wir eine Zeitschrift herausgeben?” Ver Sacrum vol. 1 (1898), 5-7, 6. The declared intention was to speak “to all” (an euch alle) unrestricted by “difference in status and wealth” (Unterschied des Standes und des Vermögens) and with “no distinction between ‘high Art’ and ‘applied art’” (keine Unterscheidung zwischen ‘hoher Kunst’ und ‘Kleinkunst’). The full passage reads as
appealing model for the Secessionists’ aim of “unity and multiplicity” and the Wiener Werkstätte’s ambition to achieve modern craftsmanship without medium-division or hierarchy. Nowhere is this link between the aims of Vienna’s modernists and the arts of Japan more clearly articulated than in the Secession’s sixteenth exhibition in 1903.

5) The Development of Impressionism in Painting and Sculpture

The Development of Impressionism in Painting and Sculpture was a greatly anticipated “highlight” of the artistic season and held particular significance as an example of the Secessionists’ efforts to bring international innovations to Vienna and engage the artists of the capital in a broader European dialogue (Fig. 2.20). In this exhibition, the pioneer historian of artistic modernism Julius Meier-Graefe began to create an origin story for the contemporary European avant-garde that he would continue to elaborate on in his various iterations of the Developmental History of Modern Art: Comparative Considerations of Visual Art, as a Contribution to a New Aesthetics. Meier-Graefe’s main spheres of influence and activity were Berlin and Paris. He was not Viennese nor was he a notable

follows: “And that’s where we turn to all of you, without difference in status and wealth. We know no distinction between ‘high Art’ and ‘small art,’ between art for the rich and art for the poor. Art is common property.” (Und da wenden wir uns an euch alle, ohne Unterschied des Standes und des Vermögens. Wir kennen keine Unterscheidung zwischen ‘hoher Kunst’ und ‘Kleinkunst’, zwischen Kunst für die Reichen und Kunst für die Armen. Kunst ist Allgemeingut.)

Ernst Schur, “Der Geist der japanischen Kunst,” Ver Sacrum vol. 4 (1899), 5-14.

Berta Zuckerkandl declared that the exhibition was “the highlight” of the artistic season (der Clou oder das Kunstereignis der Saison). Zuckerkandl, “Wien,” Die Kunst 7, no. 8 (1903), 246. In a letter to Paul Durand-Ruel, a contributing Parisian art dealer, the Secession’s president Wilhelm Bernatzik enthusiastically and hyperbolically wrote that more than “one hundred articles” on the exhibition had been published in Vienna and abroad. Bernatzik’s letter is quoted in Agnes Husslein-Arco, Wien-Paris: Van Gogh, Cezanne, und Österreichs Moderne 1880-1960 (Vienna: Brandstätter, 2007), 227.

advocate of Japonisme or Japonismus. Nevertheless, he was a staunch advocate of modernism in Europe, maintained ties to Viennese culture through his correspondence with the poet Hugo von Hofmannsthal (1874-1929), and had a keen eye for the climate and developments of the period — as is evident in his reviews of new publications, e.g., his 1906 review of one of the first German histories of the stylistic development of Japanese art, Oskar Münsterberg’s *Japanische Kunstgeschichte*. His presentation of Japanese art as part of the history of impressionism and the development of modernism, therefore, had authority and influence. Drawing attention to the significance of the 1903 exhibition in terms of modern art history, Robert Jensen has noted that the Viennese exhibition was mounted years before Roger Fry’s shows at the Grafton Gallery in London (1910–12), the Sonderbund exhibition in Cologne (1912), and the Armory Show in New York (1913). It was the first exhibition to draw a historical account of modern art, and, as Jensen argues, this was done at a time when the very idea of modernism was highly contended.

Meier-Graefe’s *Development of Impressionism* not only portrayed Japanese art as fundamentally akin to European modernism but presented the idea that there was something essential about art and its development that crossed geographic and historical boundaries. The exhibition was divided into five sections: “The Origins and Development of Impressionism,” “Impressionism,” “The Further Development of Impressionism,”

---

“Japanese Art,” and “Transition to Style.” While French art and the impressionism of Édouard Manet (1832-1883) were the focal points of Meier-Graefe’s exhibition (Fig. 2.21), the display included works by artists as diverse in style, period, and nationality as the sixteenth-century painter of the Spanish Counter-Reformation El Greco (1541-1614), the Flemish painter Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), the Dutch genre painter Johannes Vermeer (1632-1675), Francisco Goya (1746-1828), the gilded-age artist James Abbott McNeill Whistler (1834-1903), and the well-known ukiyo-e artists Utagawa Hiroshige, Katsushika Hokusai (1760-1849), and Kitagawa Utamaro (1753-1806) (Fig. 2.22-28).

The unifying principle of Meier-Graefe’s curation was his idea of impressionism as existing in all times and places. In its structure, the exhibition was reminiscent of a poem from Baudelaire’s Les Fleurs du Mal (1857). Meier-Graefe, who referenced the poet in his writings, clearly shared Baudelaire’s belief in “an eternal, immutable, element” of art and its relationship to “tradition and freedom.”

“Les Phares” (The Beacons) Baudelaire writes an organic history of art. Breaking with chronology, the artistic timeline of the poem ebbs forward and backward in an almost tidal pattern. The poet unites artists from different periods and styles claiming an essential kinship, an artistic essence shining like a beacon that “echoes through a thousand labyrinths.” For

188 In his history of modern art, Meier-Graefe cites Baudelaire’s L'art romantique (1899), writing of the poet’s belief in “an eternal, immutable, element” (einem Ewigen, Unveränderlichen) and “tradition and freedom” (Tradition und Freiheit). The whole passage reads as follows: “Baudelaire sagt einmal in seiner, Art Romantique, daß das Schöne immer aus einer Zweihheit bestehe, obwohl es als Einheit erscheine: aus einem Ewigen, Unveränderlichen, dessen Menge schwer zu bestimmen sei, und einem Relativen, das der Epoche, der Mode, der Moral, der Passion angehöre. Und es mag ihm dabei vielleicht etwas von Tradition und Freiheit vorgeschwebt haben.” Meier-Graefe, Entwicklungsgeschichte der modernen Kunst, 309.
Meier-Graefe, this ever-present guiding light moving the whole history and future of the arts was “impressionism.” In his 1903 exhibition, he drew non-linear “parallels” between Goya, “the father of modern art,” the “simplification of the impressions of nature” in ukiyo-e prints, and the “impressionistic principle” at the heart of the sculptures of Augustus Rodin (Fig 2.29). His transhistorical narrative aligned with and reinforced prominent views in Vienna on the nature of artistic development, the right path toward artistic rebirth, and the relationship between tradition and modernism. It was not a matter of rejecting history. It was a call to rediscover immutable aesthetic foundations. Meier-Graefe’s idea of an artistic essence that bridged across cultural divides must have appealed to the internationally minded modernists of Vienna. Hermann Bahr himself enacted a similar strategy to Meier-Graefe in his defense of Whistler through association with Leonardo da Vinci. Whether naming it as craftsmanship, “elemental line,” or “sensitivity to stroke,” many of the artists of the Secession and Wiener Werkstätte

191 Bahr, Renaissance: Neue Studien zur Kritik der Moderne (Berlin: S. Fischer, 1897), 11.
espoused similar beliefs in a fundamental basis for art. Meier-Graefe’s 1903 exhibition presented the arts of Japan as a path toward the modern articulation of this aesthetic essence.

As Viennese historians, critics, and artists formulated aesthetic ideas of Austrian identity, Viennese Japonismus simultaneously developed in the imperial capital. From the 1873 World’s Fair through the foundations of the Secession, and Wiener Werkstätte, substantial museum and private collections were formed, and Japanese art was advanced as a viable paradigm for modern revitalization. As will be addressed in subsequent chapters, three common elements were threaded through this complex meeting of cultures: Japanese art was viewed as a means of breaking from stagnant western visual traditions opening western artists to a new way of seeing; Japan’s traditional arts, seemingly untouched by modern industry, were extolled as a means of returning to a purer form of craftsmanship; and Japanese artists were praised for their innate appreciation of the natural world and their refined organic ornament. For many art historians in German-speaking Europe the arts of Japan were seen as a model to rejuvenate the “jaded and anemic” sensibilities of their contemporary moment. At the Museum of Art and Industry and School of Design, Japanese art was promoted as a path

---

193 In his review of the 1878 Paris exposition, Julius Lessing described the “vital connection of Japanese artists with organic nature” as the “lifeblood” of Japanese design.” See Julius Lessing, Berichte von der Pariser Weltausstellung 1878 (Berlin: Ernst Wasmuth, 1878), 69-71, 70. Peter Pantzer and Johannes Wieninger cite an article in the Salzburger Volksblatt that praises the “astounding” craftsmanship and “fine feeling” of Japanese painting. See, Peter Pantzer and Johannes Wieninger ed., Verborgene Impressionen (Vienna: Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst, 1990), 27.
toward proper ornament, and modernist artists upheld the foreign tradition as a fount of knowledge containing everything that was essential to modernist rebirth.

In the divided cultural landscape of late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Vienna, calls for aesthetic unity in heterogeneity were both pervasive and urgent. From the reformatory years of the 1860s through the ends of the empire, the architecture and urban structure of the capital, the collections and curriculums of museums and schools, and production and exhibition of the arts intersected with the political struggles of national and imperial identity. What was called and hoped for was a unified Austrian art, yet all the critical, individual, institutional, and educational efforts and all the imperial festival machinery and pageantry could not force this into being. What emerged instead was the eclecticism of Viennese visual modernism and new paradigms like Japonismus. Eitelberger, Ilg, and Zuckerkandl held strong convictions concerning the nature and future of the “Austrian” arts and their ideas impacted and blended with definitions of visual modernism in the artistic circles of the Vienna Secession and Wiener Werkstätte. Eitelberger’s and Ilg’s definitions of Austrian art were confined by their allegiances in the identity politics of the empire. Hevesi, for instance, was critical of aspects of Eitelberger’s historicism; however, he also believed that Eitelberger would have thought more freely in the climate of the Secession’s founding years.\(^{195}\) Zuckerkandl likewise

---

\(^{195}\) Hevesi, “Hofrat von Storck und Baron Myrbach,” in *Acht Jahre Sezession*, 128-130, 129. “Anyone who came up with something new was ridiculed as someone who wanted to ‘invent a new style.’ Even with Eitelberger you read this all the time; today he would of course think differently. At that time, the Italian High Renaissance was proclaimed, primarily by historians and not by artists, as the most worthy of imitation; At most, a bit of Gothic and Oriental style (for the carpets) was allowed to be used.” (Jeder, dem etwas Neues einfiel, wurde verhöhnt als einer, der ‘einen neuen Stil’ erfinden wolle. Selbst bei Eitelberger liest man dies fortwährend; heute würde er freilich anders denken. So wurde denn damals, vorwiegend durch Historiker, nicht durch Künstler, die italienische Hochrenaissance als das Nachahmenswerteste proklamiert; höchstens daß man daneben etwas Gotik und Orient (für die Teppiche) gelten ließ.)
described Eitelberger as “brilliant” but limited by his times and probably would have extended this characterization to his student and her mentor, Albert Ilg.\textsuperscript{196} Despite these limitations, both Eitelberger and Ilg believed in the universal potential of the visual arts, particularly in the public sphere which was freely accessible and specifically designed for all viewers (or at least all subjects of the Dual Monarchy). In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, music frequently was attributed with the potential of universal expression, an idea reaching back to the classical philosophy of ancient Greece.\textsuperscript{197} For Eitelberger and Ilg, it was the visual arts that could define nation while bridging between cultures, peripheries and centers, and economic and class divides. As expressed by Eitelberger:

> Because art is only one; there are different arts, different ways of art and forms of art, but art as such is only one; just as truth is only one, as law is only one, as there is only one beauty, so there is only one art. There is not one art for the poor and one art for the rich, one specific art for monuments and another for civil life; a special art for the church and a special art for the laity, just as there is no special art for industry and trade.\textsuperscript{198}

\textsuperscript{198} Eitelberger, “Das deutsche Kunstgewerbe (Betrachtungen aus Anlass der Münchner kunstgewerblichen Ausstellung im Jahre 1876),” in \textit{Gesammelte kunsthistorische Schriften} vol. II, 344–369, 345. “Denn die Kunst ist nur Eine; es gibt verschiedene Künste, verschiedene Kunstweisen und Kunstformen, aber die Kunst als solche ist nur Eine; wie die Wahrheit nur Eine ist, wie das Recht nur Eines ist, wie es nur Eine Schönheit gibt, so gibt es nur Eine Kunst. Es gibt nicht eine Kunst für die Armen und eine Kunst für die Reichen, eine spezielle Kunst für Monumente und eine andere für das bürgerlich Leben; eine besondere Kunst für die Kirche und eine besondere Kunst für die Laien, ebenso wenig, als es für die Industrie und für die Gewerbe besonders eine eigene Kunst gibt.”
Zuckerkandl’s conception of “Austria” was more cosmopolitan. Her ideas nevertheless were shaped by her personal ties, and her conception of modernism was bent in favor of French models. Meier-Graefe, who had no investment in the Austro-Hungarian Empire, allowed himself imaginative and curatorial freedom in his definitions of modernism, which gave unequivocal precedence to French artists. Notably, his 1903 exhibition did very little to acknowledge its setting; no Viennese artists were included in his presentation of the development of the international avant-garde. However, his definition of the new aesthetics of “today” in terms of “antecedents” and “a prior set of existing values,” resonated with the ideas of the Vienna Secessionists and their supporters, and reinforced views of the visual arts as a fundamental connection between nations, cultures, and histories.199

Chapter Three: The Amalgamate Nature of Viennese Japonismus

This chapter delineates the varied sources and differing levels of engagement that shaped Japonismus in Klimt’s Vienna. Beginning with a definition of the “amalgamate nature” of Viennese Japonismus, I address significant points of encounter between the Viennese public and the arts of Japan, emphasizing two influential institutions for the development of visual modernism in Austria, the Museum for Art and Industry (1864) and the Vienna Secession (1897). Three events contributed to early public collections of Japanese art and artifacts in Vienna: the Austro-Hungarian Expedition to East Asia, the Wiener Weltaustellung of 1873, and the 1892-93 world tour of heir presumptive Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria-Este (1863-1914). Beyond their significance to international commerce and diplomacy, the participants involved in these endeavors went on to create societies and museums dedicated to the arts and culture of Asia, publish photographic albums and written records of their impressions of eastern cultures, and contribute to exhibitions and the public art and ethnographic collections of the Habsburg imperial capital. Through visual analysis of expedition photography, the Japanese displays of 1873, and notable exhibitions and publications, this chapter offers a critical account of the range of works and representations of Japanese culture that made their way into the visual fabric of Vienna in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Understanding the amalgamate nature of Viennese Japonismus is essential to deciphering
its layers of exoticism, primitivism, and Orientalism, and productive misinterpretation, failed translation, and genuine appreciation and emulation.

1) The Amalgamate Nature of Viennese Japonismus

Firstly, Viennese Japonismus was fueled by representations and reproductions of Japanese art and culture constructed by European and U.S. American historians, dealers, collectors, and connoisseurs that were frequently at odds with the agenda of the Meiji government. One remarkable example is Siegfried Bing’s *Artistic Japan*. Bing (1838-1905), a German-born French art dealer, occupied a leading position in the Japonist circles of Paris. In the 1870s, he established a prosperous business importing East Asian art to the French capital and exporting French goods to Japan. Between 1888 and 1891, he published his monthly journal, *Artistic Japan*, featuring high-quality reproductions and essays by prominent critics and historians. Internationally circulated, the journal helped establish the place and value of Japanese art in Europe and the United States.200

The cover of the second volume, 1881 (Fig. 3.1), introduces the arts of Japan with one of Katsushika Hokusai’s ukiyo-e depictions of Mount Fuji. Ukiyo-e, “images of the floating world,” were paintings, woodblock prints, and books produced in a range of qualities. The simplest of these works cost the same price as a bowl of noodles; the most complex were comparable to a laborer’s daily wage.201 Their affordability made them

---


201 The word *ukiyo* (浮世) is tied to the Buddhist view of life as transitory, “floating.” In the Edo period, the term became associated with life’s pleasures and excesses, and the association with “floating” was more of an expression of joie de vivre. Ukiyo-e (浮世絵) is commonly associated with woodblock printing, however, it more properly refers to a style, as there were ukiyo-e artists who only produced paintings. The first artist associated with ukiyo-e, Hishikawa Moronobu (active in the 1680s and 1690s), signed his works
popular and prolific in the Edo period (1603–1868), which had a thriving print culture.  
Carrying their wares through the streets of the capital city, traveling salesmen sold prints and illustrated books, which were also available in the capital’s numerous picture book shops.  
These artworks and especially those of Hokusai played a significant role in international Japonism. However, ukiyo-e was considered a low form of popular culture and was not an acknowledged part of the artistic traditions of Meiji Japan.  
While ukiyo-e featured prominently in the first histories authored in Europe and the United States, a very different set of works and schools were used by Japanese scholars, artists, and cultural leaders in defining the nature and history of Japanese art, the future of their aesthetic traditions, and the role of arts and crafts in international exchange.  
The Meiji government established The Tokyo School of Fine Arts in 1889 to train the next generation of artists and artisans in painting, sculpture, and the decorative arts.  

____________________

202 Scholars have debated the end date of the Edo period, as the decline of Shogunal power was lengthy and complex.

203 The number of ukiyo-e works produced at this time can only be approximated due to the large edition sizes and the reprinting of popular images. It has been estimated that there were a minimum of 2,300 ukiyo-e works produced in the Edo period. A “work” typically meant a book of twelve prints or a series of three books with ten prints. Hence, the number of estimated individual prints is 46,000. See, Hayakawa Monta, “Ukiyo-e and Shunga,” in Secret Images: Picasso and the Japanese Erotic Print, ed. Jordi Hereu (Hong Kong: Paramount, 2010), 12-23, 16. On print culture in the Edo period, see Peter F. Kornicki, The Book in Japan: A Cultural History from the Beginnings to the Nineteenth Century (Boston: Brill, 1998).

204 The Meiji government attempted to prevent the export of certain objects to protect Japan’s international image. Ukiyo-e in general and shunga (erotic pictures) in particular were considered a misrepresentation of Japanese culture. Colette Colligan, The Traffic in Obscenity from Byron to Beardsley: Sexuality and Exoticism in Nineteenth-Century Print Culture (Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2006), 127.


curriculum of this institution included nearly all traditional styles and schools; two artistic practices were excluded, literati painting (which was Chinese in heritage) and ukiyo-e. Ernest Fenollosa, who helped establish this institution, only acknowledged the importance of this popular genre after seeing its positive impact on the arts of Europe and the United States in the late 1880s, and it still played a minor role in his art historical writings and preservation efforts.

Secondly, original Japanese art works exported abroad were recontextualized and displayed either in the language and manner of European museums and collections or on the particular stage of the world’s fairs (Fig. 3.2). There is a jarring difference between the monumental setting of Japanese temples and their integration of architecture and nature and the pedestals and encased displays of Buddhist art in European museums (Fig. 3.3-5).\textsuperscript{207} Even when exhibitions were controlled and constructed by Japanese officials, as in the world’s fairs from the 1867 Paris Exposition Universelle onward, the arts of Japan were framed by essentially foreign terms and categories, a difficulty that the Meiji government met by sending an unprecedented number of students abroad to study foreign models of art, industry, and education and by hiring foreign advisors to help guide the modern development of Japan and their diplomatic efforts abroad.\textsuperscript{208} With the western

---

\textsuperscript{207} The Meiji Restoration of 1868 brought an end to the feudal system in Japan. With its sweeping reforms and “Enlightenment” agenda, the new government initially signaled a move away from Buddhism, which was the religion associated with the deposed daimyō of the Tokugawa. During the early years of the Meiji era, many Buddhist temples were dissolved and/or destroyed, and important artworks were exported abroad, frequently by illegal or underhanded means, ending up in private collections and museums across Europe. Okakura Kakuzō, “Exhibition of Recent Acquisitions in Chinese and Japanese Art (13 December 1912-15 January 1913),” \textit{Museum of Fine Arts Bulletin} vol. 10, no. 60 (1912), 48. Joan Miller, “Idolizing Sans Idol: Buddhist Art and Its Reception during the Meiji Period,” \textit{Art Journal} vol. 1 (2018), accessed November 1, 2023, https://digitalcommons.providence.edu/art_journal/vol2018/iss1/5.

\textsuperscript{208} In the first years of the Meiji restoration the fledgling government organized an ambassadorial tour through America and Europe, the Iwakura Mission (Dec. 1871 – Sept. 1873). This embassy was one of the many efforts of the Meiji government to understand the foreign powers and cultures that were rushing into their country. One of the most significant destinations for the delegation was the 1873 Weltausstellung. On
expansion on the Asiatic mainland during the Anglo-Chinese Opium Wars (1839-1860) and the establishment of unbalanced treaties between China and Britain (part of which included the British acquisition of Hong Kong), many officials in the Tokugawa and Meiji era feared that without extreme intervention their national fate would follow that of China. In the years surrounding the Meiji Restoration (1868), the dominant and shared concern of vying political factions was the vulnerable sovereignty of Japan.

The majority of early European collections of Japanese art were part of seventeenth and eighteenth-century princely collections. By the 1870s many of these imperial collections were made publicly accessible stimulating awareness and fueling an increased market for Japanese wares. In 1873 Meiji officials were eager to take advantage of foreign interest, and display objects were selected and specifically manufactured for the Weltausstellung and the international market. On the stage of the world’s fairs, Japanese arts and crafts became a means of emphasizing the nation’s cultural equality. Meiji export wares modified to meet foreign tastes reinvented and redefined the aesthetic traditions of Japan with an outward-looking view of “fine art” in the complex cultural expression of their nation’s modern identity. The works sent to the Weltausstellung were a curated mixture of old and new Japanese art. The national display, which was

the Iwakura Mission, see W. Beasley, Japan Encounters the Barbarian (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 159, 15-19, 160; and Kume Kunitake, Japan Rising: The Iwakura Embassy to the USA and Europe 1871-1873 (Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University, 2009). On the preparatory exhibitions, see Kornicki, “Public Display and Changing Values: Early Meiji Exhibitions and Their Precursors,” Monumenta Nipponica 49, no. 2 (1994), 167–96, 168; and Josef Kreiner, “Some Remarks,” in Japanese Collections in European Museums vol. I, ed. Josef Kreiner (Bonn: Bier’sche Verlagsanstalt, 2005), 4-34. An interesting aside, one of the young students included in the Iwakura Mission was Tsuda Umeko (1864-1929), who later returned to the United States to study at Bryn Mawr College and subsequently founded a similar institution in Japan now known as Tsuda College. Ernest Fenollosa was one of many Meiji-era foreign advisors (oyatoi gaikokujin).


On the role of the arts in the politics of the Meiji era, see Alicia Volk, In Pursuit of Universalism: Yorozu Tetsugorō and Japanese Modern Art (Berkeley: University of California, 2010).
studied and critiqued by the Iwakura Embassy, served as a starting point. From 1873 forward the Japanese government participated in as many international exhibitions as possible and staged similar expositions in Tokyo (1877, 1881, 1890), Kyoto (1895), and Osaka (1903). In following years, the 1873 display continued to inform the evolution and modification of Japanese export art as well as how the traditional arts of Japan were presented to the international public.

Thirdly, Viennese travelers to Japan, who encountered and collected the country’s arts first-hand, nevertheless had specific prejudices, backgrounds, and intentions that filtered their view of the emerging Asian nation (Fig. 3.6). While the number of diplomats and merchants living in Japan increased throughout the Meiji era (1868-1912), foreigners were still circumscribed in their movement and access, and the newly established government fought, with debatable success, to regulate foreign settlements and workers. Tourists were required to obtain special passports, which enable officials to monitor their time in Japan, and the primary routes and sites were established by guide books “illustrated by woodcuts of the most striking objects, and giving itineraries, names of yadoya [inns], and other local information.”

---


212 On the world exhibitions as “the main venues for market research” and the dissemination of design in Onchizuroku (also known as the Onchi catalog), see Dōshin Satō, Modern Japanese Art and the Meiji State, trans. Hiroshi Nara (Los Angelos: Getty Publications, 2011), 109, 113.


diplomatic embassies, the foreigner’s experience of Japan was carefully molded, including the places visited, the people encountered, and the presentation of Japanese culture relative to the larger world.215

Finally, alongside museum displays, private collections, and scholarly and artistic publications, popular culture influenced Viennese perceptions and, in turn, Viennese Japonismus. In theaters, festivals, fashion, popular press, and travel picture books, the re-imaging of Japan as “pure aesthetic fancy” was a prominent aspect of this international phenomenon (Fig. 3.7).216 As Oscar Wilde pithily observed in 1882, the “Japan” of Japonism was “pure invention.”217

For instance, The Mikado by the librettist William S. Gilbert and composer Arthur Sullivan was an instant and lasting success. Reportedly inspired by Gilbert’s visit to a pseudo-ethnographic Japanese village in London’s Knightsbridge district, the operetta was translated and staged in cities across Europe and the United States, remaining a popular production for decades following its 1885 debut.218 In Vienna, the operetta was

Language Tourist Guidebooks of Japan in the Meiji period (1868–1912),” Japan Forum vol. 35, no. 2 (2022), 172-94. Favi argues that Meiji guidebooks, and particularly those published by the Kihinkai (The Welcome Society), had diplomatic aims and “were carefully constructed to showcase Japan to the world into a specific light- in a way that wasn't totally new to the genre, as a longer tradition of ‘politically charged’ guidebooks dated back to Tokugawa-period (1603-1868) meisho zue.”


217 Oscar Wilde, “House Decoration,” in Oscar Wilde Essays and Lectures (Whitefish, Mont.: Kessinger, 2004), 79. “[The] whole of Japan is a pure invention. There is no such country, there are no such people ... If you desire to see a Japanese effect, you will not behave like a tourist and go to Tokio. On the contrary, you will stay at home and steep yourself in the works of certain Japanese artists.”

performed in September 1886 (Carl-Schulze Theater), March 1888 (Theater an der Wien), January 1889 (Theater in der Josefstadt), February 1889 (Vienna Carltheater), and December 1909 (Volksoper).\textsuperscript{219} Much like tourist photography and travel books the operetta’s “Japan” became integrated in the cultural memory of the late nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{220} Viennese museum directors, historians, and artists who studied Japanese arts and culture intently, nevertheless, encountered and digested the tropes and stereotypes presented therein. For example, Franz Ferdinand, who amassed one of the most substantial nineteenth-century collections of East Asian arts in Europe, felt that the props used in \textit{The Mikado} productions offered the attending public a “characteristic” and authentic view of Japanese culture.\textsuperscript{221} Similarly fabricated “Japans” like the Prater Park cherry blossom festival organized by Pauline von Metternich (1836-1921) in 1901 and the enthusiastically received stage performances of actress Kawakami Sadayakko (1871-1946) created lasting impressions in Vienna’s artistic circles (Fig. 3.8-9).\textsuperscript{222} This mixture


\textsuperscript{220} Josephine Lee, \textit{The Japan of Pure Invention: Gilbert and Sullivan’s The Mikado} (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), viii. For contemporary travelogues, see Alexander Hübner. \textit{Ein Spaziergang um die Welt} (Leipzig: T.O. Weigel, 1874).

\textsuperscript{221} E. F. Ferdinand, \textit{Tagebuch meiner Reise um die Erde, 1892-1893} vol 2. (Vienna: A. Hölder, 1896), 219.

\textsuperscript{222} Peter Pantzer, \textit{Japanischer Theaterhimmel über Europas Bühnen: Kawakami Otojiō, Sadayakko und ihre Truppe auf Tournee durch Mittel- und Osteuropa 1901/1902} (Munich: Judicium, 2005), LXVIII. “For a generation of theater lovers and writers in Europe, Sadayakko, along with her husband and his troupe, became a cult figure. Hugo von Hofmannsthal was entranced. Max Reinhardt staged plays in the ‘Japanese style.’ Hermann Bahr shouted. Karl Kraus countered about such paradisiacal rapture. Ludwig Hevesi literally melted. For Theodor Herzl, whom the world associates with very specific themes, Japan was the promised land in those days. August Kisielewski was in his element. The authors of Young Poland, of Croatian Modernism, the theater reporters from Budapest to Basel, from Wiesbaden to Vienna, all of them sang their praises. ... Here they were fulfilled, the European's longings for exotic distances, his desires for escapism from the reality he knew.” (Für eine Generation Theaterliebhaber und Literaten in Europa wurde Sadayakko samt ihrem Mann und seiner Truppe zur Kultfigur. Hugo von Hofmannsthal war hingerissen. Max Reinhardt inszenierte Stücke nach ‘japanischer Art.’ Hermann Bahr tirilierte. Karl Kraus konterte ob solch paradiesischer Verzückung. Ludwig Hevesi schmolz förmlich hin. Für Theodor Herzl, den die Welt
of cultural appropriation, stereotype, and fascination with the foreign adds a complex level of Orientalism to Japonismus in the Viennese arts.

Promoting ideas of “civilization and enlightenment” and “increased production and industry,” the Meiji government made organized efforts to modernize and meet the challenges of western encroachment. From politics and industry to education and the arts, Japanese culture was affected by debates concerning westernization, modernization, and native tradition. As described by Okakura Kakuzō, a leading proponent for the preservation of native arts, the imitation and assimilation of “Western polity and science in order to adapt [Japan] to the exigencies of the modern world” created a devaluation and “opposition to aesthetic tradition.” Despite and in part due to these cultural tensions, three ideas became prevalent in European Japonism, the view of Japan as a preserved window into a medieval past, the perception of Japanese craftsmanship and ornament, unsullied by industrialization and modernization, as fundamentally drawn from nature, and the perception of Japanese art as a path toward modern aesthetic revitalization. In the late nineteenth century, the prior seclusion of Japan heightened the sense of the island nation as the “unknown East,” and the arts of Japan were described in


223 The Meiji slogan “bunmei kaika” (文明開化 civilization and enlightenment) coined by writer and translator Fukuzawa Yukichi (1835-1901) was intended to inspire policies and innovations based on British models, see Albert M. Craig, Civilization and Enlightenment: The Early Thought of Fukuzawa Yukichi (Boston: Harvard University Press, 2009), 143. On “shokusan kōgyō” (殖産興業 increased production and industry) and the applied arts, see Satō, Modern Japanese Art and the Meiji State, 96-137.

Edenic terms as a past “now lost to European culture.” For many, Japanese aesthetics appeared as a path of both rupture and return. On the one hand, it was seen as a means of overcoming stagnant visual traditions, opening artists to a new way of seeing. On the other, it was extolled as a way of returning to an earlier mode of artistic production lost in the dehumanized machine age. There were even plans for a Japanese museum at the Wiener Werkstätte’s Purkersdorf Sanatorium, which implies the far-reaching potential attributed to Japanese artistic models, as the medical institution’s program for nervous disorders included the “regulation” of aesthetic as well as environmental stimulants in the design. Although these views originated in an appreciation of the refined craftsmanship and non-hierarchical unification of Japanese art, they reflect the problems of cultural translation and mistranslation, appropriation and primitivism, and a reliance on stereotypes, biases, and colonial, imperialist, and Orientalist worldviews at odds with the endeavors and agenda of Meiji Japan.

In Vienna, the late nineteenth century was a period of eclectic architectural and artistic historicism. Hence, a model for a modern future drawn from a foreign past, i.e., Japanese art as a means of revival and modernization, fit into the Zeitgeist of the moment. From the introduction of Japanese art and culture at the Wiener Weltausstellung of 1873 through the foundations of the capital’s modern arts organization, the Viennese

225 Writing on the 1862 International Exhibition in London, the architect William Burges (1827-1881) specifically linked William Morris’s Medieval Court to the Japanese display writing: “One of the curious features of the Mediaeval Court is the attempt to revive the (Mediaeval) … If, however, the visitor wishes to see the real Middle Ages, he must visit the Japanese Court, for at the present day the arts of the Middle Ages have deserted Europe and are only to be found in the East W. Burges, “The International Exhibition,” The Gentleman’s Magazine and Historical Review 213 (1862), 4–5, 10–11.

encounter with Japanese art and culture was shaped by wide-ranging sources, a diverse spring of originals and reproductions, traditional arts and new Meiji exports fashioned for foreign markets, and varied presentations of Japanese culture consciously constructed for specific audiences. This is the “amalgamate nature” of Viennese Japonismus.

2) The k.k. Austro-Hungarian Expedition to East Asia (1868-1871)

Led by admiral Anton von Petz (1819-1885) and foreign minister Heinrich von Calice (1831-1912), the Austro-Hungarian Expedition to East Asia included stops in Gibraltar (November 1868), Singapore/Borneo (April 1869), Siam (now Thailand, April-May 1869), Vietnam (May 1869), China (June-September 1869), and Japan (Nagasaki, Yokohama, Osaka, Kamakura, Tokyo, September 1869-March 1870). The aim of the diplomatic mission was the establishment of trade agreements enabling the empire to benefit from the ever-expanding commercial opportunities afforded by the completion of the Suez Canal (1869).227 The expedition members included first secretary Karl Ritter von Scherzer (1821-1903), textile engineer Arthur von Scala, translator Alexander von Siebold (1846-1911), official photographer Wilhelm J. Burger (1844-1920), and photographer assistant Michael Moser (1853-1912).

Karl Ritter von Scherzer was a founding member of the Geographical Society (1856) who helped establish ethnographic and anthropological studies in Vienna.228 For

the 1868 voyage, he served as a correspondent for the newly established Museum for Art and Industry, which commissioned him to bring back models demonstrating a “sound sense of color and form” and “correct principles of ornamentation.”\textsuperscript{229} The museum specifically requested acquisitions from Japan, and the works obtained laid the foundations for the growth of the museum’s collections. Additionally, he was an avid collector and patron of photography, and it was through his advocacy that the expedition was visually documented by Wilhelm J. Burger and his assistant Michael Moser.

Under the direction of Scherzer, Arthur von Scala served as the expedition’s advisor for the textile industry. In this role, he built on his prior studies and works for the Ministry of Trade, which included industrial reports for the 1867 Paris Exposition Universelle. In addition to advising on the fabrics, ceramics, paintings, and woodblock prints obtained for the Museum for Art and Industry, he helped complete new trade agreements enabling China, Japan, and Siam to participate in the Wiener Weltenausstellung of 1873.\textsuperscript{230} As the secretary of the Committee for the Orient and East Asia for the Weltenausstellung, an original member of the Cercle Oriental, and the founding director of the Oriental Museum, Scala was critical to the development of Japanese art collections in the Habsburg capital and a keen advocate of East Asian arts as a model for Viennese

\textsuperscript{229} Pantzer, “Japonisme in Austria or: Art knows no Boundaries,” in \textit{Verborgene Impressionen}, 23-36, 27. Pantzer outlines the intentions of the museum. For greater detail, see Karl Scherzer, \textit{Fachmännische Berichte über die österreichisch-ungarische Expedition nach Siam, China, und Japan 1868-1871} (Stuttgart: Verlag von Julius Maier, 1873).

artistic revival. While he did not write expansively, mainly concerning himself with exhibition forewords, he edited and supported important journals about East Asian and modern art. In 1897, he became the fourth director of the Museum for Art and Industry and the affiliate School of Design and remained in this post until 1907. Under his guidance, the museum amassed its sizeable and diverse collection and mounted the largest presentation of Japanese art in Vienna to this day, *Exhibition of Old Japanese Artworks* (1905). Through his career, he befriended modern artists like Otto Wagner, Koloman Moser, and Josef Hoffmann. He was also an early promoter of the Wiener Werkstätte. Cultivating an alternative vision for Vienna’s museum and school of the applied arts, he adopted innovative contemporary practices from around Europe that informed subsequent generations of Viennese artists.

The Siebolds were one of the most important families in the history of Japanese collections and Japanese studies in Europe. Beginning with Philipp Franz von Siebold (1796-1866), a German physician who was one of the few foreigners permitted to

---

231 Scala’s opinions, the details of his approach to museum collections, and his efforts to expand Japanese collections in Vienna are difficult to trace. His writings are limited to around 40 exhibition forewords. Wieninger, an important scholar of Viennese Japonismus and the history of the Museum for Art and Industry, describes Scala as an enigmatic figure who “over the course of his forty-year career in the museum” always “seems to have stayed in the background, to animate and challenge those who, in his opinion, really had something to say.” See Wieninger, “Arthur von Scala als Mittler zwischen Ost und West und die Grundlegung der Asiensammlung des heutigen Museums für angewandte Kunst 1868-1909,” in *Kunst und Industrie die Anfänge des Museums für angewandte Kunst*, ed. Peter Noever (Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz, 2000), 164–172, 164.

232 See, *Oesterreichische Monatsschrift für den Orient* (1875-1918) and *Kunst und Kunsthandwerk* (1897-1932).

live in Japan during the isolationist period, the family occupied significant positions in Japanese-European political affairs as advisors, diplomats, interpreters, and translators. Through their professional endeavors and private collections, they forged complicated channels of cultural exchange between Japan and Europe. Alexander von Siebold, who had previously served as a secretary for the British Embassy in Tokyo, was the expedition’s official interpreter and assisted Scherzer in his acquisitions for the Museum for Art and Industry. In subsequent years, he and his younger brother Heinrich worked for the Austrian-Hungarian embassy in Tokyo, served as translators and guides for important visitors from and to Japan, and as correspondents for various Viennese museums.

Wilhelm J. Burger’s extensive photographic portfolio of the expedition, which included over 850 negative plates, and Michael Moser’s later documentation of the 1873 Weltausstellung provide a wealth of information concerning the traditional places promoted as sites of interest, the types of arts and crafts available to collectors, and the romanticized images of Japan that illustrated travel guides and tourist albums in the early Meiji era. Moser, Burger’s expedition assistant, remained in Japan for more than seven years working as a photographer and translator for the Japanese delegations at the world’s exhibitions in 1873, 1876, and 1878. The place of Burger’s and Moser’s work

within the larger histories of photography, Orientalist photography in East Asia, and the role of photography in ethnographic, anthropological, and sociological studies in the nineteenth century is beyond the scope of this dissertation, as is the production, dissemination, and reception of the works of Austrian photographers active in Japan.237

Here, it is significant, nonetheless, to emphasize that despite the efforts of the Meiji government to meet and exceed the modern industries of the west, historicizing and naturalizing images informed the international perception of Japan. Foreign and Japanese photographers alike created carefully staged pictures of traditional culture that propagated many of the period’s stereotypes, tropes, and Orientalist clichés. Notably, Burger’s East Asian album presents Japan as a preserved past and pre-industrial traditional culture.

Tourist photography, also known as Yokohama-style photography, was a flourishing industry in the Meiji era. Hand-colored prints and photo albums by photographers like Felice Beato (1832-1909), Tamamura Kozaburo (1856-1923), Kusakabe Kimbei (1841-1934), Ogawa Kazumasu (1860-1929), and Raimund von Stillfried (1839-1911) were popular souvenirs through the first years of the twentieth century.238

In my early research and explorations of the TriCo Special Collections, I

encountered several photographs and folios of this type. Figure 3.10 is a Yokohama-style portrait of Bryn Mawr College’s foundational benefactor Mary Elizabeth Garret (1854-1915) posed in a studio in traditional Japanese clothing with a parasol in hand in front of a landscape backdrop. Donated to Haverford College in the 1980s, figure 3.11 is a hand-colored albumen print of a site captured by many early photographers of Japan. These examples from the TriCo collections and archives demonstrate how ideas of traditions and cultures crafted by popular imagination could and did become part of larger ideological fabrics and dialogues.239

Burger’s images from the East Asian expedition reflect the influence of Yokohama-style in their careful selection of site, intentional framing of place, and conscientious staging of the individuals captured by the camera lens.240 Rather than documenting the drama and transformation of the Meiji era, Burger’s photographs of shrines, temples, samurai, sumo wrestlers, monks, and geisha are picturesque and exoticized. His images create an idea of feudal Japan aimed to captivate and hold the interest of foreign visitors in “contrast to their own cultural environments” rather than document the full experience of the expedition.241

Burger’s *Kamakura Daibutsu* (1869) shows one of the most iconic places in Japan. Cast in 1252, the Great Buddha stands in the grounds of the Pure Land School

---


240 From Michael Moser’s diaries and letters, Miyata has found that some of the pictures attributed to Burger were purchased from local photographers.

temple Daii-san Kotoku-in Shojosen-ji in the ancient shogunal capital (1185-1333) of Kamakura (Fig. 3.12). Designated as a National Treasure in 1897, the site has a long history as a famous place (meisho). As early as 1607, the Jesuit missionary Father Rodrigues (1561-1632) visited the Buddha; the site was a destination for large tourist excursions in the early twentieth century; and to this day, the Kamakura landmark remains a popular destination for foreign visitors. From travel albums to postcards and carte de visite, thousands of images of the monumental Buddha were made in the Meiji Era. As previously noted, it was a site documented by almost every early photographer of Japan, notably including the Austrians Raimund von Stillfried and Michael Moser.

Burger produced several versions of the Kamakura Daibutsu. Figure 3.12 shows the conventional, full-frontal view of the bronze statue. Only a small section of the front stairs and stone pavement leading to the seated Buddha are visible. The trees that frame either side of the image and the numerous people posed around the monumental Daibutsu, like the row of children seated at the top of the stair and the figure using a long

---

242 The statue was originally located inside the temple hall. The buildings were destroyed by natural disasters in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and the Buddha has remained in the open air since.
ladder to climb the statue, provide a sense of scale. The people pictured are dressed in traditional garments, and the adults wear only fundoshi, a undergarment made from a length of cloth. Burger’s selection of site, subject, and composition reinforce the view of Japan as an exotic, preserved past, and in a 1905 illustration produced by the Secessionist Emil Orlik, we can see echoes of this type of photograph in the visual fabric of modern Vienna (Fig. 3.13).

In Burger’s Lacquerware dealer, Yokohama, a street merchant in traditional dress and top-knot hairstyle stands amid his wares (Fig. 3.14). On the surface, the photograph captures an artisan displaying his hand-crafted medicine cabinets, tea services, and caddies on a village street lined with wooden structures. It is a tranquil scene of a pre-industrial culture. However, the surrounding historical context is more complicated. In the Tokugawa era, lacquerwares were used by all strata of society. However, the primary patronage for this craft came from the shogunate and his supporting feudal lords (daimyō), who commissioned lavish bridal trousseaus and refined wares for incense and tea ceremonies. Temple and monasteries were also important customers for lacquer artists and workshops. The dissolution of the shogunate and the decline of the feudal structure of the Tokugawa era had a profound impact on this craft. Writing in 1908, the art critic and educator Okakura Kakuzō claimed that “the Restoration of 1868 with its

---

246 Photographs from the Meiji era show people scaling or sitting on the Buddha. Around 1900, a plaque was placed beside the statue prohibiting climbing. By 1910, accessing the statue became increasingly difficult as measures were taken to prevent this activity. The figure in Burger’s photograph is not characteristic of this type of image, which usually shows the statue alone or visitors sitting in front. It seems plausible that the figure in Burger’s image is climbing the Buddha for some maintenance purpose. It is also possible that Burger staged this climber to emphasize the scale of the statue. On preventing climbers, see Herbert G. Ponting, In Lotus-land Japan (London: Macmillan and Co., 1910), 357.

series of civil wars, and overwhelming influx of Western ideas was almost fatal to lacquer.”\footnote{Okakura, “The History of Lacquer Art,” in \textit{Collected English Writings} vol. II (Tokyo: Heibonsha, 1984), 179-194, 193.} Despite the paucity of native demand, this traditional craft was sought after by foreign collectors. In his study on the Meiji era export industry, Jan Dees states that “ten years after the Restoration some 74\% of all well-known lacquer artists in Tokyo were working for one of the companies or dealers catering for export.”\footnote{Dees, \textit{Facing Modern Times}, 15.} Beneath the surface of Burger’s photograph is the presentation and production of Japanese crafts for the tourist trade and foreign markets.

The place of Yokohama is significant. While Burger’s framing of the scene shows no evidence of modernization, the history of the city began with the reopening of Japan in 1854. Before its establishment as a western port, Yokohama was a fishing village off the transport avenue of the Tokaido road. It quickly became one of the country’s most populous ports, known as a city of firsts and for its international and modern influences.\footnote{Kiyoko Sawatari, “Innovational Adaptations: Contacts between Japanese and Western Artists in Yokohama, 1859–1899,” in \textit{Challenging Past and Present: The Metamorphosis of Nineteenth-Century Japanese Art}, ed. Ellen P. Conant (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2006), 83–113.} By 1867, it was a “great centre of foreign traffic in Japan” facilitating “communication from abroad.”\footnote{Nicholas Belfield Dennys ed., \textit{The Treaty Ports of China and Japan, A Complete Guide to the Open Ports of Those Countries, Together with Peking, Yedo, Hongkong, and Macao: Forming Guide Book & Vade Macum for Travellers, Merchants, and Residents in General} (Hong Kong: A. Shortrede and Co., 1867), 580–81.} In Burger’s photograph, the shifting society of the Meiji era and the burgeoning growth of Yokohama are outside of the camera’s frame. Reflecting the influence of Yokohama-style photography, Burger portrays Japan as an idyllic, insular, and ancient culture rather than an emerging country on the precipice of
great change. The Austro-Hungarian Expedition to East Asia instigated important museum and private collections of Japanese art in Vienna, it also brought photographs like Burger’s East Asian album into the cultural landscape of the Habsburg capital.

3) The Japanese Display at the Wiener Weltausstellung of 1873

The Meiji government spent more than a year preparing for the 1873 Weltausstellung. In this first self-curated presentation, the Japanese delegation attended to the purchasing public, assembling traditional arts and collectible wares specifically for the Viennese market. Although the Japanese could not yet compete with international industry and technology, their applied arts had been admired in Europe since the mid-sixteenth century and had become an increasingly marketable commodity since the end of isolationist foreign policy. The interest generated by the 1862 World Fair of London and great success of the Japanese pavilions at the 1867 Paris Exposition Universelle marked the beginning of an aesthetic dialogue between Japan and European countries in the field of

---

253 Satō, *Modern Japanese Art and the Meiji State*, 111. Japan’s first national display at a world’s fairs was in 1862 (London). Japan was invited to participate on a larger scale at the 1867 Paris Exposition Universelle. It was not until 1873 that the Japanese display was self-orchestrated. Only objects from Hizen (Saga) and Satsuma were sent to the 1867 Paris exposition. The Shogun noted the importance of the event and sent his younger brother Tokugawa Akitake to observe foreign policies and practices. The Japanese had little to no input concerning their national displays. See Beasley, *Japan Encounters the Barbarian*, 114. In his history of the Iwakura Embassy, Beasley writes that Kume’s report “gave no less than forty pages to … the Japanese exhibits” and that officials concluded that the Japanese were “not yet able to distinguish between the purpose of an exhibition and a museum.” Ibid., 15-19, 160. See Satō, *Modern Japanese Art and the Meiji State*, 11, 116; and Kornicki, “Public Display and Changing Values,” 168.
255 Ibid.
architecture. Under the guidance of the scientist turned ceramicist Dr. Gottfried Wagener (1831-1892) and his advisors Alexander and Heinrich von Siebold (1852-1908), the Japanese display of 1873 consequently was dominated by applied arts and large-scale architectural works that would have immediate visual impact and generate broad interest (Fig. 3.15-17).

Wagener advised the Meiji government to hold onto their “unique national ways and means” and “remember the original beauty inherent” in their own traditions. In the interior gallery, ceramics, lacquerware, and paintings were exhibited side-by-side without hierarchical distinction (Fig. 3.18-19). Eight master carpenters and three master gardeners were sent to build the architectural elements of the display, which included a Japanese garden, a model of a Kagura hall (a type of Shinto shrine), and a traditional tea house (Fig. 3.20). The construction of the tea house was led by the Austrian photographer Raimund von Stillfried, who was active in Japan from the early 1870s through the first years of the 1880s.


258 On the 1873 displays Wagener stated: “If [Japanese] porcelain is used for such everyday items as tableware and tea sets, then among all ceramics it will be ranked the best.” Wagener’s remarks from Tanaka Yoshio and Hirayama Narinobu’s report on the 1873 World Exposition are quoted in translation by Itani, “Export Porcelain from Seto in the Meiji Era,” 33, 111.

259 “Bijutsu” 美, “beauty,” and jutsu 術, “skill” or “technique,” was likely thought of in general terms as beautiful things made with skill. It is unknown who coined the term. See Lee, “Resisting Boundaries,” 69.

260 Among the Japanese participants were Sano Tsunetami (the statesman and director of the delegation), Kawase Hideji (the vice-president of the Ryuuchikai and supervisor of Japan’s first National Industrial Exposition in 1877), Yamataka Nobutsura (the director of domestic and international exhibitions), and Yokoyama Matusaburō (Tsütenrō) and Takahashi Yuichi (two artists working to document the exhibited arts of Japan in paintings and photographs). See Lee, “Resisting Boundaries,” 64.

made can be seen in a visual comparison of a large paper lantern photographed by Michael Moser and a wood, lacquer, and mother-of-pearl sword stand from Heinrich Siebold’s personal collection (Fig. 3.21). Both lantern and stand are decorated with depictions of a dragon emerging from spiraling clouds. While this is a common motif in Japanese art, the examples illustrated here are near mirror images, which seems more than coincidental.

European art historians and critics reporting on the Weltausstellung admired the technical expertise, natural ornament, and eye-catching coloration of the displays. The administrator of the Berlin Museum of Decorative Arts Julius Lessing (1843-1908) described the Japanese artworks as exceptional in their “beauty and splendor of colors.”262 Similarly, the German history painter and successful feuilleton journalist Friedrich Pecht (1814-1903) praised the Japanese silks for their “sense of color” and “incredible brilliance.”263 The Viennese museum directors Jakob von Falke and Bruno Bucher, who helped develop the Japanese collection of the Museum for Art and Industry, admired the keen observation of nature and “certainty of drawing” evident in the displayed objects.264 The Japanese exhibit was among the most successful of 1873, and

263 Friedrich Pecht, Kunst und Kunstindustrie auf der Wiener Weltausstellung 1873, (Stuttgart: J.G. Cotta, 1873), 297. Christiane Hertel has noted that Pecht’s title sounds modern, an emphasis that is interesting given his reflections on what was perceived to be the traditional arts of Japan.
264 Quotation from Bucher, Über ornamentale Kunst auf der Wiener Weltausstellung (Berlin: C.G. Lüderitz’sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Carl Habel, 1874), 48. See also, Jakob Falke, Die Kunstindustrie auf der Wiener Weltausstellung 1873 (Vienna: Verlag Carl Gerold’s Sohn, 1873), 199. After the death of Eitelberger, the founding director of the Museum for Art and Industry, Falke, who had served as the first deputy of the museum, was made director in 1885. Falke’s prior work with the collection of the House of Liechtenstein enabled him to expand the collection of the Museum for Art and Industry. Falke’s tenure was followed in 1895 by Bruno Bucher, who was the long-standing curator of the Museum for Art and
the majority of the curated artworks were purchased by or gifted to museums in the Habsburg capital. As Falke boldly expressed, it was hoped that the natural ornament and craftsmanship of these exceptional models would be absorbed in Vienna’s “flesh and blood.”

Expressly made for the Weltausstellung and gifted to the Museum for Art and Industry, Kawamoto Masukichi’s ornamental panel depicting Mount Fuji is a salient example of the 1873 displays and the influence of European Japonism on Meiji export art (Fig. 3.22). The craft tradition of Seto, where Kawamoto Masukichi I (1831-1907) was educated and worked, dates back to the thirteenth century. With the international trade boom of the 1870s, Seto artisans turned from established stoneware traditions to white unglazed pottery brilliantly decorated in blue pigment (Sometsuke) and overglaze enamels. Trained by his father-in-law Kawamoto Hansuke IV, Masukichi began working for Yokohama-based exporting companies in 1872. In the plate exhibited in 1873, the mist and mountain are delicately drawn in a deep indigo. There is a balance between realistic rendering and the rhythmic stylization of the spiraling clouds

266 Kawamoto Masukichi I is also known as Kitoken and as Kawamoto Hansuke V. On Kawamoto Masukichi I (1831-1907) and Kawamoto Masukichi II (1852-1918), the second generation Masukichi whose work in porcelain made the family one of the leading potteries in Seto, see Itani, “Export Porcelain from Seto in the Meiji Era,” 24; Pollard, “Gorgeous with Glitter and Gold,” 139; and Pollard, Master Potter of Meiji Japan: Makuzu Kozan (1842-1916) and His Workshop, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 73.  
267 Pollard, “Gorgeous with Glitter and Gold,” 139.  
268 Ibid. “Sometsuke” is often translated as “blue and white porcelain,” but it refers to a range of ceramics decorated in blue and white that drawn on Chinese artistic traditions. After the 1873 Weltausstellung, Kawamoto participated in the first ever project to export blue-and-white porcelain tableware through the Mitsui-gumi company founded in 1876 (later known as Mitsui Bussan, or Mitsui Trading). In 1881 he established a Tokyo-based exporting company called “Jikosha” with his son-in-law Kawamoto Hideo.
reminiscent of karakusa patterns (winding plant) (Fig. 3.23).

At the international expositions, similar Sometsuke wares received high praise for their striking blue and white coloration and their realistic renderings of nature. Following the success of the 1873 displays, Masukichi became a prominent artist in the field of porcelain works and was commissioned by the Meiji government to produce showpieces for exhibitions in and outside of Japan.

Vienna’s one and only world’s fair served as an important source for the expansion of existing collections, the foundation of new institutions, and the initiating spark of substantial private collections in the Habsburg capital. In preparation for the Weltausstellung, a Viennese group named the Cercle Oriental (also known as the Oriental Society for Trade and Economics) was created to support foreign delegations and, more generally, to encourage trade between Austria-Hungary and previously untapped markets (Fig. 3.24). In 1875, the society founded the Oriental Museum (Orientalisches Museum), renamed the Trade Museum (k.k. Österreichisches Handelsmuseum) in 1887. This institution grew out of the 1873 Weltausstellung, and the program of the museum was developed by important world’s fair contributors like Baron von Schwarz-Senborn, Baron Schwegel, Karl Ritter von Scherzer, and Arthur von Scala.

The karakusa (唐草) is a tendril or arabesque pattern that appears in various stylized iterations. It is also referred to as karahanamon (唐花文 Chinese floral motif).


The two important patrons of the institution were Archduke Karl Ludwig (1833-1896) and Archduke Rainer Ferdinand (1827-1913). See, Österreichisches Handelsmuseum Curatorium, Das k.k. österreichische Handels-Museum, 1875-1900 (Vienna: Verlag des k.k. Österreichischen Handels-Museums/ Ch. Reisser & M. Werthner, 1900), 1-4; and Orientalischen Museum, Bericht an die General-Versammlung des Orientalischen Museums in Wien (Vienna: Carl Fromme, 1876). There are few original documents concerning the history of this institution. For primary scholarship, see Franz S. Griesmayr, “Das österr. Handelsmuseum in Wien, 1874–1918,” Ph.D. diss., (Universität Wien, 1968); Wieninger, “Das Orientalische Museum,” Vienne, porta Orientis. Austriaca. Cahiers universitaires d’information sur
Museum’s exhibitions and publications (Österreichische Monatsschrift für den Orient 1876-1918) promoted commercial relationships between eastern countries and Austria-Hungary and introduced readers to the history of Asian arts. Japanese culture and art were frequent topics in the museum’s journal, and correspondents and contributors to the publication like Karl von Scherzer, Heinrich von Siebold, and Dr. Gottfried Wagener sustained the thread of Japanese influence in Vienna’s cultural fabric. Under the direction of Scala until 1897, the Oriental Museum continued to expand their collection, and many of the members of Cercle Oriental donated Japanese artworks to the institution. Through Scala’s efforts, the institution’s holdings were consolidated by the Museum for Art and Industry in 1907 and became an important resource for the School of Design. The broader awareness and engagement with the arts of Japan initiated at the Weltenausstellung had a lasting impact on the modern arts of Austria-Hungary, and the Japanese displays were still referenced by cultural critics decades later.

4) The 1892-1893 World Tour of Archduke Franz Ferdinand of Austria-Este

In the years following the Weltenausstellung, Vienna’s public museums benefited from the sizeable collection of Franz Ferdinand and Heinrich von Siebold. Siebold, who

---


276 Wieninger, “Die Leben Einer Sammlung.”

spent most of his professional life in Japan, began his diplomatic work for the Austrian-Hungarian embassy in Tokyo in 1869. He served as an advisor to the Weltausstellung of 1873 and then interpreter to the Archduke during his global travels. He was an important collector in his own right and his donations and bequests contributed to the strength and reputation of Vienna’s museums.

Guided by Siebold, Franz Ferdinand collected over 14,000 items from East Asia during this year-long voyage. Most of his acquisitions came from Japan. Both noteworthy collections were donated to the Imperial Museum of Natural History (k.k. Naturhistorisches Museum), the Oriental Museum (Trade Museum), and the Museum for Art and Industry, entering the public domain of the Habsburg capital. Part of the Archduke’s collection gifted to the ethnographic department of the Imperial Museum of Natural History were displayed in the new wing of the Belvedere Palace in 1912.278

Siebold likewise made contributions to the Imperial Museum of Natural History in 1889.279 However, the majority of his bequest were to the Oriental Museum in 1873 and 1892 and to the Museum for Art and Industry in 1897.280 Through numerous loans and donations to museums, both collectors actively influenced Viennese exhibitions of

---


280 Wieninger, “Die Leben einer Sammlung.”
Japanese art from the 1880s through the early 1900s. Siebold also published works on the ethnology, anthropology, and art of Japan. The remainder of Siebold’s collection entered the public sphere through a posthumous auction held by “Au Mikado,” a Ringstrasse emporium for eastern goods, in 1909.

5) The Museum for Art and Industry and the Arts of Japan

Under the directorships of Rudolf Eitelberger (1863-1885), Jakob von Falke (1885-1895), Bruno Bucher (1895-1897), and Arthur von Scala (1897-1909), the Museum for Art and Industry promoted the arts of Japan and played a definitive role in contemporary aesthetic debates. Eitelberger believed that Austrian artists should learn from the best models from every nation, including Japan, and rigorously diversified the museum’s holdings. Falke and Bucher assisted the museum’s first director in these

281 One example is the 1883 Exhibition of Industrial Art Objects from Japan (Ausstellung kunstindustrieller Objekte aus Japan) held at the Oriental Museum. Heinrich von Siebold, “Ausstellung kunstindustrieller Objekte aus Japan,” in Monatsschrift für Kunst und Gewerbe XVIII (Vienna: Gerold's Sohn, 1883) 441-445.


efforts, and Scala laid the foundations of the museum’s substantial collection of East Asian art.\textsuperscript{284} Many of the museum’s exhibitions were accompanied by publications and lecture series, giving the arts of Japan a continued presence in the cultural dialogue of the Habsburg capital. Two significant examples are the Secessionist Emil Orlik, who presented on his travels and artistic training in Japan in 1902, and the 1904 lecture series given by Justus Brinckmann (1843-1915), the first director of the Museum of Art and Industry in Hamburg and colleague of Siegfried Bing.\textsuperscript{285} Orlik, who was an important proponent of Japanese aesthetic models in central Europe, and Brinckmann, who was influenced by Rudolf Eitelberger’s popular lectures on craft reform, are discussed in greater detail in Chapter Four.\textsuperscript{286} As will be addressed shortly, numerous ties existed between Vienna’s Museum for Art and Industry, its affiliate school, and Viennese visual modernism.\textsuperscript{287}

The museum’s displays featured Japanese art as early as 1865.\textsuperscript{288} Between 1883 and 1905, the institution began a nearly annual series of exhibitions highlighting or exclusively dedicated to the arts of Japan. Ambitious in terms of size and scope, these collaborative enterprises drew support from important collections throughout central Europe. The donor lists for the 1883 \textit{Exhibition of Historical Bronzes} and the 1905

\textsuperscript{284} Bucher collaborated with Albert Ilg and Alois Riegl. The role of Ilg in Klimt’s development will be discussed in Chapter Five. Riegl is discussed in Chapter Six.

\textsuperscript{285} On lectures at the Museum for Art and Industry, see \textit{Mitteilungen des k.k. Österreichischen Museums für Kunst und Industrie} des k.k. Österreichischen Museums für Kunst und Industrie, Nr. 235 (Vienna, 1885), 359-368; Nr. 236 (Vienna, 1885), 398-406; Nr. 87 (Vienna, 1893), 328-334; Nr. 120 (Vienna, 1895), 528; Nr. 88 (Vienna, 1893), 354-359; Nr. 5 (Vienna, 1902), 165. On Brinckmann and the Museum für Kunst und Gewerbe Hamburg, see Johannes Wieninger, “Networks of Enthusiasm for Japan,” in \textit{Collecting Asian Art: Cultural Politics and Transregional Networks in Twentieth-Century Central Europe}, ed. Markéta Hánová (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2024), 97–110.

\textsuperscript{286} Alfred Lichtwark, \textit{Der Deutsche der Zukunft} (Berlin: Bruno Cassirer, 1905), 182.


Exhibition of Old Japanese Artworks demonstrate the extent and quality of private collections in and accessible to Vienna (Fig. 3.25). Moreover, the contributions of collectors like Emil and Berta Zuckerkandl in 1905 illustrate a correlation of interest between Japanese art and Viennese visual modernism.

Two significant examples in this history are the museum’s 1899 and 1901 exhibitions focused on Japanese woodblock prints. The first presented a range of works from the collection of the Dresden art dealer Ernst Arnold (1792-1840) and placed special emphasis on artists described by Viennese critics as “the three great ‘moderns,’ Utamaro, Hokusai, and Hiroshige.” The second, entirely devoted to Hokusai, was the first of its kind in continental Europe. The displays included loans from aristocratic families, museum professionals, academics, foreign dignitaries, art dealers, and artists alike, demonstrating the continued interest in the museum-attending public and pervasive cross-class appeal of Japanese art for Viennese collectors. Both exhibitions prove the importance of ukiyo-e for Japonismus in the German-speaking context and the


international exchange between dealers, historians, and collectors in France, Germany, and the broader Austro-Hungarian Monarchy.

In his account from 1899, the art critic and supporter of Viennese modernism Ludwig Hevesi described the public’s enthusiasm and the numerous European artists engaged with Japanese sources. The 1901 exhibition, which was collaboratively organized by Arthur von Scala, Parisian art dealer Siegfried Bing, and Viennese industrialist and art patron Fritz Wärndorfer, demonstrates the fluid exchange of ideas concerning Japanese art in central Europe. Wärndorfer’s participation establishes the importance of Japanese aesthetics and ukiyo-e prints for those vested in the modern arts of Austria. As a leading patron and collector of European modern art and founder, financer, and commercial director of the Wiener Werkstätte, he was at the heart of Viennese cultural life. His collection reflected the international tastes of his contemporaries, uniting art by Charles Rennie Mackintosh (1868-1928) and the Glasgow School, the Belgian sculptor George Minne (1866-1941), expressionist painters Egon Schiele and Oskar Kokoschka, and ukiyo-e printmakers. The 1901 Hokusai exhibition shows the impact of Wärndorfer’s interests in Japanese art on Vienna’s visual landscape. In my view, the expansive network of Japonism lent credence to Viennese interpretations of Japanese art as an artistic language transcending cultural boundaries.

6) Vienna Secession and the Arts of Japan

Described by Hevesi as young modernists who “set the entire art world on fire,” the Vienna Secession was shaped by and reciprocally influenced the Museum for Art and

293 Ibid.
Industry and its School of Design. Gustav Klimt was an applied arts student at the School of Design from 1876 to 1883, and from 1889 to 1939 the Secessionists and Wiener Werkstätte founders Josef Hoffmann and Koloman Moser instituted a new curriculum at the institution utilizing Japanese stencils from the affiliate museum collection. Through their exhibitions and modernist’s organ *Ver Sacrum* (1898-1903), the group intended to bring the most forward-thinking international trends to Vienna, an aim that resonated with the objectives of the Museum for Art and Industry. In search of an “absolute and pure” unity of the arts, these artists drew inspiration from across historical and geographic boundaries fueling the stylistic plurality and international spirit that characterized the Austrian arts around 1900.

In 1900 and 1903, the collaborative group mounted two exceptional presentations of Japanese art. The Secession’s sixth exhibition highlighted the collection of Adolf (1856-1914) and Frieda Fischer (1874-1945). As discussed in Chapter Two, the sixteenth exhibition, *The Development of Impressionism in Painting and Sculpture*,


placed the arts of Japan within the history of visual modernism in Europe. Here, the
discussion focuses on the 1900 Fischer exhibition.

In the fourth volume of Ver Sacrum, 1899, Ernst Schur described European Japonisme as such:

When the French enthusiastically embraced the newly discovered art of Japan, they were the only European culture capable of doing so. At the time no one guessed that this bright star would fade so quickly. … Did we really fully taste what was there for the tasting? (…) So-called Japoniserie (…) was only a transient fashion. (…) No other country can hold a candle to the unity and multiplicity of even one of their arts. (…) What is the essence of this high art? …

Japanese art is absolute and pure in a way that no other art is. (…) We aspire to unity — here then is unity. 298

Schur holds up the arts of Japan as a superlative model for the reanimation of European and, more particularly, Austrian art. While the Parisian engagement was a “transient fashion,” the artists of Vienna were uniquely situated to absorb the essence of Japanese aesthetics. As he adamantly asserts, the purity and unity of Japanese art was a clear path toward creative equality united in craftsmanship. He also uses a distinct word, “gamekeeper” (Hegemeister), in his characterization of the relationship between Japanese artists and nature. In Grimm’s German language dictionary, the verb “hegen” has a long article on its wide-ranging semantics. 299

298 Schur, “Der Geist der japanischen Kunst.” This translation is from Pantzer and Wieninger ed., Verborgene Impressionen, 427-428.
protecting, literally of nature (gardens, estates, animals, forests, game habitat, etc.), and metaphorically of feelings and relationships. The noun “Heger” and compound “Hegemeister” derived from the verb most likely relate to the medieval guild systems. It is a term that is not commonly associated with art or art criticism, and it is striking that Schur applies it to the technique of Japanese artists and their resulting mastery of representing nature. It implies a sense of serving the natural world, as though the arts of Japan had an ecological dimension. In his 1901 book on the meaning and beauty of Japanese art, Schur again used the past tense “hegte,” claiming that the people of this country had a unique relationship to the natural world. For Schur, nature was their “teacher,” and the artists of Japan held “tender love for her that we don’t see anywhere else.”300 However interpreted, his use and repetition of “hegen” is indicative of the contemporary perception of Japanese art as essentially bonded to the natural world, which was significant to the artists of the Vienna Secession and Wiener Werkstätte, who tied modern art to the vitality of nature. Mounted a year after Schur’s declaration, the 1900 display of the Fischer collection provided a significant avenue for study and emulation.

Adolf Fischer, who was born in Vienna and trained as a court actor, most likely first encountered Japanese art at the 1873 Weltausstellung. However, it was his world tour of 1892 that initiated his life as a collector.301 He and his wife Frieda traveled

300 Schur, Von dem Sinn und von der Schönheit der Japanischen Kunst (Leipzig: Hermann Seemann, 1901), 32. “The Japanese live in and with nature like hardly any other people. She is their teacher and more than that; As they stand next to her, it seems as if they have a tender love for her that we don't see anywhere else.” (Der Japaner lebt in und mit der Nature wie kaum ein anderes Volk. Sie ist ihm Lehrmeisterin und mehr als das; wie er sich zu ihr stellt, hat es den Anschein, als hegte er ein zärtliche Liebe zu ihr, wie wir es nirgends sonst sehen.) The emphasis on hegte is mine.

301 Fischer’s stage name was Adolf Werther.
together to Japan in 1895 to acquire new works. They were accompanied by the future Secessionist Franz Hohenberger, who documented their journey in drawings and paintings that would later become part of Vienna’s visual landscape (Fig. 3.26). The Fischers returned to East Asia in 1897, 1901, and 1905 and traveled throughout continental Europe and the United States to expand their collection.

Described in detail in the 1900 catalogue, their collection encompassed a wide range of Japanese arts and crafts. Two photographs by Moritz Nähr illustrate the diversity of the 1900 exhibition, which included a sixteenth-century screen decorated in the manner of the Kōrin School, a “Buddhist Paradise” from 763 AD, and a range of textiles, ceramics, cloisonné, lacquerwares, paintings, and ukiyo-e woodcuts (Fig. 3.27-28).

According to Hevesi, the works selected by curator Koloman Moser presented an opportunity to learn more than ever about the “old arts of Japan.” The modern author Hermann Bahr likewise felt that the young painters and artisans of Vienna should closely study the displayed works, which offered an alternate “worldview” and a “new feeling for color, air, and light.” Adolf Fischer opined that the exhibition provided a “foundational gleaning” for the “evolution of European art.” Each of these authors described

302 Ferdinand Andri, “Nikko, November 1895, Aus einem Briefe von Franz Hohenberger,” Ver Sacrum vol. 3 (1900), 37-50. Adolf Fischer was born in Vienna. He trained as an actor for the Viennese court with Josef Lewinsky and briefly worked on the stage in Berlin. In 1905, the Fischers established the Museum of East Asian Art in Cologne, which attests to the quality and breadth of the works displayed by the Secession in 1900. On Fischer’s theater career, see Wilhelm Kosch, Deutsches Theater-Lexikon 6 (Zurich: De Gruyter, 2008), 327.

303 Wiener Secession and Fischer, Kunstausstellung der Vereinigung bildender Künstler Österreichs VI, 22. The Austrian photographer Moritz Nähr was a friend of the Secessionists and documented most of the group’s exhibitions. His portraiture adds an intimacy to our historical view of the period.

304 “In fact, you will enjoy and learn more about old Japanese art here than was ever possible in Vienna.” (So wird man hier in der Tat mehr von alter japanischer Kunst genießen und lernen, als je vorher in Wien möglich gewesen.) Hevesi, “Ausstellung der Sezession,” in Acht Jahre Sezession, 222-223, 223.


306 Adolf Fischer’s comment from Das Neue Wiener Tagblatt is quoted in Pantzer and Wieninger eds., Verborgene Impressionen, 21. “There can be no better of more thorough introduction to Japanese art than is
Japanese art as a path of revival leading away from stagnate contemporary practices toward a purer, unified craftsmanship of the past.

Following the 1900 exhibition, the Fischers’ growing collection continued to influence the Viennese cultural landscape, as they published works on their travels and the arts of Japan and contributed to exhibitions and collections in Berlin and Munich that influenced the reception of Japanese art in German-speaking Europe.307 As with many private collectors of the period, the Fischers aims grew and their private collection became a first of its kind museum dedicated to the arts of East Asia in 1909 (Museum für Ostasiatische Kunst Köln). Their institution was intended to present “a unified picture of all East Asian art (…) in its phases of development” and place it “on an equal footing with European art.”308 In her books detailing their East Asian travels and

provided in this collection, and everyone who is keen to follow the ways of mankind’s inner development should make a point of studying it. When the time of acute Japonisme in our culture is over, the stimulation we were able to receive from the artists of the East will not have been completely exhausted or utilized and we are convinced we will harvest the foundational gleanings of this, to be brought to light in the future evolution of art in Europe.” (In die japanische Kunst kann nicht besser eingeführt werden, als dies durch diese Sammlung geschieht, deren Studium sich jeder angelegen sein lassen mag, der den Wegen gerne folgt, welche die geistige Entwicklung der Menschheit geht. Wenn die Zeit des akuten Japanismus in unserem Kunstleben auch vorüber ist, ganz sind die Anregungen noch nicht verarbeitet, welche wir von den Künstlern des Ostens empfangen konnten und wir sind überzeugt davon, daß wir noch eine gründliche Nachlese halten werden, die in der fernen Evolution der Kunst in Europa an den Tag treten wird.)


308 Frieda Fischer wrote in her diary in 1902 about the museum as “a unified picture of all East Asian art,” (ein einheitliches Bild der gesamten ostasiatischen Kunst), its “phases of development” (ihren Entwicklungphasen), and the desire to place it “on an equal footing with European art” (gleichberechtigt neben die europäische zu stellen). The full passage reads as follows: “Alle Gedanken konzentrieren sich auf das Eine, unsere Museumsидеe. Noch scheint es eine Kühnheit, die ostasiatische Kunst als gleichberechtigt neben die europäische zu stellen, noch gibt es in Europa kein Museum eigens für jene Kunst. Unbetretene Pfade sind es, die wir gehen wollen. (...) Wir haben uns einen Überblick geschaffen über das, was Europa an ostasiatischer Kunst besitzt. Wir kennen die Museen und Privatsammlungen in London, Paris, wir studierten solche in Frankfurt, München, Leipzig, Dresden, Wien und Berlin (...). Nirgendes aber hat man versucht, ein einheitliches Bild der gesamten ostasiatischen Kunst zu geben, sie in ihren Entwicklungphasen darzustellen. Das aber ist unser Bestreben. Malerei und Plastik, diese Hauptpfleger
the development of their collection, Frieda poignantly included “Lehr- und Wanderjahre” in her titles. Her word choice references any apprenticeship in the German, Austrian, and Swiss guild system of trades and crafts dating back to the Middle Ages and has added significance when one considers how Adolf chose to be photographed in 1913 amid their museum collection in a lab coat and “Schiebermütze,” a cap associated with the working class (Fig. 3.3). He is presented as a worker-conservator on behalf of East Asian art. Her titles also refer to two quintessential Bildungsromane (a genre of novel exploring moral and psychological formation and education), Goethe’s *Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre* (1795–96) and *Wilhelm Meisters Wanderjahre* (1821). Fischer borrows from these titles, assigning equal importance in German culture to Japanese and Chinese art alongside Goethe, the “metonymic concretization” of German Classicism. Like Schur’s appraisal of the “high” arts of Japan, she claims equal value for the arts of East Asia and links them to European tradition.

---

7) Viennese Café Culture and Ver Sacrum

Describing his early life in Vienna, the writer Stefan Zweig (1881-1942) claimed that his education owed much to the abundant and highly accessible magazines and newspapers of the city’s coffeehouses. Of a younger generation than the Secessionists, his memory reflects the vibrant café culture that fostered modernism and intellectual exchange in the last decades of the nineteenth century. Established in 1881, the café Zum blauen Freihaus was one of the many places for artists and enthusiasts to gather, read, and debate. It was the preferred meeting place of the Haagengesellschaft (1876), whose members included future Secessionists like Adolf Böhm, Josef Engelhart, Alfred Roller, Friedrich König, and Ernst Stöhr. Opened in 1880, Café Sperl was favored by the avant-garde Siebner-klub (1894-95), whose members included Koloman Moser, Josef Hoffmann, and Joseph Maria Olbrich. Although he was not an official participant, Gustav Klimt was a friend and visitor of the Siebener-klub, and many of his lifelong collaborative relationships began in his visits to Café Sperl. The members of both unofficial associations were united in their commitment to new art and in their frustration with current official and academic systems. Their gatherings at Zum blauen Freihaus and Café Sperl laid the grounds for the foundation of the Secession.

European publications on Japanese art steadily increased in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and museum journals, magazines, and newspapers became

310 Stefan Zweig, The World of Yesterday (Lincoln NB: University of Nebraska Press, 1964), 39. “The Viennese coffeehouse is a particular institution which is not comparable to any other in the world. As a matter of fact, it is a sort of democratic club to which admission costs the small price of a cup of coffee. Upon payment of this mite every guest can sit for hours on end, discuss, write, play cards, receive his mail, and, above all, can go through an unlimited number of newspapers and magazines.”
a fertile source for Viennese Japonismus.\textsuperscript{311} “Between 1888 and 1900, there were 2,150 new magazines and newspapers founded in Germany alone, with circulations from 50,000 (Kladderadatsch) to as much as 600,000 (Berliner Illustrierte).”\textsuperscript{312} In the café culture of the Habsburg capital, publications like The Studio (1893-1964), Pan (1895–1915), Jugend (1896–1940), Simplicissimus (1896–1967), and Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration (1897–1935) nurtured international trends.\textsuperscript{313} Notably, The Studio, which was admired by the Siebner-klub and Ludwig Hevesi, frequently featured essays on a range of Japanese arts and crafts — including the Japanese artists relationship to nature and the medium of stencils, which were a significant part of the collection of the Museum for Art and Industry and an important resource for the School of Design.\textsuperscript{314} The British journal also served as a model for the modernist organ of the Vienna Secession, Ver Sacrum (1898-1903).\textsuperscript{315}

The first pages of Ver Sacrum’s inaugural volume announced the Secession’s intentions. Their publication would encourage innovation, nurture the artistic voice of the

\textsuperscript{311} “Between 1888 and 1900, there were 2,150 new magazines and newspapers founded in Germany alone, with circulations from 50,000 (Kladderadatsch) to as much as 600,000 (Berliner Illustrierte).” Ann Taylor Allen, A Playful Judgement: The Social function of Satire & Society in Wilhelme Germany, Kadderatsche and Simplicissimus 1890-1914 (Lexington: University Press of Kentucky, 1984), 3. Non-Viennese publications like Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration (1897-1932), The Studio, and Jugend all published essays on Japanese art. European publications on Japanese art continued to increase in the 1880s and 90s. Geneviève Lacambre, Le Japonisme (Paris: Editions de la Réunion des musées nationaux, 1988), 82- 88.

\textsuperscript{312} Non-Viennese publications like Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration and The Studio published essays on Japanese art. Publications increase in the 1880s and 90s. Ann Taylor Allen, A Playful Judgement, 3.


\textsuperscript{315} Josef Hoffmann, Leo Kainradl, Koloman Moser, Joseph Maria Olbrich, and Joseph Urban were consistent members of the Siebner-Klub, a precursory group to the Secession who gathered at Café Sperl to discuss and debate contemporary artistic concerns. In a letter to Hoffmann from December 1895, Olbrich uses the word “Siebner.” The origins of the group’s name are uncertain. Robert Judson Clark, “Joseph Maria Olbrich and Vienna,” PhD diss., (Princeton University, 1973), 87. Hevesi, “Japanische Farbenholzschnitte,” 437.
age, give respect and freedom to all artists, reach across national and class divides, and create an equality in the arts. From its typography to its illustrations, ornamental borders, and written content, each edition was designed as a unified whole. The Secession’s undertakings and aspirations toward a non-hierarchical harmony of the arts were influenced by Richard Wagner’s concept of the Gesamtkunstwerk (total work of art) and Max Klinger’s artistic and literary engagement with the composer’s ideas of aesthetic transcendence. The group’s 1902 exhibition designed entirely around Klinger’s Beethoven Monument attests to this. However, Ernst Stöhr, who was an amateur

316 Bahr and Max Burckhard, “Weshalb wir eine Zeitschrift herausgeben?” Ver Sacrum vol. 1 (1898), 5-7, 6. “BUT EVERY TIME HAS ITS OWN FEELING. Awakening, stimulating and spreading the artistic feeling of OUR TIME is our goal and is the main reason why we publish a magazine. And we happily extend a hand in alliance to all those who strive towards the same goal, even if by different paths. We want an art without obsequiousness to the foreign (Fremdendienerei), but also without fear of the foreign (Fremdenfurcht) and xenophobia (Fremdenhass). Foreign art should encourage us to reflect on ourselves; we want to acknowledge it, admire it, if it is worth it; We just don't want to imitate them. We want to attract foreign art to Vienna, not just artists, scholars and collectors, in order to form the great mass of art-receptive people, so that the slumbering drive that is in every human breast for beauty and freedom of thought and feeling can be awakened.” (ABER JEDE ZEIT HAT IHR EIGENES EMPFINDEN. Das Kunstempfinden UNSERER ZEIT zu wecken, anzuregen und zu verbreiten ist unser Ziel, ist der Hauptgrund, weshalb wir eine Zeitschrift herausgeben. Und allen, die dem gleichen Ziele entgegenstreben, wenn auch auf anderen Wegen, reichen wir freudig die Hand zum Bunde. Wir wollen eine Kunst ohne Fremdendienerei, aber auch ohne Fremdenfurcht und ohne Fremdenhass. Die ausländische Kunst soll uns anregen, uns auf uns selbst zu besinnen; wir wollen sie anerkennen, bewundern, wenn sie es wert ist; nur nachmachen wollen wir sie nicht. Wir wollen ausländische Kunst nach Wien ziehen, nicht um Künstler, Gelehrte und Sammler allein, um die grosse Masse kunstempfänglicher Menschen zu bilden, damit der schlummernde Trieb geweckt werde, der in jede Menschenbrust gelegt ist, nach Schönheit und Freiheit des Denkens und Fühlens.)


318 The concept of the Gesamtkunstwerk was introduced and developed in Wagner’s writings from 1849 onward. He envisioned a transcendent form of operatic drama in which all the arts were united, based on the model of early Greek tragedy. Richard Wagner, “Art and Revolution,” in The Art-Work of the Future and Other Works, trans. Washington Ashton Ellis (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 1993), 33-35. On Klinger’s creative engagement with Wagner’s ideas, see Kevin C. Karnes, “Max Klinger, the Gesamtkunstwerk, and the Dream of a Third Kingdom,” in A Kingdom not of this World: Wagner, the Arts, and Utopian Visions in fin-de-siècle Vienna (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013), 37-65.

composer and wrote the forward to the *Ver Sacrum* issue dedicated to the Klinger-Beethoven exhibition, was the only Secessionist expressly committed to musical ideas of aesthetic unity. Writing to Gustav Klimt in 1898, Alfred Roller asserted: “every issue of V. S. is a small exhibition, and the whole V.S. is a very large one.” The journal was intended to create a dialogue between each of its parts. Dedicated to the “beauty and freedom of thought and feelings,” the journal was a curated selection designed to forward the development and contemporary practice of the modern arts.

The square format of *Ver Sacrum* reflects the aesthetic influence of Japan, as do many of the journal’s vignettes, borders, and illustrations. Marian Bisanz-Prakken has illuminated the importance of the square motif in Viennese modernism, arguing that “the predominance of the quadrangular shape in Viennese style” indicates “the radically progressive development towards strictly geometric design principles that began after 1900.” She explores various inspirations for this pervasive motif, citing British innovations illustrated in *The Studio*, Walther Crane’s 1900 “Line & Form,” and the geometric designs of Charles Rennie Mackintosh and the Glasgow Group, who were showcased by the Secession in 1900. She also notes the influence of Japanese art. The square motif can be found in Japanese prints, signature crests, fabric stencils, ceramics, metal works, and architecture (Fig. 3.29-30). Additionally, European Japonism played

---

a role in the artistic development of Mackintosh’s circle, drawing the square motif back to the arts of Japan.\textsuperscript{325}

Within \textit{Ver Sacrum}, the impact of Japanese aesthetics can be traced in the stylized representations of nature, use of asymmetry and negative space, scroll-like vertical compositions, bold silhouettes, compressed perspectival space, and the use of Japanese techniques, formats, and motifs like the elemental forces of water and lightning throughout the journal’s pages. Two prolific contributors, Friedrich König and Adolf Böhm, and the journal’s primary designer, Koloman Moser, best demonstrate this creative influence. In examples of each of these artists’ contributions, we can see the various ways Japanese art permeated the Secession’s publication.

The works of painter, illustrator, and designer Friedrich König were frequently featured in \textit{Ver Sacrum}.\textsuperscript{326} A founding member of the Secession, he remained an active member of the organization until his death and forwarded the modernization of the Austrian arts as a teacher at the Art School for Women and Girls.\textsuperscript{327} In \textit{Ver Sacrum} vol. 11 (1898), König’s “A Fresh Wind” frames Rainer Maria Rilke’s essay “About Art.”\textsuperscript{328} König’s landscape and vignette reflect his engagement with Japanese art (Fig. 3.31). The bare treetops of the central image bend to one side indicating the elemental force of the


\textsuperscript{327} On the Kunstschule für Frauen und Mädchen, see Olga Stieglitz and Gerhard Zeillinger, \textit{Der Bildhauer Richard Kauffungen (1854-1942): zwischen Ringstrasse, Künstlerhaus und Frauenkunstschule} (Vienna: Peter Lange, 2008).

\textsuperscript{328} Rainer Maria Rilke, “Über Kunst,” \textit{Ver Sacrum} vol. 11 (1898), 22-23.
wind. In the drawn, decorative frame, walking male figures struggle to hold onto their hats. The graphic minimalism, articulation and implied motion of the trees, and the gestural depiction of a gust of wind tearing at the figure’s clothing are reminiscent of Hokusai and Hiroshige landscapes (Fig. 3.32). In this example, we see references to the arts of Japan framing a poet’s definition of its modern essence.

A graduate of the Academy of the Fine Arts Vienna, Adolf Böhm was a founding member of the Secession, who frequently assisted Koloman Moser with the group’s exhibitions and catalogues. As a teacher at the School of Design from 1910 to 1925, he influenced younger artists and their graphic approach to the natural world. His interest in Japanese art can be seen in his delicate, organic lines, charged negative space, and high contrast compositions. Fig. 3.33 shows one of Böhm’s illustration for Ernst Stöhr’s “About Art, Criticism, and Interpretation” published in Ver Sacrum vol. 7 (1901). Böhm’s landscapes and border designs surround and intersect Stöhr’s essay. Fig. 3.33 is a full-page landscape of a cloud contour rising to fill a barren prospect. Both the uppermost regions of the sky and the lowest regions of the land are rendered as bold black bands. In his essay, Stöhr defines art as an expression of “vitality” that “directly intervenes on life.” Fig. 3.33 is one such pause, as the depicted elemental forces of the landscape and the full-page illustration creates an intermission in the text. The dramatic simplicity of the composition resembles Hokusai’s Manga (Fig. 3.34), the sketchbook volumes of

331 Ibid.
“everything Hokusai had seen or that his mind had conceived.”332 In this example, there is a blending of Stöhr’s conception of art as a vital expression of nature, the illustrated landscapes, and Böhm’s visual references to the arts of Japan.

Koloman Moser was deeply engaged in the artistic life of Vienna and had close ties to creative circles in Munich and Paris. His collaborative fellowship with Gustav Klimt and Josef Hoffmann began around 1895, when the young artist became involved in Martin Gerlach’s modern allegorical project Allegorien, Neue Folge and joined the Siebenerklub. A founding member of the Secession and Wiener Werkstätte, he began teaching at the School of Design in 1899, where he, alongside Hoffmann, encouraged his students to draw from Japanese stencils. At this time the arts and crafts school shared a building with the museum, making the institution’s collection easily accessible. He was also chosen as the designer of the Secession’s sixth exhibition of the Fischer collection; this was perhaps due to his clear and lengthy artistic engagement with Japan. In addition to reproducing Japanese stencils (Fig. 3.35), he studied and transformed Japanese ornament in the pages of Ver Sacrum.

One significant example is the title page of Ernst Schur’s “The Spirit of Japanese Art” in the fourth volume of Ver Sacrum, 1899 (Fig. 3.36). Moser’s patterns based on Japanese design are included as borders and illustrations throughout the essay and volume (Fig. 3.37). In Fig. 3.36, we can see the merging of Schur’s ideas, Moser’s interpretation of Japanese art, and the visual elements of typography, illustration, and page layout designed by Moser, Alfred Roller, Friedrich König, and Joseph Maria

Olbrich. In figure 3.36, the bold black and white pattern of salmon swimming upstream forms a column on the left side of the text. The high contrast and repetitive rhythm of the pattern resemble Japanese textile stencils (Fig. 3.38). The organic lines of the river flow out of the rectangular illustration into the large “D” of the essay’s title. In turn, the drawn line tendrils out of the “D” to form the decorative leaf-like border of the page. The type becomes part of the decorative vignette. Reproductions of Japanese art were included in volumes of *Ver Sacrum*.\(^{333}\) Here, a Secessionist’s interpretation represents the “spirit of Japanese art,” which Schur declared the best model for modern Viennese art. It is a visual blending that mirrors the amalgamate nature of Viennese Japonismus.\(^{334}\) In the *Ver Sacrum* contributions of König, Böhm, and Moser, we see a growing integration that is itself an imaginative amalgamation, a method or process that is not a binary dynamic, but in fact, exponential.

In this chapter, I emphasize the complexity of this meeting of cultures and its multifaceted expression in the visual arts of Vienna. Beyond substantial public and private collections and curated exhibitions of Japanese art, widely varied depictions of “Japan” became part of the visual culture of the Habsburg capital in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Viennese artists encountered a wide range of artworks and complicated and conflicting representations and interpretations of Japanese culture. Three prevalent ideas emerged from these amalgamated sources: the view of Japanese craftsmanship as preserved, the conception of Japanese ornament as fundamentally drawn from nature, and the perception of Japanese art as a path toward modern aesthetic

\(^{333}\) For Japanese patterns printed in the journal, see *Ver Sacrum* vol. 9 (1899), 8-21.
\(^{334}\) Schur, “Der Geist der japanischen Kunst,” 11.
revitalization. The formation of these ideas was tied to the fact that the primary stages for the promotion of Japanese art and artifacts in the Habsburg capital were also significant to the development of Viennese visual modernism. As will be discussed in the following chapter, the layers of exoticism, primitivism, Orientalism, translation, mistranslation, and genuine encounter in Viennese Japonismus shaped the visual adoptions and adaptations of Japanese aesthetics by the modern artists of Vienna. The components of Viennese Japonismus were an inseparable alloy, taken metaphorically a new cultural alloy. Viennese Japonismus thus became an active, dynamic paradigm extending to the definition and process of making art.
Chapter Four: Adoption and Adaptation in Viennese Japonismus

Building on the understanding of Viennese Japonismus as an amalgamation, in this chapter I examine adoptions and adaptations of Japanese aesthetic principles in Viennese visual modernism. This pervasive influence can be seen in artistic reevaluations of representation and the natural world, the medium of woodblock printing, and the relationship between ornament and craftsmanship. Beginning with definitions of “adoption” and “adaptation,” this analysis focuses on two examples: Emil Orlik and Josef Hoffmann. Orlik’s works are considered for their illustration of the amalgamated influence of Viennese Japonismus. He was one of the few Secessionists who traveled to Japan to study Japanese methods of artistic production and technical processes first-hand and became known in Viennese circles as the “wandering apostle of modern woodcut.”

Hoffmann is studied as Klimt’s close friend, frequent collaborator, and the primary designer of the Palais Stoclet (1905-11), the setting of Klimt’s frieze addressed in Chapter Six. Through Japanese models, Hoffmann believed that artists could learn “to see form itself” and distill this into the essential “element of line.” His emulation of Japanese art illustrates a visual language and approach to modernism that he shared with Klimt. The chapter concludes with a close study of Klimt’s personal library and the

characterization of Japanese art therein. Klimt owned diverse volumes and had standing subscriptions with booksellers, suggesting both a serious commitment and that his library grew with his interests.\(^{337}\) Although documentation is incomplete, the known contents of his library reveal the breadth of his intellectual endeavors, his engagement with the history of art, and an interpretative lens to his encounter with Japanese aesthetics. Examining Klimt’s library, one uncovers conceptions of Japanese art that inspired Viennese adoptions and adaptations. In essence, this consideration offers one more potential answer to the question of what Klimt and his contemporaries believed they were emulating in the arts of Japan. Additionally, within the volumes of Klimt’s library, there are evident connections between historians, museum directors, and artists that establish the existence of a culture of shared or at least overlapping concepts and searches for new models in Japanese art and aesthetics that extended far beyond Vienna.

1) Adoption and Adaptation

“Adoption” and “adaptation” have specific meanings and refer to different practices within and outside of the fields of art and art history, cultural and literary theory, and post-colonial, translation, and adaptation studies. Here, I use the term “adoption” in a layered sense as an assumption of a particular method, technique, or visual motif and as an accepting or starting of something new. It is a conscious, artistic selection. I use “adaptation” to refer to a refashioning in part or whole of an artistic work. Expressive of

\(^{337}\) For partial documentation of Klimt’s books and subscriptions in 1917, see Christian M. Nebehay, *Gustav Klimt: Dokumentation* (Vienna: Nebehay, 1969), 52-53. In correspondence, Dagmar Diernberger at the Belvedere Research Center, Vienna, has informed me that Buchhandlung Artaria might have purchase slips in their business files that could add to the documentation on Klimt’s library.
admiration of the informing source, an adaptation is a translation that reimagines the original while attempting to honor and re-create the essence of the model. These intertwined definitions entail what Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel names “resemanticization;” in that, the change of cultural framework inevitably transforms and recontextualizes the original.” Implicitly and at times explicitly, adoptions and adaptations are palimpsests. They bear the traces of their source and history. In visual examples that will be discussed in greater detail throughout this dissertation, Orlík’s *The Japanese Printer* adopts the approach and technique of Japanese woodblock prints (Fig. 4.1); Klimt’s *Nuda Veritas*, *The Bride*, and Stoclet Frieze adapt Japanese ornament into the mediums of drawing, painting, and mosaic (Fig. 4.2); and Hoffmann’s pattern adopts composition and imagery while adapting the decorative function and scale of the original design (Fig. 4.3). As part of the visual eclecticism of Viennese modernism, Japonist adoptions and adaptations raise the question of indiscriminate imitation versus appreciative invention: Did the artists unconsciously gather sources without clarity of purpose, or was there a conscious selection and unifying system of approach?

Derived from the Greek verb eklegein/eklegesthai (to choose or select), eclecticism has both positive and pejorative connotations in philosophy and the history of art. In the late nineteenth-century, Viennese reformers like Rudolf Eitelberger feared

---

338 “Resemanticization can come about with the voluntary or forced migrations of artists or the transfer of objects, texts, images, motifs, or styles. Circulation can occur between cultural or linguistic systems, between artistic disciplines, between mediums (from painting to engraving or photography, for example and even, alongside geographical transfers, between time periods.” Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel, “Circulation and Resemanticization: An Aporetic Palimpsest,” *Artl@t’s Bulletin* vol. 6 iss. 2 (2012), 4-17, 4.
that aims of cosmopolitanism were being compromised by eclecticism, in which diverse artistic sources were drawn together but lacked wholeness, cohesion, or a “total conception of art.” The museum director’s view of eclecticism as an incoherent accumulation rather than a conscious selection and unification reflects the established views of his moment and are deeply entrenched in the discipline of the history of art. However, this negative view was not shared by Viennese Secessionists like Klimt, who matured artistically amid historicism, encouraged internationalism, and united a multitude of sources in their pursuit of visual modernism. Contemporary scholarship has reclaimed the term along with “bricolage,” “assemblage,” and “hybridity” to theorize the mixing of cultures, the power dynamics implicit in cultural exchange, and the art historical problems of objects in translation. Holly Shaffer defines intercultural eclecticism as a creative process in which the arts of multiple, distinct traditions intersect and converge creating something new while maintaining cultural autonomy. Shaffer’s reclamation of eclecticism offers a productive foundation for considering Viennese


341 “Just as eclectics are regarded only as copyists from philosophers of particular schools of thought and have produced little or nothing original, so in art, if one chose the same path, nothing whole, distinctive, or harmonious was to be expected.” Johann Joachim Winckelmann, History of the Art of Antiquity, trans. Alex Potts (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2006), 238.


Japonismus. It is a recuperative definition that allows for both the positive connotations of “adaption” and “adoption” as offered here, while acknowledging the related issues of artistic and interpretative authority, the ethics of creative expression, and problems of cultural specificity and identity. This is how the terms are applied in the examples that follow.

2) Emil Orlik and the Art of Japan

In his series *The Painter, The Woodcutter, and The Printer*, we see how Emil Orlik, who traveled to Japan and studied with Japanese craftsmen, adopted and adapted the unique approach and technique of Japanese woodblock prints (Fig. 4.4-6). Reminiscent of Japanese portraits of scholars and the interior views, subject matter, and triptych format of ukiyo-e prints like Harunobu’s *Poetess Murasaki* and Utamaro’s and Kunisada’s triptychs depicting the printing process (Fig. 4.7-4.8), Orlik’s series is an example of the characteristic layering of Viennese Japonismus. His utilization of Japanese printing techniques was a very intentional choice, and his adaptation of compositional elements and subject matter from Japanese sources transformed his prints creating new and distinct works of art. As described by the art historian Julius Leisching (1865-1933), Orlik intended to honor the Japanese as “great connoisseurs of nature” and “masterful technicians” and to emulate “the magic of a foreign, highly refined culture.”

prefaces this characterization by claiming that Orlik “became Japanese” in his year of travel, reflecting the mixture of genuine appreciation and naivety in terms of cultural specificity and identity in early twentieth-century perceptions of foreign art and Japonismus in central Europe.

Born into the German-speaking Jewish community of Prague, Orlik forged his artistic career in his birthplace as well as in Munich, Vienna, and Berlin. His background is typical of the multinational, multiethnic peoples of the Habsburg Empire. Inspired since childhood to pursue the arts, he developed an early interest in printmaking during his studies in Munich and first experimented with woodblock printing alongside his friend and fellow artist Bernhard Pankok (1872-1943) between 1896 and 1899. During his extensive travels in 1898, he met the Japonist painter James Abbott McNeill Whistler and the prominent East Asian and Art Nouveau dealer Siegfried Bing. Later, in February of 1900, he was given a “foretaste” of what it would be like to visit Japan in the form of the sixth exhibition of the Vienna Secession featuring the Japanese collection of

345 In his autobiographical essay, Orlik writes: “Even as a boy I knew no other wish than to become a painter,” (Schon als Knabe kannte ich keinen anderen Wunsch, als Maler zu werden.” Emil Orlik, “Aus meinem Leben,” in Kleine Aufsätze (Berlin: Propyläen, 1924), 52-80, 52. His artistic training in Munich included studies at the private painting school of Heinrich Knirrs, the engraving school of Johann Leonhard Raab, and three semesters at the Münchner Akademie. Orlik describes his first attempts at woodblock printing in “Kleine Holzschnitte.” Ibid., “Kleine Holzschnitte,” in Kleine Aufsätze, 20-22.

Adolf and Frieda Fischer. All of these early endeavors and encounters inspired Orlik to travel to Japan in March of 1900 to study Japanese artistic methods and techniques first-hand and, most importantly, learn the “simple and summary language of the woodcut.”

Julius Leisching located the greatest thread of continuity in Orlik’s artistic production in his “striving for simplicity,” the “conscious simplicity of line” he modeled after the arts of Japan. Orlik’s almost yearlong stay in the eastern country can be traced in his correspondence and essays as well as in his many drawings, watercolors, pastels, engravings, and woodblock prints depicting Japan and its peoples. He studied printmaking in Tokyo and Kyoto, and traveled extensively in search of Japanese culture untouched by industrialization, visiting Nikkō, Numata, Ikaho, Aizu-Wakamatsu, Tsugawa (Niigata), Yokohama, Kamakura, Hakone, Enoshima, Shizuoka, Nagoya, Nara, Osaka, Kobe, and Lake Biwa. During his stay, he predominately remained in Tokyo and Kyoto, where he met many individuals engaged in the changing culture of the Meiji.


Leisching, “Emil Orlik,” 25. Leisching writes of Orlik’s “striving for simplicity” (Streben nach Einfachheit) and “the conscious simplicity of line” (die bewusste Schlichtheit des Striches). The whole passage reads as follows: “Dieses Streben nach Einfachheit, nach einheitlicher grosser Wirkung durch Hinweglassung aller kleinkligen und nichtssagenden Einzelheiten musste in Japan um so lebhafter gefördert werden, als es, wie man sieht, in der Eigenart des Künstlers tiefinnerlich begründet ist. Die gewollte Einfachheit der Flächenwirkung in der Radierung fand im Holzschnitt seine naheliegende Ergänzung durch die bewusste Schlichtheit des Striches.”

Orlik stayed in Japan for 10 months. His last letter from Tokyo is dated February 22, 1901. Setsuko Kuwabara, Emil Orlik und Japan (Frankfurt: Haag und Herchen, 1987), 78.
Each of these encounters deepened his experience and his knowledge about the foreign country and its artistic traditions.

From Orlik’s letters and postcards to his mentor, the Dresden museum director Max Lehrs (1855-1938), we know that he met the American scholar Ernest Fenollosa, who was a foreign consultant and professor at Tokyo Imperial University and a foundational director of the Tokyo School of Fine Arts (f. 1887). He was also introduced to Fenollosa’s mentee and collaborator Okakura Kakuzō, who was an important proponent for the preservation, revitalization, and continuation of Japan’s traditional arts. In his other explorations, Orlik met Baron Kanda Naibu (1860-1923), a professor of English Literature at the University of Tokyo who had an extensive private collection of Japanese art, and Sigisbert Chrétien Bosch Reitz (1860-1938), a Dutch painter and collector who later became the first curator for East Asian art at the Metropolitan Museum in New York.

Orlik also encountered the writer and translator Lafcadio Hearn (1850-1904), whose books on Japanese folklore the artist would begin to illustrate in 1905 (Fig. 4.9-10). Referred to in Japanese language literature “as the ‘best’


352 For a comprehensive account of Orlik’s correspondence from Japan see, Kuwabara, Emil Orlik und Japan. On his relationship with Lehrs, the longtime director of the Kupferstich-Kabinett, see. Orlik’s meeting with Fenollosa is of particular importance, as Fenollosa’s history of Japanese and Chinese art is one of the documented books in Klimt’s personal library.

353 Also known as Okakura Tenshin (1862-1913), Okakura Kakuzō is most well-known for his 1904 The Awakening of Japan and 1906 Book of Tea. The name Tenshin was popularized posthumously and is tied to the author’s associations with Pan-Asianism and the ultra-nationalism of the Great East Asia War. As other scholars focused on his role as an art historian and proponent of the traditional arts in the Meiji Era (1868-1912), I refer to him as Okakura Kakuzō. Kinoshita Nagahiro, “Okakura Kakuzō as a Historian of Art,” Review of Japanese Culture and Society vol. 24 (2012), 26–38.

354 On Reitz, see Christoph Otterbeck, Europa verlassen: Künstlerreisen am Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 2007).
foreign interpreter of Japan,” Hearn was an American immigrant who became a Japanese citizen under the name Koizumi Yakumo. His translations of Japanese folktales and his essays on Japanese culture were popular in the United States and Europe, as indicated in the translation of his works into German with a forward by the Viennese poet and dramatist Hugo von Hofmannsthal and illustrations by Orlik.\(^{355}\) Orlik’s travel correspondence only names one of his Japanese instructors, Kanō Tomonobu (1843-1912), whom Orlik chose to portray in his depiction of the painters, woodcutters, and printers of Japan.\(^{356}\) One of the last painters of the centuries-long tradition of the Kanō school, Tomonobu was a professor at the Tokyo School of Fine Arts and was part of the circle of Fenollosa and Okakura.\(^{357}\) Orlik’s evaluation of Japanese traditional arts reflect the impact of these encounters.\(^{358}\)

In his correspondence and essays, he frequently lamented the precarious position of the eastern country’s traditions and the dangers posed by foreign influences, modernization, and industrialization. In this, he agreed with Okakura and Fenollosa, who


\(^{356}\) Orlik wrote about learning in the workshops of Japanese woodcutters and printers. See, Orlik, “Aus Meinem Leben,” 53. Orlik also wrote about his visit to wood engravers and graphic designers in various letters and postcards. Unfortunately, the names of the artists who taught Orlik are not mentioned in his correspondence. On Orlik’s study of Japanese painting under Kanō Tomonobu and this painter’s courses for foreigners, see Ahrens, “Brückenschlag nach Japan,” 18.


\(^{358}\) Orlik exhibited some of his works in the fifth exhibition of the art association Hakuba-kai (1896-1911) in September 1900. However, he did not mention this in his correspondence as he most likely viewed the artists of this group as too westernized. Kuwabara, Emil Orlik und Japan, 83. Felice Fischer, Ink and Gold: Art of the Kano (Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2015). Fig. E-13 of this catalogue is a Screen from the Bryn Mawr collection that was restored through a grant from The Sumitomo Foundation.
feared that Western-style painting would overtake and eventually supplant the traditional arts of Japan. Orlik echoed these sentiments writing:

European influence has made a breach in Japanese art that is leading it to ruin. The European aniline dyes with their false shine helped accelerate the decline in taste as early as the middle of the century. Even some of Hiroshige’s last sheets are coarse in their color effect. Kunisada and his school give the remainder to color. In cutting itself, art has given way to artistry. The attempt is not to reproduce the character of the simple calligraphic woodcut line, but rather the brush stroke with its thousand coincidences.\(^{359}\)

In 1912, Orlik made a second trip to Japan via Egypt and China. Scholars have only found one extant postcard written by the artist from Tokyo during this later visit in which he expressed his deep disappointment with the further modernization of the eastern country.\(^{360}\)

When Orlik first traveled to Japan, woodblock printing was in a moment of transition. The influx of printing technologies like lithography and photography and the cultural shifts of the last decades of the Edo Period had brought about a decline in the more than two-and-a-half-century long tradition of ukiyo-e. Prints were still produced by artists like Toyohara Kunichika (1835-1900), Tsukioka Yoshitoshi (1839-1893), and Kobayashi Kiyochika (1847-1915). However, ukiyo-e was not made as abundantly in the


\(^{360}\) Mastalski, “Emil Orlik,” 37.
Meiji era as it was in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. European artists and collectors showed little interest in these contemporary works. This is most likely due to the fact that later prints utilized “western stylistic techniques” and depicted the changes of the Meiji era, namely, “contact with foreigners, current events, new inventions, technical developments and fashions that were rapidly changing the face” of Japan. In 1900, revivalist movements like shin hanga (new prints) and sōsaku-hanga (creative prints) were already beginning to foment when Orlik arrived in search of the “true Japanese color woodcut.” What he depicts in his print series, is the division of labor and joint effort between designing artist, carver, and printer that was a defining feature of full-color ukiyo-e prints, nishiki-e (brocade prints), which reached their apex in the 1790s. From papermakers to block carvers and printers, the highly structured collaborative production process of these works allowed for the prolific creation and creativity of the Edo period as well as the technical perfection and intricacy that make these prints truly remarkable within the history of art.


363 The first full-color print by Suzuki Harunobu (1725-1770) dates to 1765. The collaborative printing process of these works emerged out of traditional printing methods dating back to the 8th century. On the apex of nishiki-e (brocade prints), see Kanada, *Color Woodblock Printmaking*, 11-16.
In Orlik’s series, which he published as a lithographic triptych in *Die Graphischen Künste* in 1902 (Fig. 4.11), we see the three primary steps of the Japanese printing process. The first print shows the artist designing the image. Kanō Tomonobu, who is portrayed here, never made prints and was not an ukiyo-e artist. However, what was captured in Japanese color woodcuts, according to Orlik, was the calligraphic line of the painter. His depiction of Tomonobu as the designer of prints significantly ties printmaking and its aesthetics to the traditional arts of Japan and Orlik’s own experience learning from Japanese artists and artisans. In the second print of the series, we see an unnamed artisan using knives and chisels to carve the painter’s design into a wood panel. The last image shows an anonymous printer using a bamboo baren, or rubbing pad, to transfer delicate ink from the block to the page.

Orlik was interested in all aspects of Japanese color printmaking from the hard cherry wood and resilient mulberry paper used to achieve the highest level of detail to the bamboo barens that allowed for printing without the use of a press. However, the aspect that most inspired him was their “level of technical perfection” and refined simplicity. In his view, these works captured the materiality of the artist’s hand, the calligraphic line of the “handwritten” that was at risk in the age of mechanical reproduction. The poet Rainer Maria Rilke (1875-1926), a close friend of Orlik, began his monograph on the sculptor Rodin with the following quotation: “*Writers work through words—Sculptors through matter*”—Pomponius Gauricus in his essay, “De

365 Ibid.
Sculptura” (about 1504). To sculpt is to work with matter, shape matter, a description that brings to the imagination the sculptor’s hands deeply encrusted with wet clay, terracotta earth filling every fold and crease of the skin. Orlik’s reflections on the visual arts place similar emphasis on the hands and the materiality of craftsmanship. For Orlik the calligraphic line, the essence of the “handwritten,” is the matter with which the artist works. It is the trace of the hand, the mark of the artist untouched by machines, that is quintessential to craftsmanship. This interpretation cuts through barriers of time and place, emphasizing the common element of artistic production that crosses cultural divides, the human hand. In his description of Japanese color woodcuts, he argues that the fundamental lifeblood of these works, their “pure Japanese style,” is their “fraktur,” a description which again emphasizes the artist’s mark. Here, Orlik is referring to the decorative calligraphic style (Fraktur/Fracture) named after the German typeface that emerged in the late fifteenth century and was widely used in books, newspapers, and posters into the early twentieth century. By adopting Japanese techniques of printmaking and adapting compositional and aesthetic principles from the arts of Japan, he sought to emulate this sensitivity to the handwritten and preserve this “style of simplicity.”

366 Rainer Maria Rilke, Auguste Rodin, trans. Daniel Slater and William H. Gass (New York: Archipelago Books, 2004), 2. In his early years in Munich, Orlik became friends with Rilke. Rilke focuses intensely on hands in his monograph on Rodin, mentioning the hand of the artist and his rendering of this part of the human anatomy over 50 times in his essay. He ties the idea of the artist’s hand, its materiality, and its physical connection to sculpture to the essence of craft. “[Rodin’s] art was not built upon a great idea, but upon a minute, conscientious realization, upon the attainable, upon a craft.” For Rilke’s view of Orlik, see Ibid., “Ein Prager Künstler,” in Ver Sacrum vol. 7 (1900), 101-114.


368 Orlik, “Aus einem Brief, Tokio, Juni 1900,” Deutsche Arbeit: Monatschrift für das geistige Leben der Deutschen in Böhmen (1902-03), 61-63, 63. “So it happens that the painter in the true Japanese style never creates his picture directly from nature. Their ideal lies in the representation of the essential. The simpler the means, the greater the artist's concentration on the work, and the more esteemed the value. This
Significantly, Orlik felt that Japanese techniques moved beyond the model of nature harnessing an artistic essence.

Still enthusiastic about his experiences upon his return in April of 1901, Orlik became an important advocate of Japanese art in central and German-speaking Europe, contributing to the amalgamated layers of Viennese Japonismus. He discussed his experience and the art of Japan in numerous essays and lectures, and his works depicting the eastern country were printed in Ver Sacrum and shown in exhibitions in Prague, Brno (Brünn), Vienna, Dresden, and Frankfurt, as were many of the ukiyo-e prints he collected during his travels. His understanding of Japanese art and the calligraphic line relates to nineteenth-century views of craftsmanship as a cross-cultural foundation of artistic revival and the ambitions of his contemporaries to establish a transnational, universal basis for visual modernism, as examined in Chapter Two.

3) Josef Hoffmann and “Form Itself”

Hoffmann was among Klimt’s closest friends and collaborators. In addition to designing his colleague’s studio, he created numerous frames for the painter, which was far from inconsequential to the two men united in “the conviction that no realm of human technique gave rise to style: the style of simplicity.” (So kommt es, dass der Maler echt japanischen Stils niemals sein Bild direkt nach der Natur fertigt. In der Darstellung des Wesentlichen liegt ihr Ideal. Je einfacher die Mittel, je grösser die Konzentration des Künstlers bei der Arbeit, un so geschätzter ist das Wert. “Stil der Einfachheit.” Diese Technik hat zum Stil geführt: zum Stil der Einfachheit.)

369 For illustrations of Orlik’s depictions of Japan in Ver Sacrum, see Ver Sacrum vol. 19 (1902), 278-83. Part of Orlik’s collection was included in an exhibition in 1902, which traveled to Brno and Prague after its premiere in Dresden and Berlin. See, “Anmerkungen über den Farbenholzschnitt in Japan 1900,” Die Graphischen Künste vol. 25 (1902), 3.

370 On their collaborative relationship, see Agnes Husslein-Arco, Alfred Weidinger, and Jeanne Haunschild, Gustav Klimt, Josef Hoffmann: Pioneers of Modernism (Munich: Prestel, 2011).
life is too insignificant and small to offer room for artistic efforts.” In his personal papers and writings for public presentations he voiced the aims and concerns of his artistic community. In 1897, the founding year of the Vienna Secession, he published an essay in The Architect in which he expressed many of his future precepts. The arts and crafts of the contemporary moment needed to embrace examples of folk art, “right in [their] smooth simplicity, free from artificial excess with bad decorations” that spoke “for everyone an open, intelligent language.” This universal basis for modern design could only be achieved by looking to the natural world and distilling a visual language united with the artist’s surroundings. Hoffmann was not advocating for mere copying or imitation, as he explicitly states that foreign architecture does not belong in “our landscape.” Rather, in the model of the folk arts, he saw a path to emulate. Like Orlik’s conception of an essential, cross-cultural calligraphic line, Hoffmann was seeking an underlying aesthetic essence that could be molded and harmonized with the artist’s

---

374 Ibid. “Nature, especially ours, is already rich in design, variety in tree species, color and shapes, so that the simple straight or understated curved lines of our buildings will happily contrast with it. But one can never describe those many-acute, many-foggy, sham architectures as fitting our landscape.” (Die Natur, namentlich unsere, ist ohnehin reich an Gestaltung, Mannigfaltigkeit in den Baumgattungen, an Farbe und Formen, so dass die einfachen geraden oder dezent gekrümmten Linien unserer Bauten mit derselben glücklich contrastieren werden. Nie aber kann man jene vielspitzigen, vielnebeligen, Schwindelarchitekturen als zu unserer Landschaft passend bezeichnen.)
“regional living conditions and the surrounding area.” In subsequent years, he cultivated this idea in his modern curriculum at the School of Design.

In 1899, the vocal advocate of Viennese visual modernism Ludwig Hevesi wrote that Hoffmann was teaching fundamental principles “in the Japanese style.” Hoffmann believed that “the modern practice of art” required and new foundation. Previous approaches had led students to focus on the image, getting lost in the details of representation, rather than appropriately distilling ornament. “Form itself” could not be achieved through the “imitation” of nature; rather the eye and hand needed to be trained in stylization, “the impulse of construction,” and “the elemental line.” To achieve this, Hoffmann guided his students to the abundant collection of Japanese stencils at the Museum for Art and Industry. As he expressed in 1897, Hoffmann was not advocating for duplication of either nature or Japanese examples. He was encouraging his students to emulate the Japanese approach to ornament. He guided his students to stencils where design was removed from the distractions of the representational source of nature and decorative application. Hoffmann studied these models alongside his students, and his patterns visually articulate what he wanted his students to accomplish.

375 Ibid.
377 Ibid.
378 Ibid.
379 Ibid.
Hoffmann’s pattern in figure 4.12 adopts the approach of Japanese stencils while adapting specific design elements. In side-by-side comparisons (Fig. 4.13a-b-4.16), we can see models for figure 4.12, but there is no replication of an entire design. Figure 4.13 shows Hoffmann’s adaptation of the visual rhythm created by alternating horizontal and vertical rectangles and combined organic and geometric elements. Figure 4.14 illustrates his adaptations of specific designs like the lined triangles and variegated repetition. Similar relationships can be seen in figure 4.15 in the use of cross-hatching and diagonals. In figure 4.16, we see Hoffmann’s adoption of nestled layers and his juxtaposition of curvilinear and rigid patterns. He emulates the broader structure of Japanese stencils while altering medium, composition, and function and combining these elements into an original work.

Analogous examples can be found in Hoffmann’s sketches and designs (Fig. 4.17-18). His engagement with Japanese sources was one he shared with his fellow instructor at the School of Design Koloman Moser and close collaborators, as can be seen in the paired illustrations of the artists’ signatures for the Secession’s 1902 Beethoven-Klinger exhibition and Japanese stencils, and the monograms of the Wiener Werkstätte and Japanese crests (Fig. 4.19-20). This mutual investment is particularly visible in the works of Klimt, as both he and Hoffmann adapted and repeated specific patterns from Japanese art (Fig. 4.21-23). How this shared visual language is uniquely manifested in Klimt’s work will be addressed in Chapter Six.

---

380 Peter Pantzer and Johannes Wieninger, *Verborgene Impressionen* (Vienna: Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst, 1990), 336
4) Klimt as a Reader

Contrary to the view of Klimt as a sensualist whose works were inspired by physical rather than intellectual pursuits, in the recollections of his inner circle, we see the importance that books played in his life. Egon Schiele felt that his mentor’s studio, including his extensive library and collection, should be preserved for the insight they offered into his methods and ambitions. In her memoirs, the composer, musician, and socialite Alma Mahler (1879-1964) wrote that although his education and background were humble, he always carried around Goethe’s Faust and Dante’s Divine Comedy, two exemplary models for allegory in poetry. As I will demonstrate in Chapter Five, allegory played an important role in Klimt’s approach to visual modernism, which makes this biographical detail more striking. Similarly, Friederike Maria Beer (1891-1980) recalled him reciting Dante and Petrarch while she sat for her portrait. His friend Franz Servaes (1862-1947) named the writings of Poe, Hebbel, Baudelaire, and Wilde as sources of the artist’s inspiration. In his recollections of visiting Klimt’s studio during the years that he was working on the Faculty Paintings, the author Ludwig Abels (1867-1937) wrote that he found the artist surrounded by books spread out for his

381 In his letter “Klimt’s Generosity of Spirit was Genuine,” Schiele describes the number of Japanese and Chinese art objects in Klimt’s last studio as well as the entire house as a work of art that should be preserved. This letter is quoted in Ida Foges, “Klimt: Persönliche Erinnerungen Egon Schieles,” Neues Wiener Journal, March 4, 1918, 3. “Nichts sollte weggenommen werden – denn das Gefüge des Klimt Hauses ist ein Ganzes, ist selbst ein Kunstwerk, welches nicht zerstört werden dürfte. Auch die unfertigen Bilder, Pinsel, Maltisch und Palette sollten unberührt bleiben und als Klimt-Museum für die wenigen, die Freude und Liebe für die Kunst haben, zugänglich sein.”


383 Nebehay, Dokumentation, 28, 53.

In defense of these same paintings, the art historian Franz Wickhoff (1853-1909) praised *Philosophy* arguing that it gave “the idea of scholarship and learning” rare homage. In fact, his training at the School of Design and early rise to fame as a Ringstrasse painter necessitated a particular skill set and dedication to mining sources and innovating from historical models. He was mentored by and in partnership with individuals who believed in the necessity of artistic renewal in the modern era and felt that the future of craft and culture lay in the revival of the best models of the past. He needed to study art history to achieve this aim. In contrast to the accounts of his friends and patrons, the public view of Klimt was dominated by the image of him as a bohemian and “true Oriental.” It is possible that the artist performed this clichéd persona, particularly in the years of the notorious Faculty Painting scandal, to shield his endeavors.

---


386 Wickhoff’s lecture in defense of Klimt entitled “What is Ugly?” given at the Philosophical Society of Vienna is cited in Nebehay, *Dokumentation*, 52.


388 For a contemporary description, see Anton Faistauer, *Neue Malerei in Österreich: Betrachtungen eines Malers* (Zurich: Amalthea-Verlag, 1923), 13. “Klimt's personality corresponded to his work. He was of robust health, his spirit was childishly cheerful, nothing challenged him. He was sociable, surrounded by a circle of admirers, devoted to the enjoyment of life. He loved the well-being and peace and quiet like a true Oriental, looked the same, was benevolent and generous, lived as a bachelor the life of a happy Viennese fellow with wine, women, singing and games.” (Die Persönlichkeit Klimts entsprach seinem Werke. Er war von robuster Gesundheit, sein Gemüt war kindhaft heiter, nichts focht ihn an. Er war gesellig, von einem Kreis von Bewunderern umstellt, dem Lebensgenuss ergeben. Er liebte das Wohlleben und die Ruhe wie ein echter Oriental, sah auch so aus, war wohlwollend und freigebig, lebte als Junggeselle das Leben des Wiener fröhlichen Gesellen mit Wein, Weib, Gesang und Spiel.) Klimt’s biographer Christian M. Nebehay (1909-2003), who met the artist as a child, writes that Klimt himself described one of his subjects stating that “The girl has a body whose behind is more beautiful and intelligent than many others' faces.” (Das Mädel hat einen Körper, von dem der Hintern schöner und intelligenter ist, als das Gesicht bei vielen anderen.) Nebehay, *Gustav Klimt: Dokumentation*, 428. For reflections on these sensual descriptions of Klimt’s art, see Gottfried Fliedl, *Gustav Klimt 1862-1918: The World in Female Form* (Cologne: Taschen, 1991), 121; and Petra Renneke, *Körper, Eros, Tod: Gustav Klimt im Kontext der Ästhetik des Fin de Siècle* (Essen: Die Blaue Eule, 1995), 51.
from public ridicule, placing himself as a decadent rather than his works on trial. In any case, this image of Klimt and the sensuality of his art have occluded the depth and complexity of his endeavors.

5) From Klimt’s Library

Klimt’s library was an active pursuit. He had to be aware of recent publications and locate the volumes that he purchased, a task that is easily underestimated from the vantage point of the twenty-first century. The titles in his library reflect his awareness of the cultural dialogue of his time and many were serious art historical undertakings. He also never stopped expanding his collection.

Klimt owned at least six titles on the arts of Japan. Most likely upon the recommendation of Adolf Fischer, the artist purchased a first edition of Woldemar von Seidlitz’s 1897 *A History of Japanese Colour-prints*. In 1906, he subscribed to Piper Verlag for a privately published portfolio of Japanese erotica (shunga) with illustrations by well-known ukiyo-e artists like Hishikawa Moronobu (1618-1694), Suzuki Harunobu (1725-1770), and Kitagawa Utamaro. He also owned the auction catalog *Estampes Livres illustres du Japon* (1902), Oskar Münsterberg’s *Japanese Art History* (1904), Siegfried Bing’s *Artistic Japan* (1888–1891), and Ernest Fenollosa’s *Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Art* (1913). Given the way Klimt wrote in his sketchbooks and drew in his notebooks (Fig. 4.24), I researched potential repositories for his volumes hoping to discover any notations that he made during his private study. Klimt’s copies of

Münsterberg’s *Japanese Art History* and Fenollosa’s *Epochs* are on permanent loan from his descendants to the Leopold Museum in Vienna. What became of his other books is unknown. In 2018, the Leopold Museum examined these volumes looking for Klimt’s characteristic scribbles and underlining; none were found, which is, in itself, interesting. In his preliminary sketches, he worked through ideas visually, dashing out descriptive notations and phrases. Reading was a distinct and receptive activity for Klimt. We know from the artist’s correspondence that he needed moments away from his visual engagements to think through aspects of his work in a different way. Studying his books on Japanese art, like wandering in nature, was a contemplative part of his process, an idea which will be addressed further in Chapter Six.

From the publication dates of his books on the arts of East Asia, we can conclude that Klimt’s study of Japanese aesthetics spanned over 20 years and was shaped by a range sources. In the example of the auction catalogue *Estampes Livres illustres du Japon*, he gained familiarity with the collection of art dealer Hayashi Tadamasa, who helped define the Japanese neologism bijutsu (fine art), the presentation of Japanese culture at the world’s fairs, the standards of aesthetic quality in the western market, and Parisian Japonisme from his arrival in 1878 through his return to his native country in 1902 and death in 1906. A principal competitor to the art dealer Siegfried Bing,

---

391 Klimt’s library contained Siegfried Bing’s *Japanischer Formenschatz* (1888–1891), Seiditz’s *Geschichte des japanischen Farbenholzschnitts* (1897), Hayashi’s 1902 sales catalogue *Dessins, Estampes, Livres Illustrés Du Japon*, Münsterberg’s 1904 *Japanische Kunstgeschichte*, a 1907 portfolio of Japanese erotica published privately by Piper in Munich, and Fenollosa’s *Ursprung und Entwicklung der chinesischen und japanischen Kunst* vol. I&II (1913).
392 Hiroshi Hasegawa, ed., *フランス絵画と浮世絵: 東西文化の架け橋: 林忠正の眼-展, Furansu kaiga to ukiyoe: tōzai bunka no kakehashi, Hayashi Tadamasa no me ten* [French Painting and Ukiyo-e: The Eye
Hayashi’s network spanned from the largest trading company of Meiji era crafts to prominent Japonists like Edmond de Goncourt. His collection was described as a “monument to the art of Japanese engraving” of “extreme rarity.” Like his folio of erotic ukiyo-e, this volume would have provided a range of visual resources for Klimt. In Münsterberg’s *Japanese Art History*, Bing’s *Artistic Japan*, and Fenollosa’s *Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Art*, a wealth of imagery was paired with characterizations of the arts of Japan as a tradition based on distilled natural forms, preserved craftsmanship, and as a viable path toward modern artistic rebirth. In studying these texts, Klimt found reflections of the concerns nearest to those motivating his own undertakings and echoes of the convictions espoused by his closest collaborators and advocates.

6) *Münsterberg’s Japanese Art History*

Although biased towards the west in its approach, Münsterberg’s three volume history contributed to the foundations of East Asian studies in Europe. Rich in its attention to detail, it was one of the earliest surveys of the stylistic development of Japanese art and

---

393 On Hayashi’s relationship to Goncourt and for a historical overview of the Kiryū Kōshō Kaisha, see Jeehyun Lee, “Resisting Boundaries: Japonisme and Western-Style Art in Meiji Japan,” Ph.D. diss., (University of Pennsylvania, 2011), 110-121. The Tokyo School of Fine Art was linked to Kiryū Kōshō Kaisha, as many of the company’s artisans were members of the school’s faculty.


the first of its kind to be published in German. Münsterberg admired the eastern nation’s “tenacious preservation” of craft traditions, the health of which he attributed to their artists’ meticulous study of the natural world. In his view, Japanese works did not replicate an animal or prospect in detail, but rather gave expression to subjective experience, capturing “the effect of nature on the individual person.” As such, they were valuable model for modern artists. Aligning Japanese landscapes with the art of Classical Greece, Münsterberger writes:

“This infinite beauty and, so to speak, chemical relationship of the lines and colors in nature can only be seen by a very great mind, a person whose soul has become fully intoxicated with line and color. When an artist like Kōetsu sees nature, he gives us, along with the depth of the impression, a revelation of truth that transforms the world. In this sense, we can call the great masters of our Kōrin school the greatest flowers and tree painters the world has ever seen. Through

397 Münsterberg, Japanische Kunstgeschichte vol 1., 78.
398 Ibid., 32. Münsterberg writes: “To reduce the diversity of nature to individual essential details. This includes mastery of technique and a security of eye and hand, which is probably the highest point in the development of art. What matters is not the copy of nature, as the naturalists once wrongly taught, because there is no nature in itself that can be objectively understood, but rather the effect of nature on the individual human being; The desirable goal is not the copy of the object, but the reproduction of what is seen, the impression of the object as it affects the eye and mind of the artist. (…) In the reproduction of these impressions, the Japanese artist has become a master and has perhaps surpassed his Chinese teachers, from whom he adopted all the basic forms of technique and presentation.” (Die Vielseitigkeit der Natur auf einzelne wesentliche Einzelheiten zu reduzieren. Dazu gehört die Beherrschung der Technik und eine Sicherheit des Auges und der Hand, welche wohl das Höchste in der Kunstentwicklung darstellt. Nicht auf die Kopie der Natur, wie einst fälschlich die Naturalisten lehrten, kommt es an, denn es gibt keine objektiv zu erfassende Natur an sich, sondern auf die Wirkung der Natur auf den einzelnen Menschen; nicht die Kopie des Gegenständlichen, sondern die Wiedergabe des Gesehenen, die Impression des Gegenstandes, wie er auf Auge und Geist des Künstlers wirkt, ist das erstrebenswerte Ziel. (…) In der Wiedergabe dieser Impressionen ist der japanische Künstler Meister geworden und hat vielleicht seine chinesischen Lehrmeister, von denen er alle Grundformen die Technik und des Vorwurfs übernommen hatte, übertroffen.”
them, the plant kingdom, which we otherwise despise and treat as a minor matter, gains dignity, the godlikeness that the Greeks gave to the human figure.\textsuperscript{399}

As will be addressed shortly, Münsterberg was not alone in drawing this comparison between Japan and the cultural foundations of the West, tying the foreign tradition to Europe and designating Japanese aesthetics as a parallel source of artistic inspiration and renewal. He references Winckelmann’s ideas of imitation versus emulation, correlating his history with the foundations of the discipline and shifting the paradigm to acknowledge Japanese art as the superior model for the contemporary moment.\textsuperscript{400}

Notably, through the model of Japanese art, he champions the serious potential of landscape painting. In Klimt scholarship, the painter’s endeavors in this genre have been considered as a private mode, separate from his public works. In Chapter Six, I address these works in relationship to his study of Japanese art and their place within his oeuvre.

There are significant similarities between Klimt’s approach to landscape and Münsterberg’s delineations of Japanese aesthetics as the distillation of the chemical relationship of line and color in nature.\textsuperscript{401}

\textsuperscript{399} Ibid., 7. This infinite beauty and, so to speak, chemical relationship of the lines and colors in nature can only be seen by a very great mind, a person whose soul has become fully intoxicated with line and color. When an artist like Kōetsu sees nature, he gives us, along with the depth of the impression, a revelation of truth that transforms the world. In this sense, we can call the great masters of our Kōrin school the greatest flowers and tree painters the world has ever seen. Through them, the plant kingdom, which we otherwise despise and treat as a minor matter, gains dignity, the godlikeness that the Greeks gave to the human figure. “Diese unendliche Schönheit und sozusagen chemische Verwandtschaft der Linien und Farben in der Natur kann nur ein ganz großer Geist sehen ein Mensch dessen Seele sich mit Linie und Farbe völlig trunken hat. Wenn ein solcher Künstler wie Kōetsu die Natur sieht gibt er uns zugleich mit der Tiefe des Eindrucks eine Offenbarung der Wahrheit welche die Welt umgestaltet. In diesem Sinne können wir die großen Meister unserer Kōrin Schule die größten Blumen und Baummaler nennen welche die Welt je gesehen hat. Durch sie wird das bei uns sonst etwas verachtete und nebensächlich behandelte Pflanzenreich zu der Würde ja zu der Gottähnlichkeit erhoben welche die Griechen der menschlichen Figur verliehen.”


\textsuperscript{401} In her account of Chinoiserie in Germany, Christiane Hertel demonstrates how this Orientalist cliché of the Far East permeated modern collecting and writing about Chinese art by western authors but also by
Like Münsterberg, several writers in Klimt’s orbit viewed Japanese art as a source of revival equal to the western classical tradition. For example, Hermann Bahr placed equal value on both cultures.\textsuperscript{402} Similarly, the Vienna School art historian Franz Wickhoff, who defended Klimt’s Faculty Paintings, praised the arts of Japan for their “fine artistic sense” and their decorative forms “drawn directly from nature.”\textsuperscript{403} He saw Japanese art as a viable path for modern artists, and along with his colleagues reflected on the origins and universality of stylistic development and art history, albeit in a manner that maintained Eurocentric cultural hierarchies.\textsuperscript{404} In a 1898 essay for \textit{Kunst und Kunsthandwerk}, the general director of the Dresden Royal Collections for Art and Science Woldemar von Seidlitz espoused the belief that contemporary artists should not imitate the Japanese but rather follow their example, one that led “from naturalistic studies to monumental style” without recasting a long-dead historical model unconnected to the contemporary moment.\textsuperscript{405} Seidlitz frequently contributed to the Berlin arts journal \textit{non-western writers for a western audience. Christiane Hertel, Siting China in Germany: Eighteenth-Century Chinoiserie and Its Modern Legacy (University Park: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 2019).}\textsuperscript{402} Hermann Bahr, “Japanische Ausstellung, sechste Ausstellung der Vereinigung bildender Künstler Österreichs, Secession,” in \textit{Secession} (Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1900), 216-230, 224.\textsuperscript{403} Franz Wickhoff, “Die Zukunft der Kunstgewerbe-Museen,” \textit{Kunst und Kunsthandwerk}, no. 1 (1898), 15-19, 17. Wickhoff writes of “fine artistic sense” (feinem Kunstsinne) and decorative forms “drawn directly from nature” (direct aus der Natur zu holen). The whole passage reads as follows: “Mit Staunen sahen die Künstler, die in London und Paris an der Spitze der modernen Bewegung standen, in der zweiten Hälfte unseres Jahrhunderts, dass Vieles, was sie anstrebten, die Japaner schon geleistet hatten, dass die Japaner, ein Volk von so feinem Kunstsinne wie nur immer die alten Griechen, der europäischen Kunstbewegung vorausgeeilt waren und sich die Fähigkeit durch alle Zeiten gewahrt hatten, ihre Schmuckformen direct aus der Natur zu holen.”\textsuperscript{404} Wickhoff, “Über die historische Einheit der gesamten Kunst entwicklung,” in \textit{Abhandlungen, Vorträge und Aufsätze} (Berlin: Meyer und Jessen, 1912), 81-91. Wickhoff’s colleague Alois Riegl (1858-1905) began recuperating the decorative and writing histories of ornament bridging between Europe and Asia in the 1890s. Riegl is addressed in Chapter Six. For a concise overview of the idea of a universal art history and the Vienna School, see Matthew Rampley, “Art History and the Politics of Empire: Rethinking the Vienna School,” \textit{The Art Bulletin} vol. 91, no. 4 (2009), 446-62.\textsuperscript{405} Seidlitz was the director of the Dresdener Königlichen Sammlungen für Kunst und Wissenschaft from 1885 to 1918. Woldemar Seidlitz, “Die Bedeutung des japanischen Farbholzschnittes für unsere Zeit,” \textit{Kunst und Kunsthandwerk} vol. 7 (1898), 244-60, 246. Seidlitz writes about the transformation “from
Pan (1895-1915) and collaborated with the Dresden gallerist Ernst Arnold, whose collection of ukiyo-e was exhibit in Vienna by the Museum of Art and Industry in 1899. As demonstrated in the writings of Viennese critics and the inclusion of Seidlitz’s history of ukiyo-e in Klimt’s library, Seidlitz’s views on Japanese art were known in the Habsburg capital. Each of these writers characterized Japanese art as intrinsically linked to the natural world and therefore a source of fundamental visual forms. While problematically denying the cultural specificity of Japan and drawing on pervasive Orientalist clichés of the “eternal” East as a source of universal understanding now lost in western culture, these assessments of Japanese art would have appealed to Klimt and his fellow artists who were pursuing a visual language for their time that revived the fundamentals of artistic tradition. As will be demonstrated in what follows, these views were shared and developed in specific ways by the authors included in *Artistic Japan* and historians of East Asian art like Ernest Fenollosa.

7) Bing’s *Artistic Japan*

Few publications contributed more to the burgeoning of international Japonism than Siegfried Bing’s *Artistic Japan*. Printed simultaneously in French, English, and German, the journal brought together essays by artists, museum directors, and leading Japonists

naturalistic studies to monumental style” (von der naturalistischen Studien zum monumentalen Stil). The whole passage reads as follows: “endlich muß ein Weg gefunden werden, der von der naturalistischen Studien zum monumentalen Stil führt, ohne daß es der Umgliessung in die Formen eines der bestehenden historischen Stile bedürfte, die für uns abgestorben sind, mit denen wir keinen Zusammenhang mehr haben. Wie die japanische und ebenso jede große Kunst unserer eigenen Vergangenheit lehrt, ist solches nur möglich durch eine Abkehr von der Natur nicht nur in den Einzelheiten der Darstellung.”


like Louis Gonse, the editor of the renowned *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* and author of one of the first surveys of Japanese art written in Europe. The 36 volumes issued monthly between 1888 and 1891 were designed as a “graphic encyclopedia.” Beautifu...
In the artistic program laid out in the journal’s first issue, Bing declared that the aesthetic traditions of the Far East provided “more than a Platonic feast,” they offered “examples worthy to be followed in every respect.”  

The illustrations of Bing’s journal needed to be “thoroughly analyzed” not merely copied or “borrowed.” To arrive at the “fundamental principles of Japanese ornament,” the reader needed to follow the path of the Japanese artist back to the source of nature, which contained “the primordial elements of all things.” Bing’s platonic metaphor reminds the reader of the banquets of the Symposium in which the philosopher expressed his theory of forms — his conception of the entirety of the physical world as instantiations of transcendental, pure form. In Bing’s interpretation, Japanese artists had captured a glimpse of this universal essence through their keen study. He goes on to declare that the works reproduced in the pages of Artistic Japan prove that these pure forms could be drawn from the smallest part of nature, inspiring art “animated by the breath of real life.”

Buttressing Bing’s introductory program, the essays collected in Artistic Japan almost unanimously returned to the bond between the arts of Japan and the natural world.

---

413 Bing, “Programme,” 4. The whole passage reads as follows: “In the new forms of art which have come to us from the uttermost parts of the East, we see something more than a Platonic feast set before our contemplative dilettanti, we find in them examples worthy to be followed in every respect, not, indeed, worthy to uproot the foundations of the old aesthetic edifice which exists, but fitted to add a fresh force to those forces which we have appropriated to ourselves in all past time, and brought to the support and aid of our national genius.”

414 Ibid., 5-6.

415 Ibid., 6.


417 Bing, “Programme,” 3. Connections to ideas of reform and modern allegory will be addressed in Chapter Five. The whole passage reads as follows: “This, if I do not err, is the great and salutary lesson that we may derive from the examples which he sets before us. Under such influences the lifeless stiffness to which our technical designers have hitherto so rigidly adhered will be relaxed by degrees, and our productions will become animated by the breath of real life that constitutes the secret charm of every achievement of Japanese Art.”
Japanese artistry in every medium, from architecture and painting to jewelry and swords was attributed with a “truthfulness to nature,” a phrase that brings to mind images like Klimt’s *Tragedy* (1897) and *Naked Truth* (1899). I will return to these works and the importance of representational truth within Viennese modernism in Chapter Five.\(^\text{418}\)

Within *Artistic Japan*, two noteworthy articulations of the natural verity of Japanese art can be found in the essays of the director of the Museum of Art and Industry in Hamburg Justus Brinckmann and the French Symbolist Ary Renan (1857-1900). In his contributions, Brinckmann — who led the way in the foundations of Japanese departments in European collections, produced the German-language version of *Artistic Japan* and contributed greatly to Japonismus in German-Speaking Europe — characterized the cyclical impermanence of nature as the heart of Japanese aesthetics.\(^\text{419}\)

This theme recurs in the writings of the painter Renan.


According to the French artist, Hokusai’s rapid sketches captured all aspects of the natural world in simple gestural line. His *Manga* was “a species of index to Nature herself.” Significantly, Renan linked Hokusai’s index to the concerns of his contemporaries in Europe, praising the “perfect” union of Japanese arts and crafts bonded in their foundations in the study of the natural world. In *Manga* he saw the aesthetic aims of the Symbolist realized. For Renan, Hokusai was an artist of “unconsciousness.” Many of the Symbolists were interested in the culture, philosophy, and aesthetics of East Asia and saw reflections of their own ambitions in the works of Japanese artists. The French critic Eugène Morel (1869-1934), for example, claimed that all modern art came “straight from Japan.” The Symbolists, in turn, were influential to the Vienna Secession, who featured their works beginning with the group’s inaugural exhibition. As Leslie Topp has demonstrated, although the leaders of the Viennese group emphatically denied the existence of a singular style, late-Romantic and

420 Renan, “Hokusai’s ‘Man-gwa’,” 85.
421 Ibid., 86. “Thus it is that they were induced to make a species of index to Nature herself. The Man-gwa is neither the first or the only dictionary of this description.”
422 Ibid.
423 Renan, “Hokusai’s ‘Man-gwa’ (Concluded),” *Artistic Japan* vol 2. no. 9 (1889), 99-102, 102. Citing the works of Poe and Baudelaire, Renan writes: “Is it not remarkable to find in the work of an artist of the extreme East the realisation of those dreams and fancies which the most advanced schools of literature in England and France have believed to be only encountered by them alone? Who, we ask, is the artist who had made farther voyage into the unreal world—we were going to say the suggested world?”
424 Renan, “Hokusai’s ‘Man-gwa’,” 85. “If it is admitted that Hokusai is worthy a place in the first rank of independent and original artists, one must assign to him immediately a characteristic which he shares with the most highly inspired of the masters of our Western Art, namely, unconsciousness.”
symbolist views of truth and its role in art inspired the rhetoric of the Secession. As the first president of the association, Klimt shared the conviction that the future of the Viennese arts depended on bringing them “into closer correlation with the progressive developments in foreign art.” His own works have been linked to Symbolism in their sensuality, their thematic representations of truth, and their reflections of the “inner condition of the artist.” In Chapter Five, I argue that Klimt attempted to visualize the “primordial Ideas” at the heart of Symbolism by modernizing allegory. In Renan’s essays for Artistic Japan, therefore, we find Klimt’s interests united and Japanese art presented as an exemplary path toward the realization of his ambitions.

Like Münsterberg and Bahr, many contributors to Bing’s journal drew affinities between Japanese aesthetics and the art of Europe, setting up the foreign tradition as a new model on par with “the foundress of the fundamental laws of our aestheticism,” Classical Greece. For example, Phillipe Burty described a Japanese weapon as having

---


the “perfect outline of Greek work” that make “it an object of art.”\footnote{Phillipe Burty, “The Sword,” 115.} Louis Gonse espoused a similar view, writing that other than Japan “Greece alone offers a parallel example of so pure and complete an enthusiasm for the pleasures of imagination and the continuous exercise of the aesthetic faculties.”\footnote{Gonse, “The Japanese as Decorators,”12.} On a grander scale, Victor Champier, emphatically claimed that “Japanese Architecture” must be given the same name as “Greek Architecture, Roman Architecture, [and] Gothic Architecture.”\footnote{Champier, “Japanese Architecture,” 20.} Although constructed in the fragile materials of paper and wood and of an intimate scale in comparison to the “colossal constructions of stone and marble” in Europe, the architecture of Japan upheld the term’s essential definition as “the material expression of the desires and manners of a people.”\footnote{Ibid. The whole passage reads as follows: “For, if the definition holds good, which says that architecture is the material expression of the desires and the manners of a people; that the style of building is the exterior form of the ideas, genius, and religion of a nation, we must agree that the Japanese possess an architecture admirably fitted to the character of their civilization, wonderfully appropriate to the conditions of their climate, and which shows the elements of beauty which we are accustomed to look for in this art, namely, unity and harmony, in its varied forms no less than any European style.”} Japanese architecture, according to Champier, exemplified “the elements of beauty which we are accustomed to look for in this art, namely unity and harmony.”\footnote{Ibid.} Significantly, Champier’s definition of architecture and view of Japanese aesthetics as fitted to its specific cultural context while offering viable models for the arts of Europe are similar to the ideas expressed by Josef Hoffmann in 1897 and Ernst Schur in 1899.\footnote{Ernst Schur, “Der Geist der japanischen Kunst.” This translation is from Pantzer and Wieninger ed., \textit{Verborgene Impressionen}, 427-428.}
8) **Fenollosa’s Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Art**

In 1878, Ernest Fenollosa came to Japan to teach western philosophy at the newly founded University of Tokyo. He soon became interested in the aesthetic traditions of East Asia and, with the assistance of his former student Okakura Kakuzō, advocated for the past and future of Japanese art. He first publicly articulated his views in a lecture delivered at the Dragon Pond Society on May 14, 1882. Translated and published in Japanese as “The True Theory of Art,” his plea for the aesthetic traditions of the rapidly changing nation circulated widely in the 1880s, and in his subsequent writings, he reiterated many of the premises of this germinal address. By 1884, he and Okakura had gained governmental support for their efforts and in years following received imperial recognition for their dedicated preservation of Japan’s cultural heritage. When Fenollosa returned to the United States in 1890 to head the Japanese art department at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts, he was respected as an authority on the arts of East Asia, and his posthumously published *Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Art* was described as “the first adequate survey of the development of Japanese art in its true perspective and proportions ever published in a European tongue.”

---

438 Founded in 1879 by politicians Sano Tsunetami (1822-1902) and Kuki Ryūichi (1852-1931), the art association Ryūchikai (Dragon Pond Society) included members of the Ministry of Education and the Finance Ministry, who were responsible for judging art in domestic and international expositions. It was renamed Japan Fine Art Association (Nihon Bijutsu Kyokai) in 1887.


440 Laurence Binyon, “National Character in Art,” *Saturday Review* December 5, is quoted in Lawrence Chisolm’s *Fenollosa: The Far East and American Culture* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1963), 59-60. Fenollosa completed full drafts of his multi-volume history prior to his death, but many of the artists and temples were left unnamed. The 1912 published version was completed by the author’s second wife Sidney McCall (1865-1954), who worked as her husband’s assistant at the museum. The German edition from Klimt’s library was published in 1913. Fenollosa’s *Ursprung und Entwicklung der chinesischen und japanischen Kunst* vol. I&II (Leipzig, Hiersemann, 1913).
In his multiple volume history, Fenollosa treated the aesthetic traditions of China and Japan as a single movement of interlocking phases. Drawing upon contemporary notions of music as an absolute art founded on the mathematics of harmony, he argued that the fine arts were based on “pure visual ideas.” All the artworks of the world were of a kind, united in a “universally valid scheme.” The arts of East Asia had developed parallel to those of Europe and in the contemporary moment — since 1853 the year that Japan’s seclusionist era ended — the two “continental lines” of art history had begun to converge, with the art of Whistler as a shared “nodule.” The aesthetic foundation of his history is the concept of nōtan, the “harmonious arrangement of values.” Distinct from chiaroscuro, nōtan denotes the tonal harmony and contrast of the visual work as a whole. Although he defines it as the essential beauty of Chinese and Japanese art, he attributed the quality of nōtan to western artists, both past and present. This is one of the
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441 Fenollosa, Ursprung vol. II, 33.
442 Nute, “Frank Lloyd Wright and ‘Composition:’ The Architectural Picture, Plan, and Decorative Design as ‘Organic’ Line-Ideas,” Journal of Architectural and Planning Research vol. 14, no. 4 (1997), 271–88, 271. Nute cites Fenollosa’s unpublished manuscript “The Lessons of Japanese Art” (1891) from the Harvard University collection. “Lines and shades and colors may have a harmonic charm of their own, a beauty and infinity of pure visual idea, as absolute as the sound idea in music. The artistic element in form is (...) the pure simple music of a form idea (...) The fact that such a line organism may represent natural fact does not interfere with its purely aesthetic relation as line ... Now such line ideas, apart from what they represent (...) are exactly what the Japanese conceive to form the basis of all their art.”
443 Fenollosa, Ursprung vol. I, 2. Fenollosa writes of a “universally valid scheme” (allgemein gültiges Schema). The whole passage reads as follows: “Ein umfassendes, allgemein gültiges Schema, eine Logik der Kunst tun sich vor uns auf, die ebenso leicht alle Formen der asiatischen Kunst, der Kunst der Naturvölker und die Versuche der Kinder in sich begreift, wie die bestehenden europäischen Kunstrichtungen sich ihr einordnen.”
444 Ibid., 37.
445 On the translation and history of nōtan (濃淡), see Shigemi Inaga, “Classical Chinese Aesthetic Ideals Meet the West: Modern Japanese Art as a Contact Zone,” Japan Review vol. 37 (2022), 7–28. 7. Inaga argues that “in the sense used by Fenollosa, nōtan is not a classical Chinese term, but a Japanese neologism of the early nineteenth century.”
446 Ibid.
447 Fenollosa, Ursprung vol. I, 3. “Ebenso ist die Beziehung des orientalischen nōtan einerseits zum griechischen nōtan, dann zum venezianischen nōtan, ferner zum nōtan der Rembrandt und Velazquez und schließlich zum nōtan der modernen französischen Kunst eine augenfällige Tatsache.”
ways that Fenollosa asserted the universality and legitimacy of the arts of China and Japan on an international scale.\textsuperscript{448}

As Kevin Nute has demonstrated, Fenollosa’s occidental approach to art history was founded on a “Kantian concept of the purely formal ‘aesthetic idea’ exemplified by the organic whole, and Hegel’s metaphysical explanation of the unique appeal of the organic form as the most complete material manifestation of the spirit or metaphysical ‘Idea.’”\textsuperscript{449} When an visual work created a “perfect harmony” of line, light, and color, it had the capacity to express “Idea,” and the arts of Japan and China excelled in this fundamental purpose.\textsuperscript{450} Reiterating his analogy to music and tone, Fenollosa maintained that Chinese and Japanese painting spoke “the very language of visual art” and possessed a “primal and universal energy.”\textsuperscript{451} In addition to capturing aesthetic essence, the

\textsuperscript{448} Inaga, “Classical Chinese Aesthetic Ideals Meet the West,” 7.
\textsuperscript{450} “Painting is an art that expresses Idea by means of lines, colours, and shading done in perfect harmony ... Japanese art is really far superior to modern cheap Western art that describes any objects at hand mechanically, forgetting the most important point of how to express Idea. In spite of such superiority the Japanese despise their classical paintings, and, with a deep adoration for Western civilization, admire its modern paintings which are artistically worthless and imitate them for nothing. What a sad phenomenon it is! The Japanese should return to their nature and its old racial traditions, and then take, if there is any, the good point of Western paintings.” This quotation from Fenollosa’s 1882 lecture is cited in Felice Fischer, “Meiji Painting from the Fenollosa Collection,” \textit{Philadelphia Museum of Art Bulletin} 88, no. 375 (1992), 1–24, 8.
\textsuperscript{451} In his chapter on mythical Buddhist painting in Japan and China, Fenollosa describes the paintings of Godoshi (Wu Tao-tzū), a Chinese painter of the T’ang period, as such: “The goal of art development is not to get ever closer to a color photograph, but rather, wherever possible, to add more and more size and purified beauty to the space, the proportions and the system of line rhythms. This is the true language of the visual arts, just as sound is that of music. Therefore, there is a certain original and all-encompassing energy in Wu Tao Tzu's drawing, which has hardly ever been surpassed in the entire course of general art history.”
paintings of artists like Sesshū Tōyō (1420-1506) were comparable to the works of Michelangelo, Velazquez, and Manet in their quality of “spirit,” the ability of an artwork to impose itself on the viewer “as really present and animated by the breadth of life.”

Another striking aspect of Fenollosa’s *Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Art* is his frequent reference to music. He draws analogies to this melodic art more than a dozen times within the volumes of his history, and harmony is the basis of his definition of nōtan. He characterizes the arts of East Asia as the visual manifestation of this aural art. Music was a vibrant part of Viennese culture and the art of the Secession. In 1892, the poet and dramatist Hugo von Hofmannsthal, who was celebrated for his collaborations with the late-romantic composer Richard Strauss (1864-1949), claimed that music was the “spirit” of the time. Scholarship has suggested direct correlations between musical rhythm and the compositional movement of Viennese visual modernism.
and contemporary innovations in art historical concepts of style. In the case of Klimt, we know from his correspondence that he attended musical performances regularly, almost weekly. Fenollosa’s conception of Japanese aesthetic tradition as the melodic arts transmuted into pictorial language, therefore, would have been recognized by and appeal to Klimt and his artistic circle.

Münsterberg’s *Japanese Art History*, Bing’s *Artistic Japan*, and Fenollosa’s *Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Art* presented the aesthetic traditions of Japan as a universal pictorial language drawn from nature, a model of non-hierarchical unity and preserved craftsmanship, and a new source of revival that could breathe life into the modern arts. The ideas expressed by each of these publications resonated with the views of Klimt’s contemporaries, and in studying these volumes the painter would have found the arts of Japan united with the threads of his own artistic endeavors. As will be explored in Chapter Five, there is a mirroring of language surrounding the aesthetic vitality of Japanese art and the path towards modernism represented by Martin Gerlach’s allegorical compendia.

Lastly, beyond common interpretations and aims, there are noteworthy connections that can be drawn from the contents of Klimt’s library. For example, Siegfried Bing was a colleague and friend of Julius Meier-Graefe, who designed the 1903 exhibition on Impressionism at the Vienna Secession that placed Japanese art within the

---

historical development of European modernism. Meier-Graefe also reviewed Münsterberg’s history, illustrating an awareness of common interest and interpretations of the pertinent place of Japanese art in contemporary European developments. Additionally, Bing was a childhood friend of the Hamburg Museum of Art and Industry director Justus Brinckmann, who studied in Vienna and was influenced by the directors of the Museum of Applied Arts and Industry and returned to lecture on Japanese art at the Viennese institution in 1904. Similar relationships can be traced in Fenollosa’s *Epochs*, which was translated into German in 1913 by Brinckmann’s assistant Shinkichi Hara (1868-1934). Hara contributed greatly to publications, exhibitions, and collections of Japanese art across German-speaking Europe. No biography of him has been written. However, in an obituary penned by the Asian art specialist and curator Otto Kümmel (1874-1957), the medical student turned museum specialist is described as the real authorial voice behind many early German-language publications on Japanese art. In Kümmel’s view, even Fenollosa’s “incredible” work benefited from Hara’s introduction and translation. Kümmel further humorously relates a story of Hara folding up an ukiyo-e print and using it as a bookmark to Brinckmann’s dismay, which indicates that Meiji dismissals of the art form were known in Europe. More significantly, Fenollosa was one of the individuals Emil Orlik encountered during his travels to Japan. While little is known about their interaction, beyond the fact that the graphic artist was able to visit


459 Ibid., 198. Kümmel is quite dismissive of Brinckmann in his praise of Hara.
and study the collection of the historian, it is clear that Orlik became familiar with and shared many of Fenollosa’s ideas.\textsuperscript{460} Orlik then promoted his understanding of Japanese art in his lectures and teachings. Finally, Ludwig Hevesi, who considered Klimt’s ornamental development as undeniably related to the arts of Japan, cited Fenollosa’s history in his art criticism.\textsuperscript{461} From these connections between Viennese culture and the authors in Klimt’s library, we can infer that the artist would not only have seen similarities drawn between the arts of Japan and the contemporary landscape of his city but would have had personal ties to the books, giving the views expressed within them heightened impact. They demonstrate that Klimt belonged to a culture of shared or at least overlapping concepts and searches for new models in Japanese art and aesthetics and that cultural discourses far beyond Vienna intersected in his library.

As this chapter’s examination of visual adoptions and adaptations of Japanese aesthetics and the library of Klimt has shown, Orlik, Hoffmann, and Klimt drew from already amalgamated sources. Viennese Japonismus and its impact on modernist reevaluations of the relationship between art and nature, woodblock printing and graphic line, and craftsmanship as a unifying principal of the arts reflects this complexity of cultural encounter. The choices of these artists to take up foreign methods, techniques, and motifs were not random. Orlik, Hoffmann, and Klimt refashioned sources that they not only admired but believed to be drawn from fundamental, cross-cultural aesthetic principles. In the example of Orlik, we see how his definitions of the calligraphic line drew him to the model of Japanese woodblock printing, and how his visual

\textsuperscript{460} Mastalski, “Emil Orlik,” 11.
\textsuperscript{461} Hevesi, “Japanische Farbenholzschnitte,” 435.
representations reflected his interpretation of this foreign place and culture. In the case of Hoffmann, we see an artist seriously engaged with Japanese aesthetic principles who was connected to Klimt, as a friend, collaborator, and lead designer in significant undertakings like the 1902 Beethoven-Klinger Exhibition, Palais Stoclet, the 1903 solo-exhibition of Klimt’s works at the Secession, and the Klimt-group Kunstschau of 1908. As will be demonstrated in Chapter Six, Hoffmann’s view of Japanese art as a path to form and elemental line is mirrored in Klimt’s artistic practice and approach to modern allegory. Finally, Klimt’s personal library destabilizes conventional and pervasive perceptions of the artist’s limited intellectual aims. He was engaged with art history and adopted and adapted from many sources in his pursuit of visual modernism. As will be argued in Chapters Five and Six, allegory and the arts of Japan were the two interwoven threads that unified Klimt’s eclecticism.

---

Chapter Five: Gustav Klimt and Modern Allegory

In Klimt’s monumental-sized painting, *Nuda Veritas* (1899) the viewer is confronted by the sensual figure of “Naked Truth” (Fig. 5.1). The personification stands in a variegated blue ground with a water-like mist wrapping around her legs. The elongated composition is framed at top and bottom with gold borders. Above Truth’s head is a quotation from Friedrich Schiller’s *Tabulae votivae* (1797):

**IF YOUR DEEDS AND YOUR ART CANNOT PLEASE EVERYONE — PLEASE A FEW. TO PLEASE MANY IS BAD.**

Written in bold capitals, the vow is an intrepid call for truth in art. Below the personification’s feet, the bold letters of the work’s title appear as if carved in the golden band. A sinuous snake cuts through the middle of the letters entering the painting’s blue ground and wrapping around Truth’s ankles. Drawing associations to biblical traditions and the Fall of mankind from a state of innocence and the truths revealed by the Tree of Knowledge, the serpent disrupts the pictorial space, challenging conventions of perception tied to European renaissance traditions. The figure’s place or placement seems

---

463 KANNST DU NICHT ALLEN GEFALLEN DURCH DEINE THAT UND DEIN KUNSTWERK — MACH ES WENIGEN RECHT. VIELEN GEFALLEN IST SCHLIMM. Friedrich Schiller and Eugen Kühnemann, *Schillers philosophische Schriften und Gedichte (Auswahl) zur Einführung in seine Weltanschauung* (Leipzig: Verlag von Felix Meiner, 1922), 420. This translation, which is common in Klimt literature, comes from Tobias G. Natter, *Gustav Klimt: The Complete Paintings* (Cologne: Taschen, 2022), 468. I address the meaning of this Schiller quotation and variations in translation in the Conclusion.
to be in transition. While she is confronting us very directly, she hovers between spatial readings.

Painted in the early years of the Secessionist movement, *Nuda Veritas* gives voice to the concerns of early Viennese visual modernism and Klimt’s art. It is an allegory that engages with the questions of the role of art in contemporary life, the relationship between tradition and modernity, and the aesthetics of the new dawning era.⁴⁶⁴ With its conventional emblem format and vernal symbols of rebirth, the painting is a modern reimagining of the allegorical tradition that permeated the façades and canvases of the imperial capital.⁴⁶⁵ Its elongated vertical format, flattening of perspectival space, and juxtaposition of figuration and decorative detail also make *Nuda Veritas* a persuasive example of Klimt’s Japonismus. The golden spirals that suffuse the background of the painting borrow much from Japanese aesthetics in their simplicity, distillation of natural form (akin to Katagami stencils), and centrality in the composition (akin to Rinpa paintings where bold wave and tendril patterns stand in for flowing water and clouds) (Fig. 5.2-4). The work thus connects to both Habsburg tradition and the newly emerging transnational paradigm discussed in Chapter Two, which raises the central question addressed here, what was the status of allegory in Klimt’s approach to visual modernism?

---

⁴⁶⁴ In 1916/17, Koloman Moser described the Secession as “the birth of a new era.” Moser’s “Mein Werdegang” is quoted in translation in Natter, *Gustav Klimt: The Complete Paintings*, 40.

Klimt’s contemporaries described him as an artist who “safeguarded his intimacy and took his deepest secrets with him to the grave.”

His studio practice was intensely private, and his library, and art collection were never fully documented. Of the many extant photographs revealing his life, very few show the interiors of his three studio spaces. None of these photographs capture the artist at work. Instead, they either show the exterior of the building or an interior uninhabited by people. The only image that depicts Klimt painting is a caricature produced by Remigius Geyling (ca. 1902) (Fig. 5.5). His painting practice is, therefore, difficult to reconstruct.

At the same time, enough is known to caution against strict periodization of his career and works, as he was a perfectionist who produced hundreds of preparatory sketches and labored over a single canvas for many years. The photographs of his unoccupied studios, in which one can see paintings in progress on easels side by side, suggest his simultaneous engagement and even potential dialogue between his artistic endeavors (Fig. 5.6).

Nonetheless, five monumental projects have been used to divide Klimt’s oeuvre: the murals at the Burgtheater (1886-88) and Kunsthistorisches Museum (1890-91), the Faculty Paintings for the University of Vienna (1898-1907), the Beethoven Frieze (1902) for the fourteenth Secession exhibition, and the mosaic murals at the Palais Stoclet (1905-11) (Fig. 5.7-11). In interpreting these works many scholars have adhered to a historical model of stylistic progression and regression in which each of these undertakings serves as a marker of the artist’s trajectory from a rising historicist painter to a modernist rebel.

---

466 This description comes from Klimt’s obituary by the art historian Hans Tietze. Hans Tietze, “Gustav Klimt,” Kunstchronik: Wochenschrift für Kunst und Kunstgewerbe vol. 29, no. 21 (1918), 217-20, 220. This translation is taken from Natter ed., The Complete Paintings, 506.

467 For the partial documentation of Klimt’s art collection and library, see Christian M. Nebehay, Gustav Klimt: Dokumentation (Vienna: Nebehay, 1969).
to an artist fleeing from public confrontation. As much as Klimt was admired by Hermann Bahr, Ludwig Hevesi, and Berta Zuckerkandl, other contemporaries belittled the seriousness and value of his endeavors. In 1900, the painter was described in the pages of *Gazette des beaux-arts* as lacking “conviction” and “simpler and more himself” in his pink portrait than in his monumental allegory of *Philosophy*. The first Klimt monograph written by Max Eisler and published in 1921 further ingrained questions concerning the merit and modernity of Klimt’s art, establishing an arc of “the nascent artist,” “maturity,” and the “late works” in retreat. However, in Klimt scholarship, the foundations of this narrative are rooted most firmly in Carl Schorske’s *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (1979). Despite numerous reevaluations of this period, Schorske’s interpretation has set a distinctive lens for the international perception of Klimt’s art and life.

In Schorske’s analysis, allegory is merely part of the artistic tradition against which Klimt and his fellow Secessionists rebelled. I argue that from his early training through his last unfinished paintings, allegory remained part of Klimt’s pursuit of an art for and of his age, and the eclectic elements of his style come together in a pluralistic vocabulary of modern allegory. This interpretation is grounded in Klimt’s contributions

---

468 Léonce Bénédite, “Les arts à l’exposition universelle de 1900: L’exposition décennale. La peinture étrangère,” *Gazette des beaux-arts* vol. 24 (1900), 591. Bénédite writes of Klimt as being “without conviction” (sans conviction) and “simpler and more himself in his portrait of a lady in pink” (plus simple et plus à son aise dans son portrait de femme en rose). The whole passage reads as follows: “C’est un mélange sans conviction de toutes les inspirations et de toutes les écoles, qui produit un dilettantisme facile, dangereux et très souvent sans grand intérêt. Tout au plus nous arrêterons-nous à la section autrichienne, devant les portraits de MM. Angeli, Pochwalski, Kramer, de Pausinger, Klimt, plus simple et plus à son aise dans son portrait de femme en rose que dans son plafond, où il suit par trop notre Besnard.” Bénédite is referring to *Portrait of Sonja Knips* (1898), which was displayed at the Paris Exposition Universelle in 1900 along with *Philosophy*.

to Martin Gerlach’s *Allegorien und Embleme* vol. I&II and *Allegorien: Neue Folge*, between 1886 and 1900. Henceforth, these titles will be referred to as *Allegorien und Embleme* and *Neue Folge*. This chapter first addresses Schorske’s narrative of Klimt’s rise and fall from modernism, pointing to the overlapping timelines and simultaneities in his artistic practice that contradict this trajectory. I then turn to the details of Gerlach’s compendia, the artistic community revealed within these volumes, and the definition of modern allegory presented by the art historian Albert Ilg in his forewords to *Allegorien und Embleme*. This chapter concludes with a critical examination of how this revitalization of allegorical tradition influenced Klimt’s contributions to these volumes and, more broadly, his approach to modern art. In Ilg’s forewords, we find a proposal for modern allegory that resonates with a central design principle in Klimt’s art, the juxtaposition of mosaic-like pattern and realistically rendered anatomy. A close consideration of Gerlach’s compendia and Klimt’s allegories produced for these volumes reveals a continuous thread in his diverse oeuvre, giving a new voice to the famously reticent artist. Understanding the persistent role of the “free, genuine artistic spirit” of modern allegory in Klimt’s art provides a new ground for interpreting his particular practice of Japonismus addressed in Chapter Six.

1) *Narrative Arc of Rise and Decline and Divisions of Klimt’s Oeuvre*

Supported by journalists, historians, and collectors, Klimt was a reputed and established artist in the Habsburg capital throughout his relatively brief but productive career. Consequently, when his monumental ceiling panels commissioned for the Great Hall of the University of Vienna provoked a tremendous protest in 1900, the ensuing
debate was one of the most heated controversies in Austrian art history. Both biographic facts, namely Klimt’s centrality in his time and the highly contentious reception of his now notorious Faculty Paintings, lend themselves to Carl Schorske’s account of the artist’s career as an evolution from traditional, legible allegory to confrontational modernity and then fall into decadent aestheticism.

The murals at the Burgtheater were a state commission given to the newly established Künstler-Compagnie (1882-92) in 1886. In these first monumental works as well as in the subsequent murals at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, each of the young artists involved, Franz Matsch, Gustav Klimt, and his younger brother Ernst Klimt (1864-1892), worked in a style reflective of the symmetry and perspectival illusion tied to the Italian Renaissance tradition. The Künstler-Compagnie’s murals deemphasized the individual artists’ hand to create visual unity throughout the decorative program. Stylistically, the painters emulated Viennese historical neo-classicism and the works of their celebrated predecessor Hans Makart (Fig. 5.12).470

These state commissions were hugely successful and earned the young artists the high recognition of the Emperor’s Golden Order of Merit. With their reputations established and numerous lucrative opportunities arising along Vienna’s Ringstrasse, the future of the Künstler-Compagnie, and Klimt in particular, seemed to be secured. In Schorske’s view, this early achievement established the artist as a purveyor and beneficiary of the “positivistic historical spirit” of Austria’s “liberal hegemony.”471 Like

---

470 One of the most celebrated artists of nineteenth-century Vienna, Hans Makart received the original commission for the Kunsthistorisches Museum murals. The Künstler-Compagnie took over the work after his death in 1884.

the historicist buildings along the Ringstrasse, the Künstler-Compagnie’s works reinforced the veneer of rational rule governed by empiricism, utilitarianism, humanistic ethics, and scientific morality, and thus promoted the state’s “classical liberal view of man.” Yet, in his next public commission, Klimt, according to Schorske, rebelled against this tradition. In 1896, the Ministry of Education commissioned Franz Matsch and Gustav Klimt to paint ceiling panels illustrating the core faculties of the university. The program’s overarching theme was to be the “triumph of light over dark.” Matsch was assigned the central panel depicting Theology and Klimt the faculties Philosophy, Medicine, and Jurisprudence. Between the commission and the first public display of these paintings, Klimt and twenty other artists broke with the conservative, court-funded artists’ society and founded the Vienna Secession (1897). The Secession was the first step of his modernist rebellion, which reached its pinnacle in his final Faculty Painting, Jurisprudence.

Philosophy’s debut at the seventh Secession exhibition in 1900 and the subsequent unveilings of Medicine (Tenth Vienna Secession Exhibition, 1901) and Jurisprudence (Klimt Collective Exhibition at the Secession, 1903) provoked the intense debate chronicled in Hermann Bahr’s Gegen Klimt (1903) (Fig. 5.13-15). Within days of Philosophy’s display, more than eighty university professors publicly called for the rejection of the paintings or at least their drastic alteration. With each unveiling, new criticism was cast against the artist. Although several prominent figures publicly

---

472 Ernst Klimt died suddenly in 1892, and the Künstler-Compagnie dissolved.
defended them, the overwhelming opposition to the works led Klimt to withdraw his panels and repay the commission in 1905.

The Ministry of Education had anticipated a very different set of paintings, one reassuring and edifying viewers with unquestioned and effortless triumph of light over darkness. Instead, Philosophy was described as a “dishonest orgy of lies,” an illegible riddle, and a depiction of Schopenhauer’s pessimism. Detractors similarly asserted that Medicine failed to be decipherable. Klimt’s Hygeia was adorned with all of the conventional attributes (a serpent, bowl, and mistletoe). Nevertheless, she was seen as an “apotheosis of crippledness.” Jurisprudence, the last of Klimt’s paintings for the university, was denounced as ugly and senseless. Each allegory was viewed as either conveying an improper meaning, i.e., disease and death instead of the promise of healing, or as failing to be interpretable at all. For Schorske, the scandal of the Faculty Paintings led Klimt to retreated into the safety of the Klimt-Group and the solipsistic celebration of art for art’s sake.

Completed at the height of the controversy in 1902, the Beethoven Frieze was made specifically for the Secession’s fourteenth exhibition honoring Beethoven and Max

---


476 See Karl Schreder, “Vienna 29 March, 1901” in Gegen Klimt, 56-57. For the significance of symbols and conventional depictions of Hygeia, see Marlowe-Storkovich, “‘Medicine’ by Gustav Klimt,” 231.

477 Klimt, who led the Secessionist movement in 1897, resigned from the association in 1905 forming a new community of like-minded artists referred to as the Klimt-Gruppe.
Klinger (1857-1920).\textsuperscript{478} Installed next to the central gallery exhibiting Klinger’s monumental sculpture of Beethoven (Fig. 5.16), Klimt’s paintings extended across the top half of three walls and depicted the final movement of Beethoven’s Ninth Symphony (1824), the combined orchestral and choral arrangement of Schiller’s poem “Ode to Joy.” Significantly, the first responses to Klimt’s wall cycle acknowledged its “frieze-like” quality, perhaps in response to its original approach to materials (the paintings contained buttons, brass curtain rings, mirror fragments, and ground glass mixed with pigment).\textsuperscript{479} Klimt himself, seemingly, did not refer to either the Beethoven cycle or his later mosaics for the Stoclets as friezes but “pictures.”\textsuperscript{480} Hevesi’s essays on the painter’s Malmosaik style, which will be addressed shortly, drew a strong link between the words “frieze” and and Klimt’s negotiations of the “artistic concept of flatness,” setting the basis for Klimt’s scholars’ titling of both works.\textsuperscript{481}

\textsuperscript{478} On Klinger’s Beethoven iconography and its amalgamation with Christian iconography, see Christiane Hertel, “‘Mit unserer Metaphysik läßt sich alles machen:’ Zu Max Klingers Gemälden Die Kreuzigung Christi und Pietà,” \textit{Städel-Jahrbuch N.F.} 13 (1991), 199-226.

\textsuperscript{479} The description of Klimt’s Beethoven paintings as “frieze-like” (FRIESARTIG) comes from the exhibition catalogue. The work was cut into panels by its subsequent owner, Carl Reininghaus. When art historians write of panels as identified in the Secession’s original catalogue, they are referring to iconographical sections in the allegorical drama and to the room’s walls, but not to physical panels. Wiener Secession, \textit{XIV. Ausstellung der Vereinigung bildender Künstler Österreichs Secession Wien: Klinger Beethoven: April-Juni 1902} (Vienna: Adolf Holzhausen, 1902), 22.

\textsuperscript{480} In his article on Klimt, Karl Moser refers the Stoclet mosaics as a “Frieze.” He then includes Klimt’s undated letter to Wärndorfer in which he speaks of his “picture” (Bild). Karl Moser, “Unbekannte Briefe Gustav Klimts: Wie der grosse Maler schuf,” \textit{Neues Wiener Journal}, 3 January 1932, 10. “Lieber Fritz! Das Bild ist ja total unfertig, besonders in den Figuren, die Köpfe, Hände, es ist so, wie es jetzt ist, ganz eine andere unverständliche (künstlerisch unverständliche) Geschichte. Ich kann’s nicht glauben, daß was daraus wird. Das Bild muß Freitag früh wieder bei mir sein, ich rechne bestimmt damit. Besten Gruß Gustav Klimt.”

\textsuperscript{481} Hevesi, “Weiteres von Klimt,” in \textit{Altkunst Neukunst}, 316-20, 318. “Sie ist von jetzt an eine neue Kunstart, wie das Fresko, wie die Miniaturmalerei. Sie wird vielleicht ein ‘Fach’ werden, für Spezialisten der Mosaikmalerei. Seit Jahren geht Klimt; diesen blühenden Dornenpfad. Wer verstand die frühen Keime? Im ersten Stock bei Miethke hängt jener Apfelbaum voll goldener Früchte, der nichts ist als der Versuch, ein Stück Wand auf Mosaikwirkung anzulegen.” (From now on it is a new art form, like fresco, like miniature painting. It will perhaps become a “subject” for specialists in mosaic painting. Klimt has been walking this blossoming, thorny path for years. Who understood the early germs? On the first floor at Miethke hangs that apple tree full of golden fruit, which is nothing but an attempt to to create a mosaic
The Beethoven-Klinger exhibition itself was conceived of as a Raumkunst (spatial art) celebrating the redemptive power of art, and valor of the artist “knight” as he battles the “hostile forces” in his epic journey culminating in the “kiss to the whole world” (Fig. 5.17-19). The frieze was described by journalists as a “lascivious” “Ninevehan” disappointment, referring to the Neolithic city of Nineveh in a derogative sense as barbarous. According to his most vehement detractors, the artist had discarded the technical abilities of his Ringstrasse accomplishments and chosen to create a “beautiful body destroyed by an incurable disease.” The work was deemed “incomprehensible,” and Klimt’s personifications as too grotesque to be properly allegorical.

The mosaic murals at the Palais Stoclet (1905-11) were Klimt’s last monumental commission. In 1904, the industrialist Adolphe Stoclet (1871-1949) and his wife Suzanne (1871-1949) appointed Josef Hoffmann and the Wiener Werkstätte to build their family estate in Brussels. The plans included a comprehensive decorative program and gave the workshops complete artistic and financial freedom. Designed for the formal dining room, effect on a piece of wall.) Hevesi, “Bilder von Gustav Klimt,” in Altkunst-Neukunst: Wien 1894–1908 (Vienna: Verlagsbuchhandlung Carl Konegen, 1909), 205-10, 205.

482 The names of the Beethoven Frieze panels come from the detailed descriptive program of the exhibition catalogue. The idea of a “Raumkunst” or “Gesamtkunstwerk” in the Vienna Secession was influenced not only by Richard Wagner (1813-1883), one of the first to develop and espouse the idea of totality and unity in art, but also by several leading contemporary figures. Otto Wagner (1841-1918) held that architecture should transcend function through the creation of Gesamtkunstwerks. The British Arts and Crafts movement and William Morris, whom Klimt quoted in his speech at the 1908 Kunstschau, established a precedent for the equality between the fine arts and crafts. Max Klinger, whose monumental sculpture of Beethoven was the focal point of this Secession exhibition, delineated his views on the potential of “Raumkunst” (another term for Gesamtkunstwerk) in his 1891 Painting and Drawing. See Max Klinger, Malerei und Zeichnung (Leipzig: Insel, 1885).

483 Robert Hirschfeld, “Frankfurt, 20 April 1902,” in Gegen Klimt, 68-69; Pötzl, “Vienna, 20 April 1902,” in Gegen Klimt, 15-16. Contemporary art historians, particularly in the Viennese School, had begun to recuperate previously denigrated periods and styles of art like Byzantine, Roman, and Asian art. However, “Gothic” still had strong associations with ideas of decay and decline.

484 Pötzl, “Vienna, March 1900,” in Gegen Klimt, 43-44.

Klimt’s murals reworked visual motifs and forms found throughout his artistic production like the embracing couple and the repeated tendril pattern (Fig. 5.20). The Stoclets wanted a mosaic similar to the Beethoven Frieze, which like the Faculty Paintings had received high praise in modernist circles while shocking the general public. Klimt did not want this new, meticulously rendered work offered up to public derision, and the frieze was not exhibited before its installation in Brussels. In keeping with his psycho-biographical approach, Schorske views this private commission as Klimt’s complete retreat from modernist confrontation into complacent “décor for the well-to-do.” Chapter Six offers an in-depth analysis of the role of Japonismus in this modern allegory.

Quoting the architect Otto Wagner, Schorske describes the Faculty Paintings as Klimt’s attempt “to show modern man his true face.” In these public works the artist launched a “critical assault on the screen of historicism (…) with which bourgeois man concealed his modern, practical identity,” formally indicated by his shift from the “realization” of personified embodiment to a “two-dimensional concept.” While this dissertation owes much to Schorske’s analysis, his examination of Klimt is limited by his strict periodization of the oeuvre, one-sided conception of modernism as a complete rejection of tradition, and his primary focus on finished works rather than preliminary sketches, creative process, and studio practice. Schorske views Klimt as three distinct

---

486 For Rodin’s positive response, see Berta Zuckerkandl, Österreich intim: Erinnerungen 1892-1942 (Vienna: Wien Verlag Ullstein, 1970), 526-62. For Otto Wagner’s evaluation, see Anon., “Plein Air Wien 28 April 1902,” 71. For an overview, see Marian Bisanz-Prakken, Gustav Klimt, Der Beethovenfries: Geschichte, Funktion und Bedeutung (Munich: Deutsche Taschenbuch Verlag, 1980).
487 Nebehay, Dokumentation, 390.
488 Schorske, Fin-de-siècle Vienna, 266-67.
489 Ibid., 215. Otto Wagner was a celebrated leader in modern Viennese architecture and had a lasting influence among the artists of the Secession.
490 Ibid., 215, 217.
artists with mutually contradictory aims. Scholars like Alice Strobl and Marian Bisanz-Prakken have provided crucial insight into Klimt’s simultaneous engagement across mediums and overlapping projects that enable us to see continuities across his oeuvre, namely, his resolute pursuit of modern allegory and, as will be demonstrated in Chapter Six, his engagement with the arts of Japan.

2) Klimt’s Working Method: Continuities and Dialogue

Klimt’s patrons knew him as a perfectionist, who would often rework a canvas years after its first exhibition, for example, Portrait of Emilie Flöge (1902, reworked at an unknown later date) and Death and Life (1908-11/1915-16). Many of his projects spanned a significant period and thus their genesis overlapped considerably, e.g., Allegorien und Embleme and Neue Folge (1882-1900), Faculty Paintings (1894-1907), and the Stoclet Frieze (1905-11). His first sketches for the Faculty Paintings date from 1894, before Klimt and his fellow artists founded the Secession. He drew prolifically throughout his career and drawing continuously served as the foundation of his artistic practice, a fact attested to by the hundreds of sketches he produced for a single portrait. The appearance of several faculty sketches in Ver Sacrum in 1898 and the quantity of sketches for the Faculty Paintings that Strobl and Bisanz-Prakken have catalogued suggest that he quickly began work on the university commission.491 Jurisprudence made its first debut in 1903. However, Klimt did not consider this work complete until 1907,

491 See, Ver Sacrum vol. 3 (1898); and Alice Strobl, Gustav Klimt: Die Zeichnungen (1878-1903) vol. I. (Salzburg: Galerie Welz, 1980).
when it was displayed at the Berlin Galerie Keller und Reiner.\textsuperscript{492} The working timeline for the Faculty Paintings, therefore, spans from approximately 1894 to 1907, five years beyond Schorske’s narrative apex and two years after Klimt returned his advanced commission to the Ministry of Culture. The thirteen-year period he spent working on these paintings makes it difficult to neatly divide them into a distinct artistic period or separate them from his other endeavors.

Klimt’s sketches frequently reveal repetitions in his oeuvre. For example, figure 4.21 shows a preliminary drawing for \textit{Tragedy} (1897), his last contribution to Martin Gerlach’s compendia of modern allegories. In the sketch, Klimt is visually working through his ideas for Tragedy’s drawn frame. The center of the composition, the place of the personification, is left empty. Suggestions of willowy figures form columns on the left and right sides of the composition. At the bottom, Klimt wrote “FRAU WAHRHEIT … WIE NIEMAND ERKENNT (LADY TRUTH … AS NOONE RECOGNIZES.” These words connect Klimt’s pre-Secessioneer allegory with his modernist proclamation of artistic veracity and freedom, \textit{Nuda Veritas} (1899). Klimt is thinking of his personification of Theater (\textit{Tragedy}), which will be addressed in detail in this chapter, as an allegory of Truth or the role of truth in art.

Klimt himself drew connections between his various projects and genres. In the third volume of \textit{Ver Sacrum} (March 1898), his rejected state-commission \textit{Medicine} appears next to \textit{Tragedy}, and his sensual, Secessionist painting \textit{Fish Blood} (1898) appears close to his personifications of \textit{Old Italian Art} from the Kunsthistorisches Museum (Fig.\textsuperscript{492} For Klimt’s exhibition chronology, see Ronald S. Lauder and Renée Price, \textit{Gustav Klimt: The Ronald S. Lauder and Serge Sabarsky Collections} (New York: Neue Galerie New York, 2007), 41; and Natter ed., \textit{The Complete Paintings}, 522-643.
The illustrations in this volume present Klimt’s works in dialogue, as did the exhibitions of the Secession which paired portraiture and landscapes with monumental state-commissions, suggesting similarities across the artist’s diverse oeuvre.\footnote{494}

In 1907 Ludwig Hevesi wrote an article titled “Gustav Klimt und die Malmosaik.” Comparing the faculty murals with easel paintings like *The Three Ages of Woman* (1905) and *Watersnakes II* (1904), Hevesi notes stylistic continuity in Klimt’s works and the emergence of a new organic, geometric visual language based on Byzantine and Japanese models (Fig. 5.24-25).\footnote{495} Hevesi described the Malmosaik style as “the delicate Klimtian mixture of stylisms and naturalisms,” the juxtaposition of mosaic-like pattern and realistically rendered anatomical detail, that defined his art.\footnote{496} For Hevesi, the evolution of Klimt’s unique Malmosaik style had begun in the Faculty Paintings but still had inexhaustible possibilities.\footnote{497}

Looking at four examples from across Klimt’s oeuvre helps to illustrate what Hevesi defines as Malmosaik. In the Künstler-Compagnie’s murals in the Kunsthistorisches Museum (1890-91), several of Gustav Klimt’s contributions stand out. In the angel on the right-hand side of *Old Italian Art*, the patterned clothing worn by the angel disrupts the dimensional illusion of the image (Fig. 5.26). It seems almost entirely flat compared to the fabrics and textures volumetrically rendered in the neighboring

\footnote{493} On *Fish Blood*, see Bisanz-Prakken et al., *Gustav Klimt: The Drawings* (Vienna: Hirmer Verlag, 2012), 62.
\footnote{494} For exhibition photographs, see Lauder and Price, *Gustav Klimt: The Ronald S. Lauder and Serge Sabarsky Collections*, 416, 419.
\footnote{496} Hevesi, “Malmosaik,” 545.
\footnote{497} Ibid., 547. “Für Klimt selbst ist dieses Gebiet unerschöpflich.”
murals (Fig. 5.27-28). Although meticulously painted, the sharp detail and bold use of gold push the pattern to the mural’s plane. In contrast, the angel’s hands and faces are softly rendered, giving the illusion of depth. This juxtaposition is reversed in Klimt’s personification of Ancient Egypt (Fig. 5.29). Here, the high contrast background merges with the personification’s lined headcloth and jewelry while her naked body is given dimension and physicality. In these figures, we see an early pairing of mosaic-like pattern and realistically rendered anatomy.

This same tension is amplified in the Faculty Painting, Medicine. Here, Klimt transforms Hygeia’s body into a compressed column of spirals and circles that blend into the floral headdress framing her face (Fig. 5.30). Despite the convincing foreshortening of her right arm, the space collapses between the serpent she holds in her outstretched hand and her flattened torso. Yet, the personification’s hands and face are contoured by light and shade, giving her features dimension, texture, and subtle expression. This characteristic juxtaposition also appears in the mass of human bodies rising behind Hygeia. While limbs and torsos are translated into rhythmic contour lines, hands and faces are drawn in detail, creating oscillation between dimensional, contoured form and rhythmic pattern. One can imagine that the colors of the Faculty Paintings, which were condemned as garish by some of Klimt’s contemporaries, would have heightened these contrasts.498

The Stoclet Frieze is arguably one of the artist’s most abstract works, as the mosaic’s marble, ceramic, enamel, and stone tiles do not lend themselves to dimensional

498 Kraus condemned Klimt’s use of color in Jurisprudence. See, Karl Kraus, Die Fackel Nov. 21, 1903 (Munich: Kösel Verlag, 1903), 10.
illusion. In this frieze, Klimt created highly stylized and patterned representations of trees and birds, accentuating the flatness of the materials (Fig. 5.31). However, in the figures (e.g., the Dancer), Klimt achieved a level of pictorial depth softening the lines of her features and gestures (Fig. 5.32). The body of the Dancer is completely absorbed in a column of gold triangles, and her figure blends in with the patterned materiality of the frieze. However, the geometry of the whole is interrupted in part by the representation of her hands and face. As I will demonstrate in the final section of this chapter, Klimt developed this characteristic juxtaposition in his art during the years he produced his contributions to Gerlach’s *Allegorien und Embleme* and *Allegorien: Neue Folge*. It signals a conceptual, not just stylistic, framework tied to his pursuit of modern allegory. Chapter Six continues to examine this characteristic juxtaposition in relationship to Japonismus.

3) *Gerlach’s Modern Reanimation of the Allegorical Tradition*

The publisher Martin Gerlach Sr. (1846-1918) was a craftsman interested in the future of the applied arts and innovations available in the modern age. Trained as a draftsman, engraver, and metal chaser, he turned to publishing in 1872. From his first firm in Berlin to his foundation of the Polygraphic Art Institute in Vienna, he promoted the applied arts by printing innovative prototype and pattern books and literary works

---

illustrated by prominent young artists. While he has remained a relatively minor figure in art historical accounts of this period, he was active in the creative culture of his moment, as the numerous artistic projects produced by his two publishing houses between 1901 and 1924 attest.

At the end of the nineteenth century, Martin Gerlach Verlag published two multiple-volume compendia of modern allegories and emblems illustrated by contemporary artists predominantly from Munich and Vienna. The first, *Allegorien und Embleme* was issued between 1882 and 1884, and the second *Neue Folge*, between 1886 and 1900. Both were designed to be a “thoroughly modern” reanimation of the “fertile,” “age-old art form” of allegory. Modeled on emblem books like Cesare Ripa’s *Iconologia*, Gerlach’s visual encyclopedias espoused a traditional belief in the potential of allegory to express elusive truths concretely, claiming this power for the modern age.

Gerlach’s compendia were envisioned as a modern renascence of allegory. Consequently, it is helpful to look at the rich tradition of emblem books that served as models. While there are distinct differences between emblems and allegories, the format of *Allegorien und Embleme*, and to a lesser extent *Neue Folge*, is similar to Cesar Ripa’s book of emblems *Iconologia*. The reader is introduced to the anthology, the works are listed in a table of contents, and the allegories are presented with their titles either in the

---

501 Albert Ilg, “Vorwort,” *Allegorien und Embleme* vol. I (Vienna: Gerlach Verlag, 1884), 1-45, 1. Ilg states that the intention is to create works in a “durchaus modernem Sinne” and reclaim the “fruchtbares Gartenland” of the “uralte Kunstform” of allegory.

502 First published in 1593, Ripa’s *Iconologia* was the most influential and lasting encyclopedia of visual allegory. Ripa compiled his imagery from coins, mythology, archaeological texts, sculpture, metal works, and engravings. Nine publications were published in Italian (1593, 1603, 1611, 1613, 1618, 1625, 1630, 1645, 1764-7) and eight were published in other languages (1644 French, 1644 Dutch, 1699 Dutch, 1704 German, 1709 English, 1760 German, 1766 French and 1779 English).
border or within the central composition. Albert Ilg’s introduction to the first publication serves as a “modest guide” to the allegories within, playing an analogous role to the explanatory text of Ripa’s *Iconologia*.503

The tradition of emblem books began in the early sixteenth century with Andrea Alciato’s *Emblemata Liber* (1531). From this first example through the numerous publications of *Iconologia*, emblem books served as didactic guides to the allegorical visual culture of early modern Europe. Bridging between the literary and graphic arts, allegory was a widespread mode of figurative representation in the sixteenth through eighteenth centuries, and the personifications illustrated in emblem books were employed and adapted to suit diverse functions and formats from encyclopedias and religious texts to the decorative programs of royal courts and the pages of children’s educational primers. Emblem books like *Iconologia* fell out of favor in the Enlightenment, and allegory was overshadowed by the “primal Romantic symbol” in the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries.504 However, in the artistic landscape of Vienna, allegory played a more continuous role in the vibrant and eclectic style of nineteenth-century historicism. Hence, Gerlach’s production of a compilation of distinctly modern allegories and emblems between 1882 and 1900 was an endeavor simultaneously rich with possibilities and obscure in its intention. The “fertile grounds” being reanimated were expansive and manifold.505 An example from Ripa’s book of emblems illuminates the complexity of this revivalist project.

503 The style of *Neue Folge* is more modern, but the second publication still incorporates aspects from Ripa, for example, the inclusion of text within the image.
In Ripa’s *Iconologia*, the personification of Truth illustrates the potential traditionally attributed to allegory (Fig. 5.33). Conforming to the emblem’s deceptively simple definition, the concept is represented as an image accompanied by a title and motto. In its three-parts, the meaning of the emblem appears as given. The pairing of image and text is authoritatively presented as an a priori relationship. Nevertheless, the legibility of the emblem depends on the existence of a known story from which the interpreter is expected to draw specific associations. According to Ripa’s textual description, the personification’s nudity symbolizes a state of nature. Like Eve before she has eaten of the apple, Truth needs no “artificial embellishment.” Proper interpretation relies on the clarity, stability, and authority of the emblem’s associative ties. The meaning or meanings of Truth depend on numerous, culturally specific associations, for example, the Edenic conception of nature and the negative perception of artifice. However, the association between image and text is presented as a natural rather than culturally specific relationship, forming an unseen, deeper level of meaning that is activated by the viewer’s interpretation. Akin to the alchemist’s philosopher’s stone, which enables miraculous transmutation, enlightenment, and access to the eternal, the successful emblem promises to embody rather than merely represent an abstract concept through the direct participation of the viewer’s “curious and inquisitive eye.” The emblem is not simply a

---


sum of its parts, nor is the emblem book merely an alphabetically arranged series of personifications.  

In John Manning’s view, allegory’s engagement with all aspects of human culture is its defining feature and most dynamic promise. “The very flexibility” of the genre has given it life. The power of allegory stems from its permeation of the daily as well as the elemental, and its lessons, both profound and mundane, can be found everywhere. Yet, unlike “the medieval ‘Book of Nature,’” the symbolic world of allegory requires a reader. Allegory’s vital expression of truths, its embodiment, depends on its ability to draw the viewer into the representational space and capture our attention. This vitality is one of the elements of the allegorical tradition that Ilg sought to reclaim for the modern age in his forewords to Gerlach’s compendia. In his view, the valuable allegories of past ages struck the viewer with the “complete power of reality.” In other words, he wanted to recuperate traditions of allegory that broke through the painted plane.

**4) Albert Ilg’s Modern Allegory**

When Albert Ilg wrote his introductions to *Allegorien und Embleme* he was involved in contemporary debates concerning the reformation of the Austrian arts, and his prior scholarship focused on an early Renaissance emblem novel. Hence, Gerlach’s...
selection of the imperial curator as an introductory author is hardly surprising. What is striking is Ilg’s central argument. In his brief but dense forewords, he contends that art’s most important functions could only be achieved allegorically, making Gerlach’s project essential to revitalizing the Austrian arts. For Ilg, allegory expressed the eternal in the language of “the purely human.” These “new and modern” compendia were not objects of leisure for the drawing-room table or mere collections of patterns. Arranged by “ingenious thought,” the allegorical volumes were intended to foster modern art’s highest potential through a revival of Winckelmann’s “harmonious balance,” Nietzschean vitalism, and a rebirth of the Austrian Baroque.

At the heart of Ilg’s forewords is his attempt to trace an unbroken lineage originating in the art and myth of Classical Antiquity. As Christiane Hertel has noted, Winckelmann’s “aims at a ‘revitalization (Wiederbelebung) of classical allegory’” in 1766 set the stage for “Ilg’s ‘great anthropomorphosis’ of allegory in 1882.” Like Winckelmann, Ilg sought to define allegory as the origin and essence of art. Echoing Winckelmann’s appraisal of the “holy language” invented by the Greeks, Ilg defines modern allegory as a vital embodiment created by a harmonious balance between ornament and figuration, the perfect equilibrium between stylization and mimesis. He asserts that even “the superficial observer” could perceive a “certain one-sidedness” in

515 Ibid., 1.
516 Ibid., 2.
the Austrian arts, “which suffered, in so far as the culture of the ornamental [predominated] to the injury of the employment of figures.” Gerlach’s compendia were intended to provide models of lost balance, laying the foundations for a universally understandable modern visual language. Essentially, for Ilg, “harmonious balance” was the alchemic ingredient by which allegory conveyed innate signification.

The Nietzschean opposition between the Apollonian and Dionysian is a second dialectic in Ilg’s definition of modern allegory. As can be read in his praise of the “modern [Maenads]” included in Gerlach’s compendia, Ilg connected the frenzied vitality of Dionysus to the power of allegory to engage the viewer with the “complete power of reality.” Addressed directly to artists and concerned with the revival of the arts, Nietzsche’s The Birth of Tragedy (1872) was highly influential in the intellectual landscape of late nineteenth-century Vienna, and its thesis resonated with the reform movements and general climate of the era. In this text, Nietzsche claims that the model of Archaic Greek tragedy is crucial to the revitalization of German culture. As

520 Ibid., 2, 9.
521 The influence of Nietzsche’s philosophy in Vienna was closely connected to the popularity of Wagner. When Nietzsche wrote The Birth of Tragedy, the philosopher viewed Wagener as a heroic artist capable of unifying German culture. His relationship and views had completely reversed by 1886, and he viewed the composer as a posturing panderer and symptom of cultural decay. Friedrich Nietzsche, The Birth of Tragedy and The Case of Wagner, trans. Walter Kaufmann (New York: Random House, 1967). For Nietzsche’s relationship to Wagner, see Kaufmann’s translation notes, Ibid., 147-153. On the promotion of the theories of Nietzsche and Wagner in Vienna, see Timothy W. Hiles, “Gustav Klimt’s Beethoven Frieze, Truth, and The Birth of Tragedy,” in Nietzsche, Philosophy and the Arts, ed. Salim Kemal and Ivan Gaskell (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998), 162-86, 174-75. Several scholars have linked the popularity of Nietzsche in fin-de-siècle Vienna to the works of Klimt. Schorske, Fin-de-siècle Vienna; and Lisa Florman, “Gustav Klimt and the Precedent of Ancient Greece,” The Art Bulletin 72, no. 2 (1990), 310-26.
522 Nietzsche, The Birth of Tragedy, 121. In his added preface of 1896, “An Attempt at Self-Criticism,” Nietzsche both criticized the romanticism of his day as well as the overly logical culture of the later Greeks. He viewed the art of his time as unbalanced. To revitalize German culture, balance needed to be created between the Apollonian and Dionysian. See, Ibid., 17-18.
Nietzsche argues, the perfect art form of Greek tragedy evolved from the opposition between two artistic principles represented by the Greek gods Apollo and Dionysus.\textsuperscript{523}

Nietzsche aligns Apollo with the plastic arts and the culture of Homeric Greece. Characterized by the creation of illusion, the Apollonian arts are precise, ordered, austere, and governed by rationality and self-control. Conversely, Nietzsche claims Dionysus as the god of music. In contrast to the Apollonian, the Dionysian arts are wild, ecstatic, and instinctual. Typified by the Bacchanalian chant, Dionysian art is the abandonment of the self to the primal “oneness with the inmost ground of the world.”\textsuperscript{524} In bringing these two forces into balance, Archaic Greek tragedy was an Apollonian “embodiment of Dionysian insights and effects.”\textsuperscript{525} It was the expression of profound truths in a form endurable to human comprehension. While the wholly Apollonian would create complete stasis, the wholly Dionysian would “plunge nature into the abyss of destruction.”\textsuperscript{526} Both were essential to the creative potential of art, and any imbalance indicated either decadence or stagnation. For Nietzsche, his moment had become disproportionally and rigidly Apollonian. The only recovery from this logical inertia was a resurgence of the Dionysian arts.

Like Nietzsche, Ilg believed that the arts of his time needed to be radically reformed, as equilibrium had been overwhelmed by “puritanical sobriety.”\textsuperscript{527} In terms of allegory, his implied distinction is between overly Apollonian personifications that are indifferent to what they represent, merely holding attributes or wearing their identifying

\textsuperscript{523} Ibid., 33.
\textsuperscript{524} Ibid., 38.
\textsuperscript{525} Ibid., 65.
\textsuperscript{526} Ibid., 69.
\textsuperscript{527} Ilg, vol. I, 2.
garments (e.g., Justice merely seated blindfolded and holding scales) and true embodiments that are identical to what they represent. In his description of valuable models of older epochs, Ilg further articulates this difference and the Nietzschean vitality he attributed to allegory: “Giotto's angry man doesn't just represent anger, he is angry and the image therefore grabs us with the full force of reality.” For Ilg, the contemporary moment needed a resurgence of the Dionysian priests and priestesses of “Bacchus” that appeared in Gerlach’s compendia. In allegories like Franz Matsch’s Ancient Times and Modern Times, he saw Nietzschean vitality reclaimed for the modern age (Fig. 5.34). As Ilg describes, the personification of Ancient Times is naked and pure, Modern Times is frenzied and sober, and the image has the movement and vitality of an orgy while maintaining the self-possession of sobriety. Balancing the Apollonian and Dionysian, Matsch had created a new “living” art out of the “inanimate in abstraction.”

Given the place of Winckelmann and Nietzsche in Ilg’s forewords, one would assume that he would call for the reanimation of either the Renaissance tradition or Classical allegory. Indeed, he references works by Renaissance artists like Giotto, Dürer, and Raphael as “valuable” allegorical models. He surprisingly diverges from his prior scholarship, adding yet another layer of complexity to his prescriptions for the modern arts of Austria. He calls for a revival of Baroque and Renaissance art, thus uniting

---

528 Ibid., 9. “Giotto’s wüthiger Mann stellt den Zorn nicht bloss vor, er ist zornig und das Bild packt uns darum mit voller Gewalt der Wirklichkeit. Darin liegt die Werth der Allegorien der älteren Kunstepochen.”
529 Ibid. Ilg describes Franz Matsch’s Modern Times as “a priestess of Bacchus,” shedding “light and enlightenment,” and F. Simm’s allegory of the seasons as “a priest of Bacchus.”
530 Ibid., 3.
531 Ibid., 9. Ilg uses Giotto as an example of the emergence of the Renaissance.
532 In 1882 Ilg had begun to recuperate the Baroque period in Kunstgeschichtliche Charakterbilder aus Österreich-Ungarn, a project initiated by Eitelberger. His dissertation on the Hypnerotomachia Poliphili held a significant place in his scholarship at this time.
Baroque drama with Renaissance individualism. In Christiane Hertel’s assessment, Ilg believed that the “expressive creativity” of the Baroque’s dramatic color and ornamental form was essential to art and its future. In this dual reanimation, Ilg asserts that modern allegory is a free form of personal expression.

*Allegorien und Embleme* and *Neue Folge* (1882-1900) contain many complexities. Lucia Curta has argued that the first “extensive compendium was conceived in a purely historicist spirit, its aim being to revive the genre of allegory … threatened with oblivion in the nineteenth century.” The nationalist and imperialist overtones of Ilg’s introductions paradoxically cast a conservative shadow over the project. There is a sense of anxiety concerning the modernity of allegorical revival, as Ilg self-consciously repeats the term “modern” and seems anxious to justify his support of the endeavor and distinguish his views from a regressive idea of neo-Baroque allegory. With all of their tensions, these volumes, nevertheless, present allegory as a valuable path forward and were produced during a significant time for visual modernism in Vienna.
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533 Hertel, *Vermeer*, 150.
536 Ilg, vol. II, 1, 2. Ilg was anxious about his recuperation of both allegory and the Baroque. While claiming the strengths of Baroque allegory for the modern age, he emphatically rejects Baroque emblematics. The worry for Ilg was that modern allegory might be considered distinctly un-modern or too esoteric to be universally legible. Hence, he repeatedly asserts that these allegories do not need explanation and that every page of the book “breathes” a decidedly modern air. Christiane Hertel notes Ilg’s “need to justify not only the revival of [allegory and emblematics] but also, … his own support for them.” See Hertel, *Vermeer*, 149.
In his forewords, Ilg asserts that allegory is not only a continuous but progressive tradition fundamental to art’s “highest triumph.” He ties the future progress of his Winckelmannian, Nietzschean, and Baroque modern allegory directly to the goals of the Secessionists of Munich and Vienna. The Munich Secession was founded in 1892, the same year Gerlach began his modern allegorical project. According to Ilg, these artists already had begun to resuscitate and modernize allegory and revitalize the contemporary arts through harmonious balance, Nietzschean vitalism, and baroque rebirth. Austrian artistic revival could thus follow the lead of Munich’s Secessionists’ vital reawakening in “the spirit of today.” His emphasis on the uninhibited expression of modern allegory resonates with one of the central aims of the Vienna Secession, to give the age its art and art its freedom. Significantly, Ilg’s language mirrors the characterization of Japanese art expressed in volumes from Klimt’s library examined in Chapter Four. Ilg defines the nature and purpose of art in terms of animation and the direct engagement of the viewer. Siegfried Bing and Ernest Fenollosa believed that Japanese artists had an exemplary power to create works “animated by the breadth of life.” The same words are used to

538 Ibid., 2.
539 Ibid., 3.
540 The motto inscribed above the entryway of the Vienna Secession building is: “Der Zeit ihre Kunst—Der Kunst ihre Freiheit.”
541 Ernest Fenollosa, Ursprung und Entwicklung der chinesischen und japanischen Kunst vol. II (Leipzig, Hiersemann, 1913), 81. Fenollosa writes of “spirit” (Geist) and art “as really present and animated by the breadth of life” (als wirklich gegenwärtig, als von einem Lebenshauch beseelt, aufdrängt). The whole passage reads as follows: “Eine andere ganz große Eigenschaft die Sesshū in hohem Maße besitzt ist ‘Geist.’ Darunter versteht man nach chinesischer Auffassung in erster Linie den Grad, in welchem sich uns ein gemalter Gegenstand als wirklich gegenwärtig, als von einem Lebenshauch beseelt, aufdrängt. … Von dieser Kraft belebt, stellt uns Sesshū seine Figuren, seine Porträts, sogar seine Vögel und Landschaften vor Augen. Sie nehmen die eindrucksfähige Seele gefangen und werden so weit wirklich, als eine Flut photographischer Aufnahmen je werden könnte. Ihre ‘Geistigkeit’ brennt gleich einer Säure; wir werden vor ihnen festgehalten, als ob die Nadel dieses Radierers durch lebende Drähte mit unserm Herzen verbunden wäre; wir gehen atemlos von ihnen fort reiner und besser als hätten wir in einem neuen Äther atmen gelernt. … Mit Hilfe dieses Elixiers haben die Dichter zu allen Zeiten die Welt verwandelt. Darum
describe the aims and functions of allegory and the spirit of Japanese art, demonstrating a possible path of connection. How Klimt’s art engages the viewer and how his Japonismus accentuated or disrupted his modern allegories will be addressed in Chapter Six.

5) The Nascent Artistic Community of Gerlach’s Allegorical Compendia

Looking at Gerlach’s allegorical compendia, we find Klimt in the middle of a group of artists and historians in the early 1880s pursuing modernism through the reform and revitalization of a past tradition. Gerlach hand-selected the artists included in his compendia, and the volumes emphasized the importance of each contributor. In the first two volumes of Allegorien und Emblem, the artist of every allegory is listed alongside the work’s title, and Ilg introduces each plate included in the first volume. In Neue Folge, Gerlach’s very brief introduction does not address specific works, but the names of the contributors are featured prominently in the table of contents. Klimt’s participation in this project is notable, as his seven works included in Allegorien und Embleme outnumbered the contributions of the sixty-two represented artists with the exception of the co-founder of the Munich Secession, Franz von Stuck (1863-1928), who contributed nineteen as well as numerous emblems, and Georg Sturm (1855-1923), who contributed eight. In Neue

überraschen uns sogar die Felsen und Bäume bei Sesshū durch eine Art überirdische Kraft, als ob sie wirklicher seien als die Wirklichkeit. Und diese Eigenschaft stellt Sesshū auf gleiche Stufe mit Wu Tao tzu, Phidias, Li Lung-mien, Michel-angelo, Nobuzane, Velazquez, Hsia Kuei, Manet und Mu Ch’i.” Bing, “Programme,” Artistic Japan, vol 1. no. 1 (1888), 1-7, 3. The whole passage reads as follows: “This, if I do not err, is the great and salutary lesson that we may derive from the examples which he sets before us. Under such influences the lifeless stiffness to which our technical designers have hitherto so rigidly adhered will be relaxed by degrees, and our productions will become animated by the breath of real life that constitutes the secret charm of every achievement of Japanese Art.”

542 Despite his substantial oeuvre, little has been written about Sturm. He was a student and assistant to the historicist painter of the Ringstrasse Ferdinand Laufberger (1829-1881), who also taught Gustav Klimt. Rob Delvigne and Jan Heij, “Rehabilitation for Georg Sturm,” Rijksmuseum Bulletin 61 (2013), 24-63.
Folge, Klimt’s allegories were outnumbered only by two of the fifty-four contributing artists and, along with Stuck, he was one of the few artists included in both Allegorien und Embleme and Neue Folge. We can infer that Gerlach gave emphasis to the works of these young artists to promote allegory among the younger generation.

Klimt and Stuck contributed to Allegorien und Embleme and Neue Folge, which suggests a level of dedication throughout Gerlach’s project (1882-1900). This early connection between Gerlach and Secessionists continued well beyond these allegorical volumes. Gerlach & Schenk (1882-1901) and the publisher’s second house Gerlach & Wiedling went on to print the first thirteen issues of Ver Sacrum (1898), Aus des Knaben Wunderhorn illustrated by the Berthold Löffler (1899), a three-volume portfolio of planar ornament by Koloman Moser and C. O. Czeschka (Die Quelle, 1900-1902), a special binding of Giovanni Segantini: sein Leben und sein Werk (1902) illustrated by Moser, a 1906 folio of folk art designed as “a treasure trove of motifs and a source of inspiration for ongoing invention” (notably including Japanese models, Fig. 5.35), and Die Nibelungen dem Deutschen Volke (1909) and Johan Peter Hebel’s Erzählungen und Schwänke (1920) illustrated by Czeschka. As to the influence of Allegorien und

Embleme and Neue Folge on Klimt’s artistic community, the compendia included the works of another six artists who would subsequently join Vienna’s modernist movement, several artists of German Art Nouveau, three future members of the Wiener Werkstätte, and numerous artists whose works were later featured in Ver Sacrum.\(^{544}\)

Many connections can be drawn between the participants of Allegorien und Embleme and Neue Folge. In these volumes, we find Klimt surrounded by his teachers and classmates; the members of the Künstler-Compagnie; his future colleagues from the Munich and Vienna Secessions, Wiener Werkstätte, and Klimt-Group; several artists who would become his lifelong collaborators; and many artists who inspired him throughout his career and shared his concerns for art in the modern age. Bridging between Klimt’s foundational years and his major undertakings, Gerlach’s project, included Julius von Berger (1850-1902), Max Klinger, and Koloman Moser. Berger was a compatriot of Hans Makart who worked on the mural program of the Kunsthistorisches Museum and was one of Klimt’s professors at the School of Design.\(^{545}\) Klinger’s sculpture of Beethoven was the artistic center of the Vienna Secession’s largest collaborative experiment, the 1902 Beethoven Exhibition. Although Klinger engaged with the ideas of the Symbolists, he did not wholly discount the potential of allegory, particularly regarding his conception of

---


\(^{545}\) Berger taught decorative painting from 1881 to 1887, and Klimt was a student there between 1876 and 1883.
“graphic art” (Zeichnung) and Gesamtkunstwerk (Raumkunst). Moser, who participated in the Beethoven exhibition with Klimt and Klinger, was one of the most prolific artists of the Vienna Secession and Wiener Werkstätte. He also was part of the Klimt-Group. Known as the “stylists” for their emphasis on the decorative arts, these artists followed Klimt when he left the Secession in 1905. These three individuals show a network branching through and between Klimt’s early and late artistic communities.

6) Klimt’s Contributions to Gerlach’s Allegorical Compendia

Between 1882 and 1897, Klimt contributed seven works to Allegorien und Embleme and four to Neue Folge. In the context of his overall artistic output, which includes hundreds of paintings and thousands of drawings, these eleven visual allegories initially seem unremarkable. Few historians mention his inclusion in this unique and substantial printing project or see these early works as part of his modernism. Beyond the numerous connections apparent in Gerlach’s compendia, there are several reasons why Klimt’s contributions should not be excluded from considerations of modernism in his oeuvre.

In the eighteen-years between Gerlach’s first and last volume of allegories (1882-1900), Klimt’s career burgeoned. When he produced The Times of Day (1882), he was

---


547 Lucia Curta has argued that these contributions were “crucial” to Klimt’s art.” In contrast to my view, she sees them as “the first signs of rupture with [the] academic tradition.” Lucia Curta, “Painter and King,” 102.
still a student at the School of Design. By 1897, the year Klimt produced *Tragedy*, he was
the founder and president of the Vienna Secession and had already made numerous
sketches for his heatedly disputed Faculty Paintings. Notably, both Gerlach’s *Neue Folge*
and Klimt’s *Philosophy* made their public debuts in 1900, which places Klimt’s inclusion
in this modern allegorical project in temporal proximity to the public display of his
contentious Faculty Paintings. Spanning a significant period in his career and the
conception of modern Austrian art, Klimt’s participation in these compendia was not
simply a lucrative way for the young artist to advance his career.

Born into an artisan family, Klimt was personally invested in the contemporary
discussion concerning the applied arts industry.\(^{548}\) It is reasonable to assume that he
would have been aware and interested in the future of art implied by the publication of
Gerlach’s allegorical compendia. How Gerlach influenced Klimt’s career is exemplified
in the publisher’s promotion of the artist via print from 1882 through 1901. Gerlach’s
forays into photography and collotype also suggest the publisher’s kinship with the aims
of the Secessionists, who were vested in a non-hierarchical unity of the arts. The
influence of Ilg is more direct, and, as will be addressed shortly, there is a distinct
resonance between the historian’s conception of modern allegory and the artist’s
contributions to Gerlach’s compendia.

Ilg’s mentor Rudolf Eitelberger also shaped Klimt’s education at the School of
Design and procured noteworthy commissions for the Künstler-Compagnie. The
influence of this early advisor can still be heard in Klimt’s speech at the 1908 Kunstschau

85-95. For the various reforms promoted, see Rampley, “Design Reform in the Habsburg Empire.”
in which he echoed Eitelberger’s Anglophilia as well as his championing of the applied arts. Sharing this early mentor, it is easy to conceive that Klimt was affected by Ilg’s definition of modern allegory. Reciprocally, Ilg spoke favorably about Klimt’s work and came into direct dialogue with the artist in the decorative plans for the Kunsthistorisches Museum (1890-91). In Hans Makart’s original design the spandrels of the Kunsthistorisches Museum were supposed to be purely ornate grotesques. When the Künstler-Compagnie undertook the completion of this project, Makart’s designs were replaced by an ambitious plan to depict art’s history. Ilg selected works from the museum collection for models, and, in this instance, directly informed the Künstler-Compagnie’s illustrations and interpretations of prior artistic traditions.

While Ilg was a more of a traditionalist than Klimt, and his writings were tinted by his nationalism (adherence to the Baroque), he nevertheless was innovative in his approach to art and art history in a manner that would have appeal to the younger artist. In his dissertation, Ilg considered an illustrated novel of “love in a dream” (Francesco Colonna’s Hypnerotomachia Poliphili, 1499) published at the height of Venetian humanism. In the book’s woodcut illustrations, the protagonist moves

---

549 Eitelberger was one of the many Anglophiles in late nineteenth-century Vienna who thought the reform of the Viennese art industry should follow in the footsteps of Britain. In his 1908 speech, Klimt announced the intentions of the Klimt-Gruppe, stating: “We have come together … united only by the conviction that no realm of human life is too insignificant and small to offer room for artistic efforts, that in [William] Morris’ words- even the most unprepossessing thing, if it is perfectly executed, can help increase the beauty of this earth, and that the progress of culture is founded solely in the ever-increasing permeation of all life with artistic intentions.” Klimt’s speech is quoted in translation in Lauder and Price, Gustav Klimt: The Ronald S. Lauder and Serge Sabarsky Collections, 465.
551 I use the term eclecticism, referencing Ilg’s definition of modern allegory in Gerlach’s compendia.
552 Ilg, Über den kunsthistorischen Wert der Hypnerotomachia Poliphili (Vienna: W. Braumüller, 1872).
through a world of hieroglyphs and monuments in which the Renaissance tradition of allegory and emblems are united with Egyptian pictorial writing. In his evaluation of the *Hypnerotomachia*, Ilg thus incorporates Egypt, or rather an Orientalist view of Egypt, into his reconfiguration of the classical tradition. This freedom to draw across cultures was mirrored in late-nineteenth and early twentieth century Viennese art, which brought disparate and distinct elements into dialogue. This shared openness to eclecticism lends weight to connections between Klimt’s visual modernism and Ilg’s definition of modern allegory.

Klimt’s participation in Gerlach’s compendia was significant to the artist. He worked extensively on his contributions and produced numerous preparatory sketches for the eleven allegories, three of which were completed in the more time-consuming medium of oil paint. He repeatedly exhibited these works in the years following their publication by Gerlach, including in the context of the Vienna Secession. The *Times of Day* (1882), *The Realms of Nature* (1882), *Youth* (1882), and *Opera* (1883) were all exhibited at the Künstlerhaus in 1885 and 1896 and at Vienna City Hall in 1901. *The Fable* (1884) and *June* (1896) were shown at Vienna City Hall in 1901. *Sculpture* (1896) was displayed in Vienna City Hall in 1901 and by the Secession in 1903, and *Tragedy* (1897) was reproduced in *Ver Sacrum* (1898) and displayed by the Secession in 1898, at Vienna City Hall in 1901, and again by the Secession in 1903. The purpose of this selective exhibition list is to illustrate the continued relevance Klimt attributed to these lesser-known works. He did not view them as separate from his Secessionist aims. As

553 On exhibitions of these works, see Strobl, *Gustav Klimt: Die Zeichnungen (1878-1903)* vol. I, 30, 32, 34, 40, 96.
Alice Strobl has noted, there are stylistic continuities between these early allegories and the artist’s later works.\textsuperscript{554}

Drawing a neat line between the Vienna Secessionists and aspects of the historicist tradition is challenging, particularly in the case of Klimt. Many Viennese intellectuals and artists engaged in the pursuit of artistic modernism held to their foundations in historicism. The mentor of the Jung-Wien generation and advocate of the Secession, Ludwig Hevesi, wrote that one should “never reject yesterday’s ideals of beauty just because the new fashion had turned decisively against them.”\textsuperscript{555} In his writings on Klimt, which spanned more than thirty years, the author Hermann Bahr frequently drew parallels between Klimt and the historicist painter Makart, declaring in 1921 that the disciple had exceeded his predecessor becoming “the newest of the new,” and “the most modern” of the moderns.\textsuperscript{556} Many of Klimt’s fellow Secessionists maintained their educational roots, carrying over the values and ambitions of the historicist era. A prime example of this is the complete work of art (Gesamtkunstwerk), which was explored by historicist artists of the Ringstrasse and the Vienna Secession. The importance of craft implied within the concept also shaped the aspirations of later artistic groups of the Wiener Werkstätte and Klimt’s “Stylists.”

---

\textsuperscript{554} Ibid., 96. In Strobl’s view, Klimt’s \textit{Sculpture} reflects the influence of Ferdinand Knopff, a Belgian artist frequently exhibited by the Vienna Secession.

\textsuperscript{555} Sáramany-Parsons, “The Art Criticism of Ludwig Hevesi,” 103. Parson argues that “[the] imperative of knowing and understanding the past in order to create something of quality in the present is fundamental to the historicist worldview of the 1860s – Hevesi’s formative years. With his background in German art history, in French cultural positivism and in the progressive politics of Liberalism, Hevesi regarded European culture as an invaluable treasure-trove of humanist ideals, all of them still valid in the present.” Ibid., 93.

\textsuperscript{556} Bahr first addressed Klimt’s work in his article entitled “Secession” (1898). His last written commentary on Klimt is in his journal \textit{Der Zauberstab} (1926). Bahr, “Klimt,” in \textit{Bilderbuch} (Vienna: Wila, 1921), 55-58.
Given Klimt’s experimentation with modern allegory in the years surrounding the founding of the Secession, it is reasonable to conclude that allegory was another aspect of tradition that he sustained in his visual pursuits. Ilg’s description of modern allegory as the “free, genuine artistic spirit” of the modern age resonates with Hevesi’s motto inscribed above the entrance of the Secession’s building: “To every age its art. To art its freedom.” In Klimt’s eclectic style, we see both his assertion of artistic independence as well as his kinship with the ideas of Hevesi. Indeed, Sáramany-Parson’s assessment of Hevesi can be applied to Klimt: He believed that “all novelties and all experiments could be considered valid if they truthfully reflected the state of humanity and society in their time,” even those which evolved from the art historical past.557

Klimt’s contributions to Allegorien und Embleme and Neue Folge provide a foundation for viewing the artist’s oeuvre as a resolute pursuit of modern allegory. To be clear, not all of his works were allegories, and art as divergent in time, space, and medium as Italian Byzantine mosaics, Edo period Japanese prints, Greek and Egyptian sculpture, and Symbolist painting influenced his eclectic style. As is evident in a comparison of his early and late works, Klimt’s art changed as he progressively flattened the perspective of his compositions, produced more asymmetrical designs with expanses of negative space, and increasingly compressed the planes of his canvases with dense layers of interlocking pattern. There are, however, uninterrupted threads in his oeuvre. One is his juxtaposition of mosaic-like pattern with realistically rendered anatomical detail. In many ways, the rising tension between these two modes of representation characterizes his art. Focusing on works to which the concept applies, I read this

intensified relationship between plane and illusion as Klimt’s attempt to modernize allegorical form and locate the cultivation of this conceptual and stylistic principle within the framework of Gerlach’s compendia and Ilg’s definition of modern allegory.

Alice Strobl, Marian Bisanz-Prakken, and Susanna Partsch have noted that Klimt’s contributions to Gerlach’s compendia thematically and stylistically foreshadow his later endeavors. Where they view Klimt’s contributions as evidence of his embrace of Symbolism, I see these works as rooted in the allegorical tradition and emerging from Ilg’s call to revitalize. This is not to say that Symbolism did not impact Klimt’s art. The Vienna Secession, after all, promoted the works of Symbolist painters from its first exhibition in 1898 onward. However, it is important to note that Klimt continued to utilize allegorical devices in his works most frequently associated with this visual espousal of subjectivity and emotion. The traditional structuring of the emblem is visible in Klimt’s Naked Truth; he employs “the High Baroque convention of dual vision” in Philosophy and Medicine to “[indicate] that the background depicts the foreground figure’s message;” and his later oeuvre includes many works with clearly allegorical titles. Ultimately, this is not a matter of symbol or allegory, but of both, with allegory, in my view, remaining the guiding concept. Examining Klimt’s art as rooted in the allegorical tradition adds nuance to our understanding of his relationship to Symbolism and the position of his art as a bridge between historicism to modernism.

In his allegories for Gerlach’s publications, Klimt was not attempting to create a secret, interior language, or, as we saw Schorske arguing, confronting the public by

558 Marlowe-Storkovich, “Medicine,” 231. In Philosophy and Medicine, the viewer is invited into the painting by a figure centrally located in the foreground. She embodies the idea as her message unravels behind her.
subverting allegorical form. In alignment with Ilg’s delineation of modern allegory he was attempting to give new form to “the eternal, universal concepts that always remain the same but nevertheless appear differently in the artistic mediums of different ages.”

Klimt’s eleven allegories for Gerlach’s compendia show the artist’s experimentation with decorative motifs and personifications in ways that reflect Ilg’s Winckelmannian proposal for a “harmonious combination” of ornament and figuration, his Nietzschean vitalism, and his recuperation of the Baroque’s expressive power. As demonstrated through close reading, Ilg’s complex conception of modern allegory influenced the stylistic and conceptual development of Klimt’s art from *Allegorien und Embleme* and *Neue Folge*.

First, consideration of the differences and continuities between Gerlach’s two publications of modern allegory is in order. While there are notable changes in the organization and style of these publications, the most striking difference between the first and second publications is the shift in thematic emphasis. Filled with representations of hourly, daily, and yearly markers of time passing, the thematic emphasis of *Allegorien und Embleme* is the human perception, measurement, and qualification of time. In several ways this is the publication’s most modern feature. The personification of Time is repeated in so many guises that the first volume expresses concern over the speed of the modern age. Pace is one source of anxiety, but faster connection, by railroad and


560 Ibid., 2.

561 Whereas *Allegorien und Embleme* more closely resembles a traditional emblem book like Ripa’s *Iconologia*, the format and visual organization of *Neue Folge* is precursive to the Secessionist Magazine *Ver Sacrum*. The latter publication is printed in color and contains very little text.
steamship, to other parts of the world may well be another, along with unease about travel, world fairs, and increasing networks of the world’s economies and cultures. This anxiety is visible in Anton Seder’s personification of Time as a winged hourglass powered by the wheels of a steam locomotive in *Allegorien und Embleme* (Fig. 5.36). Here, Time is given the power of modern technology. The hard lines of the decorative backdrop surround and meet the edge of the carved patterns of the hourglass, creating rigidity in the composition. Yet, the smoke rising from under the locomotive’s wheels implies that the speed of modern times will inevitably cause the grains of sand to flow more quickly. The tension between the implied motion of the locomotive and the weight of the architectural backdrop creates a sense of uncertainty in the image that permeates the volumes’ repeated allegories of Time.\(^\text{562}\)

The apprehensive tone of the first publication gives way in *Neue Folge* to a new Dionysian emphasis. As Gerlach states, here we find “themes that breathe pleasure and life: wine, love, song, music, and dance.”\(^\text{563}\) Despite the seeming disjointedness between the first and second publications, Gerlach’s introduction to *Neue Folge* ties the ambitions of the second publication to the program laid out by Ilg’s earlier forewords. Gerlach writes that the publication was inspired by a “living incentive” to bring the most “modern art by young, impulsive creative talents” to the eyes of the public.\(^\text{564}\) His language here echoes the vitalism and aims of Ilg’s introductions to *Allegorien und Embleme*.

\(^{562}\) Considering Gerlach’s anthology, Hertel notes the anxiety and “fatalism” that dominates Seder’s representation of time. See Hertel, *Vermeer*, 151.

\(^{563}\) Martin Gerlach, Introduction to *Allegorien: Neue Folge: Originalentwürfe von namhaften modernen Künstlern* (Vienna: Gerlach & Schenk, 1900). The works in this volume are supposed to capture “das Lust und Leben athmende Thema: Wein, Liebe, Gesang, Musik und Tanz.”

\(^{564}\) Ibid., Gerlach writes that the contributions are the “modernsten Kunst von jungen, impulsiv schaffenden Talenten.”
Regardless of whether Ilg would have agreed with the style of the works in *Neue Folge*, which are markedly more experimental than the works of the previous volumes, the shift in theme to Bacchanalian personifications of Dance, Love, Wine, and Music relates to his Nietzschean call for artistic revitalization.

The predominant allegorical topics of *Allegorien und Embleme* and *Neue Folge*, i.e., Time, Love, and Music, prefigure many of Klimt’s later allegorical works. From his earliest figure studies to his repeated allegories of the stages of human life, he focused on the temporal fragility of the human body. In his drawings and paintings, he paid close attention to hands and faces, the anatomy that most displays age and the passing of time. Love and music were also repeated themes in his oeuvre. For my argument, the most compelling aspect of Klimt’s eleven contributions to Gerlach’s compendia is the works’ increasing resonance with Ilg’s definition of modern allegory. In Klimt’s heightened juxtaposition between mosaic-like pattern and realistically rendered anatomy, we can trace the artist’s experimentation with ideas of representational space, the distance between the viewer and the allegorical subject, and his vitalization of personifications. Hence, in the context of modern allegory, we see Klimt developing a unifying stylistic and compositional principle.

In Klimt’s first work for Gerlach’s publications, the times of day are represented by four female personifications. Framed separately by elongated, horizontal rectangles, Morning, Midday, Evening, and Night are depicted in classicizing garb and Michelangelesque poses (Fig. 5.37). Although rendered with such detail that the viewer can see curls in Night’s up-drawn hair, there is no danger of mistaking these figures as representations of individuals. Their idealized bodies and faces are turned away from the
viewer. Rather than meeting our gaze, they look back into the picture plane. Their poses create a distance between the viewer and represented subject that is further maintained by the use of the human figure as sign. Like Ripa’s Truth, each of the personifications’ gestures and garb are intended to be legible for the viewer. Midday’s upward gaze and shielded eyes imply the light of the noon sun. Similarly, Night’s contorted reclining figure suggests her dreaming state. In this first contribution, Klimt creates pictorial depth, contrasting delicate yet precise lines with areas of soft gradation. He idealizes the personifications and maintains rather than modernizes the allegorical tradition.

Klimt’s next images begin to reanimate Baroque vitality and dynamism. As Ilg contends in his forewords to Allegorien und Embleme, Baroque allegory achieved a universal language of embodied personification by engaging the senses and emotions as well as the intellect.\(^565\) This expressive power is tied to movement, a central characteristic of Baroque art.\(^566\) Created in a variety of ways, from “flickering [chains] of figures” to oscillations of pattern, shading and color, and compositional rhythm, Baroque art directs the viewer in ways that destabilize the “barrier between the world of the image and that of the [beholder].”\(^567\) Take, for example, Peter Paul Rubens’ Feast of Venus (1636-37), a work in the permanent collection of the Kunsthistorisches Museum (Fig. 5.38). Although this is not an allegory, this work is discussed here for its illustration of the Baroque compositional elements admired by Ilg. The saturated color of the painting adds to the animated quality of the canvas. Although the painter has set a vanishing point in the

\(^{565}\) Ilg, vol. II, 2.
\(^{567}\) Ibid.
upper left corner, the viewer’s eye does not follow the perspectival line into the
background of the painting. Instead, our gaze traces the weaving chain of dancing figures
in a perpetual loop that circles up and around Venus at the heart of the composition. The
ordered, still space commonly established by a single vanishing point is overpowered by
the rhythmic motion of the active figures in the foreground and the vibrant lighting and
coloration of the canvas. Rather than inducing the viewer’s passive contemplation, the
drama and movement of the painting invite the viewer into the scene. This is the
expressive vitality of the Baroque that Ilg wanted to recuperate for the modern age.

In *Youth* (1882) and *Opera* (1883), Klimt begins to vitalize allegorical form in
ways that reflect Ilg’s recuperation of the Baroque. In comparison to the sculptural
figures in *The Times of Day*, Klimt’s *Youth* and *Opera* are depicted in active poses that
begin to push up against the works’ framing devices. Here, Klimt is testing different ways
of bringing “the inanimate in abstraction” to life.\(^{568}\) In *Youth*, each of the figures seems to
step through the plane of the drawing (Fig. 5.39). The small putti occupying the ornate
frame look as if they are about to crawl into a neighboring section of the image, and the
figure of youth hovers over the ledge on which he stands. It seems that were he able to
complete his step forward, the viewer would be able to hear the melody he is in the midst
of playing. Similarly, in *Opera* the lively putti completely take over the image’s drawn
frame (Fig. 5.40). Their climbing, turning, and reaching bodies animate the whole
composition, and the viewer’s eye is drawn around the central figure of Opera by the
almost percussive rhythm of their play. Klimt is manipulating representational space as
well as creating a synesththetic experience for the viewer. In both works, he creates

---

\(^{568}\) Ilg, vol. I, 3.
dimensional layers by juxtaposing simple contour line, softly rendered figural forms, and rigid architectural frames. This at once produces dimensional illusion and disrupts the boundaries of the allegories’ numerous framing devices.

In his next contributions to *Neue Folge*, we see Klimt add to this return to the Baroque in several ways, building to the distinct style of his last contribution *Tragedy*. In *Youth* and *Opera*, the personifications stand in the windows of elaborately drawn architecture. Although their figures are compositionally central, Klimt creates the illusion of an expansive sky in the background of the window frames. When compared to *Sculpture* (1896), a striking difference becomes apparent (Fig. 5.41). Here, the principal figure stands in front of a marble, solid wall. The viewer is invited into this shallow space by the head of a woman at the bottom edge of the composition. Like the personification she introduces, this baroque allegorical device has lively features and peers directly out of the picture plane. The central personification is fringed by sculptural columns decorated with harpies, a sphinx, and a bust of Zeus. Directly above her head, we see a monumental Hellenistic sculpture of Athena flanked by a sculptural relief that runs along the uppermost edge of the composition. Brimming with art historical references, this is not an allegory of sculpture; it is an allegory of the history of sculpture. Like a miniature version of the Künstler-Compagnie’s spandrels at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, the busts and columns that surround the central personification depict a nonlinear history of art in which each of the represented periods is treated with equal care and attention. Additionally, we can read the influence of Ilg in Klimt’s return to an allegory of the history of art.
The relaxed pose, disheveled hair, and softly rendered features of the central personification strongly contrast with the static sculptures that form an ornamental frame around her. Holding an apple in her right hand, she stands in a relaxed contrapposto posture and gazes directly at the viewer, prefiguring Klimt’s *Nuda Veritas* (1899) and *Adam and Eve* (1917-18). Her slightly tilted head and distinctive facial features give the unmistakable impression of an embodied rather than an idealized personification. Klimt intentionally blurs the line between the allegorical representation and portraiture. Seeming to offer the viewer the apple that she holds in her outturned hand, this Eve personifies Modern Sculpture. Her fleshy figure foregrounded in the shallow space of the composition and framed by large areas of negative space, is pushed to the plane of the page. The composition’s compressed representational space and the rhythms created in the sculptural background repeatedly bring the viewer’s eye back to her direct gaze. In comparison to *Youth* and *Opera*, there is no illusion of distance between the personification and the viewer. The division between the space of the allegory and that of the beholder is further disrupted by the subtle sense of motion created by the soft, almost blurred rendering of Modern Sculpture’s figure and face. In contrast to her marble surroundings, she seems to have breath and life. All of this gives this allegory an animated quality that engages the viewer, as Ilg might say, with the “power of reality.”

In alignment with Ilg’s proposal for a revitalization of allegorical form that eclectically draws from many periods of art history, Modern Sculpture is supported by the Renaissance, Byzantine, and Rococo and is announced by the Baroque. In its composition and artistic devices, the image creates rhythms, patterns, and details that
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guide the viewer’s eye and disrupt the boundaries between background, foreground, and the space of the viewer. In addition to the compressed pictorial space surrounding Modern Sculpture’s lively figure, Klimt has drawn a vine of climbing roses that weaves in and out of the sculptural relief, seemingly growing over the edge of the frieze. Here, the illusion of hard marble appears to be broken by the organic vine, which animates the image and fissures the representational space. Klimt’s vine is also a precursor to the Secessionists’ vernal imagery of rebirth. In this composition, we see Klimt searching for a lively balance between representational and ornamental form. The decorative borders of the allegory consist of sculptural figures that blend into rhythmic patterns and heighten the animated presence of the central personification. Sculpture resonates with Ilg’s conception of modern allegory in several ways, and the differences between this work and Klimt’s prior contributions are remarkable. Yet, it is not until Tragedy (1897), the final work, that we see a complete adaptation of Ilg’s conception of modern allegory, i.e., the harmonious balance between figuration and ornament (Winckelmann), a vital Apollonian-Dionysian equilibrium (Nietzsche), and the expressive creativity of the Baroque. In Tragedy all these elements come together and establish a conceptual and stylistic design principle, namely, Klimt’s heightened juxtaposition between isolated moments of realistic detail and mosaic-like pattern.

In Klimt’s Tragedy (1897) (Fig. 5.42), the allegorical figure commands most of the rectangular composition. As in Sculpture, the personification peers out of the image confronting the viewer. The stark circles of Tragedy’s irises and pupils are echoed in the wildflowers that adorn her hair, her circular earrings, and the features of the mask she presents to the viewer. This repetition, emphasized by the bright gold of Tragedy’s
earrings in an otherwise monotone composition, intensifies the challenge of the personification’s gaze. Rather than being idealized, Tragedy’s facial features are individualized and rendered in careful detail that contrasts with the overall flatness of the image. Unlike Klimt’s earlier allegories in Gerlach’s compendium, Tragedy has almost no perspectival depth. Even the shallow background of Sculpture has more dimensional illusion than this last allegory. The reiteration of circular patterns, the cropping of Tragedy’s figure, and the large, uniform mass of her black robe create a compressed composition. The contour lines of the allegory’s drawn frame emphasize the plane of the page. Only Tragedy’s hands and face create a sense of depth.

The isolated moments of realistically rendered anatomical detail are held in a tense balance with the flattened plane of the image. Regarding Ilg’s Winckelmannian harmony between figure and ornament, Klimt’s Tragedy plays with these two modes of representation in a marked way. Here, concrete forms like the figure become stylized, and the use of pattern and negative space heightens the brief moments of illusionistic detail. Klimt turns the dragon and figures in Tragedy’s frame into spiraling patterns and buries Tragedy’s torso under the flat black column of her robe. There is a fluctuation between forms that Winckelmann would categorize as concrete or abstract, respectively, which creates a suspended tension. For Ilg, the proper balance between figuration and ornament animates the allegory for the viewer, creating embodiment rather than mere representation. In this work, Tragedy’s face and hands are animated through contrast with the overall flatness of the image. In my view, Klimt’s juxtaposition between realistically
rendered anatomical detail and mosaic-like pattern is his independent adaptation of Ilg’s call for the revitalization of Winckelmann’s “harmonious combination.”

Equally striking is Tragedy’s incorporation of Nietzschean vitalism. Mirroring the shift in Gerlach’s compendia from themes of time to ones of “pleasure and life,” the temporal subject of Klimt’s first contribution gives way in his last allegory to a Dionysian personification of Greek tragedy. The image is filled with Dionysian references. Tragedy’s gaze has a Bacchanalian intensity, and the flowers in her hair can be interpreted as allusions to the wreath used in traditional representations of Dionysus as well as his status as the god of wild vegetation. The dramatic posture and fluid contour lines of the figures in the drawn frame are reminiscent of customary representations of Maenads in their ecstatic rituals wearing loose, flowing garments. On the flattened Ionic column in the bottom right corner of the composition, the heart-shaped ivy is also associated with Dionysus. However, the allegory’s most marked allusion is the mask that Tragedy presents to the viewer, which establishes two possible Dionysian meanings. In myths of Dionysian cults, ritual dancers wore wooden masks believed to empower “second sight,” and the god is also represented as “only a face.”

The numerous references to Dionysus in Klimt’s Tragedy create the expectation of a frenzied image. Despite the way the viewer’s eye is guided to circle round the composition, the allegory has a stillness that intensifies Tragedy’s gaze. At the core of

571 Gerlach, Introduction.
573 Ibid., 362.
574 Ibid., 61, 89.
575 Ibid., 80.
Nietzsche’s Apollonian-Dionysian divide is the opposition between essence and appearance. Here, this opposition is articulated in the tension between Tragedy’s lifelike features and the overall two-dimensionality of the composition. While the stylized patterns and flattened forms activate the viewer’s eye, the hands and face of Tragedy hold our attention. The image, as Ilg might characterize it, is a balance between Apollonian order and Dionysian intensity.

Klimt’s allegory also mirrors the conception of art proposed by Nietzsche in The Birth of Tragedy. The definition of truth as absolute and objective or finite and illusionary is a complicated question debated in the philosopher’s writings. Throughout The Birth of Tragedy, Nietzsche returns to this problem and the role of truth in art arguing that “[it] is only as an aesthetic phenomenon that existence and the world are eternally justified.” The art of Greek tragedy substantiates and validates reality presenting the truth of existence — “all that comes into being must be ready for a sorrowful end” — in a form bearable to human comprehension.

In the preliminary sketch of Tragedy illustrated in figure 5.21, we see that Klimt was thinking of this allegory in terms of the role of truth in art. In the final version, the flowing figures framing the central personification appear in their flowing robes, posture, and gestures like a Nietzschean Greek chorus, “a living wall that tragedy constructs around itself in order to close itself off from the world of reality and to preserve its ideal domain and its poetic freedom.” This is the truth and role of art allegorized by Klimt’s Tragedy.

576 Nietzsche, The Birth of Tragedy, 55.
577 Ibid., 52.
578 Ibid., 76.
579 Ibid., 58.
The amplified tension between the personification’s softly rendered features and the compressed patterns and large areas of flattened single-toned space can also be read in terms of Ilg’s call to reanimate Baroque drama and dynamism. In _Tragedy_, it is as if there were no air between the personification and the viewer. She meets our gaze directly. Ilg valued the way Baroque art’s dramatic color and vital movement addressed the viewer’s senses to create an emotional effect. In _Tragedy_ the pairing between the collapsed perspectival space and stylized patterns has a similar effect to Rubens’ _Feast of Venus_. In both cases, the composition guides the viewer’s eye through the canvas, always returning it to the central subject and involving the viewer in its dynamic between diffused and focused attention. In _Tragedy_, although the composition is symmetrical (the frame is composed of mirrored figures and Tragedy is centered in the image) and the personification is rigidly posed, the repetition of circular patterns causes the viewer’s eye to move through the image continuously. As our eye weaves around the frenetic contour lines of the allegory’s frame, we are brought back to encounter the gaze of the personification. The tension between delicately rendered anatomic detail and mosaic-like pattern brings the viewer close to Tragedy’s hands and face, the most expressive parts of the human body. Echoing Ilg’s language, we might describe Tragedy as actively present to the viewer. Like the valuable allegories of older ages, Klimt’s personification “strikes us with the fullness of reality” by drawing the viewer into the image and its content.\(^580\)

Rather than dividing Klimt’s oeuvre into distinct periods by medium or style, I view the artist’s works in terms of continuity and proximity. Essentially, when the overlapping chronology of his works is considered alongside his simultaneous use of
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\(^{580}\) Ilg, vol. 1, 2.
different styles and formats, it is difficult to maintain that Klimt cleanly broke with his early foundations and influences as he endeavored to find a modern visual language. Looking carefully at the artist’s participation in Martin Gerlach’s modern allegorical compendia between 1882 and 1900, we find him surrounded by a nascent artistic community pursuing the future of the Austrian arts through a revival of the allegorical tradition. Klimt began experimenting in these works with allegory in ways that would permeate and shape his art. Here, he began to develop a stylistic and conceptual principle of his oeuvre, his juxtaposition of mosaic-like pattern with realistically rendered anatomy. Like Alice Strobl, Marian Bisanz-Prakken, and Susanna Partsch, I consider Klimt’s participation in Gerlach’s allegorical project as substantial grounds for a more nuanced interpretation of his oeuvre. However, rather than signaling a shift toward the private, mysterious language of Symbolism and the heightened eroticism of Fernand Khnopff’s female figures who hypnotically gaze directly at the viewer, these early works attest to Klimt’s investment in Ilg’s proposal for modern allegory and the structural signification of this tradition.\textsuperscript{581} Although much could be added to this analysis with regard to the relationship between Symbolism and allegory, this view of the artist as reaching towards the new while being rooted in the past adds to our understanding of his relationship to the art for and of his age. In his artistic practice, he drew from his contemporary moment as well as from the art historical tradition. The connecting thread in his diverse artistic production is his desire to allegorize.

The mosaic-like patterns that permeate Klimt’s work have been described as decorative, geometric, abstract, jewel-like, painted mosaic, and modern ornament with varying positive and pejorative connotations, as the definition, function, and value of terms like ornament were debated in turn-of-the-century Vienna and remain a complex area of art historical study today.\textsuperscript{582} Klimt’s realistic rendering of hands and faces, which in the case of his portraits undeniably captured the likenesses of his sitters, has been viewed as his unbroken link to naturalism, realism, historicism, and traditions of the past.\textsuperscript{583} Klimt’s contemporaries and present scholars alike have interpreted the tension between these two modes as the “core” of his art, the space in which he negotiated between tradition and modernism, the fine and applied arts, and art and life.\textsuperscript{584} In this chapter, I have argued that Klimt developed this stylistic and conceptual principle within the context of Gerlach’s compendia. Chapter Six turns to the nature and role of pattern in Klimt’s modern allegory. From his public commissions to the canvases completed in his


private studio, pattern was central to his visual vocabulary. Beyond mere decoration or senseless eclecticism, he returned to and reworked specific motifs like the spiraling tendril throughout his oeuvre. To understand the form and function of pattern in Klimt’s modern allegories it is necessary to look toward what the art historian Franz Wickhoff claimed to be the “single most consequential event … to affect the nineteenth century,” the introduction of Japanese art to the west.  

Chapter Six: Interwoven Threads: Japonismus in Klimt’s Modern Allegories

In *Death and Life* (1908-11, revised in 1915-16), Klimt’s Japonismus meets his modernization of allegory (Fig. 6.1). Taking up a pictorial tradition dating back to the medieval period, the painting depicts mortality as an ever-present and defining characteristic of human existence. The work is markedly modern in its composition and physicality. Standing 71.1 inches in height, the nearly square canvas features an almost life-sized skeletal figure of Death hovering by an architectural mass of human bodies representing Birth, Youth, Maturity, and Old Age. Departing from incomparably influential images like the prints of Hans Holbein (1497-1543), in which the fatal form carries a scythe or an hourglass, Klimt’s Death wields a blunted club (Fig. 6.2). The personification’s skull and boney hands emerge from an ornate shroud and seem at once suspended and animated, adding to its sense of menace. Two patterns embellish the personification’s robe, a Latin Christian Cross and varied crest-like circles. The choice of an elongated cross over a more symmetrical Greek Orthodox cross, which would be more compatible with the painting’s nearly square composition, augments the tension between these two ornaments. The shroud’s cross patterns directly reference the largest religion in Vienna. The varied circles, which are a repeated motif in Klimt’s œuvre, are open to interpretation, perhaps alluding to an alternative concept of death. Joined together on the right side of the canvas, the figures representing the stages of human life are enveloped by vibrant patterns suggesting fecundity and the annual renewal of spring. With their eyes
closed and bodies entwined, they seem blissfully unaware of Death’s proximity except for a single undulating female at the extreme left of the organic mass. She peers directly out, evoking a conventional baroque reconceptualization of the renaissance repoussoir figure, as used by Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), Andrea Pozzo (1642-1709), and Johann Michael Rottmayr (1654-1730) in works likely accessible to Klimt in Vienna, in which our attention is engaged and guided by a figure’s foreground position, gaze, or gesture to the painted message (Fig. 6.3). Eyes wide, Klimt’s animated female draws the viewer into the allegory, implying everyone’s part in its meaning.

Klimt began sketches for *Death and Life* in 1908, labored over the painting for multiple years, unveiled and exhibited it abroad, and returned to revise the work five years after its celebrated debut at the International Art Exhibition in Rome in 1911 (Fig. 6.4). Between the first and second version, the artist made noteworthy changes. He animated the figure of Death and added several female figures to the edges of the entangled mass representing humanity, including the mask-like face that interrupts the imaginary wall between the allegory and the viewer. Lastly, he heightened the contrast and line of his patterns, strengthening their role in the composition. Klimt’s alterations modernize allegory in line with Albert Ilg’s Winckelmannian proposal for a “harmonious combination” of ornament and figuration, his Nietzschean vitalism, and his recuperation

of the Baroque’s expressive power. His changes to the painting also claim the viewer’s attention, an idea that will be addressed throughout this chapter.

Described by the painter Egon Schiele as the artist’s “greatest picture,” Death and Life held a prominent place in Klimt’s œuvre. Neither a commission nor executed for a specific event or setting, the painting was meaningful to the artist, as was its theme of life “on its path from cradle to grave.” Looking at works such as Allegory of Love (1895), Hope I (1903), Hope II (1907-1908), and The Bride (1917-1918) we can see that the fragility of the human body was like a leitmotif in his œuvre (Fig. 6.5-8). Life’s cyclical nature fascinated Klimt, who was described as spending hours in dissection rooms working on From the Realm of Death (1903), “distilling” his portrayal of mortality into a “waxen, rigid play of lines and colors” (Fig. 6.9). As Bisanz-Prakken has argued, in his final works the artist returned to this central theme, referencing the medieval German tradition of Death and the Maiden. In this last painting, Klimt presents us with
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587 Albert Ilg, foreword, Allegori en und Embleme vol. 1 (Vienna: Gerlach Verlag, 1884), 2.
590 Ludwig Hevesi, Acht Jahre Sezession (März 1897-Juni 1905) Kritik-Polemik-Chronik (Vienna: Carl Konegen, 1906), 449. Hevesi described Klimt’s process for the lost painting From the Realm of Death (1903), writing that the artist spent hours in Professor Zuckerandl’s dissection room “distilling” (destillieren) death into a “waxen, rigid play of lines and colors” (bleiche, starre Farben und Linienspiel). He also compared the gold square at the top left corner of the painting to seals in Japanese woodcuts. The whole passage reads as follows: “Wie viele Stunden hat er diesen Sommer im Seziersaale des Prof. Zuckerandl eifrig gezeichnet, um aus all dem Tode dieses bleiche, starre Farben und Linienspiel zu destillieren. Stilisierte Leichen treiben schwebend zwischen weißen Tüchern entlang, von geheimnisvoller Strömung dahingerissen, und dunkelblau Schlangen, schlank und elastisch mit goldenen Köpfen, eine Wurmönigin jede, ringeln sich darin. Die Luft ist kohlschwarz, der breite viereckige Rahmen desgleichen. Eine Strecke weit sieht man liches Gewölk angedeutet, dann wieder die Finsternis mit Sternen in verschiedenen Farben bestreut. In der oberen Ecke links steht ein viereckiger goldener Stempel, wie auf einem japanischen Holzschnitt.”

207
his bride as an allegory of mortality (Fig. 6.8).\textsuperscript{591} Unfinished, the large canvas has numerous areas sketched with elusive figural forms. The reclining female farthest to the right remains as a headless torso; however, above her there is the suggestion of numerous faces and skeletal limbs, intimating that Klimt might have intended to return to the figure of Death in this final allegory (Fig. 6.10).

The Japonist elements of \textit{Death and Life} can be seen in the composition’s asymmetry, compression of perspectival illusion, approach to figuration and decorative detail, and in its atmospheric negative space suggestive of the supernatural nighttime scenes of ukiyo-e pictures of the supernatural (yūrei-zu), such as Utagawa Kuniyoshi’s depiction of the ghost of Oiwa from the famous tale of Yotsuya Kaidan (Fig. 6.11).\textsuperscript{592} Most ukiyo-e artists of the Edo Period produced works in this subgenre, which rose in popularity alongside uncanny tales in literature and Kabuki theater, fixated on macabre stories of the haunting spirits of wronged women and maternal mortality.\textsuperscript{593} Klimt’s \textit{Death and Life} is also one of the numerous canvases in which we see his adoption and adaptation of Japanese ornament. There are distinct similarities between the painting’s decorative circles and squares and the designs found in manuals like Shunkō Odagiri’s \textit{Narumikata} (Fig. 6.12). As Akiko Mabuchi’s research has shown, Klimt repeatedly


\textsuperscript{592} The Museum of Applied Arts and Industry (now MAK) had an extensive collection of ukiyo-e including the subgenre yūrei-zu, images depicting supernatural tales.

referenced Japanese ornament.\textsuperscript{594} One example of this is the interlocking triangles that blanket the coiled figures in \textit{Death and Life}. This botanical pattern is one of his adaptations of traditional uroko designs based on fish and serpent scales (Fig. 6.13).

Not all of Klimt’s works were allegories; however, the central tenet of allegory, that abstract concepts could be embodied in universal forms, was foundational to his artistic practice. Similarly, not all of his works fall neatly into the category of Japonismus. Nevertheless, the model of Japanese art played a lengthy and significant role in his pursuits, and traces of Japonismus can be seen throughout his varied oeuvre. In 1907 Ludwig Hevesi wrote: “Without a doubt, Japan plays a key role in this new Klimtian Byzantium.”\textsuperscript{595} From the perspective of the twenty-first century, Japanese aesthetic influence and its eclectic unification with past traditions in Klimt’s art needs to be rediscovered in its complexity. The aim here is to demonstrate the interplay between two interwoven threads, Japonismus and allegory. Beginning with a timeline narrated through Klimt’s works, this chapter culminates in a close reading of the role of Japanese aesthetic influences in Klimt’s modern allegory of art, the mosaic murals at the Palais Stoclet (1905-11).

One of the paradoxical ambitions of the Vienna Secessionists was the creation of an art that would be distinctly modern, of the moment, and yet evince “eternally valid ideals of beauty.”\textsuperscript{596} Their aim was to form a new visual culture that, nevertheless, grew

\textsuperscript{596} Max Morold, “Antwort auf einige Landläufige Fragen,” \textit{Ver Sacrum} vol. 3 (1899), 3-12. Morold writes of “eternally valid ideals of beauty” (ewig gültige Schönheitsideale). The whole passage reads as follows: “Die große Kunst — so meinen doch diejenigen, welche vom Niedergange sprechen — die große
out of a foundational core, a collective aesthetic that crossed national and historical boundaries. The arts and crafts of Japan were viewed as untainted by industrial and commercial stagnation and as an untarnished tradition of organic ornament without temporal or cultural boundaries. Many issues arise from these paradoxical and problematic views. The principal questions addressed in this chapter are the following: Given how new and unknown Japanese art and culture still were for the Viennese public, how did Japonismus supplement but also modify the concept of allegory? How did Klimt's Japonismus qualify his modern allegory as defined in Chapter Five? How, in turn, did his approach to modern allegory modify and qualify his understanding of Japanese art and aesthetics? Lastly, how did he reconcile his aims of universality with the cultural specificity of Japan? I argue that he adopted and adapted Japanese aesthetic principles, pursuing a visual language that, in his view, was a universal distillation of natural form and, therefore, a proper ground for an international vocabulary of modern allegory.

1) Klimt’s Engagement with the Arts of Japan

Klimt began his training at the School of Design in 1876, coming of age artistically amid the reform movements of the late nineteenth century and the burgeoning interest in Japanese art in Vienna. As he pursued his education, early career, and the foundation of the Secession and Wiener Werkstätte, his efforts were paralleled by the creation of the substantial collection of Japanese art at the Museum of Applied Arts and Industry. Many of his fellow Secessionists, collaborators, and advocates were interested in the arts of...
Japan and endeavored through exhibitions, lectures, publications, and curricula to bring this foreign tradition into the cultural fabric of the capital. Hence, Klimt’s avenues of study were diverse, and like the larger phenomenon of Viennese Japonismus, his engagement was shaped by amalgamated sources. For example, he had access to private collections like that of the Fischers, who traveled to Japan on multiple occasions and throughout continental Europe and the United States while planning their first of its kind Museum of East Asian Art in Cologne. Their institution was designed to present “a unified picture of all East Asian art … in its phases of development” and place it “on an equal footing with European art.” Several Secessionists, including Klimt, formed relationships with the couple in the 1890s, resulting in the sixth Secession Exhibition in 1900 completely devoted to Japanese art from the Fischers’ collection (Fig. 6.14). The author Hermann Bahr, who was convinced that understanding Japanese influence was critical to grasping all modern art, described the displayed works as examples of non-hierarchical unity, a way toward creative freedom, and a visual language equal to Classical Greece. Bahr writes:

The Japanese would have to come first to remind us what the essence of painting and art was in all great times. Our painting, indeed our entire art, had completely
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597 For Frieda Fischer’s diary entry see footnote 307.
forgotten, precisely in its striving for perfect illusion, that the most beautiful effect of art is to let the viewer's imagination play along.\textsuperscript{600}

As this chapter demonstrates, the beholder’s engagement in the artistic process was important to Klimt, and he would have known and likely been influenced by Bahr’s view of Japanese art as a path to revitalizing this aesthetic “essence.” Simultaneously, Klimt was aware of and influenced by productions like Gilbert and Sullivan’s \textit{Mikado} (1885), which propagated stereotypes and clichés (Fig. 6.15).

Looking at the artist’s varied experimentations with Japanese aesthetics, it is evident that his interest was neither passing nor superficial. It was an enduring exploration that intensified in the course of his career. The first notes of influence can be seen in circular vignettes from 1883 depicting women in kimonos, the 1892 design for a ball-gift referring to a dance in the \textit{Mikado} illustrated in figure 6.16, and a fan inscribed for Sonja Knips in 1895. Each of these examples takes up Japonist tropes and prevalent conceptions of East Asian culture that fueled the early spread of European Japonism in the 1860s (Fig. 6.16-17).\textsuperscript{601} In these three works, we can see a growing sophistication in the artist’s experimentation. His 1883 sketches and 1892 dance-card remind one of the eroticism and exoticism of images like Hans Makart’s \textit{Die Japanerin} (1875), which depicts a half-naked Viennese model in the costume of a Japanese woman (Fig. 6.18).\textsuperscript{602}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{600} Ibid., 219. “Dazu kam aber noch etwas: Die Japaner müssten erst kommen, um uns zu erinnern, was in allen großen Zeiten das Wesen der Malerei wie der Kunst überhaupt ausgemacht hat. Unsere Malerei, ja unsere ganze Kunst hatte, eben in jenem Streben nach vollkommener Illusion, völlig vergessen, dass es die schönste Wirkung der Kunst ist, die Phantasie des Zuschauers mitspielen zu lassen.”


\textsuperscript{602} The paintings and court commissioned architectural decorations of Hans Makart (1840-1884) dominated Vienna’s historicist era, and his dramatic, erotic style inspired many artists of Klimt’s generation. On Makart and Orientalism, see Luke Gartlan, “Dandies on the Pyramids: Photography and German-Speaking
Paintings of this type were popular in the first decades of European Japonism and drew on the ubiquitous cliché of the geisha, presenting Japan as a fashion much like modish nineteenth-century cherry blossom festivals. Makart, for example, produced three such paintings. As Peter Pantzer and others have argued, these early Japonist works do not reflect the “how” of the eastern nation’s aesthetics but use the foreign culture as a veneer or Oriental theme. Despite cliché elements, Klimt’s fan for Sonja Knips shows the artist adopting a Japanese format and adapting Japanese aesthetics. As will be addressed shortly, this broadening of experimentation continued in later undertakings like *Tragedy* (1897), *Fish Blood* (1897), and *The Bride* (1917-1918) in which Klimt referenced but also drew inspiration from the holdings of the Museum of Applied Arts and Industry and objects in his private collection (Fig. 6.19-22). Each of these later works employs familiar Japonist motifs, i.e., dragons, fish, and traditional Japanese theater while integrating Japanese formal and conceptual aesthetic principles. Additionally, the sensuality of *Fish Blood* could be evaluated in terms of the eroticism in Japonism and Orientalism. Klimt owned at least one folio of ukiyo-e erotic art (shunga), and he
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605 Several historians have pointed to Klimt’s oval-faced Bride and her resemblance to Noh masks. See, Pantzer and Wieninger, *Verborgene Impressionen*, 102.


607 Like all printed materials, shunga was strictly controlled in the Edo Period. After the Restoration, the Meiji government did not want this subgenre or ukiyo-e in general to represent Japanese culture abroad. On shunga, see Richard Lane, *Images from the Floating World* (New York: Putnam, 1978); and Rosina Buckland, *Shunga Erotic Art in Japan* (New York: Overlook Press, 2013). On printing regulations and the circulation, see Peter Kornicki, *The Book in Japan: A Cultural History from the Beginnings to the*
produced many sexually explicit drawings that allude to this subgenre in their format and emphasis on anatomical detail. While this element of Klimt’s work and the gendering and objectification of Japonism are beyond the scope of this project, it is acknowledged here as another facet of his engagement.

In the 1890s Klimt began exploring the formal elements most frequently associated with international Japonism: elongated compositions, flattened perspective, dramatic asymmetry, simplified representations of nature, emphasis on color and line, and brilliant ornamentation combining geometric and organic, floral design. *Nuda Veritas* shows the artist’s adoption of the long and narrow design of kakemono-e (vertical scrolls), and in the graphic version produced for *Ver Sacrum*, we see a minimalist aesthetic and attention to contour line reminiscent of the monochromatic prints of early ukiyo-e (Fig. 6.23-24). In *Adele Bloch Bauer I*, he employs the square format seen across the arts of Japan, a noteworthy choice not commonly made in portraiture, and his accentuation of the sitter’s dramatically posed hands and face surrounded by vibrant
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patterns resemble ukiyo-e pictures of beauties (bijin-ga) (Fig. 6.25-26). His second portrait of Bloch-Bauer is one of the numerous Orientalist portraits he produced between 1912 and 1917 (Fig. 6.27). Here, I allude to Edward W. Said’s foundational text *Orientalism* (1978) and his later approach of contrapuntal reading developed from the musical term “counterpoint” — a compositional technique in which two or more equal and yet interdependent musical lines unite in melody. Like Michael Sullivan I view the artistic meeting of eastern and western cultures “not as a conflict, or even as a reconciliation, of opposites, but as a dynamic and truly life-enhancing dialectic.”

Said’s later approach of contrapuntal reading crystalizes this aspect of Orientalism and is of particular relevance when speaking of the subtleties of international Japonism. Geographically and culturally, Japan belongs to Said’s Orient; however, reading Japonism in terms of Said’s Orientalism is challenged by the fact that the East Asian country was attempting to meet and exceed western modernization in the Meiji era and was keenly aware of the power of their cultural representation abroad. These efforts were quickly followed by the transformation of Japan into an imperial, colonial power and the rise of nationalist ideologies that created what Yuko Kikuchi has termed “Oriental
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610 Said, *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage Books, 1994), 51. “As we look back at the cultural archive, we begin to reread it not univocally but contrapuntally, with a simultaneous awareness both of the metropolitan history that is narrated and of those other histories against which (and together with which) the dominating discourse acts. In the counterpoint of Western classical music, various themes play off of one another, with only a provisional privilege being given to any particular one; yet in the resulting polyphony there is concert and order, an organized interplay that derives from the themes, not from a rigorous melodic or formal principle outside the work. In the same way, I believe, we can read and interpret English novels, for example, whose engagement (usually suppressed for the most part) with the West Indies or India, say, is shaped and perhaps even determined by the specific history of colonization, resistance, and finally native nationalism. At this point alternative or new narratives emerge, and they become institutionalized or discursively stable entities.” On Said as a classically trained pianist and his relationship to music, see Tore Holst, “‘Parallel Lines’ and Lives: Edward Said as a Musician and Critic,” in *Another Life* (Montpellier: Presses universitaires de la Méditerranée, 2021), 45-60.

Japan’s cultural leaders employed Orientalist tactics as they designated Japan as the cultural center of East Asia. The art historian Okakura Kakuzō defined the East symbolically rather than geographically, arguing that cultures from the Middle East to Japan were united in “love for the Ultimate and Universal.” The well-known opening of his 1903 *The Ideals of the East with Special Reference to the Art of Japan*, “Asia is one,” was taken up and transformed in subsequent years blending into ultranationalist slogans in the 1930’s like “Hakkō Ichiu” (the eight corners of the world under one roof). Similarly, Itō Chūta, who advocated for imperial architecture and a distinct Japanese mode of observation, and Yanagi Sōetsu, who promoted a folk art revival (Mingei movement), based their arguments upon cultural, ethnic nationalism, giving hierarchical primacy to modern Japan in Asia.

The paintings I describe as Orientalist in this dynamic sense are Adele Bloch Bauer II (1912), Portrait of Paula Zuckermandl (1912), Portrait of Eugenia Primavesi (1913/14), Portrait of Elisabeth Lederer (1914-1916), Portrait of Friederike Maria Beer

---

613 Okakura Kakuzō, *The Ideals of the East with Special Reference to the Art of Japan* (London: John Murray, 1903), 13; and Ibid., *The Awakening of Japan* (New York: Century, 1905). Also known as Okakura Tenshin (岡倉天心, 1862-1913), Okakura Kakuzō is most well-known for his 1904 *The Awakening of Japan* and 1906 *Book of Tea*. The name Tenshin was popularized posthumously and is tied to the author’s associations with Pan-Asianism and the ultra-nationalism of the Great East Asia War. Like other scholars focused on his role as an art historian and proponent of the traditional arts in the Meiji Era (1868-1912), I refer to him as Okakura Kakuzō. Kinoshita Nagahiro, “Okakura Kakuzō as a Historian of Art,” *Review of Japanese Culture and Society*, 24 (2012), 26–38.
614 Drawing on Shintoism and myths of the divine ancestry of the imperial line, wartime slogans like 八紘一宇 “Hakkō Ichiu” promoted the idea of Japan as the center of the Asia, superior to all other nations, and under special protection from the gods. The core of these slogans was the idea that the emperor had a divine right to rule all corners of the world. Walter Edwards, “Forging Tradition for a Holy War: The ‘Hakkō Ichiu’ Tower in Miyazaki and Japanese Wartime Ideology,” *Journal of Japanese Studies* 29, no. 2 (2003), 289-324, 293.
(1916), *Wally* (1916), *The Dancer* (1916/17), *The Polecat Fur* (1916/17), *Lady with a Fan*, also known as *The Dancer* (1917), and the recently rediscovered *Portrait of Fräulein Lieser* (1917). Although incomplete, *Portrait of Ria Munk III* (1917) also appears to have been advancing in this direction, as the background is swathed with circular ornaments like those found in design books of Japanese crests (Fig. 6.28). The underpainting in this work provides insight to the artist’s process, and it is plausible that many of his patterns started with a specific model and organically metamorphosed as his paintings evolved. These late portraits broadly reference the arts of East Asia as well as interrelated western art forms inspired by East-Asian cultures (Fig. 6.29). The source material for *Friederike Maria Beer*, for example, has been attributed to Chinese, Korean, and Japanese art (Fig. 6.30). Recounting her experience posing for Klimt, the sitter claimed that the painting referenced a Korean vase and that she was instructed to choose her attire from the artist’s collection of Chinese and Japanese robes. The art historian Max Eisler (1881-1937) wrote that the robed figures in the background of the portrait referenced a Chinese vase from Klimt’s collection, and a distinct likeness can be found between the bearded fighter to the right of Beer’s shoulder and the right-hand figure of Zhou Cang from a Qing dynasty group portrait that hung in the artist’s studio (Fig. 6.29). For Friederike Maria Beer’s recollections, see Natter, *The Complete Paintings*, 629; and Strobl, *Gustav Klimt: Die Zeichnungen (1904-1912)* vol. III. (Salzburg: Galerie Welz, 1984), 100. It is unclear whether Beer was referring to a vase in Klimt’s studio or something from her own collection or the collection of the painter Hans Böhlers. Böhlers was in a relationship with Beer and commissioned her portrait by Klimt as a gift. At the time of the painting, he also kept his private collection, which was featured in *Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration*, at Beer’s residence. Hans Thoma, “Zu einigen Blättern aus Hans Böhlers ostasiatischer Studienmappe,” *Deutsche Kunst und Dekoration* 29 (1911-1912), 438-44. Beer sold her portraits by Klimt and Schiele to Hugh Stix in 1933, around the time that she immigrated to the United States. On Beer’s collection, see Margret Greiner, “Ich will unsterblich werden”: *Friederike Beer-Monti und ihre Maler* (Vienna: Kremayr&Scheriau, 2019), 211. On Böhlers’ collection, see Martin Suppan, *Hans Böhlers Leben und Werke* (Vienna: Edition M. Suppan, 1990), 3, 36.

---

In recent years, several scholars have located the inspiration for Klimt’s late portraiture in Chinese art. Toshiko Osaki, for example, has argued that the dynamic figures in the background of the Beer portrait resemble depictions of the Battle of Changban on porcelains made by the imperial manufactory in Jingdezhen. In its final version the painting shows the sitter in a Wiener Werkstätte dress and coat, which Beer was instructed to wear inside out to display the bold pattern of its lining. However, I contend that the prevailing inspiration for these late portraits was Japan, international Japonism, and Japonismus. Klimt presents his sitters in the posture and guise of the beauty (bijin) of Japanese prints, reminding his contemporaries and viewers of today of paintings depicting women contemplating prints, surrounded by screens and porcelains, and wrapped in kimonos — e.g., James McNeill Whistler’s *Caprice in Purple and Gold* (1864, National Museum of Asian Art, Washington D.C.), Alfred Stevens’ *The Japanese Robe* (1872, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York), and William Merrit Chase’s *A Girl in a Japanese Gown* (1887, Museo Nacional Thyssen-Bornemisza, Madrid). One of the most well-known paintings of this type is Whistler’s *The Princess from the Land of

618 Max Eisler, *Gustav Klimt* (Vienna: Druck und Verlag der Österreich Staatsdruckerei, 1920), 46. Eisler is not specific in his reference. No vase that meets his description has been listed in accounts of Klimt’s surviving collection.


622 James McNeil Whistler (1834-1903), Alfred Stevens (1823-1906), and William Merrit Chase (1849-1916).
Porcelain (1865), a central feature of the Peacock room commissioned by Frederick Richards Leyland (1831-1892) (Fig. 6.32).\textsuperscript{623} Whistler, who was eulogized by Ludwig Hevesi as “the greatest painter of his time,” was familiar to Viennese artistic circles.\textsuperscript{624} Whistler sent seventy works to the Munich International Art Exhibition of 1888, bringing his art into German-speaking Europe in a dramatic way.\textsuperscript{625} A decade later, his works were included in the inaugural exhibition of the Vienna Secession and then in the following 1903 Secession exhibition dedicated to the development of Impressionism. His art was frequently discussed in influential publications like The Studio and The Art Journal (Fig. 6.33), which circulated widely in Vienna’s café culture.\textsuperscript{626} Hevesi frequently referenced Whistler’s work in his art criticism and wrote two essays dedicated to the American-born, British-based artist in which he highlighted Whistler’s indebtedness to Japanese woodblock prints. In Emil Orlik’s Japanese Woman in Front of a Screen (1900), we see a Viennese adaptation of the type of Japanese woodblock print referenced in paintings like The Princess from the Land of Porcelain (1865) (Fig. 6.34). Adopting characteristic elements of bijinga ranging from Hishikawa Moronobu and Nishikawa Sukenobu (1671-1751) to Kitagawa Utamaro and Keisai Eisen (1790-1848), both Orlik and Whistler

\textsuperscript{623} On Japonist depictions of western women in the guise of bijin, see Watanabe, \textit{High Victorian Japonisme} (Bern: Peter Lang, 1991), 14. The gendering of Japonisme should be noted here, as women were the most common subjects depicted in this type of painting. The subject, however, is beyond the scope of the present project. For a study of women in the male dominated arena of European collectors and East Asian art, see Emery Elizabeth, \textit{Reframing Japonisme: Women and the Asian Art Market in Nineteenth-Century France 1853-1914} (London: Bloomsbury Visual Arts, 2020).


\textsuperscript{626} On the influence of The Studio and Whistler in Vienna, see Sabine Wieber, “London-Vienna” in \textit{Connecting Whistler: Essays in Honour of Margaret F. MacDonald}, eds. Hermens Erma Joanna Meacock and Grischka Petri (Glasgow: University of Glasgow, 2010), 105-110, 105.
depict a robed woman standing at a 45-degree angle in an S-like posture in front of a screen (Fig. 6.35-38). In contrast to the calm beauties depicted in ukiyo-e and Japonist compositions, the subjects in most of Klimt’s portraits acknowledge the presence of the viewer, gazing directly out of the canvas. Posture forcefully frontal, the sitters are reminiscent of Byzantine icons and require a different engagement from the viewer. Even in Klimt’s *Lady with Fan*, in which he adopts a format like Orlik’s *Japanese Woman in Front of a Screen*, Klimt’s model is more animated (Fig 6.39). Although she is uncharacteristically turned away from the viewer, her gaze seems intent and active, and the compressed planar composition unites the figure with the art surrounding her, exemplifying Klimt’s unique adaption of this type of ukiyo-e and Japonist image.

Even Klimt’s landscapes can be viewed as experiments in distilling natural form akin to Japanese art. He began working in this genre in the late 1890s and produced at least 50 such scenes during the last decades of his life. Scholarship has characterized these paintings as done in a private mode, separate from his public works, and has focused on the inspiration of his nearly annual retreats to Attersee between 1900 and 1916. At first glance, it is apparent why these paintings have been viewed as such and why their style has been compared to Impressionism. While the settings of Klimt’s landscapes were far from Vienna, his correspondence shows that the concerns of the Secession and his artistic career were not left behind in the capital.

---

627 One of the first examples of this new venture is *Farm House with Roses* (ca. 1897-98). Notably, this is one of Klimt’s few rectangular, rather than square, landscapes. Natter, *The Complete Paintings*, 556.


629 “Gustav Klimt Database,” Klimt-Foundation Wien, accessed Sept 13, 2023, https://www.klimt-database.com/de/forschung/. In several of his letters to Maria Zimmermann, Klimt expresses concerns about his various projects. In October of 1903, he wrote explicitly about the necessity of “unification” in
his studio, he exhibited his landscapes side-by-side with his other works, demonstrating the connection between his multiple modes (Fig. 6.40). Additionally, his landscapes differ decidedly from the rapid plein air paintings of the Impressionists. Although he made sketches and even began large paintings outdoors, he executed his landscapes on 3-foot square canvases.\(^{630}\) The scale of these works and his well-known perfectionism entailed a very different approach to representing the natural world. He not only finished his landscapes indoors but far from their inspirational sources in his Viennese studio. As Dani Cavallaro has argued, he developed a “complex system” in which a prospect was “transfigured and aestheticized according to the artist’s own conception.”\(^{631}\)

Beyond the dedicated use of a square format, Klimt’s landscapes are reminiscent of Japanese art in their compositional play between representational detail and stylized pattern (Fig. 6.41-42), and his approach was akin to Japanese models. The artist Walter Klemm (1883-1957), who studied at Vienna’s School of Design under Koloman Moser, received private instruction in woodblock printing from Emil Orlik, and exhibited with the Vienna Secession, described the training of Japanese artists as such:

> a young artist would have before him, for example, a sparrow — for weeks on end. His task was to observe the bird in its movements and characteristics, but not

---

\(^{630}\) On Klimt painting outside, see his correspondence and Koja and Huemer eds., *Gustav Klimt: Landscapes*, 27. For a general introduction to his landscapes, see Tretter and Peter Weinhäupl, *Gustav Klimt: Sommerfrische Am Attersee 1900-1916* (Vienna: Brandstätter, 2012).

to draw it. Then the bird was taken away, and the student had to reproduce by memory that which had been imprinted on his mind.\textsuperscript{632}

The aim was neither to reproduce a scene with photographic precision nor to rapidly translate the direct visual experience of an ephemeral moment but to distill the structure of the natural world into what the German Secessionist Lovis Corinth (1858-1925) described as the “absolute form and pure line” of Japanese art.\textsuperscript{633} Within the volumes of Klimt’s library, we find this idea reiterated. Oskar Münsterberg writes: “Asian artists have never sought to copy nature exactly as in a work of natural history; Symbolic relationships to human and animal life are always expressed. The study of nature was only a means to an end, never an end in itself.”\textsuperscript{634} This conception of art and its relationship to nature, observation, and representation captured the imagination of artists influenced by international Japonism, artists like Klimt. During the summer retreats that inspired many of his landscapes, he spent long periods of time immersed in the outdoors, so much so that he became known as a “Waldschrat” (forest demon) by Attersee locals.\textsuperscript{635} In Vienna, his studios were surrounded by gardens, which he had planted before

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{633} Lovis Corinth, “Thomas Theodor Heine und Münchens Künstlerleben am Ende des vorigen Jahrhunderts;” \textit{Kunst und Künstler: illustrierte Monatsschrift für bildende Kunst und Kunstgewerbe} 4 (1906), 143-156. 149. Describing a painting by Thomas Theodor Heine (1867-1948), one of the most prominent illustrators of the \textit{Simplicissimus}, Corinth writes: “The Japanese and the Gothic masters encouraged him to cultivate absolute form and pure line.” (Die Japaner und die Meister der Gotik regten ihn an, die absolute Form und reine Linie zu kultivieren.)
  \item \textsuperscript{634} Oskar Münsterberg, \textit{Japanische Kunstgeschichte} vol. 1-3 (Braunschweig: Verlag Georg Westermann, 1904), 29. “Niemaß haben asiatische Künstler das Bestreben gehabt, die Natur genau zu kopieren wie in einem naturgeschichtlichen Werke; immer werden symbolische Beziehungen zum Leben des Menschen und der Tiere zum Ausdruck gebracht. Das Studium der Natur war nur Mittel zum Zweck, niemals Selbstzweck.”
  \item \textsuperscript{635} Cavallaro, \textit{Gustav Klimt}, 129.
\end{itemize}
occupying a new workspace, and his last studio lay in a more rural setting on the outskirts of the urban center (Fig. 6.43). The painter Egon Schiele described one of the older artist’s studios as “shaded by a ring of trees” and surrounded by “flowers and ivy.” His workspaces were encircled by visual resources. In a letter to Maria “Mizzi” Zimmermann (1879-1975) in September of 1902, Klimt offered a rare glimpse into his creative process writing: “first you have to rest and learn how to see; then you may find some time for painting.” Writing to his lover again in the following year, he describes wandering through the woods in search of motifs and, when feeling disinclined to paint, pausing to study “some Japanese art.” His approach was similar to that of the Japanese student: to look, contemplate, and then create.

Beyond his numerous adoptions and adaptions of Japanese artistic principles, there is a confluence of facts that imply Japan as a focal point in Klimt’s engagement with the arts of East Asia. From the remnants of his correspondence, we know that he specified his study of Japanese art on two separate occasions. The documented contents of his library, which was reported to be extensive, also demonstrate this particular interest. Additional evidence can be found in his workspaces. In 1903 the Wiener Werkstätte’s founding patron Fritz Wärndorfer commissioned fully refurbished

---

638 Ibid.
639 Klimt was a self-professed “lazy correspondent” and burnt many of the letters he received before even opening them. Those left in his estate were destroyed after his death in 1918. Hansjörg Krug, “Klimt and his Correspondence,” in Klimt: Up Close and Personal, 50-83, 50. For Klimt’s letters mentioning Japanese art, see Nebehay, Dokumentation, 108,110.
640 Nebehay, Dokumentation, 52.
studios designed by Josef Hoffmann for the leading members of the group. Klimt felt that change disrupted his ability to paint. Consequently, it took more than seven years and a necessitated relocation for Wärndorfer’s gift to be completed, and Hoffmann’s designs had to bend to his friend’s inflexibility (Fig. 6.44-45). From photographs it is known that the furnishings Hoffmann designed were first installed in the Josefstädter Straße 21 studio, but his composition of a harmonious whole had to wait until the move to Feldmühlgasse 11 in 1912. Honoring Klimt’s desire for continuity, the contents of his studio were not greatly altered. Hoffmann’s additions were limited to the furniture he personally designed, which included a black cabinet set, matching cupboard, writing table, a small table with a pair of high-backed chairs, and a ceiling lamp created in the first months of the Wiener Werkstätte in 1903. He complemented these initial plans with a rounded white upholstered armchair made in 1905, a frame created for Klimt’s Hope II in 1909, and a rug produced by the Viennese firm of J. Backhausen and first installed in the Feldmühlgasse studio in 1912. Ernst Ploil has argued persuasively that the purist Hoffmann would have disagreed with Klimt’s haphazard arrangement of his Josefstädter studio and would have completed the compartmentalized display of his bookcase with objects designed by the Wiener Werkstätte. In figures 6.45 and 6.46, we can see that Hoffmann’s precise arrangements were restricted to Klimt’s possessions, in which the

---

642 Ploil describes the new studio designs as Gesamtkunstwerks because the plans were initiated in the first months of the Wiener Werkstätte and Hoffmann’s was dedicated to the concept of a total synthesis of the arts. In an undated letter to Maria Zimmermann, Klimt wrote of Wärndorfer’s intentions to have his studio “refurbished.” Klimt’s focus is on how disruptive this would be. Klimt’s letter is quoted in Ploil, “The Studios of Klimt,” in *Klimt: Up Close and Personal*, 98-107, 100.
645 Ibid., 106.
arts of Japan held a special place. In Klimt’s studio, the artist’s inspirational sources (i.e., his full-scale human skeleton, Japanese and Chinese art, and library) were in visual conversation with his work (*Hope II*).\(^{646}\) In addition to the wall of ukiyo-e, the décor of Klimt’s studio included a red and black suit of Japanese armor that stood in the antechamber, two Meiji era paintings of fish after Ohara Koson, and a large cabinet containing small objects like a Noh mask, a pair of iron abumi (stirrups), an ivory pendant depicting the goddess of creation, a doll in a kimono, netsuke, and a wooden sculpture representing the cycle of human life.\(^{647}\) He also had numerous “fantastically colorful” East Asian textiles “with which he loved to clothe his models.”\(^{648}\) Hoffmann’s refurbishment of his friend’s studio was intended to be an ideal creative space, and it is clear that, while he had a free hand in the furniture design, Klimt’s particularity and desire for continuity shaped Hoffmann’s plans, all of which lends extra significance to the objects arranged in his workspace. While Klimt painted in the adjoining room, this space designed by Hoffmann served as a visual introduction to any visitor to Klimt’s studio.

Lastly, when the western-style painter Kijiro Ohta (1883-1951) traveled to Vienna in 1913 to write an article about Klimt for the internationally focused art periodical *News from the World of Art* (1902-1920), the Austrian artist, who had a reputation for denying

---

\(^{646}\) *Hope II* was first exhibited at the Internationale Kunstschau in 1909. It was praised by Berta Zuckerkandl and criticized by Richard Muther for its jewel-like ornament. After its debut, the painting returned to Klimt’s studio, and he made some minor changes to it between 1909 and 1914 when it was sold to Otto and Eugenia Primavesi. Natter, *The Complete Paintings*, 607.

\(^{647}\) Verena Traeger, “Klimt as a Collector,” in *Klimt: Up Close and Personal*, 108-125, 114. The group portrait at the center of the arrangement is a Chinese Qing dynasty painting.

\(^{648}\) This quotation from an anonymous visitor’s description of Klimt’s studio printed in a Vienna newspaper in 1918 is quoted by Nebehay, *Dokumentation*, 466. Traeger, who has written on Klimt’s as a collector believes that his textile collection, which was passed on to Emilie Flöge and destroyed in the late years of the Second World War, reflected the artist’s true passion as a collector. Ibid., 116.
access to those he found inconvenient or intrusive, welcomed the foreign visitor, who had
gone to great lengths to procure an introduction. Ohta, who trained at the Tokyo
School of Fine Arts before studying in Belgium, had encountered Klimt’s art before. He
had seen *Judith II* in Venice in 1909 and *The Three Ages of Women* at the 1911
International Art Exhibition in Rome and believed that the composition, coloration, and
patterns in these works demonstrated “a strong relationship” to the arts of Japan. He
was primed by these previous encounters to see Japanese influence in Klimt’s studio.

Ohta’s description of the Feldmühlgasse studio includes colorful details like
Klimt arriving in his favorite indigo blue painting smock, Ohta’s confusion over Klimt’s
characteristic disappointment with his paintings in progress, and the artist’s irritation with
Ohta’s request for an introduction to the Stoclets. Three of his recollections bear weight
for my argument: he found Klimt working on landscapes, portraits, and allegories (*The
Virgin*); the artist picked up and arranged Chinese and Japanese textiles to show Ohta
“good compositions;” and Klimt turn to his portrait of the young Mäda Primavesi and an
unidentified painting of three women and bridged the communication gap by saying
“Japon.” In Ohta’s view, Klimt was acknowledging a clear line of inspiration with this

(Weitra: Bibliothek der Provinz, 2005), 108-9. Ohta was a western-style (*yoga*) painter, the term refers to
Japanese painters who went abroad to study western practices and styles and introduced them to Meiji
Japan. The *News from the World of Art (Bijutsushinpo)* focused on international trends and contemporary
practices in Japan. On Ohta’s education and art see, “Carriage and Pair Commentary,” Ohara Museum of
650 Ibid., 8. “Es besteht eine starke Beziehung zwischen Klimts Bildern und der japanischen Malerei. In
Klimts Bildern finde ich sehr viel von der japanischen Eigenart in der Komposition, der Farbkombination
und den Mustern. Diese Muster sind ausdrucksstark und ästhetisch.”
651 “Professor Klimt took me straight into his studio and immediately began to show me his pictures. He
pointed out this and that, moving from picture to picture. Most of the pictures were still being worked on. I
told this to Professor Delvin when I returned to Ghent. He pricked up his ears when he heard that Klimt
was working on so many pictures at the time. He wanted to know what he was working on. I told him that
he uses very little gold and silver and paints differently from the way people might imagine. Before I saw
Klimt’s unfinished pictures, I assumed he painted with careful strokes of the brush, but now I saw that his
single word. Ohta’s account offers us a glimpse into Klimt’s simultaneous artistic engagements, his approach to adopting and adapting patterns, and his own awareness of the inspirational sources viewers might see in his paintings.

From Klimt’s works and correspondence, his interest in the arts of Japan can be traced from 1883, when he had just completed his training and begun to undertake major historicist commissions, through his last unfinished canvases. The extended timeline, variety of experimentation, and permutation of influence throughout his oeuvre suggest the importance of this engagement. However, it is in his adoption and adaptation of Japanese pattern that we see the depth and function of Japonismus in his art. In addition to his interlocking triangles based on uroko designs, the art historian Akiko Mabuchi has traced patterns from *Judith I* (1901), the Beethoven Frieze (1902), and *Watersnakes I* (1904-7) to Japanese textiles (Fig. 6.46-48). As she implies, once one looks for Japanese designs in Klimt’s paintings, one finds them everywhere, and the examples she cites can be found in works representing all his various modes. For example, his adaptations of uroko triangles can be found in *Jurisprudence* (1894-1907), *Tragedy* (1897), the Beethoven Frieze (1902), *Portrait of Emilie Flöge* (1902), *The Three Ages of Woman* (1905), *Portrait of Fritza Riedler* (1906), *Hope II* (Vision) 1907, *Adele Bloch Bauer I* (1907), *The Kiss* (1907-8), the Stoclet Frieze (1904-11), *Death and Life* (1908-16), and

brushwork is energetic and utterly free. There are also two landscapes among the works. In the center of another picture titled ‘Vièrge’—if I can remember rightly—there are about ten women. One picture portrays a standing girl, another has three ladies in robes that look like Japanese kimonos. Klimt looked at me as he showed me this picture and said ‘Japon.’ He frowned, and I had the feeling he would rather not have shown it to me. This I found puzzling. (...) In the room next to the studio there was a cabinet with glass doors containing a large number of old Japanese and Chinese robes. I suspect Klimt borrowed the unique patterns in his pictures from the patterns on the robes. Klimt took out some of them and said: ‘This is a good combination.’” This translations of Ohta’s article is from Wieninger, “Zum Japonismus bei Gustav Klimt,” in *Gustav Klimt: Expectation and Fulfillment* (Ostfildern: Hatje/Cantz, 2012), 97-121, 97.
The essence of this pattern can also be seen in the visual rhythm of many of his landscapes (Fig. 6.49). Building on Mabuchi’s foundational research, other Japanese sources can be found throughout his works, including the crest-like circle juxtaposed with the Latin cross in *Death and Life* (Fig. 6.50) and many others (Fig. 6.51-56). Klimt’s reiterations demonstrate the significance of these patterns (Fig. 6.50).

Looking at the whole of his artistic production, other repetitions can be found, e.g., themes of death, life, and music, the figures of the sphinx and knight, and the consistent use of a square format for his landscapes. His repetition of pattern is, nevertheless, striking in its abundance and in the evolution that can be traced therein. In his earliest works, we can see his emphasis on ornament and find examples potentially modeled upon Japanese sources (Fig. 6.57). In Detail of Greek Antiquity (Girl from Tanagra), from the murals at the Kunsthistorisches Museum (1890-1891), we see Klimt working in a historicist style based on the Italian Renaissance tradition in unity with the Künstler-Compagnie. He molds the pattern to the volumetrically rendered clothing worn by the allegorical figure, maintaining representational conventions. However, his choice of decorative form is quite planar, and, although collaborating with his brother Ernst and Franz Matsch, he is beginning to negotiate between artistic traditions in this early work.

As can be seen in *Music* (1895) and *Lady in an Armchair* (1897/98), he experimented in a variety of ways with planar elements in his compositions in the years following the Kunsthistorisches Museum commission (Fig. 6.58-59). However, it is in his preparatory works and final Faculty Paintings that he gradually left European, volumetrically rendered pattern behind. In the transfer sketch for *Medicine*, Hygeia wears folds of drapery (Fig. 6.60). Between the drawing and painting, Klimt stepped away from
representational convention, and in the final version the wisteria-like pattern of the personification’s dress bends only slightly around her torso (Fig. 6.61). In a compositional study for *Jurisprudence* (1897/98), he sketched the allegorical figure of Justice in volumetrically flowing robes (Fig. 6.62). In the transfer sketch for his final faculty painting, he discarded lines indicating pleated cloth and adopted strictly planar patterns, placing the personification in the center of a mosaic-like column at the top of the composition (Fig. 6.63). This same evolution can be traced further in his oeuvre.

Describing the 1908 Kunstschau, which showcased the painter’s portraits, landscapes, and allegories side by side, Hevesi wrote that Klimt’s familiarity with the arts of Japan and Italian Byzantium enabled him to adjust his eye and “to come to terms with the artistic concept of flatness.”652 As will be demonstrated in the final section of this chapter, Klimt’s attunement to planar pattern was part of his pursuit of a distilled natural language of modern allegory (Fig. 6.64-65).

2) Klimt and the Art of Attention

Klimt was known for his reticence. During the most heated conflict of his career, the artist left his defense almost entirely to others, giving two interviews on the controversy

---

652 Hevesi, “Weiteres von Klimt,” in *Altkunst Neukunst*, 316-20, 318. “There’s no denying we’ve become familiar with Japan. And we have struggled with the artistic concept of ‘surface’ for half a generation. And some of us have also been to Ravenna and Palermo, of course to St. Mark’s Church, and have set our sights on mosaics. You can easily see all of this in the Klimt room.” (Es ist nicht zu leugnen, wir sind mit Japan vertraut geworden. Und wir haben uns ein halbes Menschenalter lang mit dem künstlerischen Begriff der ‘Fläche’ gemüht. Und einige von uns sind auch in Ravenna und Palermo gewesen, in der Markuskirche natürlich auch, und haben das Auge auf Mosaik eingestellt. Das alles sieht man dem Klimtzimmer ohneweiteres an.)
in 1901 and in 1905. In one of his few recorded statements, he averred that “the spoken just like the written word does not come readily for me.” Literally translated, he declared:

The spoken like the written word is not fluent (geläufig) to me especially not when I have to say anything about myself or my work. … Whoever wants to know anything about me as an artist — this alone is noteworthy — should look attentively (aufmerksam) at my pictures.

In this brief profession, his choice of “geläufig” and “aufmerksam” are noteworthy and linked. Chapter Five addressed Klimt’s search for universally shared values in art through the modern revival of allegory. Fluency (Geläufigkeit) and attention (Aufmerksamkeit) in language are two means of creating commonality, a proficiency of expression and a reciprocal, receptive understanding. In Klimt’s Vienna, there was an anxiety concerning the coherence and capacity of language, both visual and written, to speak in the modern age of anonymity and individualism. Klimt’s postcards, which he wrote regularly —

---


654 “Das gesprochene wie das geschriebene Wort ist mir nicht geläufig, schon gar nicht dann, wenn ich mich über mich oder meine Arbeit etwas äußern soll. Schon wenn ich einen einfachen Brief schreiben soll, wird mir Angst und bang wie vor drohender Seekrankheit. Auf ein artistisches oder literarisches Selbstporträt von mir wird man aus diesem Grund verzichten müssen. Was nicht weiter zu bedauern ist. Wer über mich – als Künstler, der allein beachtenswert ist – etwas wissen will, der soll meine Bilder aufmerksam betrachten und daraus erkennen suchen, was ich bin und was ich will.” This quotation from an undated typescript in the Bibliothek der Stadt Wien was first published by Nebehay (1969). The full statement, which frequently has been cited in parts, is given in Agnes Husslein-Arco ed., *Gustav Klimt und Emilie Flöge: Fotografien* (Munich: Prestel, 2012), 9. The two terms given in German and English, geläufig and aufmerksam, are difficult to translate. My advisor Christiane Hertel has pointed to the anxiety expressed in *geläufig*, and my notice of Klimt’s particular choice of aufmerksam has been guided by her insight into the Vienna school of art history. For an English translation, see Natter, Smola, and Weinhäupl, *Klimt: Up Close and Personal*, 177.

655 For a primary text in studies on the “crisis of language” in early twentieth-century Vienna, see Hofmannsthal 1902 prose work commonly known as The Letter of Lord Chandos. Hugo von Hofmannsthal, “Ein Brief,” in *Prosa II* (Frankfurt: S. Fischer, 1951), 7-22. On anonymity, individuality,
sometimes sending more than one to Emilie Flöge in a day—seem to reflect this anxiety over language in the artist’s cluttered, uneven handwriting and almost frantic filling of space so completely at odds with good design, proportion, and the calligraphic mark of the artist (Fig. 6.66). As a man of few words anxious about his linguistic fluency, Klimt made a pointed choice in using the word “aufmerksam,” a “curiously double-edged term” tied to a theory of visual communication that had particular resonance in turn-of-the-century Vienna.\footnote{Iversen, Alois Riegl, 6.} In 1902, the art historian and curator of textiles at the Austrian Museum of Art and Industry Alois Riegl published *The Dutch Group Portrait* in which he further advanced his concept of Kunstwollen: “an artistic will or urge or intent informing different period styles.”\footnote{Iversen, Alois Riegl: Art History and Theory (Cambridge: MIT, 1993), 96. My understanding of Riegls’s theories has benefitted from the work of Margaret Olin and Diana Reynolds-Cordileone. Margaret Olin, “Forms of Respect: Alois Riegls Concept of Attentiveness,” *The Art Bulletin* 71, no. 2 (1989), 285-299. Diana Reynolds-Cordileone, *Alois Riegl in Vienna 1875-1905: An Institutional Biography* (Burlington VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2014).} As Margaret Iversen has demonstrated in her comprehensive study, the focus of this late work was the role and responsibility of the viewer in art. For Riegl, “attentiveness” (Aufmerksamkeit) or considering “attentively” (aufmerksam) created a dynamic, firstly, between the represented figures within the world of the modern metropolis, see German sociologist Georg Simmel’s 1903 “Metropolis and Mental life.” Georg Simmel, *Die Großstädte und das Geistesleben* (Dresden: Zahn&Jaensch, 1903).\footnote{Iversen, Alois Riegl, 6.} “Aufmerksamkeit is a curiously double-edged term. On the one hand, it means watchful, vigilant, or alert; on the other, it has connotations of courtesy or kindness. It seems to balance within itself, then, self-love and empathy. Just as some dissolution of the boundaries of objects is necessary for the representation of free space, so some dissolution of the boundaries of the ego is essential for interpersonal relations.” Margaret Iversen, *Alois Riegl: Art History and Theory* (Cambridge: MIT, 1993), 96. My understanding of Riegls’s theories has benefitted from the work of Margaret Olin and Diana Reynolds-Cordileone. Margaret Olin, “Forms of Respect: Alois Riegls Concept of Attentiveness,” *The Art Bulletin* 71, no. 2 (1989), 285-299. Diana Reynolds-Cordileone, *Alois Riegl in Vienna 1875-1905: An Institutional Biography* (Burlington VT: Ashgate Publishing Company, 2014).}
pictorial space and, secondly, between the painted subjects and the beholder. Inviting the participation of the viewer, a “psychological bridge” was formed, creating a cooperative critical process fundamental to the ethical purpose of art.658

Riegl profoundly shaped the cultural discourse of his time. His innovative writings on the history of ornament, previously denigrated periods of art, and the folk traditions of the empire founded a new approach to art history as an academic discipline and set the stage for the modern movements and theories of his and subsequent generations of scholars.659 His ideas were advanced and disseminated widely in texts like Wilhelm Worringer’s Abstraction and Ornament of 1908 and Wassily Kandinsky’s Concerning the Spiritual in Art of 1912, and the reach of his influence can be seen in the reflections of his thought evident in works of scholars like Itō Chūta, Japan’s first historian of world architecture.660 Remembering Riegl in 1916, the modernist author

---


Hermann Bahr claimed that he “fundamentally transformed” art history in way that “knowingly or unknowing” penetrated all efforts in the field.\footnote{Bahr, “Wer ist Riegl?”, 50-51. This translation is from Hermann Bahr, Expressionism, trans. R. T. Gribble (London: Frank Henderson, 1925), 55-56.} Describing the cultural climate of the time, Bahr writes:

Riegl was the colleague of Wickhoff, the discoverer of Julian-Flavian-Trajan art. They both worked at the Vienna University from 1895, the time when Hugo Wolf was still alive; when Burckhardt was rejuvenating the Burgtheater and Mahler the Opera; when Hofmannsthal und Schnitzler were young; Klimt maturing; when the secession was beginning; when Otto Wagner was founding his school; Roller, the ‘malerische Theater’; when Olbrich, Hoffmann, and Moser created the Austrian School of Applied Art; when Adolf Loos and Arnold Schönberg appeared; Reinhardt dreamed, unknown, among the quiet byways of the future; when Kainz returned; Weininger went out in flames; Ernst Mach held his popular scientific readings; Josef Popper wrote his Phantasies of a Realist; and Chamberlain, fleeing from the distractions of the world, came to our kindly city and here wrote his Foundations of the Nineteenth Century … Those must have been wonderful days in Vienna!\footnote{Bahr, “Wer ist Riegl?” in Expressionismus (Munich: Delphin-Verlag, 1920), 47-51, 47. Wilhelm Worringer, Abstraction and Empathy: A Contribution to the Psychology of Style, trans. Michael Bullock (New York: International Universities Press, 1953). Wassily Kandinsky, Concerning the Spiritual in Art, trans. M.T.H. Sadler (New York: Dover, 1977).}

Bahr draws a picture of the intellectual and aesthetic revolutions of late-nineteenth-century Vienna, placing the art historian and curator at the center. For the author and champion of modernism, it was Riegl and his radically new approach to art history that
enabled the creative freedoms of his time. In her study of the development of Riegls
theories, Iversen echoes Bahr’s assessment, arguing that his “aesthetic principle” of
Kunstwollen was in accord with Viennese modernists’ revival of ornament and the
Secession slogan — “To the age its art; to art its freedom.” Although Rieglerarely
commented directly on his contemporaries in Vienna, he was interested in modern art,
and we can see reflections of his scientific and historical recuperation of “decadent”
periods in his colleague Franz Wickhoff’s lecture in defense of Klimt’s rejected Faculty
paintings “What is ugly” delivered in May of 1900.

At least three scholars have linked aspects of Klimt’s art to Riegler’s ideas. M.E.
Warlick interprets his employment of Egyptian motifs of fertility and revival in the
Stoclet Frieze — e.g. the eye of Horus associated with healing and restoration and the
rosebush as a symbol of the great mother Isis — as his proclamation of his own creative
rebirth. In Riegler’s terms, his adoption of Egyptian imagery was not a new historicism
but an attentive rediscovery of the past that “ultimately led to the founding and
development of an essentially new artistic flowering.”

663 Iversen, Alois Riegler, 21.
664 Riegler’s only direct comment on the Secessionist circle concerned the Javanese-Dutch artist Jan Toorop
(1858-1928). Ibid., 22. Wickhoff’s lecture in defense of Klimt delivered at the Philosophical Society of
Vienna is cited in Nebehay, Dokumentation, 52.
665 M.E. Warlick, “Mythic Rebirth in Gustav Klimt’s Stoclet Frieze: New Considerations of Its
Egyptianizing Form and Content,” The Art Bulletin 74, no. 1 (1992), 115-34.
666 As expressed in his lectures given at the Museums für Kunst und Industrie in 1894, Riegler believed that
art never truly died and, hence, was never reborn. Riegler, “Über Renaissance der Kunst,” Mitteilungen des
k.k. Oesterreich Museums für Kunst und Industrie no. 113 (1895), 342-48, 343. “[When we] encounter art
developed during [a certain] art period, we talk about a renaissance, a rebirth of art. However, we do not
think of art as a whole having been reborn, but rather only the better, the more worthy of imitation, the
older art, from whose height one has since fallen for some external reason. And history shows that at least
up to the 16th century, i.e. up to the threshold of our, the more recent, modern times, every such
Renaissance movement ultimately led to the founding and development of an essentially new artistic
flowering.” (Kunstperiode herangebildete Kunst begegnet, dort pflegen wir von einer Renaissance, einer
Wiedergeburt der Kunst zu reden. Wir denken uns dabei aber nicht die Kunst im Großen und Ganzen
wiedergeboren, sondern nur die bessere, die nachahmungswürdigere, die ältere Kunst, von deren Höhe man
oeuvre from 1890 to 1907, Lisa Florman similarly argues that his references to Archaic Greek ornament owe much to Riegl’s recuperation of this formerly neglected period of art history.\textsuperscript{667} Furthermore, a relationship could be drawn between what Florman describes as the artist’s Nietzschean evocation of the Dionysian-Apollonian dialectic — the balance of reason and sensibility — and Riegl’s many references to the same philosopher.\textsuperscript{668} For Margaret Olin, it is the way in which Klimt’s works, from portraiture to landscape, “look at the viewer” that bridges between his visual oeuvre and Riegl’s writings.\textsuperscript{669} Olin is referring to the way Klimt’s art engages the viewer, creating an original interpretation of Riegl’s art of attention. In Klimt’s portraits and allegories like \textit{Nuda Veritas} the central figure commonly looks directly out, and the composition and juxtaposition of pattern and figural detail cause the viewer’s eye to circle back and return to the subject’s gaze. In works like \textit{Death and Life}, where there is a Baroque repousoir figure, the barrier between pictorial space and the space of the viewer is disrupted, inviting our participation. However, Klimt did not evoke attention solely through the motif of an alert face and open eyes. Across his oeuvre, his Baroque-like compositions, which keep the viewer’s eyes in motion, and his repetition of pattern create a sense of animation, a feeling that the painting is gazing back.

---


\textsuperscript{668} On the transformation of Nietzsche’s philosophy in Riegl’s writings, see Reynolds-Cordileone, \textit{Alois Riegl in Vienna 1875-1905}. Cordileone connects Riegl’s idea of attentiveness to the historical Dionysian.

\textsuperscript{669} Olin, “Forms of Respect,” 295.
While there is no evidence suggesting a personal relationship, the two men would have been mutually aware of one another. Both had ties to the Museum of Art and Industry and the University of Vienna and, as indicated in the earlier quotation from Bahr, were part of the same world. Hence, there are ample grounds for connecting the artist’s use of the word “aufmerksam” to Riegl’s theories. This link offers a very different image of Klimt behind his bohemian façade, his works, and his own sense of contribution to his field. Considered in this light, his statement can be interpreted as a call for the viewer to practice an art of attention and enter a serious dialogue with his painted world. In one of his rare public speeches, Klimt defined art as including creation and appreciation, requiring both the maker and the beholder.670 This conception of the creative process is reflected in the way his works invite our participation. Just as Riegl praised Dutch group portraits for their ability to imaginatively encompass the beholder in a bonded non-hierarchical relationship, in paintings like Death and life Klimt ruptures the imaginary barrier between the viewer and his art, implying our responsibility regarding the subjects and the painted message.671 He creates an intimacy between viewer and art object most often established in portraiture, in which the depicted figure is “addressed to us … in a particularly pronounced way.”672 He extends this awareness of the beholder to his various pictorial modes; our presence is acknowledged, and we are drawn in to

670 In his keynote address for the 1908 Kunstschau, Klimt stated: “And we also define the term ‘artist’ as broadly as the term ‘work of art.’ Not only the creators, but also the enjoyers are called that, those who are able to experience and appreciate what has been created. For us, ‘artistry’ means the ideal community of all those who create and enjoy.” (Und weit wie die Begriff ‘Kunstwerk’ fassen wir auch den Begriff ‘Künstler’ Nicht nur die Schaffenden, auch die Genießenden heißen uns so, sie, die fähig find, Geschaffenes fühllend nachzuerleben und zu würdigen. Für uns heißt ‘Künstlerschaft’ die ideal Gemeinschaft aller schaffenden und geniessenden.) See, “Programmrede Gustav Klimt,” Neue Freie Press, June 2, 1908, 14.  
671 Iversen, Alois Riegl, 43.  
672 Ibid., 101.
complete his creations. In terms of modern allegory and Japonismus, it requires that the viewer attend to and give equal place to two traditions. Nowhere is this more vibrantly apparent than in Klimt’s Stoclet Frieze. Resuming the examination in Chapter Five, here, I turn to address the role of Japonismus in Klimt’s ornamental development and modernization of allegory.

3) The Stoclet Frieze: A Japonist Modern Allegory of Art

Klimt’s understanding of Japanese art was inescapably biased, as cultural transfer, translation, and even the most respectful adoption and adaptation entail omission, displacement, and a loss of whole. However, in his works and the Stoclet Frieze in particular, we see an example of a Viennese artist following Hermann Bahr’s call to closely observe Japanese models.\textsuperscript{673} Weaving together the continuous threads of his oeuvre, this late work represents one of the most thorough realizations of the aims of the Vienna Secession, the Wiener Werkstätte, and Klimt. Here, the role of Japanese ornament in his very European project becomes legible. Increasingly between 1897 and 1918, Klimt’s adoptions and adaptations from Japanese art became inseparable from his modernization of allegory, and his modernization of allegory became linked inextricably to his interpretation of Japanese form. The two traditions are placed in a non-hierarchical dialogue. Reportedly described by the artist in 1911 as potentially “the final conclusion of my ornamental development,” the Stoclet Frieze is a modern allegory in which Japanese

\textsuperscript{673} Bahr, “Japanische Ausstellung,” 216-17.
form is adopted and adapted as a universal visual language and unifying principle to Klimt’s eclecticism.674

Commissioned by Adolphe and Suzanne Stoclet in the first years of the Wiener Werkstätte, the Palais Stoclet (1905-1911) in Brussels was the second substantial undertaking of the artistic collective established by Josef Hoffmann and Koloman Moser in 1903.675 Unique in the patrons’ carte blanche in terms of expense and its wholeness of design — which encompassed every detail from architecture and ground plan to interior décor and special pieces of Madame Stoclet’s jewelry — the project allowed the imagination of its primary architect to “take wing” and Hoffmann’s “ideas to become reality.”676 (Fig. 6.67-68) Constructed at the end of Avenue de Tervueren abutting the parks and ponds of the Woluwe valley, the estate united art with every aspect of life. The “white, white” façade and illuminated garden created an ethereal prospect, described by

674 Zuckerkandl, “Erinnerungen an Gustav Klimt: Zu seinem sechzehnten Todestag,” *Neues Wiener Journal*, Feb. 4, 1934, 16-17, 16. Writing 16 years after the death of Klimt, Zuckerkandl recalls the artist speaking protectively of Stoclet Frieze. She writes that Klimt said: “No! I relinquish my work, which is probably the final consequence of my ornamental development and on which so many years of tentative, struggling work hang, a work on which craftsmen have put their best effort with so much quiet, self-sacrificing perseverance, from Beckmesser and company to be mocked and belittled. My friends will be able to view the frieze in my studio. Otherwise, this time I say: ‘Away from Vienna!’” (Nein! Ich verzichte darauf, mein Werk, das wohl die letzte Konsequenz meiner ornamentalen Entwicklung sein dürfte und an dem so viele Jahre tastender ringender Arbeit haften, ein Werk, an dem mit so viel stillen, aufopfernden Beharren Handwerkskünstler ihr Bestes gesetzt haben, von Beckmesser und Kompagnie verhöhnt und heruntergesetzt zu sehen. Meine Freunde werden den Fries in meinem Atelier besichtigen können. Im übrigen aber sage ich diesmal: ‘Weg von Wien!’) It seems likely that Zuckerkandl dramatized her interview with Klimt and lent her own fluency to the artist in this statement. On the history and recuperation of the term “eclecticism” as a unification of disparate cultural, artistic, and stylistic sources and a productive means of interpreting the intercultural practices of the nineteenth and early twentieth century, see Holly Shaffer, “Eclecticism and Empire in Translation,” *Modern Philology* vol. 119, no. 1 (2021), 147–65.

675 The group’s first project was Hoffmann’s Sanatorium Purkersdorf built between 1904 and 1905. While substantial, this undertaking was not of the scale and ambition as the Palais Stoclet.

676 A.S. Levetus, “Das Stoclethaus in Brussels von Architekt Professor Josef Hoffmann, Wien,” *Moderne Bauformen Monatshfte für Architektur und Raumkunst* vol. 13 (1914), 1-34, I. Levetus writes of Hoffmann imagination growing “wings” (seiner Phantasie die Flügel wachsen) and his “ideas to become reality” (seine Gedanken zu Wirklichkeiten werden). The whole passage reads as follows: “Ein Künstler hat ja nur selten Gelegenheit, ein Kunstwerk zu vollbringen, bei dem seiner Phantasie die Flügel wachsen, seine Gedanken zu Wirklichkeiten werden und seine Künstlerschaft zur vollen Entwicklung kommen kann.”
its earliest visitors as a place of “incomparable peace.” First marked as a historical landmark in 1976 and inscribed as a UNESCO world heritage site in 2009, the Palais Stoclet has been preserved as completed in 1911, almost in its entirety, and remains a closed private residence to this day.

The Stoclets first envisioned a Wiener Werkstätte designed home in Vienna, where the Belgian engineer and financier worked and lived with his wife and three children between 1902 and 1904. After a serendipitous encounter with the Secessionist painter Carl Moll, the couple determined to work with Hoffmann and his new collective, commencing plans for their primary residence in the capital’s Hohe Warte quarter. In the late 1890s, the designer of the Secession’s exhibition hall Joseph Maria Olbrich intended to transform this scenic suburb into a utopian artist colony. With his departure to Darmstadt in 1898, the aspiration passed to Hoffmann, who produced eight related houses combining Biedermeier and Arts and Crafts elements for fellow artists and a small number of modern art patrons between 1901 and 1911. The Stoclets greatly admired...

---

677 Eduard F. Sekler, *Josef Hoffmann: Das architektonische Werk: Monographie und Werkverzeichnis* (Salzburg: Residenz Verlag, 1982), 88. Sekler cites a letter from Eduard Wimmer to Josef Hoffmann from April 12, 1912, in which Wimmer describes the “white, white house” (weiße, weiße Haus) as a place of “incomparable peace” (unvergleichliche Ruhe). The whole passage reads as follows: “Gestern spät abends beleuchtete Herr Stoclet noch den Garten. Sternenklare Nacht, das weiße, weiße Haus im Bassinwasser widerspiegelt, die dunklen Hecken, darüber eine unvergleichliche Ruhe wir blieben lange, lange davor.”

678 Annette Freytag, who has written extensively on the Stoclet House, notes that while the estate has been preserved almost in its entirety —part of their art collection was divided among descendants and auctioned — the weathering of the exterior has diminished but not extinguished the visual impact of the building’s stark white exterior, which was of particular importance to both patrons and architect. Freytag also writes that having taken up residence in 1911, Adolphe and Suzanne Stoclet did not allow for any changes to be made to the home which was their primary residence up until their deaths in 1949, even when alterations were suggested by Hoffmann and the Wiener Werkstätte. Annette Freytag, “Close to Paradise,” in *Yearning for Beauty: The Wiener Werkstätte and the Stoclet House* ed. Peter Noever, Paul Du Jardin, et al. (Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz, 2006), 360-74, 364.

Hoffmann’s design for Villa Moll (1901) and purchased a building site on Steinfeldgasse for their own similar project in 1903. Both Hoffmann and Klimt made drawings for this intended Viennese Palais Stoclet (Fig. 6.69). However, with the death of Adolphe’s elder brother in 1903 and father in 1904, he was required to take over the leadership of his family business and estate, and the Stoclets and their plans for their own private “sacred spring” were relocated to Brussels.

The Stoclets were committed to the arts and to the Wiener Werkstätte ideals of craftsmanship and the aesthetic cohesion of form and function. Beyond his professional industrial career, Monsieur Stoclet was a founding patron, member, and administrator for institutions ranging from Brussel’s Theatre du Marais and Musée du Cinquantenaire to the city’s Foundation for Egyptology and Belgian Institute for Chinese Studies. In the 1920s, he helped form the Belgian Association for the Propagation of Art Abroad and was an honorary member of the symphonic orchestra of Paris. Suzanne Stoclet (née Stevens) was the daughter of art dealer and critic Arthur Stevens (1825-1890), who introduced avant-garde painters like James McNeill Whistler, Gustave Courbet (1819-1877) and Édouard Manet (1832-1883) to Belgium. Through her uncles, painters Alfred (1823-1904) and Joseph Stevens (1816-1892), she was introduced to the artistic

680 Ibid., Gustav Klimt (Munich: Prestel, 2007), 121. Weidinger includes a photograph of the Stoclet’s guest book. The preliminary drawings are in the WW archive of the MAK.
681 Through their organ Ver Sacrum, the Vienna Secessionists defined their artistic movement as the founding of a new “sacred spring.” On the Stoclet’s garden paradise as an embodiment of this idea, see Freytag, “Close to Paradise,” 374. In a second article, Freytag argues that Klimt’s Stoclet Frieze mirrors Hoffmann’s garden designs for the palais, which included evergreens and latticework covered in climbing leaves, and that the theme of Klimt’s Knight is repeated in the herculean heroes that frame the corners of the edifice’s tower. Ibid., “The Stoclet Frieze: An Artificial Garden at the Heart of the House,” in The Complete Paintings, 100-87, 108.
683 On Madame Stoclet’s father, see Freytag, “Close to Paradise,” 364.
and musical communities of Brussels and Paris, visiting salons and the homes of Parisian writers like the early Japonists Edmond and Jules Goncourt.\textsuperscript{684} In addition to the legacy of the Stoclet House, the pair developed one of the most remarkable private art collections in Europe, including works from Egypt, Mesopotamia, China, Japan, pre-Colombia, Byzantium, and ancient Rome.\textsuperscript{685} They had a special interest in Flemish and Italian painting from the fourteenth through sixteenth centuries. However, their tastes were wide-ranging, and their collection, which the artists involved in their all-encompassing commission had ample opportunity to study, became a central feature of their Wiener Werkstätte home.\textsuperscript{686}

With their passion for art and music — the Palais Stoclet included a special music salon with Steinway and Bösendorfer pianos designed by Hoffmann and a Gebrüder Rieger pipe organ — it is not surprising that the couple attended the Vienna Secession’s fourteenth exhibition in 1902 conceived as an aesthetic “temple of devotion” centered on Max Klinger’s monumental sculpture \textit{Beethoven} (Fig. 6.70).\textsuperscript{687} There, they were

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{684} On Madame Stoclet’s engagement with the musical and intellectual salons of Paris and Brussels, see Dufour, “Yearning for Music,” 375.
  \item \textsuperscript{686} On the Stoclets in their Wiener Werkstätte home, see Freytag, “Close to Paradise.”
\end{itemize}
impressed by Klimt’s wall cycle in the lateral hall depicting a Wagnerian interpretation of the composer’s Ninth Symphony. The following year, the couple revisited the Beethoven Frieze at the Secession’s Klimt Collective Exhibition.\textsuperscript{688} Described by Ludwig Hevesi as “a fairytale-like creation” epitomizing the artist’s new painted-mosaic style, the wall cycle inspired the Stoclets’ lasting and “glowing admiration.”\textsuperscript{689} From their plans for a home in the exclusive residential area of Hohe Warte in Vienna’s XIXth district to the construction of their Belgian estate, the pair wanted Klimt to play a significant role in their Wiener Werkstätte venture and felt that he should be granted “free reign” and the ability to “express his decorative fantasy.”\textsuperscript{690} Klimt likewise was enthusiastic about the undertaking — as well as characteristically doubtful of his abilities. He was eager to create something worthy of Hoffmann’s comprehensive plans, and the commission was his first opportunity to experiment with dimensional space since his mural contributions

\textsuperscript{688} Weidinger cites a manuscript from Erich Lederer in a private collection, see Weidinger, “The Stoclet House is really very beautiful,” in \textit{Gustav Klimt}, ed. Alfred Weidinger (London: Prestel Verlag, 2007), 119-37, 121. Erich Lederer, the son of Serena and August Lederer, recalled the Stoclets’ support of the frieze, how this advocacy was appreciated by Klimt in the face of negative criticism of the work, and cited the Beethoven Frieze as a model for the Stoclet commission. On the Klimt Collective exhibition dedicated to the painter’s works, see Wiener Secession, \textit{Kollektivausstellung Gustav Klimt: Nov.-Dez. 1903} (Vienna: Vereinigung bildender Kunst, 1903). On the Lederer family, see Nebehay, \textit{Gustav Klimt, Egon Schiele und die Familie Lederer} (Bern: Verlag Galerie Kornfeld, 1987).

\textsuperscript{689} Hevesi, “Gustav Klimt und die Malmosaik,” 546. “This fairytale-like outgrowth of his decorative fantasy was certainly something new in the field of surface decoration.” (Diese märchenartige Ausgeburt seiner dekorativen Phantastik war gewiß etwas Neues im Bereich des Flächenschmuckes. In a privately owned manuscript, Erich Lederer wrote that “Suzanne Stoclet in her youth often had conversations with Edmond de Goncourt about aesthetics, and everything with her was based on aesthetics, thus her glowing admiration for the Beethoven Frieze! & G.K.” Lederer is cited in translation by Weidinger, “100 Years of Palais Stoclet,” 205.

to the Secession’s fourteenth exhibition. While there are numerous striking aspects of the Palais Stoclet, the dining room encircled by Klimt’s frieze has been called “the heart of the house” as well as the truest reflection of the Wiener Werkstätte’s objectives and the painter’s inclusive definition of art ever to be realized. As described by art historian Hans Tietze in 1926, Klimt’s mosaic embodies the “purest solutions” to the aesthetic concerns of his time; “here, the arts and crafts unconditionally become an end in themselves.” Unrestricted by financial constraints, the artists involved were able to select the best materials for every detail, a rare opportunity that appealed to the sensibilities they shared with the utopian ideals of the arts and crafts movement. Klimt in particular took full advantage of this chance and was exacting in his vision requiring numerous test pieces and corrections for the mosaic’s precious materials.

Few scholars have been granted the opportunity to enter the Palais Stoclet, and art historical analyses have relied on the reflections of guests, published photography, and drawings housed in Viennese museums. Marking significant anniversaries, in-depth studies and publications have uncovered much from the palais’ archives and the estates of Josef Hoffmann and Wiener Werkstätte founder and financier Fritz Wärndorfer. Letters addressed to Adolphe Stoclet during the commission have revealed initial ideas — one of

691 Klimt’s training at the School of the Applied Arts and his early career as a Ringstrasse painter nurtured an interest in spatial design that the artist rarely was able to explore after the rejection of the Faculty Paintings. On Klimt’s enthusiasm for the project, see Weidinger, “100 Years,” 214.
695 For Klimt’s views of the completed project, see his postcards to Emilie Flöge written in May of 1914 in the manuscripts, autographs, and estate collection of the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Archive and the database of the Klimt Foundation. For the contemporary account of a Viennese art historian and preservationist, see Tietze, “Gustav Klimt.” For the first substantial publication of photographs of the Palais Stoclet, see Sekler, Josef Hoffmann.
which included Klimt creating sculptures for the estate (Fig. 6.71) — as well as details of expense, visits and exchanges between the involved artists and clients, dates of completion, and the numerous struggles caused by Klimt’s desire for perfection and his revisionary working method.\textsuperscript{696} In the accounts of the privileged few who have viewed the palais in person, there is one shared assessment, that no illustration can capture the play of light achieved in Klimt’s frieze, the “glowing and sparkling, opalescing and reflecting” that animates and becomes a visual medium in this “timeless scene of expectation and fulfillment” (Fig. 6.72).\textsuperscript{697}

Composed of 15 inlaid marble slabs each 6.5 feet in height and 3.3 feet in width, the mosaic is larger-than-life. The accomplishment of the collaborative craftsmanship of Leopold Forstner (1878-1936), Bertold Löffler (1874-1960), Michael Powolny (1871-1954), Adele von Stark (1859-1923), and Leopoldine (Helene) König (life dates unknown), the intricate reliefs were assembled in colored enamels, mother-of-pearl, semi-precious stones, and precious metals like gold, all varied in hue to meet Klimt’s exacting expectations.\textsuperscript{698} The enamellist Stark, for example, labored to create unique shades of green for each of the hundreds of leaves on the rosebushes that cap the long

\textsuperscript{696} Weidinger, “100 Years,” 205. Weidinger cites the letters of Fritz Wärndorfer, who wrote frequently to the Stoclets during the design and construction of the palais. All citations from Wärndorfer’s correspondence are taken from Weidinger’s publications of his own archive on Klimt and the Palais Stoclet.


\textsuperscript{698} These were the primary Wiener Werkstätte members involved in the execution of Klimt’s design. Many unnamed hands were involved. Weidinger, for example, has suggested that Emilie Flöge helped Klimt with his transfer drawings. See, Weidinger, “100 Years,” 214. No life dates have been determined for Leopoldine König (sometimes referred to in the literature as Helene König), a student from the Vienna School of Applied Art. For additional information on Stark (sometimes written Starck), see Julie M. Johnson, \textit{The Memory Factory: The Forgotten Women Artists of Vienna 1900} (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2012), 392-94. On the dimensionality and pronounced relief of the mosaic, see Freytag, “An Artificial Garden,” 104.
walls of the mosaic. With the rising and setting sun and the artificial illumination of candles and electric lights at night, the frieze “comes to life.”

Klimt’s design for the Palais Stoclet repeats thematic elements from his wall paintings for the Secession’s fourteenth exhibition. As early as 1906, the artist expressed his wish to create a “great object” reminiscent of his earlier visualization of humanity’s Longing for Happiness. Enveloping the dining room, the Stoclet Frieze consists of three parts: two parallel walls composed of 7 marble sections and a single abstract panel at the north end of the dining room. The west-side composition begins with the Dancer (Expectation) (Fig. 6.73). She is mirrored on the east-side wall by embracing Lovers, also known as Fulfillment (Fig. 6.74). The two long compositions are set in flowering meadows with rosebushes and flitting butterflies, centered on mirror images of a spiraling Tree of Life. Presiding at the head of the table opposite of the entryway is Klimt’s solitary Knight (Fig. 6.75).

In the art historical literature, the titles for each section have been drawn from contemporary descriptions and congruences with the Beethoven Frieze. The Knight is the only part of the frieze named by Klimt himself. In

699 Freytag, “An Artificial Garden,” 104. Requiring a year and a half to execute, Klimt’s design cost over 100,000 crowns for the materials alone. On the materials, quality, and expense of the Frieze, see Zuckerkandl, “Kunst und Kultur: Der Klimt-Fries.”
700 Freytag, “Close to Paradise,” 360.
701 For an overview of the theme and layout of the Beethoven Frieze, see Bisanz-Prakken, Der Beethovenfries: Geschichte, Funktion, und Bedeutung (Salzburg: Residenz Verlag, 1977), 47-49; and Eva Winkler, “Beethoven Frieze,” in Gustav Klimt, Josef Hoffmann: Pioneers of Modernism, 116-29.
702 Klimt’s sentiments are expressed in a letter from Fritz Wärndorfer addressed to Adolphe Stoclet, April 17, 1906. For the letter in translation, see Weidinger, “100 Years,” 212.
704 Strobl was the first art historian to recognize this abstract panel as a reiteration of Klimt’s knight imagery. Noting the title given by the artist in his correspondence, she correlates the aesthetic paradise of the Stoclet frieze to the “secularized ideology of salvation” in the Beethoven Frieze. See, Alice Strobl, “Klimt Fries für den Speisesaal des Palais Stoclet in Brussels,” in Das Palais Stoclet in Brussels von Josef Hoffmann, mit dem berühmten Fries von Gustav Klimt (Salzburg: Verlag Galerie Welz, 1991), 65-90, 87. Sekler also interprets the Knight panel as critical to the work, see Sekler, Josef Hoffmann, 94.
a picture postcard to Emilie Flöge dated May 18, 1914 (Fig. 6.66), Klimt wrote from the Palais Stoclet describing the finished estate, his knight, and areas that could have been improved, in a manner typical of his perfectionism.⁷⁰⁵ Here, Klimt not only titled this section of the frieze, but paid singular attention to the finished translation of his artistic vision, indicating its clear personal significance.

The Stoclets refused to allow their mosaic to be exhibited — the Expectation panel was only presented to “a few of [the Wiener Werkstätte’s] most intimate friends.”⁷⁰⁶ Klimt’s designs and the Palais Stoclet in all of its detail, nevertheless, became part of the aesthetic landscape of Vienna and the broader dialogue of the arts and crafts movement.⁷⁰⁷ In 1906, Hoffmann’s final architectural model was displayed at the internationally focused Galerie Miethke, generating debate in the capital’s artistic circles.⁷⁰⁸ Many of the vocal supporters of the Secession, Wiener Werkstätte, and Klimt

---

⁷⁰⁵ In a picture postcard dated May 18, 1914, Klimt wrote: “Auch diese Fotographie giebt ein schlechtes Bild. Mein armer Ritter wird ganz schwach und grün – der Dessin seines Kleides ist zu viel ‘gebuckelt,’ die Veränderung des Metalls aber nicht schlecht. Manches hätt’ ich anders machen sollen – vieles hätte die Werkstätte besser anders gemacht. Viel mehr Gold hätte die Wand vertragen!” (This photograph gives a poor picture. Too. My poor ‘Knight’ is becoming quite weak and green [nauseous]. The pattern on his robe is much too ‘buckled’ but the change into metal [vis-à-vis the original] is not bad. I should have done some things differently; it would have been better if the Werkstätte had done a lot of things differently. The wall could have taken a lot more gold!) Gustav Klimt, “Ansichtskarte von Gustav Klimt in Brüssel an Emilie Flöge in Wien, May 18, 1914,” Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, accessed Jan. 24, 2024, https://onb.digital/.

⁷⁰⁶ On the display of the mosaic in Vienna, see Zuckerandl, “Kunst und Kultur: Der Klimt-Fries,” 2. The Stoclets were incensed by requests to exhibit the frieze. In a letter to the patrons, Wärndorfer is emphatic in his word choice, stating that their display was not an exhibition. For a translation of Wärndorfer’s letter dated October 14, 1911, see Weidinger, “100 Years,” 234.


⁷⁰⁸ For discussions stimulated by the display of the Stoclet House model at Galerie Miethke, see A.F.S, “Zweckkunst,” Neue Freie Presse Dec. 7, 1906. Under the direction of Carl Moll since 1904, the gallery played an important role in the internationalization of the Viennese art market and was a significant platform for the Klimt Group after their exodus from the Secession in 1905.
published articles addressing the collaborative undertaking during and after its completion. The Viennese art critic Ludwig Hevesi reported that each of the rooms were “assembled completely” before being sent to Brussels for installation, implying that he, among others, was aware of their development and had the opportunity to view the final products.\footnote{Hevesi, “Neubauten von Josef Hoffmann,” in \textit{Altkunst Neukunst}, 214-21, 217.} In a letter to the Stoclets from 1911, Wärndorfer maintained that Forstner’s workshop was “continually disturbed by visitors” interested in Klimt’s paintings translated into marble.\footnote{For a translation of Wärndorfer’s letter from October 13, 1911, see Weidinger, “100 Years,” 233.} Two large-scale drawings for the frieze were purchased by Viennese collectors. A full-scale production drawing of the embracing lovers (Fulfillment) was purchased by Karl Grünwald (1899-1964), a collector known for his support of the Impressionists and Egon Schiele, and the final transfer drawings were purchased by Otto (1868-1926) and Eugenia Primavesi (1874-1963) in 1914 when they assumed Wärndorfer’s position as primary financiers of the Wiener Werkstätte.\footnote{Ibid., 235, Nebehay, \textit{Dokumentation} 382.} In the 1920’s, the Primavesis sold their Stoclet cartoon to the Museum of Art and Industry (now MAK), where the work remains a highlight of the permanent collection.\footnote{Christoph Thun-Hohenstein and Beate Murr eds., \textit{Gustav Klimt: Expectation and Fulfillment: Cartoons for the Mosaic Frieze at Stoclet House} (Ostfildern: Hatje/Cantz, 2012).} Given Klimt’s dedicated practice of drawing we can conclude that there were many iterations of the Stoclet Frieze, despite the scarcity of extant examples.\footnote{Wärndorfer wrote to Adolphe Stoclet on January 26, 1911 about recouping some of the expense of the frieze through the sale of sketches. Weidinger, “100 Years,” 234.} This inference is supported by the correspondence of Wärndorfer. In 1908, the Wiener Werkstätte founder wrote that Klimt was turning down commissions in order to dedicate himself entirely to the Stoclet assignment.\footnote{1908.} The artist was known for his routine of waking early and spending the full
day in his studio, even during his retreats to Lake Attersee.\textsuperscript{715} In 1910, Wärndorfer wrote again claiming that he had seen at least fifty drawings for the frieze’s dancing figure alone.\textsuperscript{716} Where and how these preliminary sketches entered the aesthetic fabric of Vienna remains unknown, however, it is reasonable to assume that like the numerous samples and transfer drawings produced by the Wiener Werkstätte, they became part of private collections of admirers interested in Klimt’s art and the development of visual modernism in the Habsburg capital (Fig. 6.76).\textsuperscript{717}

Covered in notations and directives, the MAK’s full-scale transfer drawing is a clear representation of the artist’s intentions and vision (Fig. 6.77-78). Notably, its current display is closer in organization to Klimt’s early intentions — in Hoffmann’s first architectural plans the mosaic frieze would have covered a single wall opposite a bay of windows overlooking the Stoclet garden.\textsuperscript{718} It also reflects what the artist described as “many years of tentative, struggling work.”\textsuperscript{719} During his visit to the completed palais in 1914, he wrote of the difference between the final product and “my Knight;” Klimt’s use of the possessive refers to both his aesthetic vision and its physical translation in the final transfer drawing.\textsuperscript{720} Along with preliminary sketches, the cartoon, therefore, deserves

\textsuperscript{715} Egon Schiele described Klimt’s working habits in a letter to Anton Peschka quoted in translation in Natter, Smola, and Weinhäupl eds., \textit{Up Close and Personal}, 279.
\textsuperscript{716} Weidinger, “100 Years,” 214, 225. On the samples from the Wiener Werkstätte in private collections, see Ibid., 228.
\textsuperscript{717} Ibid., 225.
\textsuperscript{718} The division of the frieze and encircling design came with Hoffmann’s revisions of the dining room layout. Freytag, “An Artificial Garden,” 108.
\textsuperscript{719} Zuckerkandl, “Erinnerungen an Gustav Klimt,” 16.
\textsuperscript{720} See, footnote 705 for original German. “This photograph gives a poor picture. Too. My poor ‘Knight’ is becoming quite weak and green (nauseous). The pattern on his robe is much too ‘bumpy’ but the change into metal is not bad. I should have done some things differently; it would have been better if the Werkstätte had done a lot of things differently. The wall could have taken a lot more gold!”
close analysis. It shows Klimt’s artistic practice, his devotion to each detail, and the importance of ornament in the program of the frieze.

   Scholarship has consistently dated the three extant sketches of the mosaic as a whole to 1907 and 1908, two years prior to the final transfer cartoon (Fig. 6.79). In these small works, Klimt experimented with the recurring elements of pattern, the Dancer, Fulfillment, and the Tree of Life. Around 5 inches in height and 55 in length, the elongated rectangular compositions resemble Japanese stencils in their density, repetition, and layering of pattern (Fig. 6.80). In the upper-most sketch illustrated in figure 6.79, the Dancer is at the left, a rectangular iteration of the Tree of Life with black birds at the middle, and the Knight rendered in thin blocks of color sits at the right. In the middle sketch shown in figure 6.79, we see an alternate design for Fulfillment. Together the two drawings contain each of the components of the final frieze, including the dominant patterns of stacked triangles, squares with dark jeweled centers, ovals that become eye-like, and spiraling tendrils. The drawing illustrated at the bottom of figure 6.79 comes close to the ultimate design for Expectation. Here, we see birds of prey perched on the limbs of a spiraling tree and the first rendering of Klimt’s rosebushes at the far left.

   Each of the repetitions and alterations between these three preliminary drawings and the final frieze is revealing. In the sketches and final design, Klimt consistently used patterns modeled on Japanese ornament. The resemblance between his triangles, squares, ovals, and tendrils and Japanese models is demonstrated in figures 6.13, 6.52, 6.55, and 6.64-65. The repeated appearance of the Knight and the embracing couple show the artist

reworking themes from the Beethoven Frieze, and the first iteration of the lovers adds to our understanding of the ultimate design. Here, the embracing couple is turned toward the viewer. Eyes closed, the pair is entwined, and the woman nestles a swaddled child. The composition blends Klimt’s 1908 *The Kiss*, a work greatly admired by the Stoclets, with his depictions of motherhood and the cycle of life.\textsuperscript{722} He was clearly relating the Stoclet Frieze to his other paintings, including *The Kiss, Three Ages of Woman,* and *Death and Life.*\textsuperscript{723} Parallel figures can be found between each of these paintings and his preliminary Stoclet sketch of the family (Fig. 6.81-82). In the sketch at the bottom of figure 6.79, a Rinpa-like river streams behind the dancing figure. The art historian Alfred Weidinger has connected this blue rivulet to the Villa Oleander at Attersee, where the artist spent the summer of 1908 working on drawings for the Stoclets and watching Emilie Flöge dance in the garden.\textsuperscript{724} Beyond biographical connections, it is significant as an adaptation of a motif and compositional device used in both Chinese and Japanese art (Fig 6.83). It shows Klimt blending inspirational sources from katagami stencils to East Asian painting and Japanese printmaking (Fig. 6.84). In ukiyo-e, water often becomes an allusion to “the impermanence of things, the transitoriness of life, which in Buddhism was allied to human sorrow;” in the floating world this mutable element of nature is converted into “a positive and glowing inspiration.”\textsuperscript{725} Although the river was not included in the final

\textsuperscript{722} *The Kiss* was unveiled at the 1908 Kunstschau and immediately acquired by the Moderne Galerie. The Stoclets, otherwise, likely would have purchased it. Weidinger, “100 Years,” 215.

\textsuperscript{723} Kevin Karnes has linked the works of Klimt and the composer Gustav Mahler, who conducted the performance of Beethoven’s *Ode to Joy* at the opening of the Secession’s fourteenth exhibition in 1902. Karnes draws parallels between Klimt’s paintings and Mahler’s *Das Lied von der Erde* (Song of the Earth) in which mother earth encompasses both birth and death. Kevin Karnes, *A Kingdom Not of this World: Wagner, the Arts, and Utopian Visions in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013). Weidinger, “100 Years,” 215.

version of the frieze, its presence in the preliminary sketch signals a theme treated variously by different figures, motifs, references, and symbols throughout the frieze. Here Klimt’s Japonismus encounters his modernization of allegory in a marked way. The artist takes up the recurrent allegorical subjects of his oeuvre, art and life, and addresses them by adopting and adapting Japanese forms.

As Zuckerkandl noted in 1911, “Klimt’s poetic style” always entailed the looming presence of death. Even in his depiction of “blossoming bodies,” there was an impending threat. In the “festive” dining hall of the Palais Stoclet and its frieze celebrating the power of art, the representation of human impermanence would seem “unsuitable.” According to Zuckerkandl, Klimt could not resist “the tempting contrast of joy and misfortune.” Here, “black, rigid birds of prey” sit amid branches “forming three deep black spots in the bright gold,” a reminder to the viewer of their own mortality. The echoes of Klimt’s Three Ages of Woman, and Death and Life explored in his preliminary sketch reinforce this interpretation. Zuckerkandl’s description

727 Ibid.
728 Ibid.
729 Ibid.
730 Ibid.
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continues, pointing to the blooming roses and fluttering butterflies that are “composed entirely flatly” intersecting with the tree’s spirals “without any perspective in between.” Her emphasis on the flatness of the frieze signals its place in what Klimt himself described as his ornamental development. The artist draws the viewer’s attention to these details of nature’s ephemerality by pairing accentuated flatness with brief moments of pictorial depth in the features and gestures of the Dancer and embracing couple. As demonstrated in Chapter Five, this juxtaposition is part of Klimt’s modernization of allegory. The frieze plays with the proximity between art object and beholder, encouraging us to engage with the allegorical subject. When Klimt visited the completed Palais Stoclet in 1914, one element that disappointed him was the buckling, arching (gebuckelt) of the Knight. Through the whole creative process, he was exacting in how his design was translated into mosaic and very specific on what aspects should be completely planar and what elements should be softened, as in the features of Expectation whose animated figure Wärndorfer described as capturing “a momentary pause” and “the entire preceding dance.” He did not want complete flatness nor did he aim for volumetric rendering throughout. He wanted the mosaics to heighten the stylistic and conceptual principle of juxtaposition central to his modernization of allegory.

Like Zuckerkandl, subsequent scholars have tied The Dancer, falcons, and repeated eye-shaped patterns to Egyptian tomb imagery (Fig. 6.73, 6.76, 6.85),

731 See, footnote 705.
732 Klimt’s expressed his frustration and necessary alterations to test samples in terms of color, flatness, and materials in a letter to Fritz Wärndorfer from Kannerl am Attersee in August 1910. For Klimt’s letter, see Max Eisler, “Gustav Klimt,” Österreichische Rundschau vol. 2, no. 7 (1936), 302. For the letter in translation, see Weidinger, “100 Years,” 224. For Wärndorfer’s description of the Dancer in a letter addressed to Adolphe Stoclet, June 23, 1911, see Weidinger, “100 Years,” 232-33.
interpreting these elements as references to mortality. In the case of the Dancer, art historians have pointed to the flourishing of interpretative dance in the early 1900s and the contemporary view of this creative form as an innate expression of animation and life. Her vitality stands in contrast to the rigid symbols of death. Mediating all of its visual sources, the Dancer is unified by Klimt’s references to Japanese art — e.g., the stark juxtaposition of geometry and floral print, the pairing of ornament and figuration, and the layering of pattern. Further visual similarities can be found between Klimt’s Expectation and the dancing figures of ukiyo-e (Fig. 6.86), and the large and small triangles that dominate Expectation’s torso, which reiterate the uroko pattern that Klimt frequently adapted in his art (Fig. 6.13b). The Dancer has no one model, she is a synthesis of sources. However, the unifying principle of the figure and the frieze as a whole is drawn from Japanese ornament.

As in the preliminary versions of Expectation, Klimt’s final design centers on the Tree of Life. This element of the Stoclet Frieze references the visual language of the Secession as an awakening, a new sacred spring of art, showing Klimt’s continued dedication to the group’s ideals after his exit in 1905. On the cover of Ver Sacrum in 1898, Alfred Roller represented this idea with a tree in full bloom, its roots rupturing barriers to return to the soil (Fig. 6.87). In Klimt’s Tree of Life, the visualization of

aesthetic fecundity adopts and adapts from Japanese models. Japanese ornament is the soil to which Klimt’s tree returns.

Weidinger relates the Stoclet Frieze with Attersee and the painter’s landscapes, an interpretation supported by the fact that many of his sketches and cartoons date to his 1908 visit to the lake.\textsuperscript{736} Weidinger also views the Knight “as a private sign that points to Klimt’s own person and his relationship to nature.”\textsuperscript{737} In agreement with this reading, I correlate Klimt’s Stoclet designs with his approach to landscape painting, a connection that leads back to the example of Japanese aesthetics (Fig. 6.41-42). In the spiraling limbs of Klimt’s tree, we see his search for “the primordial elements of all things;” he adopts and adapts Japanese ornament as fundamentally drawn from nature and, thus, a universally intelligible visual language of modern allegory.\textsuperscript{738} The tendrils of the tree closely resemble spirals in Japanese art and are the frieze’s most significant pattern. As seen in the golden triangles of the Dancer, in the square bird on the cloak of the embracing couple, and throughout the Knight, it reoccurs in each section of the work (Fig. 6.88-90). It is also the most repeated pattern in Klimt’s oeuvre, giving it the role of second signature. In the frieze, the tendril’s centrality and reiteration form a direct correlation between ornament and the artist, placing Klimt at the center of his modern allegory. The spiraling tree becomes a symbol of art and the artist surrounded by and intersecting with representations of life.

\textsuperscript{736} Weidinger, “100 Years,” 220.
\textsuperscript{737} Ibid., 214.
\textsuperscript{738} S. Bing, “Programme,” \textit{Artistic Japan}, vol 1. no. 1 (1888), 1-7, 6.
The Stoclet Frieze concludes with Fulfillment (Fig. 6.91). Encircled by representations of life’s metamorphoses and impermanence, Klimt’s embracing couple represents the culminating purpose of art, the transient beauty of nature crafted in a manner that encourages us to reflect on the evanescence of life. The butterflies of the frieze are reminiscent of patterns from traditional family crests and Japanese textiles, in which the fragile insects are linked with departed spirits and the temporality of nature (Fig. 6.92). Klimt’s roses likewise allude to the seasons and the ephemera of the natural world. From *The Tale of Genji* to Zen landscape paintings and the mended fractures of kitsugi porcelain, reflections and celebrations of impermanence are central to Japanese aesthetics. Brevity is intrinsic to beauty. In Buddhism, the transience of life does not incite nihilism but rather vital engagement with the present. Art is a means of connecting to and practicing awareness of this fact. From Klimt’s library, we know that the artist was familiar with these themes and the role and representation of nature in Japanese art. In S. Bing’s *Artistic Japan*, he would have encountered Justus Brinckmann’s description of the short-lived petals of the cherry-tree “drawn along by the impetuous force” of a river. In studying Ernest Fenollosa *Epochs of Chinese and

---

739 Scholars have viewed the entwined figures as a representation of the patrons, Klimt and his muse Emilie Flöge, and as a mixture of these two pairs. Weidinger, “100 Years,” 215; Freytag “Close to Paradise,” 360; Strobl, “Klimt Fries für den Speisesaal,” 81.
Japanese Art, Klimt would have learned about the visual expression of Japanese philosophical and religious tenets, as the art historian converted to New Buddhism and integrated these principles into his writing.\textsuperscript{744} The flowering meadow of the Stoclet Frieze places similar emphasis on the interconnection between temporality and beauty. In the frieze, the fleeting beauty of the roses and butterflies—their transience—is brought into focus.

Notably, the Stoclet composition does not include a figure looking directly out to the viewer. The Dancer is drawn in profile, as are the various birds and fish included in the overlapping patterns. In Fulfillment, the woman’s eyes are closed, and her face is only half visible. The male figure is more implied than depicted, as we only see a fragment of the back of his head and neck, and Klimt’s Knight is fully abstracted. However, throughout the frieze ornament becomes animated. The oval patterns resembling eyes in Fulfillment and the Tree of life seem to look out and acknowledge the viewer, a feeling that is reinforced by repetition. In the visual rhythm of the frieze, the ovals are echoed by the rose blossoms, spiraling tree limbs, and recurring tendril patterns, all of which creates the impression of awareness. The frieze’s allusions to impermanence and representations of life blend into symbols of art, and visualizations of creativity blend back into depictions of the transience of humanity in a way reminiscent of Klimt’s Death and Life and Medicine in which vertically streaming mankind arises beside and against

\textsuperscript{744} Fenollosa, like his student and collaborator Okakura Kakuzō, converted to an esoteric school of Japanese Buddhism, Shin Bukkyō, also known as “New Buddhism.” The religion was a nationalistic movement deeply influenced by social Darwinism and Hegelian philosophy. He received baptism from Sakurai Keitoku of the Tendai monastery of Miidera and adopted the Buddhist name Tei-Shin. Several prominent figures of New Buddhism were former students of Fenollosa, e.g., Inoue Enryō (1858-1919) and Okakura. Jonathan Stalling, “Emptiness in Flux: The Buddhist Poetics of Ernest Fenollosa’s ‘The Chinese Written Character as a Medium for Poetry,’” in Poetics of Emptiness: Transformations of Asian Thought in American Poetry (New York: Fordham University Press, 2011), 33-58, 7.
disease and death. The frieze as a whole allegorizes art in life — the ephemeral beauty of
the natural world brought into heightened focus by art, and life in art — the ever-present
specter of fragility and death.

In 1911, the first visitors to the completed Palais Stoclet noted an “Oriental
influence.”\footnote{N.N., “L ‘excursion des architectes belges du 22 septembre 1912 au Palais Stoclet,” Tekhné vol. 2 no. 79 (1912), 801-2, 802.} Klimt’s style during the period of his most intense work for the Stoclet
Frieze, was described by one of his closest advocates as a Japonist Byzantium.\footnote{Hevesi, “Gustav Klimt und die Malmosaik,” 548. “Ohne Zweifel spielt Japan ganz wesentlich in dieses
neue Klimtsche Byzanz hinein.”} Art
historical readings of the frieze have noted the influence of Egypt, Byzantium, and the
Spanish Renaissance, and Klimt’s ornamental development has been interpreted in terms
of nineteenth-century debates on the nature of arts and crafts as well as to nineteenth-
Speisesaal,” 79. Strobl argues that the influence of El Greco, whose works Klimt encountered during a trip
to Paris and Spain in 1909, is evident in the Stoclet Frieze. Emily Braun, “Ornament as Evolution: Gustav
Klimt and Berta Zuckerkandl,” in Gustav Klimt the Ronald S. Lauder and Serge Sabarsky Collection, ed.
Renée Price, 145-69.} The influence of Japanese art on
the frieze has also been noted in scholarship.\footnote{Wieninger, “Zum Japonismus bei Gustav Klimt,” 97-121.} However, the most apt description is that
of Berta Zuckerkandl, who wrote that “nothing like it” had ever been created before.

While Klimt’s long engagement with Japanese art and the pursuit of modern allegory
remain as the interwoven threads of the frieze, the work is a poignant example of Klimt’s
conscious gathering and uniting of eclectic foundations.

As an allegory of art, the Stoclet Frieze stands out in Klimt’s oeuvre, beckoning
the art historian to locate his creative foundations in a nutshell. In its return to previous
motifs and subjects, and the long struggles its conception and execution entailed, the
work was important to the artist himself. While I have argued that Japanese aesthetics played a unifying role in the Frieze, it is also a clear example of Klimt’s creative flexibility. There is room for other inspirations. For Klimt, the essence of ornament was universal, allowing for conscious selections from Egypt, Byzantium, Archaic Greece, and Japan (ad-infinitum), forging a modern paradigm that encompasses the past and the foreign.

During Klimt’s lifetime, Japanese art and culture were new and largely unfamiliar to the Viennese public. Consequently, his engagement was informed by amalgamated and partial sources. Japonismus heightened aspects of his modern allegory, as in the example of his juxtaposition of mosaic-like pattern and realistically rendered anatomy. The planar simplicity of Japanese ornament adopted and adapted by Klimt accentuated the moments of dimensional illusion in his works, engaging the viewer in a pronounced way. The contemporary view of Japanese art as founded on aesthetic universals also aligned with Klimt’s pursuit of an open, intelligible visual language of modern allegory, and his lengthy and substantial engagement with this foreign tradition was at least in part motivated by this fact. In other ways, the model of Japanese art destabilized the visual tradition that he was attempting to revive by introducing unfamiliar, incongruous elements. The legibility of allegory depends on the existence of a known story from which the interpreter is expected to draw specific associations. Proper interpretation relies on the clarity, stability, and authority of the allegory’s associative ties. In order for Klimt’s viewer to read his modern Japonist allegories, one has to first recognize the artist’s attempt to interweave these distinct threads. Perhaps this is where Klimt’s modern allegory begins to blend in with symbolism, in that it is addressed, either intentionally or
unconsciously, to a very particular audience. Lastly, Klimt’s adoptions and adaptations of Japanese aesthetic principles problematically ignore the cultural specificity of Japan. Many questions posed by this analysis have been left unanswered and are perhaps unanswerable. We will perhaps never know to what extent Klimt distinguished between East Asian cultures in his visual study and adoptions and adaptations. One of his primary resources, Fenollosa’s *Epochs of Chinese and Japanese Art* (1913), treated the aesthetic traditions of China and Japan as a single movement of interlocking phases, giving privileged place to Japanese art. Klimt likely would have held similar views. Through examinations of his library, collection, and art, scholars have proven that he was deeply inspired by the arts of both countries, and the subject of Klimt and East Asia is continually expanding.\(^749\) Efforts to reconstruct the artist’s library and collection will inevitably reveal much concerning his creative practice and working process. However, as Verena Traeger, whose ongoing research concerns Klimt’s collection, has pointed out, the artist kept many of his possessions at Emilie Flöge’s apartment, which “was gutted by fire in the last days of the war in 1945” and “the precise losses… can no longer be determined today.” Klimt’s textile collection, which was passed on to Flöge, numerous sketchbooks, and lost correspondence might have provided insight into direct references to specific patterns and the artist’s views and engagement with his library.\(^750\) What this examination has shown is how Klimt negotiated between contemporary revivalist conceptions of classical heritage and the introduction of Japanese art to Vienna. For Klimt, form was not autonomous or separate from content; style was not just an


\(^{750}\) Traeger, “Klimt as a Collector,” 116.
individual choice or artistic preference or response to a movement or fashion. They had intrinsic, interrelated meaning. That is to say, Klimt did not simply adorn allegory in the new cloak of Japonismus, he aimed for coalescence and a unity that would establish a new modern paradigm.
Chapter Seven: Conclusion

In 1903 Rilke responded to a young poet requesting guidance, writing: “An artwork is good when it springs of necessity. Therefore, dear sir, I have no other counsel for you than this: Go into yourself and explore the depths from which your life flows. There you will find the answer to the question, _Is it essential that I create?_”\(^{751}\) For Rilke, it is a necessity that the artist is drawn back, despite uncertainty, to take up the tools of their medium. As he goes on to explain to his correspondent, this is the “burden” and “greatness” of the creative process, it inescapably defines and belongs to the artist. Hence, to ask others for advice, approval, or even perhaps understanding is vain.\(^{752}\)

Gustav Klimt, who wrote of his art in terms of difficulty, disappointment, and “stern duty,” would have related to Rilke’s view.\(^{753}\) This is how I interpret Klimt’s pairing of his personification of _Nuda Veritas_ with the Schiller quote: “If you cannot please everyone with your actions and your artwork — please only a few: to please many is bad.”\(^{754}\)

---

\(^{751}\) Rainer Maria Rilke, _Briefe an einen jungen Dichter_ (Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1929), 12. “Ein Kunstwerk ist gut, wenn es aus Notwendigkeit entstand. In dieser Art seines Ursprungs liegt sein Urteil: es gibt kein anderes. Darum, sehr geehrter Herr, wüßte ich Ihnen keinen Rat als diesen: in sich zu gehen und die Tiefen zu prüfen, in denen Ihr Leben entspringt; an seiner Quelle werden Sie die Antwort auf die Frage finden, ob Sie schaffen müssen.” This translation is taken from _Letters to a Young Poet: A New Translation and Commentary_, trans. Anita Barrows and Joanna Macy (Boulder: Shambhala, 2021), 15. I have modified two words. For _Kunstwerk_, Barrows and Macy use _poem_ and for _schaffen_ they use _write_. I have chosen the more literal translations of _artwork_ and _create_, as Rilke was speaking of all artistic endeavors emerging of necessity.

\(^{752}\) Ibid.
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translation of Schiller’s votive is frequently used in Klimt literature.\textsuperscript{755} However, in the standard English complete works, \textit{schlimm} is rendered as \textit{vain}.
\textsuperscript{756} In the original German, the author’s ironic choice of \textit{schlimm} rather than the rhyming \textit{schlecht} does away with the semantic oscillation between bad and evil. In contrast, \textit{vain} comes closer to the implication that pleasing many is futile, inconsequential, and, in fact, contrary to the very nature of art. In a 1901 interview following the parliamentary opposition to his Faculty Paintings, Klimt reiterated the sentiment of this earlier quotation, stating: “In matters of art there is only one judgment, the judgment of artists!”\textsuperscript{757} He believed that \textit{Philosophy} expressed “purely artistic knowledge” (rein künstlerischen Erkenntnissen) and could,

\textsuperscript{755} For example, “Bad” is used in Natter, \textit{The Complete Paintings}, 566.
\textsuperscript{756} The standard English translation is more formal. See, Friedrich Schiller, \textit{The Collected Works of Friedrich Schiller, Delphi Poets Series} vol. 25 (Sussex, UK: Delphi Classics, 2013), 425. “Choice. If thou canst not give pleasure to all by thy deeds and thy knowledge, Give it then, unto the few; many to please is but vain.”
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therefore, only be justly evaluated by those who understood the necessity of the creative impulse.\textsuperscript{758}

In this dissertation, I build upon comparative stylistic analyses, institutional histories, historiographies, critical examinations of Austrian visual modernism, Japonisme studies, scholarship on Meiji era arts, and post-colonial theories of artistic exchange. The complexity of Viennese Japonismus and the art of Gustav Klimt necessitate this diversity of approach. Close visual analysis of preliminary sketches, unfinished canvases, and the details and presentation of finalized works forms the basis of each chapter. This is of particular importance to examinations of Klimt’s oeuvre, as he was an artist forever chasing the actualization of his creative vision. I argue that these details enable us to reevaluate the painter’s ambitions, achievements, and limitations, all of which have been overshadowed by his bohemian persona and the biographical facts that underlay this image. While scholars have acknowledged the presence of allegory and Japonismus in Klimt’s art, these interwoven threads have been treated separately. Examined together, the resoluteness of his pursuit of modernism via tradition and his attempts to integrate Japanese models into this commitment become legible.

Acknowledging and inviting the viewer into his painted world, Klimt asks his audience to do justice to two traditions. His approach was eclectic, his ornamental language and developments were not solely Japonist, and his works were not limited to allegory. Nevertheless, understanding these two lengthy and serious engagements offers a new foundation for interpreting his varied artistic endeavors.

\textsuperscript{758} Ibid.
In Chapter Two, I examine the divided political and cultural landscape of Klimt’s Vienna that motivated the search for aesthetic unity in cultural heterogeneity. Rudolf Eitelberger’s commitment to reform, his foundation and furtherance of art institutions throughout the empire, and his innovative approach to the history of art had a lasting impact in and beyond the Habsburg imperial capital. His belief that the visual arts could speak a universal language was echoed and transformed in the opinions and publications of his peers and subsequent generations. Albert Ilg believed that an aesthetically unified Dual Monarchy could be forged through a Baroque revival. Like his mentor, he linked the visual arts to the contemporary politics of nation, religious faith, and empire. Despite these limitations, he joined in preservative and reformatory endeavors and held a similar conviction that there was “universality” in every art form. For Berta Zuckerkandl, Austrian art was defined by the diversity of the Dual Monarchy and aligned with the internationalism of the Vienna Secession. Each of these individuals influenced Viennese artistic developments and the works of Klimt. Efforts towards unity highlighted rather than ameliorated the dilemma of the fracturing empire, making the question of Austrian identity unavoidable. As demonstrated in Julius Meier-Graefe’s *The Development of Impressionism in Painting and Sculpture*, what emerged in response to these calls was the pluralism of Viennese visual modernism and new paradigms like Japonismus.

---

The Renaissance debates and reform movements in the Habsburg capital were lengthy and circuitous. Viennese perceptions and interpretations of Japanese art, therefore, were shaped by a range of evolving definitions of the arts, folk traditions, nation, and empire. This leads to the question of how Viennese Japonismus related to or was completely distinct from other trans-national modernisms and romantic idealizations of regional, foreign, and ancient cultures in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. In the writings of advocates of modernism like Ludwig Hevesi, Hermann Bahr, and Zuckerkandl, the subjects of folk traditions, preserved models of craftsmanship, and ideas of innate “primeval art” (Urkunst) overlap. Hevesi, for example, related Egyptian painting to the drawings of children arguing that they shared an unconscious, stylistic logic more fundamental and accurate than the illusions of visual realism. Moreover, many Secessionists and collaborators of the Wiener Werkstätte considered the Dual Monarchy’s craft traditions as a path toward modern rebirth, as was manifested in the intersection of vernacular ornament and modernist design in the

760 On the prevalence of national romanticism and the idealization of the medieval, see Barbara Miller Lane, National Romanticism and Modern Architecture in Germany and the Scandinavian Countries (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000).
pageantry and visual works produced for the 1908 Kaiserhuldigungsfestzug. In the example of Klimt, the painter never stopped expanding his library and collection. In addition to the Japanese art objects and texts addressed in this study, he owned Chinese portraiture, Italian silks, sculptures from Northeast Africa, and volumes on Egyptian art, Muhammadan masterworks, and the paintings of Goya. He claimed that the “wonderful and magnificent” sculptures of the Congo had accomplished much more than his own art, relating yet another foreign tradition to his ambitions. An important question raised for my research is: Did Klimt make distinctions in his collection, study, and adoptions and adaptations, or did each of these foreign cultures represent the same path toward modern universal form? It returns to the question of eclecticism as disordered or as a process of conscious selection. Given the length and complexity of Klimt’s engagement, I have argued that the arts of Japan held a special place in his approach to modern allegory. However, I also think that his views on the universality of Japanese ornament were drawn from this larger complicated discourse. Further contextualization of Japonismus within the aesthetic debates of Klimt’s moment, would provide nuance to our understanding of this meeting of cultures.

In Chapter Three, I ground my interpretation of Klimt’s Japonismus, offering a critical account of the varied images of “Japan” that permeated the visual fabric of

---

Vienna. Viennese Japonismus was fueled by the Meiji era’s reinvention and redefinition of the aesthetic traditions and nation. Simultaneously, it was propelled by European popular culture and externally fabricated representations and reproductions of Japanese crafts and culture that often conflicted with the aims of the Meiji government. These amalgamated sources fostered interpretations of Japanese craftsmanship as a preserved tradition, Japanese ornament as a natural visual language, and Japanese art as a path toward modern revival. These assessments were a product of inseparable layers of exoticism, primitivism, Orientalism, translation, mistranslation, and genuine encounter with old and new Japanese art. Drawn from amalgamated sources, Viennese Japonismus was, itself, an inseparable cultural alloy, a dynamic paradigm that extended beyond works of art to the definition and process of making.

My definition of the amalgamate nature of Viennese Japonismus emerged from my early research into the agency of Meiji Japan in the development and character of Viennese and, more generally, international Japonism. Chapter Three opens this line of inquiry. For example, the artist and design educator Eizo Hirayama (1855-1914) came to Vienna in 1873 as a member of the Japanese delegation for the Weltausstellung. He remained in the Habsburg capital to train in western-style applied art. Between 1874 and 1877 he was a student at the School of Design under Josef von Storck, Alois Hauser (1831-1909), and Oskar Beyer (1849-1916) and became familiar with the ideas of Jacob von Falke, Gottfried Semper, and Felix Kanitz (1829-1904). After his return to Japan, Hirayama advanced the principles he learned abroad via the Meiji Product Design Department and Patent Bureau, his select translations of Falke, Semper, and Kanitz for journals associated with the Dragon Pond Society, and his instruction at the Training
Institution of Industrial Teachers and the Higher Technological School of Tokyo. Yoshinori Amagai’s research has shown the importance of Hirayama in the development of Meiji-era applied arts. Considering that Falke greatly admired the Japanese displays at the Weltsausstellung and promoted Japanese models in Viennese reforms, it would be interesting to follow the adoption and adaptation of his theories in Japan and their possible return to Europe in the amalgamation of Japonism. Hirayama’s efforts are just one example of the way the Meiji government accommodated and translated foreign concepts and perceptions of art at a state level, conceivably with the practical consequence of amalgamation on the Japanese side. This mirroring of amalgamation and the differing structures of empire and cultural authority it reveals represent an expansive area for future study.

In Chapter Four, I critically examine Viennese adoptions and adaptations of Japanese aesthetic principles, recuperating eclecticism as a creative process in which the arts of multiple distinct traditions converge to create something new. Emil Orlik and Josef Hoffmann consciously selected Japanese methods and aesthetic principles. Like Klimt, they refashioned sources that they admired and believed to be drawn from fundamental, cross-cultural aesthetic principles. In these two examples, we find an artistic language and approach to modernism that corresponded to but also differed from Klimt’s. Neither shared the painter’s investment in the tradition of allegory. As such, their engagements with the arts of Japan offer insight into common threads and motivating

---

aims of Viennese Japonismus as well as its idiosyncratic manifestation in specific oeuvres.

I conclude Chapter Four by addressing Klimt’s library. Siegfried Bing’s visual encyclopedia and Oskar Münsterberg’s and Ernest Fenollosa’s art historical surveys presented Japanese aesthetics as a superior source of fundamental visual forms intrinsically linked to the natural world, advanced Japanese models as paradigms of non-hierarchical unity, craftmanship, and revival, and upheld the eastern nation’s traditions as equal to the classical tradition of Europe. The titles in Klimt’s library reflect his engagement with contemporary scholarship and the history of art. They also provide an interpretative lens for his encounter with Japanese aesthetics. The ideas expressed by Münsterberg, Bing, and Fenollosa echoed the assessments espoused by his contemporaries, like Orlik and Hoffmann, and aligned with the threads of Klimt’s own artistic endeavors. Additionally, the connections evident in these volumes demonstrate the artist’s participation in an international culture of Japonism.

My critical approach to Klimt’s Japonismus and Chapter Four’s exploration of his private library could be applied to many of his fellow Secessionists, artists of the Wiener Werkstätte, and the Expressionists who were their students. In the case of Orlik, Chapter Four addresses the beginning of his explorations of Japanese art and its impact in Vienna. It was, however, a lasting interest that he carried with him as an artist, collector, educator, and theater designer in Berlin (1905-1932). Setsuko Kuwabara’s research has shown that he purchased hundreds of ukiyo-e works during his travels and from auctions in later years, deliberately trying to encapsulate the development of Japanese woodblock printing
in his collection. Orlik loaned his prints to exhibitions across central Europe, and his collection served as the visual basis for Julius Kurth’s three-volume history of Japanese woodcuts (Die Geschichte des japanischen Holzschnitts, 1925-1929). He also owned porcelains, scroll paintings, sculptures, kimonos, dolls, netsukes, fans, theater masks, and other Japanese and Chinese handicrafts with which he decorated his apartment. Further explorations and reconstructions of Orlik’s collection, which included photographs from his two trips to Japan that he used as visual aids in his lectures, would provide a deeper understanding of his adoptions and adaptations. Orlik’s estate, inherited by his brother Hugo (1861-1942), was only partially preserved. Only one of Orlik’s relatives survived the Jewish genocide of the Second World War, and the artist’s collection and estate have yet to be fully traced. Orlik’s oeuvre and his engagement with the arts of Japan contains many areas for further investigation, not least of which includes a detailed study of the six books of Japanese folklore by Lafcadio Hearn that he illustrated between 1905 and 1921. Printed in Frankfurt as specially bound limited editions with an introduction by Viennese poet and playwright Hugo von Hofmannsthal, these ornamented German translations of Hearn’s transformations of Japanese folklore are a perfect example of the amalgamation of International Japonism.

---

769 Kuwabara, Emil Orlik und Japan, 114.
770 Ibid.
In Chapter Five, I critically analyze the status of allegory in Klimt’s art. Destabilizing interpretations of the painter’s oeuvre as a rise and decline or as divided by changing ambitions, I consider his working practice, simultaneous engagement across mediums, and overlapping projects to reveal his lasting investments. Klimt did not abandon tradition in his approach to visual modernism. Rather, the revitalization of allegory played a continuous role in his pursuit of an art for his age. Martin Gerlach’s modern reanimation of the allegorical tradition initiated an artistic community that bridged through Klimt’s endeavors and career. In his contributions to these compendia, the artist progressively experimented with Ilg’s proposal for modern allegory. In *Tragedy*, we find the culmination of this experimentation and Klimt developing a conceptual and stylistic principle within this revivalist framework.

Chapter Five was the initiating spark of this dissertation and opens many lines of inquiry. One of the most compelling for my research is the role of modern allegory across the artist’s oeuvre. Klimt saw connections between his modes, leading one to consider whether he intentionally blended the lines between and within his works. In their interpretations of the painter’s art, both Hevesi and the art historian Hans Tietze addressed allegories, landscapes, portraits, and sensual images together as associated parts of a whole, and Klimt approached each as an equally “serious and sacred matter.”

I have argued that his characteristic juxtaposition of mosaic-like pattern and realistically
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772 Hans Tietze, “Gustav Klimt,” *Kunstchronik: Wochenschrift für Kunst und Kunstgewerbe* vol. 29, no. 21, 1 (1917-1918), 217-219, 219. Tietze writes that “For Klimt, his work was a serious and sacred matter (den Klimt war seine Arbeit eine ernste und heilige Sache.) The whole passage reads as follows: “Seine Bilder, in denen die seelische Sorglosigkeit orientalischer Paradiese atmet, sind das Ergebnis schwerer, ehrlicher handwerklicher Arbeit; den Klimt war seine Arbeit eine ernste und heilige Sache. Er hat eine Zeit, der die Kunst nur ein Gewerbe oder eine leichtfertige Vergnügen war und eine Stadt, in der diese frivole Auffassung am unbeschränktesten um sich gegriffen hatte, zu einer ernsteren Auffassung gezwungen; das ist das Geheimnis seines starken Erfolges in den ersten Jahren der Sezession.
rendered anatomy was part of his modernization of allegory. This leads one to question how the artist’s desire to allegorize permeated his various undertakings. Phrased differently, was modern allegory for Klimt what “inner vision” was to Bahr’s definition of Expressionism, an essential creative force? In the example of his biblical figures, Eve (Adam and Eve, 1917-18) strongly resembles Naked Truth, and the comparison would be an interesting place to begin a detail study of this last unfinished canvas. The forbidden fruit was knowledge, and the consequence of Eve’s fall was sickness, pain, and death, three repeated elements in Klimt’s allegories. His portraiture also blurs boundaries, particularly in the case of the late works, in which his sitters are transformed in a quasi-allegorical manner becoming semi-personifications adorned by ornamental symbolic attributes. The remarkable likenesses of his portraits could be read as an animation of allegory. As Marian Bisanz-Prakken has argued, ties to traditional personifications can be seen in the artist’s sensual female figures whose “mesmerizing frontality” references representations of Virtue. Further commonalities can be found between allegorical works and the painter’s water sprites and will-o’-the-wisps. Rather than viewing these works as a rejection or subversion of tradition, the artist’s intertwined, flowing female forms could be read in relationship to their counterparts in modern allegories like

773 In Expressionism (1914), Hermann Bahr wrote: “Artistic vision depends on an inner resolve: the eye of the spirit, and only by the way in which a man decides the issue of opposing forces does he truly become an artist.” Later in the text, he writes: “Anyone who will take the trouble to experiment in this way with the inner seeing power, will learn thereby to understand in a new way the development of formative Art. Its history consists of periods which entrust themselves to the inner vision (as all primitive and all Oriental Art does) alternating with periods which give the physical eye pre-eminence, as does Greek Art from the Apollo of Tenea, and every Art which is in any way modeled on or derived from the Greek.” Hermann Bahr, Expressionism, trans. R.T. Gribble (London: F. Henderson, 1925), 50, 68.
774 On Adam and Eve (1917-18), see Natter, The Complete Paintings, 641.
776 On Water Sprites 1902/3, Will-o’-the-Wisps (1903), Water Snakes II (1904), see Natter, The Complete Paintings, 585, 591, 596.
Philosophy and the Beethoven Frieze. Even Klimt’s landscapes and his search for universal forms in nature offer a path for allegorical interpretation. The artist did, after all, carry around Dante’s *Divine Comedy*, a significant model of poetic allegory rife with landscape imagery, and his advocates and collectors did not see these works as separate from the core of his art. Reading contemporary descriptions of the “fanatical diligence” that went into “every picture and part of the picture,” one begins to see more associations than divides. I have argued that the modern allegory was foundational for Klimt. It would be limiting to say that his art was only allegorical. Nevertheless, I would argue that it is a productive interpretive lens for investigating the ties between his various modes.

In Chapter Six, I critically analyze the interwoven threads of allegory and Japonismus. From Klimt’s works and correspondence, his interest in Japanese aesthetics can be traced from his early historicist paintings through his last unfinished canvases. His varied experimentation intensified in the course of his career, informing the basis of his artistic process: to look, contemplate, and then materially work and rework. Klimt rarely publicized his views or approach to art. His few statements ask the viewer to consider his paintings alone and reflect his belief in art as a collective creative process. I connect this request for our “attention” to the ideas of Alois Riegl. Works like *Death and Life* draw the viewer in, creating a dynamic cooperative critical process that gives equal place to allegory and the arts of Japan. Through a close reading of the Stoclet Frieze, I argue that Klimt adopted and adapted Japanese forms as a universal visual language and unifying principle to his eclecticism. Juxtaposing accentuated flatness with brief moments of pictorial depth, the frieze plays with the proximity between representational space and the beholder, inviting the viewer to complete this modern allegory of art. Klimt’s Japonismus
becomes inseparable from his modernization of allegory, and modern allegory becomes
an essential part of his interpretation of Japanese aesthetics.

Klimt characterized the Stoclet Frieze as the potential culmination of his
ornamental development, the resolution of his visual language of volumetric organic
forms, flat natural patterns, and composite stencil-like motifs. Allegory and Japonismus
can be traced through his oeuvre to his last canvases. We cannot know if he would have
left allegory behind and further immersed himself in Japonismus. His death from
complications after contracting the Spanish flu simply leaves this open. We also cannot
know how the seismic political and cultural shift in Austria that came with the end of the
First World War would have impacted Klimt’s art. Building on this study, what could be
considered is the expansive question of the artist’s ornamental development after the
Stoclet Frieze. In the seven years after its completion, Klimt returned to Death and Life,
produced at least 25 landscapes, experimented with the boundaries of portraiture, and
reworked iconography, compositional elements, and patterns from his earlier pictures.
His last unfinished works return to the theme Hevesi described as “youth and age,
blossoming and withering, the entire calamity of desire and suffering known as human
life.” For The Bride, Klimt drew over 150 preliminary studies, showing that his
working process continued in its intensity through his final endeavors. I would argue
that he continued to unify his eclecticism following the Stoclet Frieze. In subsequent
works, he expanded his color palate using less gold and metal pigments, which is notable
as he felt that the mosaics could have been much more golden. Personally significant

---

777 Hevesi, “Gustav Klimt und die Malmosaik,” Kunstchronik: Wochenschrift für Kunst und Kunstgewerbe
vol. 18 no. 33, 27 (1906-1907), 545-547, 546. Translation from Natter, The Complete Paintings, 93.
778 Natter, The Complete Paintings, 206.
patterns remained dominant in his art, filling the majority of his compositions. A significant aspect of his ornamental development that continued to transform his art was his openness to international art in what Tietze characterizes as his pursuit of “a generally valid language of art.” In his brief but regular correspondence, Klimt often reflected on the shortcomings of his endeavors but never seemed disheartened when he found his own ambitions visually articulated in the works of others, whether past, contemporary, or foreign. Modern allegory and Japonismus did not restrict his expansive adoptions, adaptations, and conscious selections. These continuous interwoven threads unified Klimt’s eclecticism.

From the vantage point of today, the earnestness and continuity of Klimt’s endeavors can be easily mistaken or overlooked. To the artist’s closest advocates, however, they were apparent and significant. From his library, we can infer that he was part of a larger cultural dialogue and that his friends and advocates would have recognized the investments and complexities of his artistic endeavors. The statements of Hevesi, Zuckerkandl, Bahr, and Tietze support this view. In this dissertation, I underscore the proximity and coexistence of Klimt’s styles, the continuities in his works, and his lasting investments in allegory and Japanese art as a model for artistic rebirth. I contextualize Klimt’s Japonismus within the broader context of his oeuvre, offering a new understanding of his works, a new way of seeing the eclectic visual fabric of late-

---

779 Tietze, “Gustav Klimt,” 219. Tietze writes of Klimt’s pursuit of “a generally valid language of art” (einer allgemein gültigen Sprache der Kunst). The whole passage reads as follows: “Weil Klimt die angestammte Eigentümlichkeit der Wiener Malerei zu neuer Idealität zu erwecken verstand, ist er für die Kunst dieser Stadt — gegen deren Willen — von entscheidender Wichtigkeit gewesen; in dieser lebendigen Durchdringung liegt aber auch ein Teil seiner allgemeinen Bedeutung; so sehr er einer allgemein gültigen Sprache der Kunst entgegenstrebe, so zieht doch auch die Krone seines Gewächses ihre Eigentümlichkeit aus der Kraft, die die Wurzeln speist.”

nineteenth and early twentieth-century Vienna, and a new view of the importance of Japonismus in the development of Viennese modern art.
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I.


Allen diesen Meinungen von Kunst, derjenigen Tolstoj mit eingeschlossen, ist aber Eines gemeinsam: es wird nicht so sehr das Wesen der Kunst betrachtet, vielmehr sind alle bemüht, sie aus ihren Wirkungen zu erklären.
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