Paris—Vienna:

Modern Art Markets and the Transmission of Culture, 1873-1937

by

CHRISTIAN HUEMER

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York
2013

Online-Veröffentlichung auf ART-Dok (2022), DOI: https://doi.org/10.11588/artdok.00007734

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty of Art History in satisfaction of the
dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Patricia Mainardi

Date	Chair of the Examining Committee

Kevin D. Murphy

Date	Executive Officer

Emily Braun

Diane Kelder

Petra T. Chu
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

Paris—Vienna: Modern Art Markets and the Transmission of Culture, 1837-1937

Christian Huemer

Adviser: Professor Patricia Mainardi

Organized chronologically in four chapters, this dissertation provides a broad-based account of the cultural transfers between Paris and Vienna at a time of increased artistic mobility. Focusing on the period between the 1873 World Exposition in Vienna and the 1937 Exposition of Austrian Art in Paris, the study seeks to elucidate what specific works of art were transferred from one cultural region into the other, and how they were appropriated within different regimes of value. While Paris managed to establish itself as the capital of the modern art market with exports on a large scale, Vienna faced tremendous difficulties in its attempt to become a major player in the European art world.

How the cultural optimism before the Vienna World Exposition turned into a deep and sustained economic depression is examined in chapter one. Consequently, a number of Austrian artists decided to seek their fortune in Paris where the powerful art dealer Charles Sedelmeyer managed some of their careers. Chapter two shows how the *grandes machines*, theatrically presented and toured internationally by dealers, became the target of criticism. While the Vienna Secession intensified contacts to French artists, dealers, and collectors, intimate displays and clear narratives were able to disguise the commercial character of its shows. The role of Carl Moll for the importation of French modernism is considered in chapter three. Not only did he serve as

director of the Galerie Miethke but was also instrumental in the foundation of a museum of modern art in Vienna. The study closes with a discussion of the impressive Exposition of Austrian Art at the Jeu de Paume which is exemplary for the French government's active foreign cultural politics after World War I and the collapse of the Habsburg Empire.

A powerful gallery-system, able to implement and sustain Austrian art on foreign markets, never developed in Vienna where private patronage and artists associations continued to play a much more significant role.

Acknowledgements

Over the years many institutions and individuals have generously supported my research and inspired my ideas. This dissertation project originated in an exhibition planned for the MdM (Museum of Modern Art) Salzburg. During 2005 and 2006, I worked as co-curator of the exhibition *Affaires Modernes: Austrofranzösische Kunstbeziehungen 1880-1960* in Paris. In this function, I was involved in shaping the concept of exhibition and catalog as well as selecting and organizing loans. My catalog essay devoted to the art market as a medium of cultural transfers formed the basis of this thesis.[*] Together with Michael North I was able to chair a panel on the same topic at the 2007 CAA conference in New York. Fellowships at the Internationales Forschungszentrum Kulturwissenschaften in Vienna and the École des Hautes Études en Science Sociale in Paris allowed me to conduct archival research in both cities and to build up scholarly networks. In Paris I would like to mention Madeleine Fidell-Beaufort (American University) and Markéta Theinardt (Sorbonne, Université Paris IV) who gave me valuable advise on archival resources in the capital city. Flavie Durand-Ruel provided me with some important pieces of information from the company records of her family. In Vienna it was Paul Rachler who helped with both the Secession and Künstlerhaus archives. Stephan Koja (Belvedere Museum) and Stefan Kutzenberger (Leopold Museum) cannot be thanked enough for their continued moral and scholarly support. I am also extremely grateful to the Getty Research Institute in Los Angeles—and here explicitly Thomas Gaehtgens, Gail Feigenbaum, and Terence Ford—who despite my

[*] Due to a change in directorship and budgetary issues the exhibition was canceled at the Museum of Modern Art in Salzburg shortly before the opening. When Agnes Husslein became director of the Belvedere Museum in Vienna, she decided to realize this show at her new venue under the title *Wien-Paris: Cézanne, Van Gogh und Österreichs Moderne* (October 3, 2007—January 13, 2008) without acknowledging my intellectual and curatorial contribution. The controversy over the authorship of his exhibition was discussed in the Austrian press. See, for example, Anselm Wagner, "Gartenfrust: Was man im Belvedere unter 'Aufblühen' versteht," *Die Presse*, May 22, 2007, 37; Nina Schedlmayer, "Wie Gesinde behandelt," *Profil* 40 (October 1, 2007): 118; "Art Nouveau Riche," *Falter,* Oct. 10, 2007, 68.

full-time position as managing editor of the Project for the Study of Collecting and Provenance (e.g. the Getty Provenance Index®), never stopped encouraging me to finish. Even if other fascinating international research projects on collecting and display may have sidetracked me from time to time, the numerous lively discussions with Getty staff and visiting scholars widened my intellectual horizon. In this regard I am also deeply indebted to Sophie Raux, Hans van Miegroet, and Neil de Marchi who invited me to participate in a series of stimulating workshops on *Marchés de l'art en Europe (1500-1800)*.

My special thanks goes to Patricia Mainardi who guided me through the PhD. program at the Graduate Center, City University of New York. Without her continued support this dissertation would never have been completed. I would also like to thank all other members on my committee consisting of Emily Braun, Diane Kelder, and Petra T. Chu for their valuable time and suggestions. Among the many friends and colleagues who have in one way or another aided my work, I am especially grateful to Thomas Angerer, Ján Bakos, Peter Bogner, Alexandra Caruso, Anne-Lise Desmas, Patrick Fiska, Ernst Gebetsroither, Anne Helmreich, Kurt Ifkovits, Julie Johnson, Eva Kernbauer, Kolja Kramer, Almut Krapf-Weiler, Andreas Kugler, Richard Kurdiovsky, Tamara Loitfellner, Eleonora Louis, Christa Magerl, Christopher Marshall, Decourcy McIntosh, Monique Nonne, Martina Nußbaumer, Ilona Parsons, Pierre-Lin Renié, Margaret Stenz, Margarethe Szeless, Georg Vasold, Midori Yamamura, and Leanne Zalewski.

My final word of gratitude goes to my family, Johann, Rudolfine, and Peter Huemer, and to my dear wife, Veronika who always stood by and helped in moments of crisis. May the completion of this piece put an end to years of long distance relationship!

Table of Contents

List of Illustrations

Introduction

It was not only with the recent debate on "globalization" that cultural concepts such as identity and hybridization, place and displacement, center and periphery were linked with the nature of markets. Artistic exchange always had something to do with trade relations, foreign affairs, and the transnational circulation of commodities. The influential Florentine Renaissance painter and writer, Giorgio Vasari, even deemed the development of easel painting as the result of pure transfer considerations: "In order to enable paintings to be shipped from one country to another, the painted canvas was invented, which weighs almost nothing, and thus can be transported easily in any size."[1] The migration of images, the breaching of distances, and the crossing of thresholds, all accelerated tremendously in the era of the railroad. In 1856, an editor of the *Deutsches Kunstblatt* was so surprised at the mobility of paintings that he wrote: "Just look at how many crates of pictures are being shunted around by the railroads! You could even think that no train leaves the station without some artworks on board. If you can't come to them, they come to you. Anything that is not much too big makes the trip, even fresco walls…"[2] During the nineteenth century, the development of the means of transportation and communication led to a considerable expansion in the markets for the highly demanded products of fine art. It was no longer rare to come across one and the same painting in exhibitions in Paris and Vienna, Saint Petersburg and New York within a short period of time. So-called "touring pictures" were specifically produced to be shown in the most important European and American cities for year and years. The

[1] "Gli uomini, per potere portare le pitture di paese in paese, hanno trovato la comodità delle tele dipinte, come quelle che pesano poco et avolte sono agevoli a traportarsi." Giorgio Vasari, *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori* (Florence: Edition Torrentiniana, 1550), 1, XXIII: 136-37.
[2] "Welch' ein Wandern der Bilderkisten auf den Eisenbahnen! Man möchte glauben, es geht kein Zug ab, der nicht Kunstwerke mit sich führte. Wer nicht zu ihnen kommt, zu dem kommen sie. Was nicht durch seine monumentale Natur gehalten wird, begiebt sich auf die Reise und selbst Freskowände... " Friedrich Eggers, "Die deutschen Kunstvereine," *Deutsches Kunstblatt* 7, no. 39 (September 25, 1856): 337.

migration of images, the bridging of distances, and crossing of borders, all accelerated enormously in the age of the railroad. In 1900, the Viennese critic Ludwig Hevesi complained in the Pester Lloyd newspaper that "intellectual exchange has become too powerful in our busy age and is breaking out of all national enclosures."[3] The various artists now drift "without roots in the general flow of the art market. It is a pity that this has led to the disappearance of the many individual colors of the overall picture."[4] Culture, it seemed, was no longer tied to a specific location, it was on the move—less about roots than routes.

This dissertation examines the cultural transfers between France and Austria from a market perspective. By focusing on the period between the 1873 World Exposition in Vienna and the 1937 *Exposition d'art autrichien* (*Exhibition of Austrian Art*) in Paris I analyze the major points of contact and the dynamics of exchange, the *regards croisés* and the construction of national identities. What is Austrian about Austrian modern art? Or, how French is Austrian modern art? What specific works were transferred from one cultural region into the other via markets, and how were they appropriated within different regimes of value? How can we grasp such dynamic processes of selection, mediation, and reception? A common bias in the historiography of Austrian art is that the artistic circles of Vienna refused to acknowledge the hegemonic position of Paris. According to Robert Fleck, the Austrian art world—in contrast to that of Germany—never established a genuine and permanent relation to the European avant-garde.[5] Its deep-rooted skepticism towards the modernist utopia of a universal language of art based on pure form and color is often interpreted as ignorance of the developments in Western art, especially in France.

[3] "Der geistige Austausch in so verkehrreicher Zeit ist zu stark geworden, er geht über alle nationalen Gehege hinweg." Ludwig Hevesi, "Michael Munkácsy," *Pester Lloyd*, May 3, 1900, 2.
[4] "Andere aber treiben wurzellos in der allgemeinen Fluth des Kunstmarktes. Es ist schade um die viele Spezialfarbe, die dadurch dem Gesamtbilde des Kunstschaffens abhanden kommt." Ibid.
[5] Robert Fleck, "Gibt es einen österreichischen Expressionismus in der bildenden Kunst?" in *Expressionismus in Österreich: Die Literatur und die Künste*, Klaus Amann and Armin A. Wallas, eds. (Vienna: Böhlau, 1994), 113-22.

However, it is problematic to reduce the question of artistic interchange to the formal analysis of a few canonical masterpieces by Gustav Klimt, Egon Schiele, or Oskar Kokoschka. While we are able to discern traces of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist art in some of Klimt's paintings, the Secessionist colleagues who established contacts to Parisian agents where often less prominent figures such as Wilhelm Bernatzik, Josef Engelhart, and Eugen Jettel. It is therefore necessary to shift scholarly attention to the politics of representation, the economics of exchange, and the role of mediators such as dealers, collectors, writers, and minor artists. Although there were of course moments of relative isolation, the relationship between the two art worlds seems to be more closely knit than usually expected.

As the subtitle of my dissertation suggests, I intend to fuse the latest research on the history of art markets for this period with the methodological concepts of "cultural transfer" or "cultural transmission." The former has been developed by the French specialists in German studies Michel Espagne and Michael Werner since the mid-1980s, in order to break up prevailing national narratives in the humanities.[6] In contrast to the traditional comparative model of "influences," the theory of cultural transfers puts more emphasis upon the agencies of mediation. The movement in-between, the inter-active dynamic is stressed rather than the separateness of static national dichotomies. Furthermore, it expresses the material concreteness of intercultural exchange: symbolic goods such as paintings are also commodities, produced by certain carrier

[6] See for example: Michel Espagne and Michael Werner, eds. *Transferts: les relations interculturelles dans l'espace franco-allemand, XVIIIe-XIXe siècle* (Paris: Editions recherche sur les civilisations, 1988); Michel Espagne and Michael Werner, eds. *Qu'est-ce qu'une littérature nationale?: Approches pour une théorie interculturelle du champ littéraire* (Paris: Editions de la maison des sciences de l'homme, 1994); Michel Espagne, *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999); Michael Werner and Bénédicte Zimmermann, "Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung: Der Ansatz der Histoire croisée und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen," *Geschichte und Gesellschaft 28* (2002): 607-36; Federico Celestini and Helga Mitterbauer, eds. *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers* (Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003); Alexandre Kostka and Françoise Lucbert, eds. *Distanz und Aneignung: Kunstbeziehungen zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich 1870-1945* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2004); Helga Mitterbauer and Katharina Scherke, eds. *Kulturelle Transfers um 1900 und in der Gegenwart* (Vienna: Passagen, 2005).

groups, transported and sold by mediators, acquired and consumed by recipients. During this process the transferred cultural assets are transformed, since their identity and meaning depends on the relation to a context. At the point of departure, there is a selection of what to export (or extract) and a de-contextualization; at the point of arrival, there is a reinsertion and a re-contextualization. In contrast to the notion of "influence," which suggests a merely passively receptive culture, the notion of "transfer" insists on the productive act of appropriation. Similarly, Régis Debray's mediology is devoted to "everything that acts as milieu or middle ground in the black box of meaning production."[7] In his book "Transmitting Culture," he clearly differentiates the material act of transmitting from communication, the latter having been used most prominently in text-based or linguist studies. His concept seemed therefore especially suitable for a dissertation examining the physical mobility of symbolic goods across borders in Europe.

"Towards the East and South Austria is a giving, towards the West and North a receiving country," noted the writer Hugo von Hofmannsthal.[8] Since the West and North would eventually make art history, Austrian art was regarded as a *peripheral* and—compared to the developments in France—*belated* aspect of European Modernism for a long time. On a stylistic level, French innovations often showed traces in Austrian art only decades later, if at all. A case in point is the so-called "Stimmungsimpressionismus," a problematic term usually translated as "Lyric" or "Atmospheric Impressionism" that became increasingly established in Austrian art historiography since the 1950s.[9] It represents an attempt to approximate Austrian landscape painting of the last

[7] Régis Debray, *Transmitting Culture* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997), 7.
[8] "Österreich ist gegen Osten und Süden gebendes, gegen Westen und Norden ein empfangendes Land." Hugo von Hofmannsthal, *Prosa III*, Herbert Steiner, ed. (Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1964), 230-31.
[9] See for example: Gerbert Frodl, ed. *Geschichte der bildenden Kunst in Österreich,* vol. 5, *19. Jahrhundert* (Munich: Prestel, 2002), 314-16; Gerbert Frodl and Verena Träger, eds. *Stimmungsimpressionismus: A European Phenomenon* (Vienna: O□sterreichische Galerie Belvedere, 2004). The term was first introduced in Fritz Novotny, *Hundert Jahre österreichischer Landschaftsmalerei* (Vienna: Jaffé, 1948).

third of the nineteenth-century with what is considered the most progressive movement of the period (Impressionism) while at the same time retaining a specifically central European quality ("mood," "lyricism," "atmosphere"). However, this rather artificial connection tries to conceal the fact that these Austrian landscapists—Emil Jakob Schindler, Eugen Jettel, Rudolf Ribarz, Tina Blau, etc.—were responding to the French generation of 1830, e.g. the Barbizon School, rather than to their contemporaries, the Impressionists. Another example for such asynchronicities would be the reception of Paul Cézanne which becomes apparent in Austrian paintings of the 1920s and 1930s.[10] But why did this happen so late, and why at all? Only if we try to understand the networks of transmission and the specific demands on the receiving end, will we come to grips with this phenomenon. In chapter 3, I argue for example, that this retarded reception of Cézanne had something to do with his catholic and conservative worldview that some Austrian painters of the interwar period could relate to. If we only consider formal invention and expect its immediate spread throughout Europe, the cultural processes of appropriation remain completely unexplored. In the business world an important distinction is made between invention and innovation. While the first signifies merely the emergence of a new idea, the second represents its successful introduction into the market. Applied to the arts this distinction means that formal invention alone will never leave a trace in the history books unless innovative agents capitalize on it by bringing it into the real world.

In the 1980s the Austro-Hungarian imperial and royal capital moved from the periphery to the center of scholarly attention. "Vienna 1900" gained international recognition as a consequence of a number of spectacular large-scale exhibitions: *Experiment Weltuntergang* in Hamburg (1981),

[10] Christian Huemer, "On the Reception History of Paul Cézanne in Austrian Modernism," *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 2 (Fall 2006): 127-34.

Le Arti a Vienna in Venice (1984), *Traum und Wirklichkeit* in Vienna (1985), *L'Apocalypse joyeuse* in Paris (1986), and *Vienna 1900* in New York (1986). Yet, all of these shows focused on the creative environment of the city, and therefore fostered a rather isolationist view. Kirk Varnedoe, curator of the "Vienna 1900" show at New York's Museum of Modern Art, clairvoyantly warned about its limitations: "the will to tie all Viennese developments most significantly to each other, and to the local conditions and traditions of the city, risks reimposing an isolating provincialism. The vision of Viennese art that favors proximate contexts over larger ones, and immediate associations over broader judgments—that would pair Klimt with Freud to the exclusion of, say, Rodin—can share this risk."[11] The dilemma is quite obvious: while the formalists had to grapple with retarded stylistic influences, the more interdisciplinary approaches to "Vienna 1900" tended to neglect international connections.

Over the last two decades, increasing attention has been paid to the institutional structures through which modern art has been promoted and displayed to the public. However, most of these studies on the latter part of the nineteenth century and the early twentieth century have been focused on Paris. Patricia Mainardi, for example, examined in her stimulating book of 1993 the Salon system, asserting that art institutions are subject to the same pressures as the political structure as a whole. Indeed, it makes sense that this type of investigation started with government art institutions. First of all, source material on the state is usually better preserved and easier to access than for private institutions such as commercial art galleries. Secondly, the agencies of an anonymous art market are even harder to grasp than the links between politics and a state-controlled entity such as the Salon. In order to profoundly understand market dynamics, dealer strategies, consumer preferences, etc. we would need enormous amounts of sales data. Yet,

[11] Kirk Varnedoe, *Vienna 1900: Art, Architecture, and Design* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1986), 20.

even on the French nineteenth-century art market we currently only have the 43,700 records from the Goupil & Cie / Boussod, Valadon & Cie stock books available for statistical analysis, price diagrams, and network visualizations.[12] Unfortunately, the archives of major players on the Parisian art market are either lost (Sedelmeyer, Petit, Martinet, etc.) or virtually impossible to access (Durand-Ruel).

As early as 1965, Harrison and Cynthia White developed the concept of the "dealer-critic system" which in their point of view slowly replaced the Academic system in the second half of the nineteenth century. *Canvases and Careers* is an account on the emergence of the market for a new product—Impressionist painting.[13] The Whites argue that the Academic system promoted individual canvases rather than the careers of painters, a shortcoming that would eventually lead to its demise. The winning strategy of private galleries, increasingly "dealing in [artistic] temperaments" instead of singular masterpieces was further examined by Nicholas Green. Based on Green and White, Robert Jensen delivered with *Marketing Modernism in Fin-de-Siècle Europe* in 1994 the first full account of the historiographic enterprise that accompanied the merchandising of Impressionism beyond French borders. As Jensen argues, Parisian dealers in conjunction with their business partners abroad did succeed in an unreciprocated penetration of the German (and to a lesser extent Austrian) art markets.[14] And it is also true that German-speaking interpreters laid the basis for the construction of the French modernist canon, even if their influential arguments are actually derived from French exhibition practices.

[12] Goupil & Cie/Boussod, Valadon & Cie Stock Books, Getty Research Institute. The original ledgers preserved at the GRI have been digitized and transcribed for online access in the Provenance Index®, http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/digital_collections/goupil_cie/index.html (accessed Oct. 6, 2012)
[13] Harrison C. White and Cynthia A. White, *Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World* (New York: Wiley, 1965; new edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993). For a recent reevaluation of their arguments see David W. Galenson and Robert Jensen, "Careers and Canvases: The Rise of the Market for Modern Art in Nineteenth-Century Paris," *Van Gogh Studies* 1 (2007): 137-66.
[14] Robert Jensen, *Marketing Modernism in Fin-de-Siècle Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994).

Significantly less has been done on the Viennese art market as such. Werner J. Schweiger's ambitious encyclopedic project on galleries in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland (1905-1937) dealing with modern art came to a sudden halt due to his untimely death in 2011. For decades he was collecting information from primary source material, but his book—announced for 2011—unfortunately never went into print.[15] A major contribution to the field was an exhibition on the Miethke gallery, organized for the Jewish Museum Vienna by Tobias G. Natter in 2003. For the catalog Natter painstakingly assembled information on all exhibitions held in this gallery on Dorotheagasse 11, the location of today's Jewish Museum, which used to be the leading address for modern art in Vienna over decades. Kolja Kramer devoted his doctoral dissertation to the presence of French impressionist art in exhibitions of both Viennese artists associations, the Künstlerhaus and the Secession, for which he conducted extensive archival research.[16] In her master's thesis on the Neue Galerie between 1923 and 1938, Marie-Catherine Tesmar-Pfohl made first use of the only surviving Austrian dealer archive relevant to my own research topic.[17]

This dissertation is organized chronologically in four chapters. Chapter 1 starts with the economic and cultural optimism that surrounded the Vienna World Exposition of 1873. The art market flourished in the years leading up to the event: the number of local dealers increased tremendously, several important collections were dispersed in spectacular auctions, and imports from France were part of daily business routine. Paris dealer Paul Durand-Ruel and the artist Gustave Courbet had high expectations when planning their enterprises on the fringes of the

[15] http://www.kunsthandel-der-moderne.eu (accessed October 6, 2012). His archive has been acquired by the Belvedere, Vienna.
[16] Kolja Kramer, "Die Ausstellungspräsenz des französischen Impressionismus im Wiener Künstlerhaus und in der Wiener Secession, 1877-1903" (PhD. diss., University of Bern, 2003).
[17] Marie-Catherine Tessmar-Pfohl, "Die Neue Galerie von 1923 bis 1938: Kunsthandel und Kunstpolitik im Wien der Zwischenkriegszeit" (master's thesis, University of Vienna, 2003).

World Exposition. Yet, the optimism of the liberal *Gründerzeit* era was shattered with the stock market crash shortly after the opening of the Exposition, followed by a long economic depression that had a decisive impact on the Viennese art world. A significant number of Austrian artists moved to Paris at this time where the powerful art dealer Charles Sedelmeyer managed some of their careers in a flamboyant manner. Frictions leading to the foundation of the Vienna Secession were already noticeable within the Sedelmeyer circle of artists on the foothills of Montmartre long before the split. This section investigates the question of how the transformation of Parisian art dealers from petty shopkeepers to international entrepreneurial capitalists affected the production, circulation and consumption of modern art. It also evaluates the importance of Viennese art and artists associations in international exhibition practices.

Chapter 2 opens with the Universal Exposition of 1900 in Paris where Gustav Klimt's scandalous work *Philosophy* for the University of Vienna received a gold medal. The Austrian contribution to the exhibition was divided according to the recent split of the artists associations into Künstlerhaus and Secession. The latter, usually credited with the modernization and internationalization of the Viennese art world, intensified the exchange with the established capital of the arts. More than half of all corresponding members of the Secession lived and worked in Paris. Yet, for Parisian dealers, Vienna was—compared to New York or Berlin—a relatively small and insignificant market. The Secession sometimes had tremendous problems acquiring Impressionist or Post-Impressionist paintings as loans for its shows. This chapter examines the representation of French art at the exhibitions of the Vienna Secession in general, and more specifically the organization, reception, and enduring significance of the show *Die Entwicklung des Impressionismus in Malerei und Plastik* (*The Development of Impressionism in Painting and Sculpture*) of 1903.

Chapter 3 is devoted to the slow institutional transition from artists associations to commercial galleries as the dominant factor in the Viennese art world. After the exodus of the so-called "Klimt-group" from the Secession in 1905, the Miethke gallery with its Francophile artistic director, Carl Moll, played an important role in the internationalization of the Viennese art market. In a controversy about the Secessions' limited exhibition space, Gustav Klimt had referred positively to the practice of the Berlin Secession, which always kept a commercial relation to the Cassirer gallery. Miethke served as the new platform for the dissident Secessionists where French modernist art was also shown frequently, including one-man exhibitions of Van Gogh (1906), Paul Gauguin (1907), Toulouse-Lautrec (1909) and Picasso (1914). Nevertheless, imports from France never reached such an extent that a protective tariff as in America (33 percent in 1883) or a protest of nationalist artists as in Germany ("Vinnen-controversy" of 1911) had to be feared. As a consequence, the collections of French modern art at the Moderne Galerie (today the Belvedere museum), founded in 1903, remained rather meager when compared to museums of Germany and the United States. The ideal of the "community of creators and consumers" welded the Viennese art world together into a clique that in its preference for portraiture adhered relatively long to a pre-modern culture of commissions.

International Exhibitions are well suited to analyze the politics of cultural diplomacy and national identity. Chapter 4 deals with the 1925 *Exposition international des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes* (*International Exposition of Decorative and Industrial Arts*) in Paris where Vienna was lauded the "capital of luxury items." While the innovative designs of the Bauhaus and De Stijl were utterly banned for political reasons, the products of the Wiener Werkstätte became widely acclaimed and imitated. After World War I and the collapse of the Habsburg monarchy, the

grande nation pursued very active foreign politics in order to prevent the remaining parts of Austria from affiliating themselves with Germany as a consequence of the disastrous peace treaty of Saint-Germain. The Association française d'expansion et d'echanges artistiques sponsored important—but little known—exhibitions in crisis-ridden Vienna, including one on *Französische Kunst der Gegenwart* (*French Contemporary Art*) at the Künstlerhaus in 1926. This chapter concludes with an account on the 1937 *Exposition d'art autrichien* at the Jeu de Paume, a significant propaganda show of the Austro-fascist *Ständestaat* that provides a valuable survey of what was considered canonical Austrian art but was nevertheless soon dispersed as a consequence of the Nazi-regime. Various factors kept Vienna from becoming an art world center, one of which was the lack of a dynamic gallery system able to introduce Austrian art into foreign markets.

1 Gründerzeit Boom and Recession, 1873-1897

1.1 Towards a Cosmopolitan Art? The 1873 Vienna World Exposition

In the second half of the nineteenth century the concept of free trade started to assert itself increasingly and the World Expositions held at the time provided ideal opportunities for the international exchange of goods on a large scale. The increasing mobility brought about by the expansion of the transportation networks, as well as a great increment in the variety of goods, played a major role in the success of World Expositions. They were products of the need of the liberal industrial bourgeoisie for more intense cross-boarder exchange in the areas of technology, economy and culture. In this noble form of competition between the nations, the stereotypes one had of oneself—or those of others—were very much in evidence; the World Expositions offered the perfect platform for national self-fashioning or nation branding.[18] On the other hand, at the time, attention was drawn to the leveling tendencies in the fields of art and culture that resulted from the increase in international exhibition business. Maurice Cottier concluded his analysis of the 1873 Viennese World Exposition with the observation: "After the study to which we have devoted ourselves, we could determine with more force than before the principal character and the general tendency of modern art which we had only indicated: we would say the mutual erasure of schools and national originalities in favor of a cosmopolitan art, European and common to all."[19]

[18] Jutta Pemsel, *Die Wiener Weltausstellung von 1873: Das gründerzeitliche Wien am Wendepunkt* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1989); Ulrike Felber, et al., *Österreich auf den Weltausstellungen 1851-2000* (Vienna: Brandstätter, 2000).

[19] "Après l'examen auquel nous nous sommes livré, nous somme amené à constater avec plus de force qu'au début le caractère principal et la grande tendance de l'art moderne que nous n'avions fait qu'indiquer: nous voulons dire l'effacement croissant des écoles et des originalités nationales au profit d'un art cosmopolite, européen et commun à tous." Maurice Cottier, *Exposition Universelle de Vienne en 1873: Section Française: Rapport sur les beaux-arts* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1875), 81.

The 1873 Viennese World Exposition was the fifth major such event to be organized and the first in the German-speaking world. It showed the imperial city on the Danube, as well as the monarchy as a whole, at the height of the liberal *Gründerzeit* era. The Austro-Hungarian monarchy was enjoying a never-before-experienced economic boom that showed in a general spirit of optimism on the art market and gave rise to an enormous amount of building activity. The Viennese Ringstraße, one of the largest building sites in Europe at the time, was gradually taking shape. Even today, representative buildings such as the Court Opera, Court Museums, Parliament, and Stock Exchange give an impression of the euphoria of the period. The memories of the painful military defeat against Prussia at Königgrätz in 1866 had gradually receded into the background. Half a century after the Congress of Vienna, it appeared that Austria had, once again, found a cultural mission in Europe. The organizers of such events had to bear comparison with France in particular, since that nation organized five Universal Expositions in Paris between 1855 and 1900 and made special use of these to position itself as the world's leading art nation.[20]

The decision to locate the 1873 exhibition on the outskirts of the city—at the Krieau in the Prater (fig. 1)—made it possible to provide five times the exhibition area of the 1867 Universal Exposition in Paris. The general consul and director of the commercial office of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy in Paris, Wilhelm Schwarz-Senborn was entrusted with the leadership. He had been living in the French capital since 1854 and was completely familiar with the earlier Universal Expositions. Informed of his appointment shortly before the siege of Paris by German troops, he was not able to return to Vienna until June 1871. The many years he had spent abroad were seen as the reason that he supposedly had given preferential treatment to non-Austrian—

[20] Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions, and Word's Fairs, 1851-1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988).

especially French—exhibitors. Schwarz-Senborn was reproached for this and especially severely criticized for placing the fountain made by the Durenne metal foundry from Sommevoire (Champagne) so prominently. This fountain, designed by Jean Jules Klagmann, occupied the center of the monumental rotunda that, as the international pavilion, was itself the focal point of the overall complex of buildings. Although it was noted that the fountain did not have sufficient space to achieve its full effect in the rotunda, there was still no way that its placement could not be interpreted as a political statement.

Initially, it was uncertain that France would actually take part in the Vienna World Exposition because of its unstable political and economic situation. It seemed absolutely impossible that, only two years after having lost the war against Germany, the French nation would once again be able to demonstrate its superiority in the world of art. After the abdication of Napoleon III, the young republic was confronted with severe domestic tension; the confrontation between radical Republicans and Monarchists after the bloody uprising of the Paris Commune was in no way over. President Adolph Thiers was thrown out of office during the Viennese World Exposition. But France once again showed that it was prepared to defend its reputation as the cultural nation par excellence. Its number of fine arts exhibits far exceeded those of any other country. France presented 1,573 of the total of 6,600 works displayed; it was followed by Germany with 1,026 and Austria with 869. The 247 medals France was awarded trumped those of both the host country and the German Reich.[21] Edmond du Sommerard, the French delegate to the Exposition responsible for the fine arts, encouraged private collectors and art dealers to supply works. He

[21] Pemsel, *Die Wiener Weltausstellung von 1873*, 67.

even had restrictions on loans from the Musée du Luxembourg lifted.[22] Particular importance was given to bringing works by the country's most prominent artists to Vienna and, at the same time, of avoiding showing works that had already been displayed at the 1867 Universal Exposition in Paris. Austrian critics considered this ambition another proof of centuries-old exemplary state support for the arts in France. Decades later, Ludwig Hevesi still reported, full of admiration, how Léon Gambetta, notwithstanding the extreme political distress following Napoleon III's defeat at the battle of Sedan, had created a French art ministry: "He considered Antonin Proust just as important as the finance minister who had to secure the billions. The aim was to assure France of its leading role in art after it no longer marched in the vanguard of politics."[23]

It was also a well-known fact that there had been a long tradition of making use of art for representative purposes. Rudolf von Eitelberger writes: "France has always seen art as a means for promoting the fame and increasing the wealth of the nation, and elevating the public spirit of the masses."[24] Eitelberger, the holder of the first chair for art history in the German-speaking world, and founder of the Austrian Museum of Art and Industry, explained what he considered the "indisputable supremacy" of France arose from the exemplary organization of the state's artistic institutions in which "one can trace a certain continuity reaching back to the days of Colbert, in a certain sense to François I even."[25] Starting in the reign of François I, French art had

[22] Andrea Meyer, "Rudolf von Eitelberger," *Französische Kunst—Deutsche Perspektiven 1870–1945: Quellen und Kommentare zur Kunstkritik*, Andreas Holleczek and Andrea Meyer, eds. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2003), 42.
[23] "Antonin Proust war ihm ebenso wichtig wie der Finanzminister, der die Milliarden zu beschaffen hatte. Es galt Frankreich, das nicht mehr an der Spitze der Politik marschierte, die Führung in der Kunst zu sichern." Ludwig Hevesi, "Kunst und Budgetausschuss," in id., *Altkunst-Neukunst: Wien 1894–1908* (Vienna: Konegen, 1909), 290.
[24] "Zu allen Zeiten hat Frankreich die Kunst als ein Mittel betrachtet, den Nationalruhm zu fördern, das Nationalvermögen zu vermehren, den Gemeinsinn der Masse zu erhöhen." Rudolf von Eitelberger, *Briefe über die moderne Kunst Frankreichs: Bei Gelegenheit der Pariser Ausstellung im Jahre 1855* (Vienna: Kaiserlich-Königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1858): 7.
[25] "Ich habe bereits aus Anlass der ersten Weltausstellung in Paris auf die Consequenzen der Organisation des Kunstunterrichts in Frankreich aufmerksam gemacht—für Österreich nicht ganz ohne Erfolg—und damals schon nachgewiesen, dass die unbestreitbare Suprematie Frankreichs in Angelegenheiten der Kunst wesentlich von der

continuously enriched itself through foreign artists— initially, from Italy. These entered into a kind of noble competition with local artists who absorbed stimuli but then "freely translated them into French." For Eitelberger the Frenchman's most important virtue is national self-preservation. "He does not want to be anything but French, and perceives the entire world and its history from a French point of view."[26] That is why France does not recognize any French artistic deserters. Each and every French artist living abroad remains a patron of the glory and taste of his nation: "The French perception of art is the same to him as the flag to a soldier. He will never abandon it."[27]

In his reports on the Universal Expositions after 1855, Rudolf von Eitelberger repeatedly drew attention to the state education and organization system that could be traced back to Jean-Baptiste Colbert (1619–1683): "Where in the German Reich can we find an institution that could even remotely be compared with the Académie des Beaux-Arts in Paris or the Académie de France in Rome? Where is art of grand style treated so consequently and with so much earnestness as at the French academy? Where are prizes for artists and exhibitions so well organized and realized with such expertise as in France?"[28] The differences in the organization of artistic events also became clear to him at the Viennese World Exposition. Training, accompanied by a series of competitions, led to French artists knowing more and being technically superior. In his

---

trefflichen Organisation der Kunstanstalten und der Kunsterziehung abhängt, die bis in die Zeiten Colbert's, in gewisser Beziehung bis in die Franz des I. zurückreicht." Rudolf von Eitelberger, "Oeffentliche Kunstpflege," in *Kunst und Kunstgewerbe auf der Wiener Weltausstellung 1873*, Carl von Lützow, ed. (Leipzig: Seemann, 1875), 263.

[26] "Die moralische Kraft der französischen Kunst liegt in ihrer Beschränkung. Der Franzose ist kein Kosmopolit im Leben, er ist es auch nicht in der Kunst. Er will nichts anderes sein als Franzose, und betrachtet die ganze Welt und ihre Geschichte vom französischen Standpunkte." Eitelberger, *Briefe über die moderne Kunst Frankreichs*, 13.

[27] "Die französische Kunstanschauungen sind ihm das, was dem Soldaten seine Fahne. Er verlässt sie nie." Ibid., 7.

[28] "Wo gäbe es im deutschen Reiche eine Anstalt, die sich nur im Entferntesten mit der Académie des Beaux-Arts in Paris, der Académie de France in Rom messen könnte? Wo wird daselbst mit solcher Consequenz mit Kunst großen Stils, wo mit dem Ernste betrieben, wie an der französischen Akademie? Wo sind Künstlerpreise und Ausstellungen so wohl organisiert und so consequent durchgeführt, wie in Frankreich?" Eitelberger, "Oeffentliche Kunstpflege," 263.

formulation, they did not suffer "from the intellectually leveling influence of the art associations, and from the stereotyped treatment that is satisfied with creating pictures for the trade and for dealers but attacks any artistic individuality at its roots."[29] If one intended to go beyond the "mass of society and trade pictures" it would be necessary for the Austrian state to come up with financing. While the proud phrase "Appartient à l'état" could be read on almost every page of the French art catalog of the World Exposition, one could only very rarely add these words to the Prussian, Austrian, Bavarian or Saxon catalogs. This makes it not at all surprising that, faced with the permanent low-water mark in the arts budget, works were produced where it was quite apparent that they had been painted without a commission and not for the purposes of the state. What applied to the individual works was also relevant to the overall impression of the show. According to Eitelberger, French art presentation never denied its ideals, the French were masters of display (fig. 2). In contrast, the Austrian and German art exhibition seemed to be "an enlarged art society show such as could be seen under the Arcades in Munich, on the Tuchlauben in Vienna [e.g. Österreichischer Kunstverein], at Sachse's gallery in Berlin, or Schulte's in Düsseldorf […]—tiring through stringing together pictures of the same character and mainly limited to genre paintings and landscapes…"[30]

Bruno Meyer, an art historian from Karlsruhe, had similar arguments. In his review, he also observed that, due to the regional structure of the art associations, painters from the German-

[29] "Die französischen Künstler leiden nicht unter dem geistig nivellirenden Einflusse der Vereine, unter dem schablonenartigen Tractamente, das für Kauf- und Händlerbilder ausreicht, aber die künstlerische Individualität in ihrer Wurzel angreift." Ibid., 267.
[30] "Daher kommt es, dass in Frankreich die Gewohnheit, im großen Stile zu arbeiten, nicht aufgehört hat; eben deswegen haben die französischen Kunstausstellungen einen vornehmen, das Ideal nie verläugnenden Charakter, während die österreichische und deutsche Kunstausstellung wie eine vergrößerte Kunstvereinsausstellung unter den Arkaden in München, unter den Tuchlauben in Wien, bei Sachse in Berlin oder Schulte in Düsseldorf aussieht,—ermüdend durch Vorführung von Bildern desselben Charakters, sich meistens beschränkend auf Genrebilder und Landschaften…" Ibid., 272.

speaking world were forced to produce landscapes and genre paintings for the market because the state did not provide any support for monumental ambitions. “Man grows with his higher purpose. And, isn’t the execution of a painting worthier than the sketch, the monumental achievement more inspiring than the easel painting created without any specific purpose?”[31] The superior standing of the French Académie in Paris led to a concentration and the unified education of all artistic forces necessary for the foundation of a national style. German decentralization, and the more or less equality of the various artistic schools in the north and south, and in the east and west, resulted in a more diversified artistic picture. The political conflict, which was only resolved with the unification of 1871, is reflected in the disjointed development of German art; it is impossible to think of a comprehensive representation of national art in the figure of a single major artist. According to Meyer, these differences became apparent when walking through the galleries of paintings at the 1873 World Exposition. The “character of great tranquility and harmony” in the French section at the World Exposition was in contrast to the incoherent, motley chaos in the other rooms. In the first, one had the feeling of being in a museum whereas the German rooms reminded one of a bazaar. This had less to do with the “greater artistic talent of the French on the whole than with the completely different position French art held in the state and in public life.”[32]

What applied to Germany was even more the case with Austria which was not even a nation state. In the Austrian section of the World Exposition, one was confronted with a lack of homogeneity

[31] “Es wächst der Mensch mit seinen höhern Zwecken? Und ist nicht die Ausführung höher denn die Skizze, nicht die monumentale Leistung begeisternder als das ohne Bestimmung gemalte Staffeleibild?” Bruno Meyer, “Plastik und Malerei,” in *Kunst und Kunstgewerbe auf der Wiener Weltausstellung 1873*, Carl von Lützow, ed., 302.
[32] “Wenn irgend etwas den französischen Bildersälen jene bereits früher hervorgehobenen Charakter einer größeren Ruhe und Harmonie gegenüber dem wirren, bunten Durcheinander der deutschen Säle gab und es mit sich brachte, dass man dort in einem Museum, hier aber nur in einem Kunstbazar zu sein glaubte, so ist es eben nicht sowohl die größere künstlerische Begabung der Franzosen überhaupt, als die durchaus andere Stellung der Kunst im Staate und im öffentlichen Leben.” Ibid., 331.

in development and artistic education that was even greater than in the German rooms. It was intended that the Vienna Academy be open to all the peoples of the monarchy, its exhibitions accessible to "the pupils of the various tongues of the Empire." In Meyer's words, this made it possible "for the individual to feel attracted by this movement or school at one moment, and from another at the next."[33] Rudolf von Eitelberger and many of his contemporaries did not question that Viennese art was a "link in the chain of greater German art" and that Vienna was to be placed on the same level as Munich, Düsseldorf, Dresden Berlin and the other artistic centers in the German Reich in this regard: "One cannot say that the art of Vienna is specifically German; however, it is just as impossible to state that it is not German. Austro-German artistic life has a particular character, and if one intended to formulate the question of nationality, one would have to say that Viennese artistic life is specifically Austrian with a predominantly German nature, influenced by several foreign elements that can be easily explained considering the overall historical development of Vienna."[34]

As a result, reports on the artistic contributions made to the Viennese World Exposition hardly differentiated between Germany and Austria. The allocation of the halls also created a connection. The Kunsthalle, with its lighting from above, consisted of the international central hall with the sections for Austria, Hungary and Germany to the south and French, English, Swiss and Dutch art displayed in the northern section. In order to find room for Italy and the Nordic countries, two

[33] "Die Verschiedenheit der Nationalitäten, welche diesen [österreichischen] Staat bilden, hat an sich schon die Folge, dass die Einzelnen sich bald von dieser, bald von jener Richtung und Schule angezogen fühlen." Ibid., 359.
[34] "Man kann nicht sagen, dass die Kunst Wiens specifisch deutsch sei, man kann aber ebensowenig behaupten, dass sie nicht deutsch wäre. Das österreichisch-deutsche Kunstleben hat eben ein particularistisches Gepräge, und wenn man schon die Nationalitätenfrage formuliren sollte, so müsste man sagen, dass das Kunstleben Wiens ein specifisch österreichisches mit vorwiegend deutschem Charakter sei, allerdings beeinflusst von manchen fremdartigen Elementen, welche sich aus der ganzen historischen Entwicklung Wiens leicht erklären lassen." Rudolf von Eitelberger, "Die Kunstentwicklung des heutigen Wien," in *Gesammelte kunsthistorische Schriften*, vol. 1, *Kunst und Künstler Wiens der neueren Zeit,* Rudolf von Eitelberger, ed. (Vienna: Braumüller, 1879), 30.

annexes—that had originally been reserved for older works of art from museums and private collections—had to be taken over to show contemporary art. These two small pavilions and the Kunsthalle enclosed the courtyard and were intended to act as a counterpart to the machine hall—the site featuring economic progress.

In any case, France and Germany—including Austria—were considered to be the two major opponents in the arena of modern art. Friedrich Pecht described them as the "leaders of the Romanic and Germanic race" and we actually do find various stereotypes in the German-language art criticism of the period that were to stay in effect until well into the twentieth century.[35] On the one hand, there was a feeling of relief that, this time, the French had done without the gigantic battle pictures showing the glorious feats of their "unconquerable army."[36] On the other hand, there was regret that no German artist had taken the trouble of depicting the most important moments in the most significant events of the century. Emil Ranzoni wrote: "Such moments that concentrate the great historical context: the German army's departure to France, the battle at Sedan, Napoleon's meeting with Bismarck, the scene where Napoleon handed over his sword to Emperor Wilhelm, etc."[37] A cornucopia of magnificent themes had been poured out at the feet of German artists but, instead of creating magnificent works in the field of historical painting, they were content with painting genre-like scenes of everyday life. The French cultivation of a national monumental style was admired but there was still evidence

[35] "die ungeheure Kluft, die zwischen diesen zwei grossen Culturvölkern, den heutigen Führern der romanischen und germanischen Race, besteht,…" Friedrich Pecht, "Die deutschen und die französischen Bauernmaler," *Internationale Ausstellungs-Zeitung: Beilage der 'Neuen Freien Presse'* (June 29, 1873): 1.
[36] Meyer, "Plastik und Malerei," 295.
[37] "Solche Momente, die den grossen geschichtlichen Inhalt wie in einem Brennpunkt zusammenfassen, waren: der Auszug der deutschen Schaaren nach Frankreich, die Schlacht bei Sedan, die Zusammenkunft Napoleon's mit Bismarck, die Scene, da Napoleon dem Kaiser Wilhelm seinen Degen überreicht u.s.w. u.s.w. Nun, dieses Füllhorn von grandiosen Vorwürfen ist vor Deutschlands Künstlern ausgeschüttet worden, ohne dass Einer sich gefunden hätte, der so gross in seiner Anschauung und so stark als Mensch und Künstler angelegt gewesen wäre, um daraus ein Kunstwerk von entsprechender Bedeutung zu gestalten." Emil Ranzoni, "In der Kunsthalle," *Internationale Ausstellungs-Zeitung: Beilage der 'Neuen Freien Presse'* (June 22, 1873): 1.

of "expressions of that sick spirit that had developed under the Second Empire."[38] Many of those painters who were prominently displayed in Vienna represented the official art of the period Napoleon III—Ernest Meissonier, William Bouguereau, Alexandre Cabanel (fig. 3), Jean-Léon Gérôme, etc. For Meyer, Gérôme was an absolutely typical example of modern French art. His greatly admired works obviously possessed enormous artistic merit but they were "aimed at the overexcited, and therefore insensitive, feelings of a blasé society."[39] The German critics almost unanimously drew attention to what they considered the speculative element that could be observed in the choice of the subject matter, as well as in the way it was dealt with. The French painters were assured and talented in the process of painting; however, this technical mastery was offset by a lack of natural feeling. Meyer actually admired the broad, free brushstrokes in Henri Regnault's life-size portrait of *General Juan Prim* (fig. 4) that he considered one of the most important and perfect artworks of recent decades. The work had already created a sensation at the 1869 Paris Salon and laid the foundations for the fame of its painter who was only twenty-five years of age at the time. Although the technical bravura of the painting was praised, Meyer closed his comments with a critical quotation by Paul Mantz: "This work is new proof, after so much other evidence, that Regnault only saw—and only wanted to see—things from the point of view of painting, and never intended to penetrate into their soul."[40] He left it up to the French art critics to describe what one should think of French artists. The German-language critics discovered signs of intellectual fatigue and a straining of artistic emotions in the French artists' tendency towards superficial effects, to artistic chic. The unparalleled quality of being able to delve into the depths of the soul was quite simply one of the major merits of the Germans. The "chicists"—as

[38] "Neben diesem gefundenen Realismus, der mit echt malerischer Gefühlsweise verbunden ist, fanden wir aber auch Äußerungen jenes krankhaften Geistes, der sich unter dem zweiten Kaiserreich entwickelt hatte." Ibid., 322.
[39] "Die Arbeiten des vielbewunderten Jean-Léon Gérôme haben unverkennbare Künstlerische Qualitäten, doch sie sind auf den überreizten und dadurch abgestumpften Sinn einer blasirten Gesellschaft berechnet." Ibid.
[40] "Dieses Gemälde war in dem Werke Regnault's ein neuer Beweis, dass er die Dinge nur sah und sehen wollte von ihrer malerischen Seite, und dass er nicht bis zur Seele in die Tiefe drang." Ibid., 315.

Emil Ranzoni called them—intended to camouflage the bizarreness of the content of their pictures with the virtuosity of their style.[41] The most unusual and disgusting subjects were taken up in order to create a scandal. Friedrich Pecht saw "blasé beings that need the strongest, most repulsive stimulants, going as far as the abnormal—that interesting mixture of the smell of blood and the bordello—to provide the atmosphere of their life, in order to titillate the fancy of the elegant but base rabble of the capital, that has so much in common with the sophisticated pleasure-seekers and private tax-collectors of the old Roman Empire" as the main characteristics of modern French art.[42]

Around the time of the Vienna World Exposition, critics increasingly identified a troubling tendency among young Austrian landscapists to attempt to imitate French "chicists" such as Daubigny, Rousseau, Troyon, and others. In 1868, the critics already described the pupils of Albert Zimmermann at the Academy of Fine Arts—Emil Jakob Schindler, Eugen Jettel, Rudolf Ribarz, Adolf Ditscheiner, and Robert Russ—as being "absolute admirers of the French paysage intime."[43] Their unspectacular landscapes of villages and suburbs were characterized by the importance placed on the atmosphere created by the weather, the time of day and season. They paid particular attention to subjective feelings in front of the motif, capturing specific moments of light in nature. Carl von Vincenti stated that the divergent positions between "young" and "old"

[41] Emil Ranzoni, "In der Kunsthalle," *Internationale Ausstellungs-Zeitung: Beilage der 'Neuen Freien Presse'* (June 22, 1873): 2-3.
[42] "Etwas von dieser echt modernen, durch und durch pessimistischen Weltanschauung, welche den Haupt-Charakterzug der französischen Kunst von heute bildet, jenes blasirten Wesens, welches der stärksten und widerwärtigsten, ja unnatürlichen Reizmitel, jener interessanten Mischung von Bordell und Blutgeruch als Lebens-Atmosphäre bedarf, um die abgestumpften Nerven eines vornehmen und niederen hautstädtischen Pöbels noch zu kitzeln, welcher mit den geistreichen Lebemännern und Finanzpächtern des altrömischen Kaiserreichs eine so frappante Aehnlichkeit hat," Pecht, "Die deutschen und die französischen Bauernmaler," 2.
[43] In German art criticism the term "paysage intime" refers to the intimate landscapes of the Barbizon School, although the term was apparently not used in France.

artists was nowhere clearer than in the field of landscape painting. He wrote that the "old ones" accuse their opponents of

> neglecting form, tricking the eyes through pleasant color effects, copying the absolutely superficial moments of the French, and of exploiting a virtuoso technique and dubbed them "à peu-près" painters, chicists and color accordion players, copiers and cripplers. The young artists disdainfully responded with: "Your form is academic and not artistic. You draw with the pencil or tip of your brush, we draw with color […] and, by the way, what do you want, we are in fashion now."[44]

Vincenti had to admit that the modern French landscape school was attempting to penetrate to the real core of painting by giving primacy to color. At the same time, he criticized the downright imitative tendency of young Austrian landscape painters who risked going astray through the fashionable use of French "recipes." The open painting style of the French was interpreted as a betrayal of the Austrian landscape tradition that had its roots in the realism of Viennese Biedermeier art. Eitelberger discredited modern naturalism of French provenance: "The initial Viennese style was original, the modern [French] one is imitative, and despite all the talent not that important."[45]

According to Martina Haja, the Austrian landscapist really had a "realistic mindset which was not satisfied with merely capturing the accessible world optically but bringing all the sensitivity of the viewer—both the painter and audience—into play, in order to give form to the perceived in its

[44] Carl von Vincenti, *Wiener Kunst-Renaissance: Studien und Charakteristiken* (Vienna: Carl Gerold's John, 1876), 350-51.
[45] "Jene ursprüngliche Wiener Richtung war originell, die moderne dagegen ist imitatorisch und bei allem Talent doch nicht so bedeutend." Eitelberger, "Die Kunstentwicklung des heutigen Wien," 12.

momentary totality."[46] Although landscape artists such as Eugen Jettel (fig. 5) and Rudolf Ribarz (fig. 6) were living in Paris at the time of the Impressionists, they were more orientated towards the tonal works of Rousseau, Daubigny and Troyon. The preferred goals for their painting excursions were located to the north, over Auvers-sur-Oise, in Normandy and Picardy, going as far as Holland. However, their initial exposure to the School of Barbizon was a result of the private collecting frenzy in the years leading up to the World Exposition. The painter Carl Schuch remembered later, "Vienna was during the time of money and picture collecting (where did all this go?) a very good market for French pictures.[47] The conditions for financially successful private initiatives on the fringes of the Universal Exposition were very promising indeed.

1.2 On the Fringes of the World Exposition: Gustave Courbet in Vienna

"All I want to save is my paintings" Gustave Courbet wrote from Ornans to his friend Jules Castagnary on February 9, 1873.[48] The artist was rightly worried that the French Chamber would decide to seize all his real estate and personal assets to finance the reconstruction of the Vendôme Column. A prominent member of the Paris Commune, Courbet had played a fundamental role in the destruction of that symbol of Napoleonic Rule. Immediately after the event, in 1871, the Versailles War Council had sentenced him to a fine of five hundred francs and six months imprisonment. Subsequently, the new government of the Third Republic wanted to make him

[46] Martina Haja, "Der österreichische Stimmungsimpressionismus," in *Landschaft im Licht: Impressionistische Malerei in Europa und Nordamerika 1860-1910*, Götz Czymmek, ed. (Cologne: Wallraf-Richartz-Museum with Greven & Bechtold, 1990), 157.

[47] "Derselbe österreichische Leichtsinn, der sich nicht eher rührt bis der Boden auf dem er steht zu brennen anfängt hat unsere gewiss talentierten Landsleute abgehalten, die ganze Tragweite dieser Aenderung zu erfassen, so ist es gekommen, dass Wien z. Zeit des Geldes und daher Bildersammelns (wo mag das alles hin sein?!) ein sehr guter Markt war für französische Bilder. Der Kenner und Sammler sucht auch heute wenig anderes zu erwerben als was in seinem Sinn gearbeitet ist." Carl Schuch in his Paris diary (transcription by Karl Hagemeister), published in Gottfried Boehm, Roland Dorn, and Franz A. Morat, eds. *Carl Schuch 1846-1903* (Mannheim: Städtische Kunsthalle, 1986), 104.

[48] Gustave Courbet to Jules Castagnary, Ornans, February 9, 1873, *Letters of Gustave Courbet*, Petra ten-Doesschate Chu, ed. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992), 481.

financially responsible for the Column's reconstruction. While Courbet was of the opinion that he could not be punished twice for the same offense, he nevertheless immediately took the necessary precautions to safeguard his property. In another letter to Castagnary, he wrote, "we will be decentralizing and it won't matter much if I do not live in France."[49] In the midst of these turbulent months Courbet was making ambitious plans for an *exposition complète* of his works at the 1873 World Exposition in Vienna.[50] International exposure was certainly one of his motivations; getting his work out of France may have been another one. It is unclear how he hoped to realize his plans, although he did manage to get his programmatic paintings *The Painter's Studio* (fig. 7) and *A Burial at Ornans* (1850, Musée d'Orsay, Paris) shipped to Vienna. These monumental paintings, together with nine others, were neither exhibited in the French pavilion of the World Exposition nor in any other Exposition-related venue. Instead, they were presented in a show organized by the now-obscure Österreichischer Kunstverein (Austrian Art Association).

For a short time, Courbet played with the idea of presenting some of his works at the official French exhibition in the Viennese Prater. In a letter written on January 23, 1873, a few days before the official deadline for submissions, Castagnary encouraged him: "You have to exhibit in Vienna by all means. Not in Paris, not even in France, but abroad, everywhere; being present must become your line of conduct."[51] Yet Courbet's plan of taking part in the nation's exhibition met an abrupt end on January 31, 1873 when Castagnary informed the artist that Edmond du

[49] Gustave Courbet to Jules Castagnary, Ornans, March 19, 1873, ibid., 493. For the political context see Jane Mayo Roos, "The Commune, the Column, and the Topping of Courbet," in *Early Impressionism and the French State (1866–1874)* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 147–59.
[50] Gustave Courbet spoke frequently about his plans for an "exposition complète" in Vienna. See Patricia Mainardi, "L'exposition complète de Courbet," in *Courbet: artiste et promoteur de son oeuvre*, Jörg Zutter and Petra ten-Doesschate Chu, eds. (Paris: Flammarion 1998), 101–57.
[51] "Il faut, à tout prix, exposer à Vienne. Ne pas se montrer à Paris, même en France, mais se faire voir à l'étranger, partout, telle doit être votre ligne de conduite." Georges Riat, *Gustave Courbet Peintre* (Paris: H. Floury, 1906), 341.

Sommerard had categorically rejected his participation.[52] As had been the case at the Paris Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867, when Courbet had self-assuredly staged displays of his works in his own pavilion on the outskirts of the exhibition site, the only option open to him in Vienna was to look for a private alternative. However, from his retreat in Ornans it must have been difficult for Courbet to organize a competing exhibition in Vienna on his own; he had to rely on assistance from friends, and he placed his trust in the Parisian art dealer Paul Durand-Ruel with whom his commercial relationship had flourished in the past years. In February 1872, Courbet had sold him 24 paintings for 50,000 francs; a year later he disposed of another group for an estimated 37,000 to 50,000 francs.[53] Today, it is difficult to understand how a strict Catholic and monarchist like Durand-Ruel could support a Communard like Courbet. Indeed, in the year of the Vienna World Exposition, the dealer had publicly proclaimed his support for the Comte de Chambord, the legitimist pretender to the throne: "Deals were only stopped out of fear of falling back into the hands of the Republicans and we all hope—as Frenchmen and businessmen—of re-establishing the hereditary monarchy that alone can put an end to our troubles."[54] Paul Durand-Ruel, who later became legendary as the Impressionists' art dealer, not only provided works for the French World Exposition pavilion, where he managed to smuggle in an early Manet (fig. 8),[55] he also sent an employee to Vienna who offered a collection of works by French masters for sale in a rented gallery on Elisabethstraße. In his memoirs, the art dealer reminisces: "In fact, it included many splendid works such as my large-scale 'Sardanapalus' by Delacroix and many

[52] Ibid.
[53] Anne M. Wagner, "Courbet's Landscapes and their Market," *Art History* 4, no. 4 (December 1981): 415. In the years between his return from London after the turmoil of the Commune and the first Impressionist Exhibition in 1874, Paul Durand-Ruel also invested large sums of money in Edouard Manet and the young Impressionists.
[54] "Les affaires sont arrêtées uniquement par la crainte de retombe entre les mains des républicains et nous aspirons tous, et comme Français et comme commerçants, au rétablissement de la monarchie héréditaire qui seule peut mettre fin à nos maux." "Monarchie ou Pètrole," *Le Figaro*, October 31, 1873, 1.
[55] Cat. no. 472. *Exposition Universelle de Vienne 1873: France: Oeuvres d'art et manufactures nationales*, Commissariat Général, ed. (Paris: Hôtel de Cluny, 1873), 130.

other pictures by our greatest masters, which I had bought at recent sales, as well as other interesting canvases capable of giving a distinguished and well-founded impression of our fine French school."[56] Advertisements in the press show that in the fall he exhibited *The Death of Sardanapalus* (fig. 9) again at the Österreichischer Kunstverein, the venue that hosted Courbet's paintings during the Exposition. Although Durand-Ruel was not able to organize for Courbet the retrospective the artist had hoped for, shipping lists suggest that among other French masters three Courbet landscapes may have been shown in the rented Viennese gallery.[57]

Paul Durand-Ruel must have recognized that the prospects for financially successful private initiatives on the fringe of the World Fair were extremely promising. Decades later, the Viennese art dealer Hugo Othmar Miethke, in an interview he gave to Berta Zuckerkandl, recalled the spending spree that had taken place in the "famous *Gründerjahr*" 1872, a time when it was, apparently, more difficult to acquire pictures than to sell them. "I believe that this will remain a unique case in the history of the Viennese art trade," was how Miethke described it in 1905.[58] Months before the opening of the World Exposition, there was a fierce struggle between the Austrian art dealers Alexander Posonyi and Miethke & Wawra over which of them would rent the Künstlerhaus—the most prominent private exhibition hall in the city—during the World

[56] "En effet, il s'y trouvait des œuvres capitales comme mon grand 'Sardanapale' de Delacroix et beaucoup d'autres tableaux de nos plus grands maîtres, achetés par moi dans les dernières ventes, et d'autres toiles intéressantes, capables de donner une haute et juste idée de notre belle école française." "Textes inédits des mémoires de Paul Durand-Ruel." Durand-Ruel Archives, Paris. Neither this passage, nor the location of the gallery rented by Durand-Ruel in Vienna on Elisabethstraße (near the Künstlerhaus and the Academy of Fine Arts) appear in Lionello Venturi's edited Durand-Ruel "Mémoires" in *Archives de l'impressionisme* (1939). My thanks to Flavie Durand-Ruel for this information which she emailed to me January 18, 2011. In March 1873, Durand-Ruel had acquired the *Death of Sardanapalus* by Eugène Delacroix at the Hôtel Drouot for 96,000 Francs.

[57] Durand-Ruel shipped works to Vienna in several installments. According to a list preserved in the Durand-Ruel archive, Paris, the dealer sent off ten paintings on April 9, 1873, three of which were by Courbet: *Boeufs au repos*, *Cours d'eau au milieu de roches*, and *Cutter en temps calme*. My thanks to Flavie Durand-Ruel for this information which she emailed to me on May 14, 2012.

[58] "Ich glaube, dass dieser Fall wohl ein Unicum in der Geschichte des Wiener Bilderhandels bleiben wird." B. Z. [Berta Zuckerkandl], "Aus dem Leben eines berühmten Kunsthändlers: Interview mit Herrn Miethke," *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*, January 29, 1905, 3.

Exposition. Miethke & Wawra had commissioned the celebrated Viennese artist Hans Makart to create the painting *Venice Pays Homage to Caterina Cornaro* (fig. 10), measuring four by ten meters, for the reported price of 80,000 gulden—or had at least acquired the work for that price at an early stage.[59] This painting was intended to be the main draw at the firm's sales exhibition. Spurred on by the fabulous profits of the previous year, Miethke & Wawra were also prepared to make the considerable amount of 38,000 Gulden available to rent the Künstlerhaus during the World Exposition.[60] According to a report in the *Neue Freie Presse*, after Miethke & Wawra had secured the lease, Alexander Posonyi offered to pay an even higher rent, but the board—hoping, perhaps, that Miethke & Wawra's exhibition, centered on Makart's *Caterina Cornaro*, would provide a more dignified representation of Austrian artists—decided "to adhere, de jure, to the lease agreed on in a correct procedure with the mentioned company."[61] In any case, the theatrical staging of the main attraction proved to be a great hit with the public. Makart's artistic antipode Anselm Feuerbach described the presentation of the painting on the so-called "sensation wall" of the Künstlerhaus: "You first spot the gleaming Katharina [e.g. *Caterina Cornaro*] while still under the portal of the marble staircase. The auditorium is completely darkened with black cloth so that the lighting from above creates the greatest impact. Even if the colors of the picture were weaker, it would still make a magical effect through the sophisticated positioning."[62] The art journal *Kunstchronik* noted that because the Künstlerhaus had been secured as the venue, "the

[59] Gerbert Frodl, *Hans Makart: Monographie und Werkverzeichnis* (Salzburg: Residenz Verlag, 1974), 21. While the press reported a sum of 80,000 to 90,000 gulden, the dealer remembers a 50,000 gulden commission in his interview with Berta Zuckerkandl, "Aus dem Leben eines berühmten Kunsthändlers: Interview mit Herrn Miethke," 3.
[60] B. G-r. "Die Kunsthandlung von Miethke und Wawra," *Kunstchronik* 8, no. 5 (November 15, 1872): 78. According to Miethke the rent was 45,000 gulden. Zuckerkandl, "Aus dem Leben eines berühmten Kunsthändlers: Interview mit Herrn Miethke," 3. See also Tobias G. Natter, *Die Galerie Miethke: Eine Kunsthandlung im Zentrum der Moderne* (Vienna: Jewish Museum, 2003), 21–22.
[61] "Man entschloß sich jedoch, bei der in korrektem Vorgehen mit der genannten Firma de jure eingegangenen Pacht zu verharren." August Schaeffer, "Karl Josef Wawra," *Neue Freie Presse*, June 30, 1905, 2.
[62] "Schon unter dem Portal, von der Marmortreppe aus, sieht man die Katharina leuchten. Der Zuschauerraum ist durch schwarzes Tuch ganz verdunkelt, sodass das Oberlicht haarscharf wirkt. Das Bild müsste durch die raffinierte Aufstellung, selbst wenn es schwach in der Farbe wäre, immerhin eine magische Wirkung erreichen." Anselm Feuerbach, *Ein Vermächtnis* (Berlin: Meyer & Jessen, 1910), 239.

unfortunate idea of showing the painting in a special booth in the Prater" had been dropped.[63] If there ever was the idea of an independent exhibition on the fair grounds, it was probably based on the famous example set by Courbet.

While it is not absolutely clear how Gustave Courbet came into contact with the Österreichischer Kunstverein, it is probable that Jules Castagnary, and not Paul Durand-Ruel, suggested this alternative exhibition venue.[64] The Kunstverein, in the baroque Schönbrunnerhaus on Tuchlauben, was founded in 1850 and had been the top address for public exhibitions in the city for decades (fig. 11). Its concept of changing some of the pictures on display in its permanent exhibitions each month was greeted with great approval by the public, and it was especially known for entertaining its audience with globetrotting paintings, such as Paul Delaroche's *Napoleon I in Fontainebleau* (1845, exhibited 1851).[65] Indeed, it was notorious in the press as the site for theatrical displays of sensational travelling paintings—a practice from which the Genossenschaft bildender Künstler Wiens, founded in 1861, tried to distinguish itself by mounting exhibitions of its local members. While, according to a report in the German art newspaper *Dioskuren* in 1871, the Genossenschaft was directing all its efforts towards preparing the annual exhibition in the Künstlerhaus, "the directors of the Österr. Kunstverein […] indulge in creating new interest every month and attracting the curious public with unusual and rare works. This satisfies the mass seeking novelties, but the [Genossenschaft bildender Künstler Wiens] provides those who wish to

[63] "Die unglückliche Idee, das Bild in einer besonderen Bude im Prater zu zeigen, ist demnach als aufgegeben zu betrachten." B. G-r. "Die Kunsthandlung von Miethke und Wawra," 78. For an excellent account of the touring single-picture show see Christian Torner, *Ausstellungen einzelner Gemälde vom späten 18. bis zum Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte bürgerlicher Kunst, Kultur und Mentalität in Europa* (PhD. diss., European University Institute, Florence, 1997).
[64] Chu, *Letters of Gustave Courbet*, 479.
[65] Torner, *Ausstellungen einzelner Gemälde*, 150.

have a deeper understanding, and love of art with what they are seeking."[66] The differences between the two societies were actually not so straightforward. In a letter dated March 28, 1872, the director of the Kunstverein minimized the oft-cited competitive situation, writing that the same artistically inclined public visited the exhibitions in the two houses.[67] The Genossenschaft, however, owned the better-suited, sky-lit exhibition spaces in the Künstlerhaus that had been erected specifically for exhibition purposes on Karlsplatz in 1868. While a "corruptive cosmopolitanism" was considered a significant shortcoming of the Kunstverein, the Genossenschaft, as a group of creators rather than consumers, originally paid more attention to protecting the market for local artists.[68]

In an undated draft letter to the director of the Kunstverein, Gustave Courbet stated that Austria had always been "congenial" towards him: "As I consider that the manifestation of art must be free and of all nations, I turn to you and your committee [to see] whether you can authorize me to send you the works that I will have completed specifically for you by the above-named deadline."[69] Courbet had high-flying plans for Vienna. He wanted to challenge the official French presentation on the World Exposition fairgrounds with sixty works of all genres. The entrepreneurial artist proudly drew attention to the fact that his exhibition was being organized by

[66] "Während die Leitung der Kunstgenossenschaft, welcher das reizende Künstlerhaus als Eigenthum zugehört, von der Ansicht ausgeht, ihre besten Kräfte müssen der Jahres-Ausstellung zugewendet werden [...], huldiget dagegen die Direction des Österr. Kunstvereins dem Grundsatze, monatlich frisch die Neugierde anzuregen und durch Außergewöhnliches und Seltenes, das schaulustige Publikum an sich zu locken. Befriedigt diese letztere Art die abwechslungssüchtige Menge, so bietet die erstere wieder den sich vertiefenden Kunstverständigen und mit Liebe zur Kunst sich Neigenden das Gewünschte..." "Korrespondenzen, Wien," *Die Dioskuren: Deutsche Kunst-Zeitung* 16 (1871), 28.

[67] Moritz Terke, director of the Kunstverein, to the Genossenschaft bildender Künstler, March 28, 1872, Künstlerhaus Archive, Vienna.

[68] Anselm Weissenhofer, "Der neuere Wiener Kunstverein," *Monatsblatt des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Wien* 15, no. 1012 (October-December 1929): 49–54. See also Emerich Ranzoni, *Malerei in Wien mit einem Anhang über Plastik* (Vienna: Lehmann & Wentzel, 1873), 94–112.

[69] Gustave Courbet to the director of the Österreichischer Kunstverein, Ornans, incomplete draft, Chu, *Letters of Gustave Courbet*, 479.

the Kunstverein without any kind of state support. He once again dreamed of a comprehensive retrospective exhibition of his oeuvre. Courbet wrote to his assistant: "I'll go to the Vienna exhibition, where I will be having a complete show of my work at the Art Union of the young [artists]."[70] In no way was it a "union of young artists." The Österreichischer Kunstverein was a consumers' union with several thousand members who paid an annual fee to take part in a lottery to win a painting and had the right to obtain prints. Although Courbet thought a great deal about the selection of works he intended to present to the Viennese public, it was inconceivable that the Kunstverein would present a show of paintings by a single artist. While Miethke and Makart had full control over the way works were perceived in the rented Künstlerhaus, Courbet's pictures were lumped together in the Kunstverein with a wide, diverse mass of other artworks.

Due to space limitations, it was initially only possible to exhibit six of the eleven canvases brought over from Paris.[71] *The Painter's Studio* (1855, Musée d'Orsay, Paris), *The Wrestlers* (1853, Szépmüvészeti Museum, Budapest), *Alms of a Beggar* (1868, Burrell Collection, Glasgow), *Portrait of the Artist* (fig. 12), *Portrait of General Cluseret* (whereabouts unknown), and a *Bather* had to hold their own among the 152 works in the show.[72] Although Courbet had originally planned a balanced presentation of his oeuvre, precisely the one-sidedness of the selection was ultimately criticized. The *Kunstchronik* reported that both artists and lay persons

[70] Gustave Courbet to Chérubino Pata, Ornans, Februray 26, 1873, ibid., 489.
[71] "Von den vierzehn Gemälden Courbet's, welche ihrer Mehrzahl nach colossale Dimensionen haben, konnten der räumlichen Verhältnisse wegen vorläufig nur nachstehende aufgestellt werden: 'Das Atelier', 'Die Ringkämpfer', 'Ein armer Wohlthäter', 'Im Bade', 'Selbstporträt des Künstlers' und 'Porträt des Commune-Generals Cluseret'." Anonymous, "Theater- und Kunstnachrichten," *Neue Freie Presse*, April 26, 1873, 8. However, the total number of paintings submitted to the Kunstverein was eleven, not fourteen. This number is given in most of the other newspaper reports and confirmed by new evidence discussed above.
[72] The other five paintings were: *A Burial at Ornans* (1855, Musée d'Orsay, Paris), *Young Ladies at the Banks of the Seine* (1856-57, Petit Palais, Paris), *The Death of the Hunted Stag* (1867, Musée des Beaux-Arts et d'Archéologie, Besançon), *The Man with the Leather Belt* (ca. 1845-46, Musée d'Orsay, Paris), and *Madame Auguste Cuoq* (ca. 1852-57, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York).

stood shaking their heads in front of the figural paintings, puzzled in their attempts to create a connection between the works on display and the painter's reputation:

> It would have been important in Vienna, where the artist was being shown with a large number of works for the first time, for a series of pictures of different genres and from different periods to be shown alongside each other in order to provide a broader foundation for the public to judge the value of Courbet as a painter; but here it began with the worst, possibly in order to follow with the better and then the good in a purely commercial way.[73]

The newspaper *Fremden-Blatt* advised its readers to wait before making a final judgment in view of the fact that not all of the works Courbet had provided had yet been exhibited.[74] One could only hope that important paintings, still stored in the Kunstverein's warehouse, would take the place of those on display. A letter by the painter Carl Schuch reported that the *Burial at Ornans* was actually hung in June.[75] However, Castagnary's advice, given in wise foresight, of not showing paintings such as the *Burial* in the Kunstverein turned out to be right: "It has its time and its history in France. It must stay here […] in order not to give renewed impetus to old arguments."[76] Almost all of the works shown could be interpreted as political statements. The critics tended to see them as the transgressions of a probably important, but rough and untrained talent. The *Kunstchronik* noted that his *Burial* as well as his *Studio* offered "only a random lineup

[73] "Es wäre für Wien, wo der Künstler zum ersten Male mit einer größeren Zahl von Werken auftrat, wichtig gewesen, eine Reihe von Arbeiten verschiedenen Genre's aus verschiedenen Zeiten nebeneinander vorzuführen, um dem Urtheile des Publikums über den Werth Courbet's als Maler eine breitere Basis zu geben; so aber wurde mit dem Grassesten begonnen, um vielleicht mit dem Besseren und Guten in echt kaufmännischer Weise erst später hervorzurücken." Anonymous, "Aus dem Oesterreichischen Kunstverein (Schluß)," *Kunstchronik* 8, no. 38 (July 4, 1873): 604.
[74] "Kunstverein und Künstlerhaus (Kaulbach—Courbet—Makart)," *Fremden-Blatt*, May 14, 1873, 5.
[75] Carl Schuch to Karl Hagemeister, Paris, January 1883, in Karl Hagemeister, *Carl Schuch: Sein Leben und seine Werke* (Berlin: B. Cassirer, 1913), 128.
[76] "Il a sa date et son histoire en France; il faut qu'il reste ici […] pour ne pas renouveler d'anciennes querelles." Riat, *Gustave Courbet*, 341.

of figures lacking any kind of psychological coherence."[77] In the early 1850s, the critic wrote, a small group of Courbet's admirers had proclaimed that what appeared to be the shortcomings of his talent were actually a reformatory satire on academic emptiness. But the crude and ugly could not be the ideal of art as a whole. The German-language critics usually recognized the high level of technical mastery of the "official" French artists in the World Exposition pavilion, although the tendency toward superficial effects at the expense of profundity of content was often chastised as "chicism."[78] But not even technical mastery, a hallmark of French art, could be found in Courbet's figural pictures. The reviewer of the *Dioskuren*, for example, described *Alms of a Beggar* (fig. 13) as "the most off-putting, incompetent painting to have been seen in a long time."[79] Critics regretted that there were not more landscapes and paintings of animals on display in the Kunstverein as these, in particular, had made Courbet's reputation as an artist. The reviewer in the *Kunstchronik* even went so far as to say that, in his *Studio*, Courbet had unwittingly treated himself with irony as, in this allegory, the artist is shown painting a landscape—seeming to agree with the reviewer that "his brush is quite simply not made for showing people, it can only be used fruitfully in landscapes and in pictures of animals."[80]

Many of the newspapers published in Vienna at the time, including the liberal *Neue Freie Presse*,

[77] "Sein 'Begräbnis in Ornans' so wie sein 'Atelier' bieten nur eine willkürliche Aneinanderreihung von Gestalten, welchen jeder psychologische Zusammenhang fehlt." Anonymous, "Aus dem Oesterreichischen Kunstverein (Schluß)," 605.
[78] See for example Emil Ranzoni, "In der Kunsthalle," *Internationale Ausstellungs-Zeitung: Beilage der,Neuen Freien Presse'* (June 22, 1873): 2, 3.
[79] "'Der Arme Wohlthäter', ein Bettler in Lebensgröße, welcher einem Zigeunerkinde Etwas schenkt, ist das Abschreckendste, Stümperhafteste, was seit lange gezeigt wurde." S., "Korrespondenzen, Wien," *Die Dioskuren: Deutsche Kunst-Zeitung* 18, no. 19 (May 11, 1873): 151.
[80] "Der Künstler hat sich damit unbewußt selbst ironisiert und auch inzwischen durch die That bestätigt, daß sein Pinsel eben nicht für Menschendarstellung paßt, sondern nur in der Landschaft und im Thierstück gesunde Früchte erzeugen kann." Anonymous, "Aus dem Oesterreichischen Kunstverein (Schluß)," 606.

did not even think Courbet worth reviewing.[81] On the other hand, he could not simply be ignored, nor could one pretend, as Emile Mario Bacano expressed in the *Tages-Presse*, that he did not exist: "He makes too much noise for that—with his voice, with his beliefs, with his brush."[82] Bacano criticized what he considered Courbet's ostentatious, arrogantly large, programmatic paintings. Yet the public of the Österreichischer Kunstverein was completely accustomed to colossal paintings intended as marketing tools. Such sensational pictures that circulated by way of the widely ramified channels of the central European artistic societies stopped over in Vienna at regular intervals. The art historian Rudolf von Eitelberger repeatedly railed against the "leveling effect of the society and trade pictures" that, through their subjects alone, "reveal the loud secret that they have been painted without any commission, that they are not intended for any purpose of the state."[83] The commercialization of painting was the price paid for dismissing the artist from the service of the state, court, and church. Pierre-Joseph Proudhon had addressed the same problem in respect to Courbet when he asked: "But just who did Monsieur Courbet intend this picture [the *Burial*] for? Where would be the right place for it? Definitely not in a church, where it would be an insult; nor in a school, a town hall, or even a theatre. It would take a special kind of gentleman with a taste for curiosities to even think of letting it into his attic and he would be

[81] Sieghard Pohl, "Courbet und die Wiener Kritik 1873," in *Courbet und Deutschland*, Werner Hofmann, and Klaus Herding, eds. (Cologne: DuMont, 1978), 586–87.
[82] "Er schreit dafür zu laut—mit seiner Stimme, mit seinem Glaubensbekenntnisse, mit seinem Pinsel." Emile Mario Bacano, "Kunstverein: II Courbet," *Tages-Presse*, May 2, 1872, 3.
[83] "Der Staat giebt eben so wenig wie möglich Geld aus, und fast scheint es eine Verlegenheit, wenn irgend ein deutscher Künstler, getrieben von dem Drange, etwas im großen Stile zu arbeiten, was über das Maß der Vereins- und Handelsbilder hinausgeht, mit einem Werke historischen Stiles auftritt und Erfolg hat, was man bei der stetigen Ebbe des Kunstbudgets machen soll mit Werken, die schon ihrem Gegenstande nach das laute Geheimnis verrathen, daß sie gemalt sind ohne Auftrag, daß sie für keine staatlichen Bedürfnisse bestimmt sind, und daß der Staat—ungleich den französischen Nachbarn—so bedürfnislos in Sachen der Kunst, so bureaukratisch-haushälterisch ist, daß er weder bestellen kann, wie der französische, noch auch wollte, wenn er es könnte." Rudolf von Eitelberger, "Oeffentliche Kunstpflege," in *Kunst und Kunstgewerbe auf der Wiener Weltausstellung 1873*, Carl von Lützow, ed. (Leipzig: Seemann, 1875), 273.

careful not to hang it in his salon."[84]

The main attraction of the exhibition in the Österreichischer Kunstverein was not Gustave Courbet's *Studio* but Wilhelm Kaulbach's *Nero Persecuting the Christians* (fig. 14). Kaulbach's work was used to promote the show in paid advertisements in the daily newspapers, which usually did not even mention Courbet (fig. 15). Intentionally or not, the two paintings were hung directly opposite each other in the Kunstverein, creating a contrast that undoubtedly played a role in the negative reception of Courbet's work:

> His "Painter's Studio", an enormous canvas, placed directly opposite Kaulbach's "Nero", includes a great number of capably painted figures but they leave us rather cold. It is impossible to speak of a composition in the real sense of the word. There is no real grouping, no real separation. Everything seems to have been positioned by chance. It would possibly make a stronger impression if its vis-à-vis did not automatically provoke a comparison.[85]

The German late-classicist was admired as a master of form, an elegant draughtsman, and virtuoso in composition; Courbet was accused of lacking precisely these qualities. In order to characterize the difference between the two artists, some critics used terms borrowed from the area of hygiene. Courbet was felt to be vulgar in comparison with the aesthetic "cleanness" of Kaulbach's pictures. Emile Mario Bacano discovered the "filth of no less than twelve dusty weeks" in the *Wrestlers*, and he accused the female nude in the *Studio* of "not having washed for

[84] "A qui donc M. Courbet destinait-il ce tableau? Où en trouverait-on la place? Ce n'est pas une église, à coup sûr, où il serait une insulte; ni dans une école, ni dans un hôtel de ville, ni dans un théâtre. Il n'y a qu'un grand seigneur avide de curiosités qui puisse songer à le recueillir dans son grenier; il se gardera de le placer dans son salon." Pierre-Joseph Proudhon, *Du principe de l'art et de sa destination sociale* (Paris: Garnier frères, 1865), 209.

[85] "Sein 'Atelier des Künstlers', das dem Kaulbach'schen 'Nero' gerade gegenüber hängt, eine riesige Leinwand, enthält eine reiche Zahl mitunter sehr tüchtig gemalter Gestalten, aber sie lassen uns ziemlich kühl. Von einer Komposition im höheren Sinne des Wortes ist nicht die Rede. Es gruppiert sich nichts und scheidet sich nichts. Alles steht, wie es der Zufall gestellt hat. Vielleicht würde es besser wirken, forderte sein vis-à-vis nicht so unwillkürlich zur Vergleichung heraus." Friedrich Pernett, "Der Maler der Commune," *Morgen-Post*, May 4, 1873, 2.

at least six months."[86] Painting everything dirty was nothing less than an obsession and foul habit of the artist, the critic concluded. High and low seemed to clash at the Kunstverein. "From Kaulbach to Courbet! That is quite a leap: Almost as wide as from a mountain peak bathed in light to a gloomy, menacing abyss without a breath of air, without light and without life."[87] The interpretation of the contrasting formal characteristics has been pushed even so far as to signify the difference between a German god and a French demon.[88]

The Viennese public was quite clearly not as "congenial" as Courbet had hoped. Critics seized upon his reputation calling him such things as *pétroleur* (incendiary), "painter of the Commune," "hero of the Vendôme Column," "son of the people at the barricades," etc. As early as 1872, art historian Adolph Bayersdorfer warned the Viennese, in the *Neue Freie Presse*, of an upcoming sinister visit: "The bloody leader of the Communists Gustave Courbet—known since the days of the Commune as the chief of the naturalist movement in French painting—has decided to leave degenerate Paris, that incorrigible city of underlings, and move to Vienna, the new Babel that is so full of promise."[89] In his polemical article Bayersdorfer relished in creating an image of Courbet as a person who—much to the horror of those living on the Ringstraße—would stir the

[86] "Daß es [the female nude in the *Studio*] ihren plumpen, mißgeborenen Leib seit mindestens sechs Monaten nicht gewaschen hat, wird man der Malweise Courbet's, welcher alle seine Farben mit Roth mischt, begreiflich finden [...] ich will auch erst schweigen von dem Umstande, daß diese Ringer wiederum den ekelhaftesten Schmutz von mindestens zwölf staubigen Wochen an sich tragen." Bacano, "Kunstverein: II Courbet," 4. On the cleansing discourse in Viennese culture around 1900 see, for example, Anselm Wagner, "Otto Wagners Straßenkehrer: Zum Reinigungsdiskurs der modernen Stadtplanung," *bricolage: Innsbrucker Zeitschrift für europäische Ethnologie* 6 (2010): 36–61.

[87] "Von Kaulbach auf Courbet! Es ist das ein weiter Sprung; fast so weit wie von einem lichtumflossenen Bergesgipfel in einen düsterdräuenden Abgrund ohne Luft, ohne Licht und ohne Leben." Bacano, "Kunstverein: II Courbet," 3.

[88] "Uebrigens ist Kaulbach ein hehrer Gott gegen den Dämon Courbet, und Gott sei Dank ein Deutscher gegenüber diesem Franzosen!" S., "Korrespondenzen, Wien," *Die Dioskuren: Deutsche Kunst-Zeitung* 18, no. 19 (May 11, 1873): 150.

[89] "Der blutige Kommunisten-Chef Gustave Courbet—von den Tagen der Kommune längst bekannt als das Oberhaupt der naturalistischen Richtung in der französischen Malerschule—hat sich entschlossen, das entartete Paris, diese unverbesserliche Unterthanenstadt, zu verlassen und nach Wien, dem hoffnungsvollen neuen Babel zu übersiedeln." Adolph Bayersdorfer, "Gustave Courbet: Ein Steckbrief," in *Adolph Bayersdorfers Leben und Schriften*, Hans Mackowsky, August Pauly, and Wilhelm Weigand, eds. (Munich: Bruckmann, 1902), 121.

fermenting elements of Socialism and have the Jesuit plague column on the Graben "vendômized." Since his imprisonment in 1871, Courbet had repeatedly expressed his intention to move permanently to Vienna, notes Bayersdorfer who knew the artist in person.[90] However, the political situation was such that he never even made a brief visit to the "El Dorado on the Danube."[91] During the Exposition, Adolf Thiers's government collapsed and Courbet's darkest fears became reality. On July 23, 1873, after being sentenced to pay almost 250,000 francs in damages for the Vendôme column, he crossed over the French border and entered into exile in Switzerland.

As shown in the company records, it was Paul Durand-Ruel who sent Courbet's works to Vienna on February 22, 1873 and who received them all again on July 15, 1873. The paintings were part of a group of 59 works that the art dealer had taken into safekeeping from Courbet, probably to avoid their potential confiscation.[92] In his memoirs, Durand-Ruel recalls his disappointed hopes for the Vienna World Exposition: "I had every reason to expect a success. Unfortunately, my predictions were not confirmed. Cholera broke out in Vienna and this dealt the death blow to the Exposition. Everybody fled and I sold absolutely nothing."[93] Only a few days after the opening of the Exposition, a stock-market crash put an abrupt end to the widespread feeling of optimism. Even Miethke complained that the enormous costs of "producing" *Caterina Cornaro* had hardly been covered. Courbet's "guest performance" in Vienna turned out to be a failure as well, not only because he sold not a single painting, but more importantly because the exhibition with

[90] Ibid.
[91] Ibid.
[92] This is mentioned in the so-called *Bruillard*, a book in which Paul Durand-Ruel recorded daily business operations. My thanks to Flavie Durand-Ruel for this information, which she emailed to me October 6, 2011.
[93] "J'avais tout lieu de compter sur un succès. Malheureusement mes prévisions ne furent pas confirmées. Le choléra se déclara à Vienne, ce qui porta un coup mortel à l'exposition en faisant fuir tout le monde et je ne vendis absolument rien." Paul Durand-Ruel, "Mémoires de Paul Durand-Ruel," in *Les archives de l'impressionisme*, Lionello Venturi, ed. (Paris: Durand-Ruel, 1939), 199.

which he had intended to give an overview of his work remained an *exposition incomplète*. While Vienna saw the beginning of a deep and sustained recession that led to relative artistic isolation, a Viennese dealer started his breathtaking international career in the European capital of the arts.

1.3 Charles Sedelmeyer's "Salon for Austrian Artists in Paris"

"So you share the opinion that Paris is an art city?" With these words the German critic Alfred Nossig was welcomed to the "capital of the arts" in 1893. According to his published comments, this discussion with a distinguished but unnamed connoisseur modified his blissful image of the city before he even had a chance to visit a single studio or exhibition. "People in European art circles are saying," the expert went on to explain, "that Paris is the great breeding ground of genius and success, that it has the same significance for the development of young talent that Rome once possessed, and that in the end it is the world market for art, where the accomplished artist can most easily and lucratively launch his art, while being met with the liveliest interest of the wealthiest art lovers […] An art market—yes, Paris is that, but an art city—*pas du tout!*"[94] The central theme in Nossig's criticism of the French capital was the fever of speculation. Paintings were treated like stocks; money was no object when it came to acquiring the "signature" of a newly-discovered star for one's collection, and artistic fashions changed with unprecedented speed. At any rate, according to Nossig, "stable conditions, such as those that exist

[94] "Sie teilen also jenes Vorurtheil, dass Paris eine Kunststadt sei? Diese Worte richtete an mich, bald nach meiner Ankunft in Paris, ein hervorragender Kunstkenner, den ich besuchte, bevor ich die französischen Kunstgrössen an den glänzenden Stätten ihrer Wirksamkeit kennen gelernt. Allerdings hört man derzeit in den europäischen Künstlerkreisen, daß Paris die große Brutstätte des Genies und des Erfolges sei, dass es für die Entwicklung des jungen Talentes dieselbe Bedeutung habe, die sonst Rom besessen, und dass es schliesslich der Weltmarkt für die Kunst sei, auf welchem der reife Künstler seine Arbeiten am leichtesten und am lohnendsten absetzen könne, weil ihm das lebhafte Interesse vielvermögender Kunstfreunde entgegen kommt… Ein Kunstmarkt—ja, das ist Paris, aber eine Kunststadt—pas du tout!" Alfred Nossig, "Pariser Kunstbrief," *Kunst-Salon von Amsler & Ruthardt Berlin* 4 (February 1893): 117.

in German art cities like Berlin, Munich, and Vienna, have long since been impossible here."[95] For decades the private "dealer-critic system" had been developing in the shadow of government regulation of the arts.[96] In the 1880s, at the latest, it had reached its maximum effect, and the concerned defenders of a *status quo* often objected to, or even rejected, structural changes in the Parisian art world. The commodity value of art objects suddenly became obvious, and the "free market" developed to such a degree that no professional artist, whether conservative, juste milieu, or avant-garde, could easily ignore it. In this field of cultural production, lacking the stable boundaries of traditional art institutions, thousands of painters vied for public recognition and the monopoly on artistic legitimacy.[97]

That moment saw the birth of the modern art dealer, who entered into a business alliance with his painter, and in so doing, advanced to become a powerful agent and impresario in the art world. As an expert in public relations and marketing he interfered between the producer and consumer, for as Nossig concurs, the buyer no longer traded directly with artists, but "rather through third persons, to whom the task was entrusted to brand the work according to a certain designation, the better to artificially pump it up, giving careful consideration to all the reigning currents of fashion."[98] As modern as concepts such as branding and the strategic positioning within a field of production may seem, such ideas can already be found in the art criticism of the late 1800s.

[95] "Von soliden Verhältnissen, wie sie in deutschen Kunststädten bestehen, in Berlin, in München, in Wien, ist hier seit langem keine Rede mehr." Ibid.
[96] Harrison C. White and Cynthia A. White, *Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World* (New York: Wiley, 1965; new edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993).
[97] I use notions such as "field," "habitus," and "symbolic capital" in the sense of: Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1993).
[98] "Aber alle diese Käufer verkehren mit den Künstlern nicht direkt, sondern stets durch dritte Personen , denen sie es vollständig überlassen, dem Werke diese oder jene Marke to geben." Nossig, "Pariser Kunstbrief," 118.

For novelists and playwrights such as Emile Zola, Guy de Maupassant, and Frank Wedekind, revolutionary marketing strategies and the emergence of a new type of art dealer in late 19th-century Paris were synonymous with a single, well-recognized figure; a figure whose significance has nevertheless been utterly neglected in modernist histories of art: Charles Sedelmeyer (fig. 16). While an anonymously-written obituary in *Cicerone* in 1925 remarked that: "the history of the contemporary art market—no matter which page you want to begin on—will always have a chapter entitled with the name of the deceased, in his realm an innovator like only a very few,"[99] by 1994, Barbara Wild could lament in *Parnass* that even the dates of the dealer's life were "now virtually impossible to reconstruct."[100]

Born into humble Viennese circumstances on April 30, 1837,[101] Karl Sedelmeyer started his career as an art dealer by the age of seventeen as an apprentice of Georg Plach. In 1860, he was already able to take over Plach's gallery beneath the Albertina ramp and shortly thereafter opened a permanent exhibition of paintings in a building near Ferdinandsbrücke (today Schwedenplatz). His most important contribution to the development of taste in his native city was the early importation of paintings by the French Barbizon School, in connection with which he travelled to

[99] "Die Geschichte des neuzeitlichen Kunsthandels wird—mit welcher Seite man sie auch beginnen wollte—immer ein Kapitel haben, das als Überschrift den Namen dieses Toten trägt, der auf seinem Gebiet ein Entdecker war, wie es deren zu seiner Zeit nur wenige gegeben hat." B.[ode], "Zwei Tote," *Der Cicerone* 17 (September 1925): 877.
[100] Barbara Wild, "Charles Sedelmeyer: Ein österreichischer Kunsthändler macht Karriere in Paris," *Parnass 14, no.* 3 (September 1994): 76. Since then I have been able to contribute new pieces of information on the dealer's life and marketing strategies. Christian Huemer, "Charles Sedelmeyer (1837-1925): Kunst und Spekulation am Kunstmarkt in Paris," *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst 2* (Fall 1999): 4-19. Christian Huemer, "Charles Sedelmeyer's Theatricality: Art and Speculation in Late 19th-Century Paris," in *Artwork through the Market: The Past and the Present*, Ján Bakoš, ed. (Bratislava: Slovak Academy of Sciences), 2004, 109-24. Christian Huemer, "Crossing Thresholds: The Hybrid Identity of Late Nineteenth-Century Art Dealers," in *Crossing Cultures: Conflict-Migration-Convergence*, Janie Anderson, ed. (Melbourne: Miegunyah Press, 2008), 1007-11. Christian Huemer, "Globetrotting Wall Paintings: Munkácsy, Sedelmeyer, and Vienna's Künstlerhaus," in *Munkácsy: Magic & Mystery* (Vienna: Künstlerhaus, 2012), 74-84.
[101] Acte de décès, Mairie du XVI^{e} arrondissement, Paris. Sedelmeyer died on August 9, 1925 and was buried at the Cimetière de Montmartre.

Paris at regular intervals starting in the late 1850s.[102] Following Austria's defeat against Prussia in 1866, he decided to liquidate his collection and to move permanently to the French capital. His regular visits must have convinced him that this was where he would find the best conditions for dealing with art. As his departure approached, Sedelmeyer organized a public auction of his entire inventory on December 3, 1866 although he had only recently enlarged it considerably through the purchase of an entire collection of paintings. In spite of this, he showed himself to be "absolutely determined to part with the objects, even at prices much below their value."[103]

In Paris, Charles Sedelmeyer quickly worked his way up into the circle of the world's top art dealers. In no way was he lacking in expertise, but only in money, as he had no inherited fortune to fall back on.[104] His Parisian gallery in the rue de la Rochefoucauld, 16th district (fig. 17) soon became a meeting place for many of the artists from the Austro-Hungarian Empire including Mihály Munkácsy, Václav Brožik, Eugen Jettel, August Pettenkofen, Rudolf Ribarz, Franz Rumpler, Otto Thoren, Eduard Charlemont and Julius Payer. According to August Schaeffer von Wienerwald, director of the Imperial Paintings Collection, it made a lot of sense "that the Austrian in Paris took care of his fellow countrymen, at least as long as they had not yet found their own public, and that he employed them ways he considered advantageous."[105] However, the commercial and personal relationships to the individual artists were of varying intensity – they could range from sporadic studio visits to exclusive contractual obligations. In a letter to his sister, László Paál, a Barbizon landscapist of Hungarian origin, revealed that he had established contacts

[102] Theodor Frimmel, *Geschichte der Wiener Gemäldesammlungen* (Leipzig: Georg Heinrich Meyer, 1899), 47-48.
[103] Karl Sedelmeyer, *Catalog der Öhlgemälde, Kupferstiche, Antquitäten etc.* (Vienna, December 3, 1866), 4.
[104] Wilhelm Bode, *Mein Leben*, vol. 1 (Berlin: Reckendorf, 1930), 163.
[105] "Es lag ja so nahe, daß sich der kunstsinnige, in Paris heimisch gewordene Österreicher seiner Landsleute annahm und sie, wenigstens so lange sie noch ihr Publikum nicht selbst gefunden hatten, in der von ihm für günstig gehaltenen Richtung beschäftigte." August Schaeffer, "Vorwort": *Originalgemälde moderner Meister aus der Kollektion Ch. Sedelmeyer in Paris* (Vienna: Anton Stöckl, 1907), 3.

with an art dealer in Paris, who would pay him a regular monthly sum, if he could sell his paintings.[106] Comparable deals with Sedelmeyer are confirmed for Paál's close friends Eugen Jettel and Mihály Munkácsy. It appears to have been Sedelmeyer's intention to establish his gallery as a family business in the same manner as his competitors in Paris. His only son had died at the age of two but his five daughters had married successfully (fig. 18). Emma married Eugen Fischhof who was to take care of Sedelmeyer's business activities in America. Caroline's husband was the Luxembourg consul in Paris, Paul Mersch—he also found a new field of activity in the gallery. Hermine married the successful artist Václav Brožík, and Emilie, the sculptor Stanislas Lami. There seems to be some truth in the frequently quoted anecdote about Eugen Jettel that Sedelmeyer cut back his initially guaranteed basic annual salary when the artist resisted his marriage policy and took a Viennese woman named Cilli as his wife.[107] The exclusive contract with Sedelmeyer eventually pushed Jettel to the brink of financial ruin, it seems.[108]

Like many of his dealer colleagues in the French capital, Charles Sedelmeyer, at the outset discovered a window of opportunity in working closely with the state-controlled auction house Hôtel Drouot. Located just a few steps from the stock exchange and the fashionable boulevard des Italiens, writers such as Henri Rochefort, Philip Burty and Champfleury described the Hôtel Drouot as a kind of stock exchange for art objects or a gambling hall with collectors taking the place of roulette or lottery players. As Christopher Reffait demonstrated in his dissertation "Le roman de la Bourse dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle," in contemporary novels the stock exchange became a symbol of an atomized social order and the democratization of capital, which

[106] László Bényi, *Paál László 1846-1879*, Budapest: Képzo□mu□vészeti Kiadó, 1983, 52. The original letter to his sister Berta from July 9, 1875 is preserved in the Archives of the Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest, inv. no. 1246/1920.
[107] Josef Engelhart, *Ein Wiener Maler erzählt: Mein Leben und meine Modelle* (Vienna: Andermann, 1943), 43.
[108] Karl Korschann asked Josef Engelhart for 330 Francs in order to prevent seizure of Jettel's assets. Letter from Karl Korschan to Josef Engelhart, June 2, 1895, Vienna City Archive, I.N.220.971.

in the upper ranks of society caused anxieties about the threat of social chaos.[109] The dissolution of traditional, firmly established hierarchies ensuing from the constant circulation of goods and money also pervades early descriptions of the Hôtel Drouot. According to Rochefort the auction house offers in miniature a perfect image of the social fluctuations to which Parisian society was subject at the time. "All rank is confused," writes Champfleury: "There elbow to elbow and socially equal are the rich man, who sometimes devours his fortune in foolish acquisitions of art objects, and the bumpkin, who has ten francs in his pocket but will nevertheless buy the chateau of that same rich man within ten years' time [...] All are rivals but one common goal unites them: *buying*."[110]

From some francs to a chateau within ten years' time is almost true for Charles Sedelmeyer's amazing social uplift. Indeed he was proprietor of a Renaissance manor-house in the Île-de-France, le château d'Ambleville, by the end of his life. His gallery in the rue de la Rochefoucauld was a "princely hotel in the style of the First Empire, formerly belonging to an eminent manufacturer of chocolate"[111] whose noble ambience would serve all his areas of business (fig. 19): the purchase and sale of top-class Old Master paintings, the publication of sumptuous prints and books, the organization and implementation of auctions and exhibitions of more or less established artists. One approached the gallery through a park-like garden, the doors were decorated with arabesques of dazzling enamel and the walls covered with valuable fabrics: "everything presents the air of a luxurious and well-kept private residence, until you enter the

[109] Christoph Reffait, "Le roman de la Bourse dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle: généalogie et logique d'un discours romanesque" (PhD. diss., Université de Paris IV, 2003).
[110] "Tous les rangs sont confondus […] Là se trouvent en contact et égaux l'homme riche qui quelquefois mange sa fortune en folles acquisitions d'objets d'art, et l'Auvergnat qui avec dix francs en poche achètera avant dix ans le château de ce même homme riche […] Tout y est matière à rivalité. Mais un même but rapproche tout ce monde: *acheter*." Champfleury, *L'hôtel des commissaires-priseurs* (Paris: Dentu, 1867), VIII-X.
[111] Roger Riordan, "Gleanings from Paris," *The Art Amateur* 43, no. 4 (1900): 92.

great galleries, or rather warehouses," reported the *Art Amateur* in 1900.[112] In a certain sense Sedelmeyer had conceived a mis-en-scène for dealing with his customers, who would be looked after by a sort of resident master of ceremonies, and by a staff of liveried servants. Sedelmeyer himself drew important clients into the repository on the upper floor of his mansion where great surprises were kept at the ready under the illumination of dimmed daylight and artificial light. He was said to understand the psyche of his important, primarily American, customers, who were not looking for a Van Dyck or Rembrandt that hung conspicuously in the public room downstairs. Up in the narrow gallery, protected behind steel walls, was the mysterious world of delights.[113]

In these elegant surroundings Sedelmeyer applied innovative marketing methods to turn his "masters of the traveling picture"—and here, Mihály Munkácsy in particular—into international stars. Ludwig Hevesi considered him a "great art dealer or dealer in great art," so typical of the time.[114] In the 1880s Sedelmeyer was especially well-known for basing his entire marketing machinery on the theatrical staging of singular "masterpieces." However, not only these monumental paintings were greeted with great interest by the international public, also more intimate landscapes by Eugen Jettel managed to find their way across the Atlantic and into the Metropolitan Museum in New York.[115] Sedelmeyer's "galerie du dernier chic"[116] welcomed a steady stream of the most important and wealthiest collectors from North America and Europe. In his unpublished history of the Vienna Künstlerhaus, August Schaeffer comments favorably that it

---

[112] Ibid.
[113] B.[ode], "Zwei Tote," *Der Cicerone* (September 1925): 876-77.
[114] "Diese Kunstgroßhändler oder Großkunsthändler sind eine ganz charakteristische Erscheinung der siebziger und achtziger Jahre. Sie haben zwar durch sogenannte Sensationsbilder und Reklamemalerei größten Stils das Publikum amerikanisiert, aber mitunter Ersatz für mangelnde große Staatsaufträge gegeben." Ludwig Hevesi, *Österreichische Kunst im 19. Jahrhundert*, vol. 2, *1848-1900* (Leipzig: Seemann, 1903), 222.
[115] In 1883 Sedelmeyer donated the painting "Marshlands in North Holland," which had been presented at the 1878 Paris Universal Exhibition, to the young museum.
[116] Emile Zola, *Carnets d'enquêtes: Une ethnographie inédite de la France,* Henri Mitterand, ed. (Paris: Plon, 1986), 244.

should be "recognized with gratitude that Mr. Sedelmeyer has always wholeheartedly taken care of the interests of Austrian artists abroad, especially in Paris, in order to make the fame of Austrian art known throughout all of the countries of the cultured world."[117] The most successful artist within Sedelmeyer's Parisian stable was certainly the Mihály Munkácsy (1844-1900).

From the very beginning, Munkácsy's career was closely linked to the international art market. Born "Michael Lieb," the son of a civil servant in the Hungarian town of Munkacz, Munkácsy entered Vienna's Academy of Fine Arts in 1865 (when he was twenty), but departed within the year because he had not paid his fees.[118] In spite of this short, inglorious stay, he was named an honorary member of the Academy only thirteen years later—a powerful indicator of his rapid rise to fame. Munkácsy was still a student in Düsseldorf with Ludwig Knaus when an ominous English-speaking art agent knocked on his door one day and offered him the sum of 10,000 francs for his first major canvas *The Last Day of a Condemned Man* (fig. 20). The agent – who has, so far, not been identified – only demanded that the artist send the work to the Paris Salon immediately after it had been finished where the actual purchaser would collect it.[119] The painting was awarded a gold medal at the 1870 Salon and, in addition to the effusive praise of the critics,

[117] "Es ist jedenfalls dankbar anzuerkennen, dass Herr Sedelmeyer sich der Interessen der österreichischen Künstlerschaft in der Fremde, vornehmlich in Paris, stets wärmstens angenommen hat, den Ruhm der österreichischen Kunst in aller Kulturländer zu tragen." August Schaeffer, *50 Jahre Künstler-Genossenschaft unter Kaiser Franz Josef I* (unpublished typescript: Vienna Künstlerhaus Archive), 255.

[118] "Lieb Michael, 20 years of age, from Munkacz in Hungary, father, civil servant, previous education: 2 high-school classes, lived in Vienna (1st semester) Josephstadt, Wickenburggasse 7, (2nd semester) Josephstadt, Bennogasse 14" is how the young artist was officially registered in the capital city of the monarchy. The literature repeatedly mentions that Mihály Munkácsy studied under the Viennese history painter Carl Rahl. According to the list of students, he actually entered the Academy of Fine Arts on January 9, 1865, in the so-called preparatory course for painting under professor Karl Wurzinger. Michael Lieb alias Munkácsy is still shown as being in Wurzinger's class in the second semester of 1865. However, he was removed from the list on July 17, 1865 because he had not paid his study fees. No records have been found in the archives to show that he actually took part in the master class of professor Carl Rahl that was limited to five participants at the time. My thanks to Ferdinand Gutschi, archivist at the Academy of Fine Arts, for this information which he emailed to me February 22, 2012.

[119] Judit Boros, "A Hungarian Painter in Paris: Mihály Munkácsy's Career between 1870 and 1896," in *Munkácsy in the World* (Budapest, Hungarian National Gallery, 2005), 40.

immediately brought him new business. In a letter to his Hungarian patron Antal Ligeti, the painter proudly reports that he had been visited by the Parisian art dealer Adolphe Goupil and commissioned with two pictures.[120] The stock books preserved at the Getty Research Institute do not provide definite proof of this deal. Goupil did actually purchase the painting *Le Reveil* during the Salon exhibition on May 17, 1870; he then passed this on to the Knoedler Gallery in New York for 3,000 francs.[121] However, the next Munkácsy entry in the stock books is only dated with September 13, 1873. If the information in the company records is accurate, it appears that the cooperation between Goupil and Munkácsy was not a particularly close one, especially seeing that only a rather modest number of nine paintings was purchased between 1870 and 1878. Nonetheless, the fact that the sum of 10,000 francs mentioned above represents an extremely high price for the work of an unknown student from the Düsseldorf Academy is substantiated by the average price of the purchases Goupil made in the year 1870. The art dealer hardly ever paid more than a few thousand francs for a painting and, when he did, it was for the works of well-established Salon stars such as Ernest Meissonier, Jean-Léon Gérôme, and Mariano Fortuny.

In 1878 Sedelmeyer heard from the Hungarian landscapist Laszlo Paal, then living in Barbizon, that Munkacsy had just completed a magnificent painting: *Blind Milton Dictates 'Paradise Lost' to his Daughters* (fig. 21). Since Goupil, who had commissioned the work, ultimately declined to accept it, Sedelmeyer was able to acquire the canvas for 30,000 Francs. The presentation in his gallery and finally at the Paris World Fair was a great triumph. Like *The Last Day of a Condemned Man* (Wilstach, Philadelphia), *Milton* was acquired by an American collector, Lenox Kennedy of New York. However, Charles Sedelmeyer stipulated that it must remain under his

[120] Ibid., 44.
[121] Goupil Stock Books 4, no. 4997, 84. Getty Provenance Index® record no. 8277: http://www.getty.edu/research/tools/digital_collections/goupil_cie/index.html (accessed March 3, 2012)

control for the duration of a traveling exhibition, so that the painter's fame could be spread throughout the most important European cities.

Charles Sedelmeyer returned regularly to his hometown with important auctions (1869, 1872) and exhibitions (1879, 1882, 1884) that were held exclusively on the premises of the Vienna Künstlerhaus. In January and February 1879, the art dealer planned to present two sensational pictures, which he had been able to acquire in 1878, the year of the Paris World Exposition. First of all, it was intended to make the Viennese public aware of Munkácsy's *Milton* and, immediately thereafter, to show Václav Brožik's *The Emissaries of Ladislav at the Court of Charles VII of France*. The shipment to the Künstlerhaus also included three landscapes by Eugen Jettel.[122] Charles Sedelmeyer functioned as the official agent for sales of artists from the Austro-Hungarian Empire at the Universal Exposition in 1878 where they were able to book a considerable success for themselves. The renowned *Gazette des beaux-arts* praised the progress made by the school since the last Universal Exposition in Paris. French critic Paul Lefort recognized the painterly colorism as a characteristic that he interpreted as a sign for their renunciation of the dry classicism of the Germans and one which could lead to the formation of an independent school.[123] The "three great Ms" of Austro-Hungarian painting—Munkácsy, Makart and Matejko—were awarded medals of honor for their colossal paintings at the Universal Exposition. Munkácsy was even named officer of the French Legion of Honor and Emperor Franz Josef I raised him to the peerage. That makes it come as no surprise that his *Milton*, which had met with such unanimous, unreserved admiration in Paris, was so eagerly awaited in Vienna.

[122] Charles Sedelmeyer to Karl Walz, December 25, 1878. Sedelmeyer folder, Künstlerhaus Archive, Vienna.
[123] Paul Lefort, "Exposition universelle: Les écoles étrangères de peinture (1er article): L'Autriche-Hongrie," *Gazette des beaux-arts*, 2nd period, 18 (August 1, 1878): 196-205.

The opening of the 1879 show at the Künstlerhaus was delayed for a few days due to organizational problems, which put the enterprising Charles Sedelmeyer into something of a bad mood. Jan Matejko's monumental painting *The Battle near Grunwald* (1872–78) blocked the main hall on the first floor. As the already agreed-on next stopover in Budapest made it impossible to extend the exhibition, the art-dealer threatened to charge damages of 200 gulden for each day lost. On January 5, 1879, he wrote to the Cooperative that:

> I sincerely regret that the events surrounding the exhibition of the Munkácsy painting have taken such an unpleasant turn. However, in no way am I to blame for this. As you know, I cooperated to the utmost with the honorable Cooperative from the very beginning: After receiving its first correspondence, I immediately stopped negotiations with the Kunstverein and then waited several weeks until the Cooperative reached a definite decision. I then postponed the exhibition for an entire month—at their request—from December to January because they told me that Matejko's monumental *Battle* had to be exhibited until the end of December. Since then, I have foregone a sum of 3,000 francs that I was assured of for exhibiting 'Milton' in Brussels from 15 December to 8 January.[124]

In the same letter, Sedelmeyer informs of his decision to withdraw the painting. However, *Milton* was ultimately shown, separated from the permanent exhibition, in the so-called Stiftersaal. Sedelmeyer demanded that the painting be displayed in the Künstlerhaus space with the most light. It was to be hung, completely alone, on the wall opposite the entrance. A portrait of the artist by Krishaber could be hung on the second large wall but, according to Sedelmeyer, there should be "no other pictures in the same pavilion."[125] The art dealer attempted to have absolute control over the reception of the work. The solemn atmosphere of the exhibition hall, the universal message of the painting and the dramatic vitality of the figures deeply moved the Viennese audience. Milton evoked the greatness of a person struggling against growing isolation

[124] Charles Sedelmeyer to Karl Walz, January 5, 1879. Sedelmeyer folder, Künstlerhaus Archive, Vienna.
[125] Sedelmeyer to Walz, December 25, 1878. Sedelmeyer folder, Künstlerhaus Archive, Vienna.

and illness, as well as the tremendous imagination of the romantic artist. His daughters, overwhelmed by the power of his verses, devote all of their attention to the poet and in this way focus the viewer's attention on the main figure. The painting could almost be interpreted as providing a directive for the viewer. The *Neue Freie Presse* newspaper reported that the picture's fame had reached the very outskirts of the city and that crowds of spectators were streaming into the Künstlerhaus.[126]

With *Milton*, Sedelmeyer set his marketing machinery into action in a spectacular manner. The painting had been sold to the American Lenox Kennedy long before it started its tour of Europe. The purpose of this extravagant operation was to spread the fame of the artist far beyond Paris and to create additional income through entrance fees and selling reproductions. Two months before the exhibition in the Künstlerhaus, on November 4, 1878, Munkácsy, who always feared that his artistic rank could not be sustained for long in the fast moving metropolis of Paris, signed an exclusive contract with Sedelmeyer. The dealer's attitude towards Munkácsy echoes that of a noble patron towards his court artist. Sedelmeyer guaranteed the painter financial security through a fixed salary, thus relieving him of mundane cares and concerns. He even promised "to be prompter and more conscientious in payment than certain crowned heads who have played a major role as patrons in the history of art such as Philipp II, Philipp IV, and many others."[127] Although Sedelmeyer had to leave the ennobling of his artist to the Austrian Emperor Franz Joseph I, he always took care that his protégé was exposed to the social elite. In his *La capitale de*

[126] E. R. "Munkacsy's 'Christus vor Pilatus'," *Neue Freie Presse*, December 31, 1881, 7.
[127] Charles Sedelmeyer, *M. von Munkácsy: Sein Leben und seine künstlerische Entwicklung* (Paris: Sedelmeyer, 1914), 20.

l'art critic Albert Wolff wrote that it was "Munkácsy who has the most sophisticated clientele, […] the peak of Parisian elegance."[128]

During the ten year term of the contract Sedelmeyer guaranteed the artist an annual compensation of at least 100,000 Francs, depending on the artist's productivity and the collector's demand. The dealer in turn had at his disposal all paintings produced and the right to reproduce them, while the pictorial themes were to be determined according to mutual agreement. The right to influence even the production of his artist can be seen, once again, as a reflection of Sedelmeyer's self-styling as a latter-day descendent of the monarchical system of patronage. Moreover, the painter committed himself "to create—at a convenient point in time—a composition of considerable dimensions and content," for which Munkacsy, in addition to the price Sedelmeyer paid him for the work, was entitled to share in the revenues from entrance fees of the exhibition in large cities as well as royalties from reproductions.[129] Thus, already the contract called for the production of a colossal "exhibition piece" and so, one spring night in 1880, the two sat together, to discuss a suitable subject. In Sedelmeyer's account:

"It should be an extremely dramatic event from world history […] in brief, the death of a great man, a martyr […] Then I [Sedelmeyer] suddenly had the idea: Why don't we choose the greatest martyr of all time, who died for all of mankind, Christ, God Incarnate? A scene from the Passion! Munkácsy hesitated: 'Yes, but that would be a picture of a saint, something that has been painted thousands of times already! How can we discover something new in this subject?'"[130] The answer

[128] "C'est Munkacsy qui a la clientèle la plus élégante." Albert Wolff, *La capital de l'art* (Paris: Havard, 1886), 286.
[129] Contract between Charles Sedelmeyer and Mihály Munkácsy (Paris, November 4, 1878), Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest, inv. no. 3055/1930.
[130] Sedelmeyer, *Munkácsy*, 21.

was soon found: a historical painting in the positivistic spirit of Ernest Renan's *Vie de Jésus*, a bestselling novel since it was published in 1863.

Munkácsy made preparations for the project, obtaining a canvas twenty-five square meters in size; he procured models and costumes, looked for a spacious studio and made up more than thirty sketches and studies. The work on the enormous painting with its life-sized figures took him until the spring of 1881 to complete (fig. 22). The white-garbed Christ in the center of the composition is surrounded by many companion figures, who through lively gestures and expressive mime displayed their direct participation in the dramatic event. A Roman soldier holds back the assembled throng. In contrast to this agitated scene a silent dialogue enfolds between Pilate, seated on a raised throne, and the traditionally clad Christ, mediated through the charges brought by the high priest Caiaphas. The religious content is subordinated to the historical recollection of the event, while the compassionate mother with child in the crowd is conceived as an intercessor and guide to the viewer. Thus, the presence of the beholder is acknowledged or even anticipated in the spectacular composition – an external relation that exemplifies Michael Fried's notion of "theatricality."[131] The painting addresses the pseudo-religious consciousness of the contemporary bourgeoisie à la Renan, who served Munkácsy as advisor during the work on the painting. As a paraphrase by a painter named Oscar Rex demonstrates, the worldly and stage-like qualities of Munkácsy's interpretation of the religious drama could literally be conferred into the realm of theatre. He used the composition for a painting on the accusation of the actress Sarah Bernhard by the Comédie-Française (fig. 23).[132]

[131] Michael Fried, *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).
[132] François Gardey, "Sarah Bernhardt, Zola et Rex," *Gazette des beaux-arts*, 6th period, 84 (November 1974): 324-26.

According to Sedelmeyer, the painting was completed a few days too late for it to be shown at the annual Salon. Yet it is more likely that a dramatic presentation in his gallery had been planned from the outset. A correspondent writing for the *Kunstchronik* made the following report on the first exhibition of the painting in Paris:

> After passing through a lovely garden, one first of all enters a glass-roofed vestibule where a servant, dressed in black, bows politely and ushers the visitor into the first salon. It serves as a kind of preliminary stage for the holy of holies: studies of heads by Munkácsy, the master with his wife in the studio, and other paintings have been hung on the walls. Then one enters a dark room; one has to be careful not to trip over. A turn—and there is light, and we find ourselves standing in front of the large, splendidly lit, painting! Chairs invite one to sit down; in short, everything unites to make it possible to wonder at the picture at leisure and in comfort.[133]

In a mere two months, around 200,000 visitors made the pilgrimage to rue de la Rochefoucault to view the "masterpiece of the century" in the "35th hall of the Salon."[134] It has been estimated that this number rose to around 2 million after the work's three-year European tour to Budapest, Vienna, Warsaw, Berlin, Stockholm, Brussels, Amsterdam, Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds and Glasgow.

Christ before Pilate made a stopover in Vienna between January 1 and February 14, 1882. In spite of the stress caused by the preparation for the last exhibition, Charles Sedelmeyer once

[133] "Nachdem man einen schönen Garten passirt hat, kommt man zunächst in eine glasgedeckte Vorhalle und wird von dort durch einen schwarz gekleideten Diener mit höflicher Verbeugung in den ersten Salon gewiesen. Er bildet eine Art Vorbereitung für das Allerheiligste: Studienköpfe von Munkácsy, der Meister mit seiner Frau im Atelier und andere Bilder hängen an den Wänden umher. Dann kommt man in einen dunkeln Raum; man muß acht geben, um nicht zu stolpern. Eine Wendung – es wird Licht, und wir stehen vor dem großen, bewundernswert beleuchteten Gemälde! Stühle laden zum Sitzen ein, kurz alle Umstände vereinigen sich, um uns das Bild in Muße und Bequemlichkeit genießen zu lassen." A. B., "Korrespondenz," *Kunstchronik* 16, no. 33 (May 26, 1881): 530.
[134] Reviews were collected and published in Charles Sedelmeyer, ed. *Christ before Pilate by M. de Munkácsy* (Paris: Sedelmeyer, 1886).

again decided on the Künstlerhaus. However, at the same time, he presented a collection of oil paintings, sketches, watercolors and engravings by the same artist in the rooms of the competition, the Österreichischer Kunstverein on Tuchlauben. In addition to a reduction of the hit painting *The Last Day of a Condemned Man*, landscapes and still lifes, the exhibition included twelve preliminary studies for *Christ before Pilate* that, according to the press, provided a fascinating glance into the master's artistic practice.[135] The contractually stipulated painting was the talk of the town even before it arrived in Vienna. According to the *Neue Illustrierte Zeitung*, the reason for this was the "almost fantastic reports from Paris in the newspapers, the rumors about the incredible price of the picture; in short, everything that could arouse the interest of the public even if one takes all of the sensational reports spread in the art dealer's own interest into consideration."[136] Sedelmeyer craftily took advantage of the interest in the "epoch-making" work and the competitive situation between the two Viennese exhibition houses to literally dictate his conditions to the Cooperative. He did agree to cover the transport and insurance costs but demanded at least sixty percent of the revenue for himself. After taking away twenty-five percent for an art prize Sedelmeyer planned to award, the Künstlerhaus was only left with fifteen percent. In an alternative proposal, he attempted to fob the Cooperative off with a small fixed sum as rental for the hall: "Nobody will find my demands excessive seeing that I am taking over all costs and risks myself" was the way he justified himself to the secretary of the Cooperative who, in return, seems to have threatened to make their correspondence public.[137]

---

[135] Anonymous, "Theater und Kunstnachrichten," *Neue Freie Presse*, December 31, 1881, 6.
[136] Balduin Groller, *Neue Illustrierte Zeitung*, January 18, 1882, 230. Reprinted in Sedelmeyer, *Christ before Pilate*, 89.
[137] "Niemand wird meine Ansprüche übertrieben finden, da ich ja alle Spesen und jedes Risico auf mich nahm und der Genossenschaft einen sicheren Gewinn proponirte." Sedelmeyer to Walz, November 2, 1881. Sedelmeyer folder, Künstlerhaus Archive, Vienna.

Charles Sedelmeyer provided the Künstlerhaus with precise instructions on how and where the monumental work "produced" by him, *Christ before Pilate*, was to be staged. In contrast to standard practice—as had been the case with Makart's *Venice Pays Homage to Caterina Cornaro* (1873)—he wanted the gigantic painting not to be hung on the so-called "sensation wall" of the main hall on the upper floor from where it would have been visible to the visitors from the staircase. Sedelmeyer recommended "placing the picture on one of the short walls in the main hall. The public will enter from the opposite side, be able to admire it from a distance and then leave through the large door in the middle. Screens must be placed in such a way that the light only falls on the side where the picture is located."[138] The art dealer announced that he intended to travel to Vienna to make sure that the painting was installed correctly. A letter dated December 16, 1881 contains a sketch (fig. 24) elucidating the dramatic impact that would be created by the well-planned interaction between the light, the canvas and the audience. The artificial lighting with four Siemens & Halske arc lamps cost 2,300 gulden alone. Hidden from the viewer, they illuminated the painting, which was positioned inclined slightly forwards, from above. It was intended to construct a stepped podium to assure that those standing at the back of the darkened rooms would still have an unimpeded view of the masterwork. Sedelmeyer left nothing to chance; the visitor flow and receptive conditions were calculated down to the last detail:

> I think it would be a good idea to stretch a cord across the entire length of the hall at a distance of 4.5 meters from the canvas to keep the public at the appropriate distance from the painting, and then, to leave one meter of flat floor behind the cord before making steps through the entire length of the hall all the way to the rear wall. They should be around 20 cms high and one meter wide so that there is room for four steps and the viewers standing on the last step would be 80 cms higher than those at the front. Of course, the steps have

[138] "Ich möchte das Bild im großen Saale gegen eine der kurzen Wände stellen. Das Publikum würde von der entgegen gesetzten Seite eintreten, um das Bild aus einer größeren Distanz besichtigen zu können, und bei der großen Mittelthür hinausgehen. Das Licht müßte durch Blenden so arrangirt werden, daß es nur auf die Seite falle, wo sich das Bild befindet." Sedelmeyer to Walz, November 27, 1881, Sedelmeyer folder, Künstlerhaus Archive, Vienna.

> to be solidly constructed to be able to support a room full of visitors. The shades must be affixed in such a way that all of the light falls on the picture and at least three-quarters of the hall, towards the rear, remains dimly lit.[139]

Sedelmeyer established in the gallery a "theatron", a "place for seeing", which in some sense was comparable to the Bayreuth effect of Richard Wagner.[140] The contrast of the brightly-lit picture space with the darkened space of the observer prevented peripheral distraction. Many contemporary critics were writing about how the collective experience of such an event could transform and unify the different strata of society. An anecdote, based on a classic artistic legend, confirms the power of illusion and the painting's thrilling effect on the observer. In the back of the crowd a mother stood before the painting, transfixed. She lifted her little one up: "can you see now?" she asked.—"I see," called the child, "but I can't hear."[141]

Almost 50,000 visitors flocked to the Künstlerhaus in the forty-five days of the exhibition. Eight hundred posters announcing the show were hung throughout the city and the net proceeds amounted to 13,893 gulden.[142] Twenty-five percent were set aside for a scholarship for an artist to go to Paris that was to be awarded by a jury a few months later at the First International Art Exhibition. Announcements in the press proclaimed that the entire profits from the first week of

---

[139] "Ich glaube es wäre gut, in einer Distanz von 4 ½ Meter vor der Bilderwand der ganzen Länge des Saales hindurch eine Schnur zu ziehen, um das Publikum in angemessener Entfernung vom Bilde zu halten, dann, von der Schnur an, einen Meter ebenen Boden zu lassen; von da an aber bis zur Rückwand der ganzen Länge des Saales hindurch Stufen zu machen, welche circa 20 Centimeter hoch und einen Meter breit sind, so daß 4 Stufen angebracht werden können und die auf der letzten Stufe sich befindlichen Personen um 80 Centimeter höher stehen, als die auf der vordesten Reihe. Selbstverständlich müßten die Treppen sehr solide sein, um Zuschauer, die den ganzen Raum derselben ausfüllen, tragen zu können. Die Blende muß so gehängt werden, daß das ganze Licht auf das Bild fällt und wenigst drei viertheil des Saales gegen rückwärts im Halbdunkel ist." Sedelmeyer to Walz, December 16, 1881, Sedelmeyer folder, Künstlerhaus Archive, Vienna.

[140] Jonathan Crary, *Suspension of Perception: Attention, Spectacle and Modern Culture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999), 250.

[141] "'Siehst du jetzt?' fragte sie.—'Ich sehe', rief es, 'aber ich höre nichts.'" Ludwig Hevesi, *Fremden-Blatt*, January 1, 1882, 13.

[142] Settlement of Account, 1882, Sedelmeyer folder, Künstlerhaus Archive, Vienna.

the exhibition were to be donated to the impoverished victims of the fire in the Ringtheater.[143] The idea of contributing to charity provided an even greater incentive for visitors to attend the exhibition. Not wanting to be outdone, the Kunstverein also took advantage of the "mass appeal" of the disaster and displayed Josef Hoffmann's *Fire in the Ringtheater*.

Heightening the illusionist impact through the use of electric lighting and installed mirrors was subject to mounting criticism. The Künstlerhaus had experimented with evening exhibitions illuminated by gaslight for a decade or so. Brožik's *Ladislav* was first shown using electric "Bengal lights" in 1879.[144] This was a demonstration of being open to the latest technical achievements. However, quite a few critics were annoyed by the impact this had on the broad public who could now find time to visit such exhibitions at night. When describing the presentation of *Christ before Pilate* in the *Kunstchronik*, Adolf Rosenberg stated: "These kinds of aids should be shunned when dealing with a genuinely first-class work of art; the entire staging of the picture has something of a sideshow atmosphere. Even Makart's touring pictures did not resort to these kinds of fairground tricks including artificial lighting in the evening."[145]

After Mihály Munkácsy completed work on *Golgotha*—the counterpart to *Christ before Pilate*—and presented it successfully in Paris, Sedelmeyer once again started planning another exhibition to be held at the Vienna Künstlerhaus in the late autumn of 1884. In an enquiry made on June 4, 1884, he expressed his intention to "exhibit two or three interesting large-scale paintings in

[143] Announcement in *Neue Freie Presse*, January 14, 1882, 11.
[144] Torner, *Ausstellungen einzelner Gemälde*, 331.
[145] "Solche Hilfsmittel sollten aber bei einem wahrhaft vornehmen Kunstwerke verschmäht werden, wie überhaupt die ganze Inscenirung des Bildes einen schaubudenartigen Charakter hat. Selbst bei den Makartschen Wanderbildern hat man sich solcher Jahrmarktskniffe, zu denen auch die künstliche Beleuchtung des Abends gehört, nicht bedient." Adolf Rosenberg, "Munkacsy's 'Christus vor Pilatus'," *Kunstchronik* 19, no. 22 (March 13, 1884): 361.

Vienna, either in succession or jointly."[146] Sedelmeyer made it perfectly clear that he intended to do this at his own risk and therefore wanted to have a separate entrance from the permanent exhibition of the Cooperative. Not even the members' season ticket should be accepted. He finally rented four galleries on the upper floor of the Künstlerhaus to show the sixty-five exhibits from his "Collection of Paintings by Austrian and Hungarian Artists Living in Paris."[147] The catalog of the exhibition does not mention an exact opening date as the individual galleries were opened at various intervals. Sedelmeyer placed Vaclav Brožik's monumental painting *The Conviction of Jan Hus by the Council of Constance* (fig. 25) in one gallery; in the next, spectacular canvases showing the loss of Franklin's North Pole expedition by Julius Payer. The art dealer devoted still another gallery to small-scale works by Charlemont, Jettel, Thoren, Ribarz, Pettenkofen, etc. "All of the former good Austrian—and now French—artists of the modern school were on parade with selected showpieces," commented Carl von Lützow polemically.[148] Included without the artist's consent was Pettenkofen's pastel *The Duel* (fig. 26) which received quite some critical attention. Sedelmeyer had originally commissioned a larger oil painting on the subject, probably in an attempt to duplicate the enormous success Goupil had experienced with Jean-Léon Gérôme *Duel After the Masquerade* (fig. 27). For a long time, the artist didn't have the courage to tackle the demanding oil painting but did create some preparatory studies. He reported on the slow progress work was making to his patron and showed him sketches from time to time. Hevesi noted that Sedelmeyer was astonished by the genius of the pastel sketch.

[146] "Da ich die Absicht habe, in der nächsten Herbstsaison (September bis December) zwei oder 3 interessante große Bilder entweder successive oder zusammen in Wien zur Ausstellung zu bringen, so erlaube ich mir die Anfrage zu stellen, ob es möglich wäre, daß ich zu seiner Zeit im Künstlerhaus ein Lokale im Oberstock miethen könnte, welches groß genug wäre." Sedelmeyer to Walz, June 4, 1884. Sedelmeyer folder, Künstlerhaus Archive, Vienna.
[147] *Charles Sedelmeyer's Collection von Gemälden österreichischer und ungarischer in Paris lebender Künstler ausgestellt im Künstlerhaus, Giselastraße 10* (Vienna: Sedelmeyer, 1884).
[148] "Als Herr Carl Sedelmayer vor einigen Jahren einmal im Künslerhause eine Ausstellung seiner Wien-Pariserischen Klientel veranstaltete, worauf alle die früher gut österreichischen, später französisch gewordenen Maler der modernen Schule mit gewählten Schaustücken paradirten, erschien zum Ergötzen der Feinschmecker auch Pettenkofen unter diesen exotischen Gewächsen mit seiner wunderbaren Pastellzeichnung: 'Duell im Walde'." Carl von Lützow, "August Carl von Pettenkofen," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* n.s. 1 (1890): 85.

> It showed the freshness of the first draft and all of the artist's imagination without any undue sophistication. Of course, there were only suggestions, the details were missing everywhere, and it was not perfect. The crafty client pointed out these spots and asked—apparently, quite academically—what would be put there, and what somewhere else. The artist then took up his dry crayons and showed him: This, and then filled out the spaces exquisitely. The commissioned painting was completed in this way—almost by accident—not in oil, but pastel.[149]

This is another telling example of the influence the dealer exerted even on the creative process. Sedelmeyer obviously determined at which point the work was finished and ready to go on public display. Pettenkofen was not successful in having his work withdrawn before the end of the exhibition but he was at least able to insist that the work be hung in the uppermost row and, in this way, become less visible.[150]

Munkácsy's paintings of Christ once again created a furor in Vienna. It is reported that, after an unannounced visit on November 22, 1884, the Emperor himself stated that he "extremely approved" of the new painting by Munkácsy.[151] In his critique in the *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*, the Rembrandt expert Alfred von Wurzbach characterized *Golgotha* as one of the most extraordinary pictures to have been painted since the *Night Watch*: "in the last 222 years, the art world has not created a third picture that can be compared with these two, with the possible

[149] "Da war die Frische des ersten Wurfes, die ganze Phantasie ohne Klügelei. Freilich bestand sie nur aus Andeutungen, an allen Ecken und Enden fehlte es an Detail, an Vollendung. Auf solche Punkte deutete als der kluge Besteller hin und fragte, scheinbar ganz akademisch, wie es denn an dieser Stelle sein werde, und dann an jener u.s.f. Und da griff der Künstler zu seinen trockenen Stiften und zeigte es ihm: So und so, indem er die Stellen hübsch ausfüllte. Ganz unvermerkt wurde auf diese Wiese das bestellte Bild fertig, zwar nicht in Oel, aber doch in Pastell." Ludwig Hevesi, "Pettenkofen," *Pester Lloyd*, March 23, 1889.
[150] Hubert Zemen, *August Pettenkofen 1822-1889: Sein künstlerischer Nachlass* (Vienna: Privatdruck, 2008).
[151] Anonymous, "Kleine Chronik," *Neue Freie Presse*, November 23, 1884, 4.

exception of Munkácsy's own *Christ before Pilate*."[152] The Munkácsy cult in Vienna reached its peak when a play dedicated to the artist was performed in the Künstlerhaus on January 5, 1885.

The widespread practice of staging monumental paintings and sending them on tour was a popular form of visual entertainment in the nineteenth century. Art connoisseurs, on the other hand, were prone to disparagingly point out the similarities between these events and attractions at fairs and public festivals. In Paris, Jacques-Louis David was asked to pay an entertainment tax for the separate exhibition of his painting *The Intervention of the Sabine Women* (1799). The municipal administration demanded from him a quarter of the proceeds, thereby invoking a law that imposed a tax on panoramas, fireworks, balloon rides and performances of all kinds.[153] These financially risky events, whose costs were mainly covered by the sale of entrance tickets and reproductions, marked a turn towards the public and its elevation to the role of the supreme judge of art. Attendance figures and record sales prices were increasingly seen as standards for artistic success. After their tour, Munkácsy's two paintings of Christ—and many others by the artist—were sold to America for an enormous price.[154] Austrian collectors were hardly able to compete. Ludwig Lobmayer, owner of an important glass factory, was the only one able to acquire at least reductions of major works by the artist.[155] It has been said about Munkácsy that: "If Hungary is

[152] "Diese Kreuzigung, oder vielmehr dieses Golgotha, wie das Bild richtiger zu taufen wäre, ist die ausserordentlichste künstlerische Leistung seit Rembrandt's "Nachtwache", und in dem ganzen Zeitraume von 222 Jahren hat die Kunst kein drittes Gemälde producirt, welches diesen beiden angereiht werden könnte; vielleicht Munkacy's "Christus vor Pilatus" allein ausgenommen." Alfred von Wurzbach, *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*, November 11, 1884, 5. Reprinted in Charles Sedelmeyer, ed. *Christ on Calvary* (Paris: Sedelmeyer, 1887), 94. Rudolf von Eitelberger argued in the *Wiener Zeitung*, November 23, 1884, that it would belong to the French school. Ibid., 100.

[153] Torner, *Ausstellungen einzelner Gemälde,* 82.

[154] Philadelphia department store millionaire John Wanamaker (1838-1922) bought them for 160,000 and 175,000 Dollars. See also Laura Morowitz, "A Passion for Business: Wanamaker's, Munkácsy, and the Depiction of Christ," *Art Bulletin* 91, no. 2 (June 2009): 184-206.

[155] Lobmayer owned reduced versions of *Milton*, *Christ before Pilate*, and the *Death of Mozart*. Ilona Sármány-Parsons, "Munkácsy, the Melancholic Colourist: Viennese Opinions of the Hungarian Master," *Munkácsy in the World* (Budapest: Hungarian National Gallery, 2005), 105.

his native home and France his artistic one, America is gradually becoming the lasting home of his works."[156]

The partnership of Charles Sedelmeyer and Mihály Munkácsy worked brilliantly for a decade, and now they appear almost clairvoyant not to have renewed their contract when it expired in 1888. With the dawn of Secessionist movements, the concept of the touring picture, perfected by this pair, rapidly lost its importance. In an obituary for Munkácsy, the critic Ludwig Hevesi noted incisively that the "globetrotting painting" was one of this period's unique features: "As if Raphael's frescoes were wandering homelessly around the world in search of a wall where they could come to rest."[157] In fact, Munkácsy's main works did travel through the Western world for years; in Vienna only his *Apotheosis of the Renaissance* (fig. 28) found a permanent home on the ceiling of the Kunsthistorisches Museum. The Viennese noted that this most prominent of commissions had been granted not to one of their own artists, but to a Hungarian based in Paris. And rather than being created in fresco on site, as the Renaissance masters would have done, Munkácsy's *Apotheosis* was painted in his Paris studio on a canvas matching the ceiling's dimensions. It was even exhibited on the walls of the Salon des artistes français before being shipped to Vienna.[158] In the era of the railroad, pictures were intended to travel from one exhibition to the next in order to satisfy the "artwork's claim on the masses," as Walter Benjamin later put it.[159]

---

[156] Sedelmeyer, *Christ before Pilate*, 2.
[157] "Als ob die Fresken Raffaels obdachlos um den Erdball wanderten, auf der Suche nach Mauern auf denen sie zur Ruhe kommen können." Ludwig Hevesi, "Michael Munkácsy," *Pester Lloyd*, May 3, 1900, 2.
[158] Similarly *The Hungarian Conquest—Arpad* was presented in the Salon des artistes français (1893) and the Galerie Georges Petit (1894) before it was permanently installed in the Hungarian Parliament.
[159] Walter Benjamin, "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit (3. Fassung)," in id., *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. I.2, Rolf Tiedemann, and Hermann Schweppenhäuser, eds. (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991), 497.

1.4 The Vienna Künstlerhaus: Center of Art and/or Commerce?

"What future does Vienna have as a city of art?" asked Rudolf von Eitelberger on the occasion of the new Academy of Fine Arts' opening on April 1, 1877.[160] The Academy's exhibition offering an overview on the artistic development of Vienna over the prior two centuries gave him the opportunity to expound upon the current situation of art in the Habsburg Empire, and it was clear to him that, as in the past, it was not the ideas of the artist alone that exercised a decisive influence, but also social, economic, and political factors. At that moment, Vienna was witnessing the creation of art in the grandest of styles, and upon completion of the Court Museums, the Parliament, City Hall, the Court Theater, and the University a decade later, Vienna would doubtless be the most magnificent city in central Europe. Eitelberger hoped that the decoration of these representative buildings would finally present a new case where a need for large-scale historical paintings would have to be fulfilled, just as the Hungarian, Polish, and Czech painters of the empire had done to cultivate their own respective national histories. The art historian viewed Vienna as a great metropolis of worldwide significance, always equally open to the great art of all nationalities due to its geographic position and political situation. But even so: "An art city in the true sense of the world, one such as Rome, Florence or Paris, is something which Vienna is not and never was."[161]

What Vienna was missing, according to Eitelberger, was a major focal point of art exhibitions—something that Paris had created in its annual Salon. And once again, Eitelberger flirted with the glorious tradition of France, where it was possible to build upon the great efforts of Jean-Baptiste Colbert in the seventeenth century: "more and more, Paris is becoming a center not just for

[160] "Welche Zukunft hat Wien als Kunststadt?" Eitelberger, "Die Kunstentwicklung des heutigen Wien," 31.
[161] "Eine Kunststadt im eigentlichen Sinne des Wortes, wie Rom, Florenz oder Paris, ist und war Wien nie." Ibid.

France, but for the artistic life of all Europe."[162] To his mind, the nineteenth century had seen Ludwig II of Bavaria succeed in making Munich a city of art, albeit not on the same level as Paris. But at any rate, the city had come to play host to a booming art market which was no longer dependent on local demand thanks to strong tourism. In Vienna, Eitelberger asserted, there was no real art market, and he thought that it would be impossible or at least very difficult to create one. Over the prior few decades, many galleries of paintings and art collections had been dispersed on the market, but only very few new ones had come into being. Both in bourgeois circles and among the hereditary and financial aristocracy, hardly anyone collected art anymore. The hope that the new stock market aristocracy would be capable of bringing forth a new art aristocracy was dashed by the Long Depression that began after the stock market crash in 1873. The development of the Austrian art market was also severely limited by the nationalist tendencies within the monarchy. While Eitelberger repeatedly emphasized the hybrid character of Austrian art and art collecting from the sixteenth running into the nineteenth century, presenting this as a great virtue, he ascertained that an "intellectual quietism" or an "intellectual system of protective tariffs" prevailed during the 1870s.[163]

In order to draw Vienna closer to the "worldwide circulation of art" and stimulate the art market, the Künstlerhaus held its First International Art Exhibition from April 1 to September 30, 1882. The fact could not be denied, wrote a staff writer at the *Neue Freie Presse*, that Vienna still lay far out in the east in terms of both geography and art. Art-related commerce and change, he wrote, flooded past Vienna at a nearly ungraspable distance, and artists had difficulty reconciling

[162] "Das heutige Paris lehnt sich an die grossen Bestrebungen Colberts und seiner Zeit an; immer mehr und mehr ist Paris ein Centrum nicht bloß für Frankreich, sondern das Kunstleben von ganz Europa geworden." Ibid., 1:33.
[163] "geistiger Quietismus", "geistiges Schutzzoll-System." Ibid. The young writer Hugo von Hofmannsthal also characterized the situation in Vienna by contrasting it with Munich. In his assessment of 1893, the "way too busy market activity" of the latter is confronted with "a complete lack of stimulus and witty competition" in Vienna. Hugo von Hofmannsthal, "Die Malerei in Wien," *Neue Revue* 5, no. 1 (Dezember 20, 1893): 22.

themselves with the rest of Europe. The exhibition, as a "cultural policy event of the first order," was intended to give the imperial capital a push back towards the West. It was not the first time that Vienna had invited artists from foreign places. But the international exhibition of 1869 had been exclusively German in character, and the World Exposition of 1873 "was to be nothing more to Viennese life but a temporarily shining moment for which revival nobody dared even hope at the time."[164] In early 1880, representatives of the Artist's Cooperative and the Academy of Fine Arts began taking mutual steps toward petitioning Emperor Franz Joseph to sponsor periodically occurring state exhibitions. But in the wake of the financially disastrous World Exposition, the Austrian government was loath to take any risky actions in matters of art.[165] Only when the influential arts patron count Edmund Zichy succeeded in mobilizing further art lovers and establishing a guarantee fund did the initiative begin to move forward. Emperor Franz Joseph, who would ultimately open the exhibition in person, approved 30,000 gulden for state purchases and state prizes—an official contribution which many thought insufficient.

The *Neue Freie Presse* spoke of the international exhibition as "number one in the series of Viennese Salons," hoping that—in the long term—it would result in an event comparable in significance to the Paris Salon.[166] But the Viennese were conscious of the fact that the Paris event could look back on a two hundred-year tradition, and that it had by then become "a colorful world

[164] "Es ist zwar nicht das erstemal, daß Wien die fremde Kunst bei sich zu Gaste bittet; allein die Ausstellung des Jahres 1869 hatte einen ausschließlich deutschen Charakter, und was 1873 die Weltausstellung in dieser Hinsicht leistete, war und sollte im Wiener Leben nichts Anderes sein, als ein vorübergehend aufleuchtender Augenblick, welchen wiederzuwecken man damals nicht zu hoffen wagte." Anonymous, "Zur Eröffnung der Internationalen Kunstausstellung," *Neue Freie Presse*, April 1, 1882, 1.
[165] *Illustrirter Katalog der ersten internationalen Kunst-Ausstellung im Künstlerhause* (Vienna: Künstlerhaus, 1882), 15.
[166] "Die morgen [am 1. April] beginnende Ausstellung will nur der Anfang eines in die Zukunft reichenden Unternehmens sein, Numero Eins in der Serie der Wiener 'Salons'." Anonymous, "Zur Eröffnung der Internationalen Kunstausstellung," *Neue Freie Presse*, April 1, 1882, 1. The plan was to host international exhibitions at the Künstlerhaus every fourth year. In the end, such events took place only in 1888, 1894, and 1898.

of hardly measurable dimensions."[167] Although the Künstlerhaus—opened only in 1868—had been greatly enlarged by additions for the International Art Exhibition, it was still no match for the dimensions of the Palais de l'Industrie in Paris or even just the Glaspalast (Glass Palace) in Munich. Though the exhibition was to be international in its scope, encompassing all areas of fine and applied arts (architecture, sculpture, medal making, painting, and printing), a point was made to preserve the character of an "elite exhibition." While the Paris Salon of 1882 showed a total of 5,612 individual works (including 2,722 paintings), Vienna's presentation totaled only a few hundred.[168]

The exhibition's organization was the responsibility of a Viennese central committee, composed of the artists themselves and a number of prominent art connoisseurs such as count Franz Crenneville, prince Constantin Hohenlohe, prince Richard Metternich, count Hans Wilczek, Rudolf von Eitelberger, Ludwig Lobmeyr, Nicolaus Dumba, et al. This committee was originally meant to send invitations directly to all of Europe's most prominent artists until France demanded its own national committee, thereby setting an example which other countries were to follow. A large number of foreign artists participated, rewarding the organizers' hopes. Alongside Austria-Hungary, the exhibiting countries included Germany, France, Belgium, Holland, Italy, Spain, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Russia. England was noticeably absent. However, the central issue in most discussions of this peaceful competition of contemporary art was: "Which section is better, the German or the French one? Which of the two rivals was able to claim victory?"[169]

---

[167] "Der Pariser Salon ist mehr als zweihundert Jahre alt und heute ein Farbenreich von kaum ermesslichem Umfange." Ibid., 2.
[168] Arthur Baignières, "Der Salon von 1882," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 17 (1882): 349.
[169] "Welche Abteilung ist die bessere, die deutsche oder die französische? Welcher der beiden Rivalen hat den Sieg davongetragen?" Izidor Kršnjavi, "Die Internationale Kunstausstellung in Wien: III Deutschland," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 17 (1882): 340.

Young critic Hermann Bahr even saw a bitter war of revenge lead by France against Germany.[170] The two countries shared the prominent sky-lit halls of the building's addition, with France taking the eastern wing and Germany the western wing. As at the Vienna World Exposition, it was in terms of these two opponents that Austrian art would be evaluated. The way in which the First International Art Exhibition was organized even resulted in the new halls' permanent names: the old Künstlerhaus was thus augmented by the German, French, Belgian and Spanish galleries.

Although the commission only admitted works created after 1873, the exhibition showed almost no truly modern efforts. Even the Gothic ornamentation of the poster made it clear that a progressive event was not to be expected (fig. 29). The repertoire consisted essentially of various flavors of realism, with historic genre paintings and portraits dominating on the thematic level. The Austrian section, for example, showed Sigmund L'Allemand's *Entrance of Dampierre's Riders to the Vienna Hofburg* and a catholic *Procession* by Wilhelm Bernatzik. The omnipresent Hans Makart supplied aristocratic portraits such as one of the exhibition commission's president, count Edmund Zichy (fig. 30), and one of baroness Bianca von Teschenberg, in which the critics from the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* saw one of those costume paintings "as only Makart is capable of arranging them, so that they are credible to us, while in other cases we are unable to shake off thoughts of a masquerade upon viewing portraits of modern individuals in strange garb."[171] It was only due to the advocacy of this influential painter prince that the ambitious, large-format landscape painting *Spring at the Prater* (fig. 31) by Tina Blau made it into the exhibition. Due to its luminous colors and impressionistic effects, which supposedly threatened to

[170] Hermann Bahr, "Wiener Kunstbriefe I," *Salzburger Volksblatt*, May 6, 1882, 1.
[171] "Dasselbe gilt von dem Porträt der reizenden Frau Teschenberg, einem jener Kostümbilder, wie sie nur Makart zu arrangieren weiß, daß wir an sie glauben, während wir sonst den Gedanken einer Maskerade nicht los werden können, wenn wir moderne Menschen in fremdartigem Gewande porträtiert sehen." Izidor Kršnjavi, "Die Internationale Kunstausstellung in Wien: I Österreich-Ungarn," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 17 (1882): 245.

burn a "hole in the wall" of the somber exhibition hall, the commission had originally wanted to reject the work. [172] An intervention by Hans Makart, however, caused the painting to ultimately be hung after all—albeit in a disadvantageous corner where it did, however, catch the attention of the French Minister of Fine Arts, Antonin Proust, who was moved to amazement:

> One day the Minister of Fine Arts in France (Proust) came to the exhibition and was led through the house with great respect, with all the more respect as Paris was then the Mecca of painting. [He asked] "By whom is this then?"—Apologetically he was informed that the painter, Miss Tina Blau, was otherwise quite talented, one couldn't just ... "But that is the best picture in the whole room!" escaped from the lips of the guest. And with that began the fame of Tina Blau.[173]

On his subsequent visit to the artist's studio at the former World Exposition grounds in the Prater, Proust expressed surprise at the fact that Blau had never been to Paris. He urged her to show *Spring at the Prater* at the Paris Salon. Following his advice, she went on to receive an honorable mention there in 1883, on which occasion she created three quick studies entitled *From the Tuileries* (fig. 32). The aforementioned critic from the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* found the Prater painting in the Viennese exhibition "a bit green, but otherwise excellent," and added

[172] Jury protocol of March 16, 1882, First International Art Exhibition file, Künstlerhaus Archive, Vienna. Wolfgang Born, "Makart rettet ein Bild: Erinnerungen an eine Große Malerin," *Neues Wiener Journal*, November 3, 1935, 6. The painting has been recognized as the first painting by a female artist that succeeded on the Viennese art market. It has been acquired by a Bavarian collector during the First International Art Exhibition, but entered the imperial collections in 1899. Sabine Plakolm-Forsthuber, "Tina Blau und die Frauenbewegung," in *Pleinair: Die Landschaftsmalerin Tina Blau* (Vienna: Jewish Museum, 1996), 42.

[173] "Eines Tages kam der Minister der schönen Künste in Frankreich Proust in die Ausstellung und wurde mit großem Respekt durch das Haus geleitet, mit um so größerem Respekt, als Paris damals mehr noch, als je nachher das Mekka der Malerei war. Und richtig hatte er sofort das anstößige Bild heraus. 'Von wem ist denn das?'—Entschuldigend wurde ihm mitgeteilt, die Malerin, Fräulein Tina Blau, sei sonst recht talentiert, man konnte nicht wohl... 'Aber das ist ja das beste Bild im ganzen Saal!' entfuhr des den Lippen des Gastes." Friedrich Stern, "Frau Tinas 70. Geburtstag," *Neues Wiener Tagblatt,* November 13, 1913, 14-15. See also Julie M. Johnson, "The Art of the Woman: Women's Art Exhibitions in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna" (PhD. diss., University of Chicago, 1998), 35. Published as Julie M. Johnson, *The Memory Factory: The Forgotten Women Artists of Vienna 1900* (West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2012).

patronizingly that she truly painted "like a man."[174] Regarding the Austrian section, this critic complained about a conspicuous thematic gap, listing the shares of the various genres by percentage: "25% sculptures, only 5% history paintings, 10 ½% portraits, 17% genre, 20% landscapes, 2½% architecture paintings, 6% animal pieces and 8% still lifes, that is, 3% more than history paintings."[175] As Eitelberger and others before him, the critic attributed the lack of grand history paintings to insufficient support by the Austrian government for art and art exhibitions. Only in the shadows of grand art encouraged by the state, wrote this reviewer, could the local art market also flourish. And if a nation's art did poorly at major exhibitions, he continued, the artists of that nation would do poor business as a result. He concluded that the government should take the modest performance of Austrian art at the international exhibition as a warning to better fulfill its obligations in the future.

> The French need not be bashful when it comes to proving their prestige in the field of art in peaceful competition; they know where to find the pearls when the task at hand is to celebrate their art at home or shine abroad. Every important talent, upon having brought forth an outstanding work, has the assurance that it will be purchased by the state, so he dares to take on themes that are impossible in the art trade; every proficient effort by those nurtured in the Villa Medici is purchased; every painting that scores a sensation at an exhibition finds a buyer. It is in this way that the collection at Palais Luxembourg came to be, to which the Academy's Gallery in Vienna could be a pendant, since the latter's collection of modern paintings is by now outshone by many small private collections due to its having been put together in an entirely unsystematic manner.[176]

[174] Kršnjavi, "Die Internationale Kunstausstellung in Wien: I Österreich-Ungarn," 248.
[175] Ibid., 241.
[176] "Die Franzosen sind nicht in Verlegenheit, wenn es sich darum handelt, ihr Prestige auf dem Gebiete der Kunst bei irgend einem friedlichen Wettkampfe zu erweisen; sie wissen, woher sie die Perlen nehmen können, wenn es gilt, der Kunst im eigenen Hause Feste zu geben, oder in der Fremde zu glänzen. Jedes bedeutende Talent, wenn es ein hervorragendes Werk schafft, hat die sichere Aussicht, es vom Staate angekauft zu sehen, wagt sich also auch an Themata, die im Kunsthandel unmöglich sind; jede tüchtige Leistung der Zöglinge der Villa Medici wird erworben; jedes Bild, das auf einer Ausstellung Sensation erregt, gekauft. So entstand die Sammlung des Palais Luxembourg, welche in der Wiener akademischen Galerie leicht ein Seitenstück erhalten könnte, deren Sammlung moderner Bilder jetzt von vielen kleinen Privatsammlungen übertroffen wird, weil sie ganz systemlos angelegt ist." Ibid., 243.

This spoke to a further problem. Since exhibiting activity in Austria was borne largely by arts and artists' associations, there was virtually no chance that the systematic creation of a public collection of modern art comparable to the Musée du Luxembourg in Paris would take place. At exhibitions, works were purchased with member contributions only to be subsequently raffled off among them and thus scattered. The French section of the International Art Exhibition in Vienna presented a whole series of treasures which had already found a permanent home at the Palais du Luxembourg. In the catalog, William-Adolphe Bouguereau's *The Birth of Venus* (fig. 33) and *The Consoling Virgin* bore the proud note "App.[artient] au gouvernement français," to cite just one example.[177] Monumental works by Puvis de Chavannes for the decoration of the museum in Amiens were to be seen both in Vienna and at the Paris Salon of 1882. And even Auguste Rodin's life-sized sculptures *The Age of Bronze* and *Saint John the Baptist Preaching* had already long since withstood the acid test in Paris. "When the French go to competitive exhibitions abroad, they only take along that which has stood the test at home, thus excluding the possibility of any unfavorable accidents which, in other sections, are all too much in evidence," commented the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst.*[178] In terms of selection and display, the French section was put together on the basis of a well-conceived plan. This adroitness was to find frequent mention among German-language critics as a French national virtue, right alongside their doubt as to the authenticity of French sentiment and expressivity.

Even in the German section, critics found fault with the seemingly random selection of works. Wilhelm Leibl's painting *Three Women in Church* (fig. 34) garnered the most public and critical

[177] *Exposition internationale des beaux-arts à Vienne 1882: France: Catalogue des ouvrages de peinture, sculpture, gravure, architecture* (Paris: Hôtel de Cluny, 1882), 3.
[178] "Die Franzosen führen eben in die Fremde zu Ausstellungskämpfen nur daheim Erprobtes und schließen so jeden mißlichen Zufall aus, der in anderen Abteilungen zu sehr das Scepter führte." Izidor Kršnjavi, "Die Internationale Kunstausstellung in Wien: IV Frankreich—Belgien," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 17 (1882): 366.

attention. Due to the country's federal structure, a total of four German committees (in Berlin, Dresden, Düsseldorf and Munich) had been formed, a fact which might serve to explain the incoherency that some critics found fault with in the powerful German Empire's contribution. However, Bahr, who admitted his pan-German disposition and wrote at length about Franz Lenbach's portrait of *Otto von Bismarck*, praised the "national character" of both the French and the German contribution, while Austria gave the sad impression of a "variegated chain of elements completely alien, often hostile to each other."[179] The general assessment was that the effectiveness of the central committee had been severely hampered by the national committees. Even a whole week after the exhibition's opening, the halls of the French and Belgian departments were still inaccessible to the public. In the vestibule, unopened packing crates stood around, and not even a provisional guide to the exhibition was available—to say nothing of the announced illustrated exhibition catalog. Art journalists thus deemed the Vienna International Art Exhibition to be a failure from an organizational standpoint. [180]

It is interesting to note that the model character of French state patronage in the German-speaking world was still being mentioned at a point in time when the former had already extricated itself from the organization of the Paris Salon, leaving the art trade to become the dominant power in the art world.[181] In Vienna, the call for centralized government control coincided exactly with the moment at which, in Paris, the historical relationship between grand art and the state had become obsolete. Arthur Baignières reported on the first Salon to be organized by artists alone, which was that of 1882: "Now the artists can control things as they want, and instead of an art exhibition in

[179] "Hier Harmonie, Einheit in der Vielfalt, dort ein regelloses Durcheinander, eine buntscheckige Kette einander wildfremder, oft feindlicher Glieder." Bahr, "Wiener Kunstbriefe I," 1.
[180] Anonymous, "Sammlungen und Ausstellungen: Die Organisation der Wiener internationalen Austellung," *Kunstchronik* 17, no. 26 (April 13, 1882): 419.
[181] Patricia Mainardi, *The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993).

the true sense of the word, they have put on a clearance sale like any retailer would do, with the sole difference that, here, prices have not been reduced. Advertisements, large posters, wares of all kinds, at all prices, in all sizes and for all seasons are on offer."[182]

Just a few years later, Vienna's Artists Cooperative faced similar criticism. The Künstlerhaus had become a "universal warehouse" that had to have just everything constantly in stock, ridiculed the art historian and critic Richard Muther, who held a teaching post in Breslau (today's Wroclaw).[183] From the very beginning, the galleries at the Künstlerhaus were rented by dealers such as Miethke & Wawra, Peter Kaeser, Georg Plach, Alexander Posonyi and Charles Sedelmeyer in order to hold their more prestigious auctions in an appropriate setting. On December 10, 1868, the *Neue Freie Presse* announced that the two introductory auctions of that winter would draw their special attractiveness from being held at the new Künstlerhaus. On the other hand, the paper expressed "no doubt that the (of course, somewhat vulgar) din of a temporary art market will also be good for the newly created focal points of our artistic life on the banks of the Wien River."[184] The author of these lines, Carl von Lützow, associated with these events the hope that "in Vienna, as in Paris, a regular auction season might arise."[185] But while the French capital was seeing

[182] "Jetzt können die Künstler frei schalten und walten, und statt einer Kunstausstellung im wahren Sinne des Wortes veranstalten sie einen Ausverkauf, wie irgend ein beliebiges Magazin, mit dem einzigen Unterschiede, daß die Preise nicht herabgesetzt sind. Reklame, große Affichen, Ware von jeder Gattung, zu jedem Preise, von allen Größen und allen Jahreszeiten wird da angeboten." Baignières, "Der Salon von 1882," 349.
[183] Richard Muther, "Fall Klimt und Künstlerhaus," *Die Zeit*, March 30, 1901, 202.
[184] "Diese beiden einleitenden Auctionen des heurigen Winters erhalten dadurch noch ihre besondere Anziehungskraft, daß sie zugleich die beiden ersten derartigen Erscheinungen im neuen Künstlerhause sind, und es unterliegt wohl keinem Zweifel, daß der freilich etwas profane Lärm eines vorübergehenden Kunstmarktes auch dem neugeschaffenen Mittelpunkte unseres Kunstlebens an den Ufern der Wien zugute kommen wird." Carl von Lützow, "Zwei Kunst-Auctionen," *Neue Freie Presse*, December 10, 1868, 1.
[185] "Denn sie werden entscheiden, ob der Erfolg der vorjährigen Auctions-Ereignisse nur ein vorübergehender und zufälliger war, oder ob sich auch in Wien, wie in Paris, eine regelmäßige Saison der Versteigerungen einbürgert." Ibid., 3. In an obituary on Wawra, August Schaeffer maintained "that the Miethke & Wawra enterprise can be considered the founders of art auctions in Vienna in particular and Austria as a whole. It is possible that the years of the so-called economic boom, when—in a manner of speaking—money was there for the taking and being in the possession of first-rate, expensive paintings was a matter of a certain amount of pride, was advantageous for this success." *Neue Freie Presse*, June 20, 1905, 1.

auctions of exquisite art shift away from the state-controlled auction house Hôtel Drouot in favor of the luxurious palaces of the leading art dealers, Vienna saw the artists' temple of the Muses itself, of all places, forced to bear the "vulgar noise" of profiteering.

Without a doubt, these occasions did see the art dealers present some high-quality works that were largely unknown to the Viennese public. Peter Kaeser, who spent many years working for the Paris company Goupil & Cie, succeeded in presenting at one of the abovementioned auctions the collection of city building authority head Adolph J. Bösch, whose paintings of the French and Dutch schools presumably even had a direct influence on the development of Austrian landscape painting.[186] The works of the Bösch Collection had been acquired mainly through Paris art dealers, with even Ferdinand Georg Waldmüller's *Mother's Admonishment* (1850) having found its way back to Vienna.

One of the highlights of the auction season in the early days of the Künstlerhaus was doubtless the posthumous auction of the collection of Friedrich Jakob Gsell. This auction, organized by Georg Plach, began on March 14, 1872 and ran for two weeks. Gsell, a native of Alsace, had made his fortune in the wool trade. After retiring from his business, he had settled in Vienna, where he developed into a passionate collector of art. The bilingual (German-French) catalog published for this auction lists 600 oil paintings and over 1,000 works on paper.[187] Alongside several first-class works by old masters including Rembrandt, Frans Hals and Ruysdael, the collection consisted of an impressive mix of French and Austrian naturalists. The latter were represented by works including 34 paintings each by Georg Friedrich Waldmüller and

[186] Martina Haja, "Der österreichische Stimmungsimpressionismus," 156-63.
[187] *Versteigerung der Galerie Gsell und der dazugehoerigen Kunst-Sammlung durch Georg Plach* (Vienna 1872).

Pettenkofen, as well as 300 watercolors by Rudolf von Alt and 200 studies by Friedrich Gauermann. In the French category, artists included Thomas Couture, Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps, Jean-Léon Gérôme, Ernest Meissonier, Jean-François Millet, Théodore Rousseau and Constant Troyon—with twenty paintings by Troyon alone. The proceeds of the auction amounted to 1.3 million gulden and exceeded all expectations; the editor of the *Neue Freie Presse* even thought that "indeed, it is strange that some of the paintings were even sold for more than their worth."[188] Sedelmeyer purchased Thomas Couture's *Troubadour* for the proud sum of 23,600 gulden.

A few months later, shortly before Christmas 1872, Sedelmeyer brought to auction at the Künstlerhaus a collection that was very similar indeed in terms of French works. In the foreword to the extravagantly produced catalog, he wrote:

> If some should think it conspicuous that I moved a collection containing such outstanding and rare masters from Paris, the great art market of Europe, to Vienna, I hope that the honorable Viennese art connoisseurs will not reproach me for placing my full trust in their warm love for the arts and desiring to make my small contribution to my father-city's gradual ascendance to the status of an art center of the first order, which it has, happily, already begun to do.[189]

[188] "Die Versteigerung der Galerie Gsell, welche in den ersten Tagen dieser Woche zu Ende ging, hat den Erben die Summe von mehr als 1,300,000 fl. eingebracht; das Resultat ist freilich nur dadurch erzielt worden, daß einzelne der Gemälde in wahrhaft komischer Weise überzahlt wurden." Anonymous, "Kunstnotizen: Auction Gsell," *Neue Freie Presse*, March 30, 1872, 4.

[189] "Wenn es vielleicht Einigen auffallend erscheinen sollte, daß ich eine Sammlung, die so hervorragende und seltene Meister enthält, von Paris, dem großen Kunstmarkte Europa's weg und nach Wien überführte, so werden mir—so hoffe ich—die geehrten Wiener Kunstfreunde deswegen wohl keinen Vorwurf machen, daß ich in ihre warme Kunstliebe mein volles Vertrauen setzte und mein bescheidenes Scherflein dazu beitragen wollte, daß meine Vaterstadt allmählich zur Kunststadt ersten Ranges heranblühe, wozu sie bereits einen so erfreulichen Anlauf genommen hat." *Gemälde moderner und alter Meister: Collection Sedelmeyer-Paris* (Vienna: Künstlerhaus, December 21-22, 1872), 6.

Sedelmeyer's auction at the Künstlerhaus was followed with great interest even in Paris, and in light of the collection's importance and the fantastic results, it was deemed the "event of the season for the Viennese art world."[190]

Although the most spectacular auctions took place before the stock market crash of 1873, the conspicuous presence of art-dealing at the Künstlerhaus seems to have left a permanent mark on the institution. Space there was rented to gallery owners not only for auctions, but also for spectacular solo exhibitions—as discussed at length regarding Miethke's *Caterina Cornaro* or Sedelmeyer's *Christ* paintings. Earlier, since its establishment in 1850, the Österreichische Kunstverein—which entertained crowds with paintings that had been taken on tour far from home—had been viewed as a prime address for sensational art in Vienna. During the 1870s and 1880s, however, the Künstlerhaus more and more frequently also became the site of such spectacular exhibits: *The Bay of Death*, *Stanislaw Zolkiewski's Death*, *The Battle of Grunwald*, *The Entry of Charles IV in Antwerp*, *The Emissaries of Ladislaw at the Court of Charles VII of France, Golgotha*, etc. At such events, the commercial character of exhibitions was especially clear to be seen. Like the auctions, these were mounted mainly by art dealers whose gimmicky and sensationalist strategies had a lasting effect on the image of the Künstlerhaus.

Richard Muther applauded when, in Vienna, the exhibitions that had formerly been mounted by dealers were suddenly held under the auspices of the artists themselves. To him, the European Secessions represented a milestone in the history of public exhibitions. Up into the period around 1890, in his estimation, there had been exclusively giant painting markets.

[190] Anonymous, "Vente Sedelmeyer à Vienne," *La chronique des arts et de la curiosité* 7 (February 15, 1873): 59.

> These racked the nerves of true art lovers, who had to wade their way through a vast clutter of indifferent wares. They forced the painter to pointlessly waste his strength, obliging him to bring into the world stillborn children, sensational display pieces, for the simple reason that the authentic and humble would easily be outshone in this loud, carnival-like atmosphere. The Secessions—first in Paris and Munich, then in Berlin and Vienna—freed their exhibitions of this show booth-like character. Everything commercial was excluded, large-scale artistic spectacles banned.[191]

Since its opening for non-academics in 1791, the Paris Salon had been hit with similar accusations. While the Künstlerhaus was often referred to with terms like "Ramschbazar," "Universalwarenhaus" and "Jahrmarktbude," the terminology of nineteenth century French art criticism frequently includes terms such as "grande boutique d'image," "grand marché de l'art," "bazar," "entrepôt" and "hangar." The use of the Palais de l'Industrie as a multi-purpose hall, which played host not only to the annual Salon but also to exhibitions of wares of all kinds, contributed to its demise just as much as did the various rentals at the Künstlerhaus. In both places, there was criticism of the annual exhibitions and their eventually gigantic proportions, with thousands of paintings being shown in numerous, frame-on-frame rows, and with maximum utilization of available hanging space. The only time a hole appeared in the middle of the wall, according to Muther, was when a buyer wanted to take his painting home right away as a gift.[192] Although the Künstlerhaus had been accused repeatedly of not being open or receptive enough to foreign art, it was actually the huge international exhibitions that made the need for reform really obvious. Along with the Universal Expositions came the International Exhibitions of the second half of the nineteenth century. The competition for attention created the sensational picture, "a

[191] "Riesenbildermärkte. Sie zermarterten die Nerven des Kunstfreundes, da er durch einen Wust gleichgilter Ware sich durchringen musste. Sie nöthigten den Maler zu nutzloser Kraftvergeudung, zwangen ihn, todgeborene Kinder, sensationelle Schaustücke in die Welt zu setzen, nur weil das Echte, Bescheidene im Jahrmarktgetöse überschrien ward. Die Secessionen—erst in Paris und München, dann in Berlin und Wien – nahmen den Ausstellungen diesen Charakter der Schaubude. Alles Commerzielle wurde ausgeschlossen, das große Spektakelstück verbannt." Richard Muther, "Die Ausstellung der Secession," *Die Zeit*, November 18, 1899, 103.
[192] Richard Muther, "Wiener Kunstleben," *Die Zeit*, December 30, 1899, 202.

virtuoso piece that fulfilled its purpose when it's talked about; its creation is not owed to an inner necessity, but to the longing for success, to the desire to peak what's displayed right besides."[193] Modern Frenchmen such as Auguste Rodin and Claude Monet were to be seen at the Künstlerhaus long before they were in the Secession, but they were reliably overlooked in the former's polyglot assemblage of paintings. The Secession therefore considerably reduced the number of exhibited works, "for the ability of our eyes to absorb things is not larger than that of the stomach or of the ears," according to Muther. "We cannot stomach a dinner that contains loads of courses without a refined culinary program, and we find it tasteless when a concert contains a random hodgepodge of different tunes. Equally barbaric are exhibitions that, devoid of an established plan, line up artworks one after the other."[194] From this point onwards, the modern art exhibition had to weave its exhibits into a stringent narrative or at least a decorative ensemble, if it does not want to be associated with the seductive product displays of the department stores. While on the Vienna Maria-Hilferstraße, new temples of consumption such as Herzmansky proudly presented the glittering bounty of their world of wares, the Secessionists were programmatically driving out the moneychangers from the temple of art.[195] Although the Secession was also deeply involved in the international art trade, as will be shown in the next chapter, it succeeded far better than the Künstlerhaus in lending its exhibitions a non-commercial aura. Its spaces awakened the impression of being "by no means a short-lived display, filled for a

[193] "So entsteht ein Ding, das frühere Zeiten nicht kannten; das Sensationsbild, ein Virtuosenstück, das seinen Zweck erfüllt hat, wenn es von sich reden macht, das keinem inneren Drange sein Entstehen verdankt, sondern aus der Sucht nach Erfolg, dem Wunsche alles zu überschreien, was daneben hängt." Benno Becker, "Die Ausstellung der Secession in München," *Die Kunst für Alle* 22 (August 15, 1893): 343.

[194] "Wir können kein Diner vertragen, das massenhafte Gänge ohne feineres culinarisches Programm serviert, finden es geschmacklos, wenn in einem Concert bunt durcheinander verschiedene Weisen gespielt werden. Ebenso barbarisch sind Ausstellungen, die ohne festen Plan heterogene Kunstwerke aneinander reihen." Richard Muther, "Wiener Ausstellungen II," *Die Zeit*, March 24, 1900, 185.

[195] Muther talked about the "Expulsion of the Money Changers from the Temple of Art" (Die Vertreibung der Wechsler aus dem Tempel der Kunst) in Ibid., 187. On the emerging Viennese shopping malls see Susanne Breuss, *Window Shopping: Eine Fotogeschichte des Schaufensters* (Vienna: Wien Museum, 2010).

few weeks at a time, but rather as if one were spending time in the private gallery of a distinguished connoisseur."[196]

[196] "Die Räume der Secession erwecken den Eindruck, als handle es sich gar nicht um eine kurzlebige, für Wochen beschickte Schaustellung, sondern als weile man in der Privatgalerie eines vornehmen Liebhabers." Richard Muther, "Wiener Kunstleben," *Die Zeit*, December 30, 1899, 201.

2 The Vienna Secession as Market Place for French Modern Art, 1897-1903

2.1 Homeless Works: Gustav Klimt's *Philosophy*

Only a few weeks after having caused an unprecedented scandal in Vienna, Gustav Klimt's monumental painting *Philosophy* (fig. 35) was awarded the Grand Prix at the Paris Universal Exposition of 1900. Although conceived for a specific location, the ceiling of Vienna University's grand auditorium, one of Gustav Klimt's most controversial paintings achieved its greatest triumph on a gallery wall in Paris. *Philosophy* was the first of the three so-called *Faculty Paintings* presented to the public. The problem with this large government commission was that it had become impossible for Klimt to approach the fundamental questions of mankind in a positivist spirit. Instead, he depicted a cosmic vision of floating figures subjugated to a fate that was completely out of their control. The Vienna correspondent of *Die Kunst für Alle* provided an apt description.

> The painting shows how mankind, seen as a part of the universe, is nothing more than a dull, spineless mass, driven forward—in happiness and unhappiness—in the service of eternal propagation; dreaming from the first flickering of his existence to his powerless descent into the grave. In between, there lies only a brief ecstatic period of union and a painful drifting apart. Love has been a disappointment, both in terms of pleasure and knowledge. Destiny never changes. Isolated from cold, clear knowledge, isolated from the eternally-veiled questions of the universe, mankind struggles in his battle for happiness and knowledge and remains a mere pawn in the hands of nature, which uses him for its eternal, never-changing purpose of propagation.[1]

[1] "Das Bild zeigt, wie die Menschheit, als ein Teil des Weltalls betrachtet, nichts ist als eine dumpfe, willenlose Masse, die, im Dienste der ewigen Forterzeugung, im Glück und Unglück dahingetrieben wird, traumhaft, von der ersten Regung des Seins bis zum kraftlosen Niederfahren in die Gruft. Dazwischen liegen ein kurzer Rausch liebender Vereinigung und ein schmerzliches Auseinandergleiten. Die Liebe ist eine Enttäuschung gewesen, als Glück sowohl wie als Erkenntnis. Das Schicksal aber ist immer gleich. Abseits vom kalten, klaren Wissen, abseits auch vom ewig verschleierten Welträtsel, müht sich das Menschengeschlecht im Ringen nach Glück und nach Erkenntnis und bleibt stets nur ein Werkzeug in den Händen der Natur, die es zu ihrem ewig unveränderlichen

The pessimistic worldview of Klimt's *Philosophy* was at odds with the expectations of Vienna University's faculty, which had expected a more enlightened representation of its mission and therefore protested the installation of Klimt's paintings at its designated location. The subject of the ceiling's centerpiece, *The Triumph of Light over Darkness* (fig. 36), executed by Klimt's collaborator Franz Matsch, was much more suitable to the symbolic needs of a university. Despite a petition signed by a good number of professors, the Imperial Minister of Culture and Education did not allow himself to jump to conclusions. Wilhelm von Hartel insisted that it was way too early to judge, especially since the painting had only been presented on a white wall of the Secession. The installation on the ceiling of the auditorium would drastically alter the viewing conditions and the position of the beholder. Moreover, he hoped to get a second public opinion from Paris where the work would be seen "without prejudice and from a purely artistic standpoint."[2]

At the Universal Exposition the painting was the centerpiece of a carefully orchestrated presentation (fig. 37). The Austrian ministry had taken the recent split in the artistic societies into consideration when preparing the show and included several representatives of the newly founded Secession in the central committee. The consensual cultural policy of the multi-ethnic state was eager for the various artistic movements to be included in this important competition between the nations. The imperial building officer Ludwig Baumann's neo-baroque Pavillon Impérial (fig. 38), modeled on buildings by Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach and Johann

---

Zweck, der Fortzeugung verwendet." Franz Servaes, "Personal- und Atelier-Nachrichten," *Die Kunst für Alle* 15, no. 21 (August 1, 1900): 500.

[2] "Auf alle Fälle ist ja eine Beurteilung im gegenwärtigen Augenblicke verfrüht, weil das Gemälde doch unter ganz anderen Bedingungen in der Universität placiert sein soll, als es jetzt in der Ausstellung hängt. Übrigens wird das Werk Gelegenheit finden, seine künstlerische Berechtigung zu erweisen, da man es in Paris auf der Weltausstellung vom rein künstlerischen Standpunkte aus in vorurteilsloser Weise beurteilen wird." Ludwig Hevesi, *Acht Jahre Secession (März 1897 bis Juni 1905): Kritik—Polemik—Chronik* (Vienna: Konegen, 1906), 244.

Lukas von Hildebrandt's grand staircase in the Upper Belvedere, was dominated by the applied arts and luxury industry. However, the major portion of the Austrian art section was located in a wing on the Seine side of the newly erected Grand Palais. One gallery was devoted to fifty-seven works from the Viennese Cooperation of Fine Arts and the other displayed forty-two works by the Secessionists. The director of the School of Applied Arts was present in Paris and, on May 18, was able to write to his wife: "I am in high spirits, because Austria achieved a very fine, undivided success here. It has been said, that we display better taste than all the others. […] Sarah Bernhardt was absolutely enchanted by everything."[3] Although the decoration of the halls was greeted with general acknowledgement, some French critics complained that it "was impossible to obtain a precise and complete overview of the contemporary Austrian schools." Léonce Bénédite wrote in the *Gazette des beaux-arts* about a "mélange without conviction" and judged that Gustav Klimt was "simpler and more himself in his pink portrait of a lady [*Sonja Knips*, fig. 39] than in his ceiling painting [*Philosophy*] where he comes too close to our [Albert] Besnard."[4]

Klimt—who took advantage of a great variety of sources throughout his career and then translated them into his own personal style—was indeed stimulated by Besnard. It is likely that Bénédite was reminded of Besnard's *Truth Teaching the Sciences and Consequently Shades Light on Mankind* (fig. 40) on the ceiling of the Paris Town Hall when he saw Klimt's depiction

[3] Quoted in Jeroen Bastiaan van Heerde, *Staat und Kunst: Staatliche Kunstförderung 1895-1918* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1993), 160.

[4] "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. Léonce Bénédite, "Les arts à l'exposition universelle de 1900: L'exposition décennale. La peinture étrangère (troisième et dernier article)," *Gazette des beaux-arts* 3rd period, vol. 24 (December 1900): 591.

of cosmic happenings.[5] The concentration of towering, highly expressive nude figures in the faculty paintings have their roots in Auguste Rodin's *The Gates of Hell* and some formulas for expressing emotions can also be traced back to the French master.[6] In her excellent essay on the ceiling paintings for the University auditorium, Alice Strobl identified some concrete formal solutions in *Philosophy* that were clearly inspired by Rodin such as "the old man at the very bottom, holding his head in his two hands and another that reminds one of the 'Burghers of Calais' created in 1885-1888 [fig. 41], or the kneeling old woman whose figure and depiction of the horrors of old age are not unrelated to Rodin's sculpture 'Cell qui fut la Belle Heaulmière'."[7]

It is an open question how Klimt—who did not like to travel—could have become aware of this specific work by Besnard, which was firmly attached to its location in the Paris Hôtel de ville. Rodin, on the other hand, was a popular guest in Vienna who regularly provided works for exhibitions organized by both the Künstlerhaus and the Secession.[8] Along with Pierre-Puvis de Chavannes and Albert Besnard, August Rodin was particularly well received in Vienna even before the split.[9] In June 1902, Klimt and Rodin actually met in person when the French artist decided to visit the Secession on his way home from an exhibition in Prague. The francophile art

[5] Alice Strobl, "Klimt's Studies for the Faculty Paintings Philosophy, Medicine and Jurisprudence," in *Gustav Klimt: The Beethoven Frieze and the Controversy over the Freedom of Art*, Stephan Koja, ed. (Munich: Prestel, 2006), 27-47.
[6] Stephan Koja and Sylvia Mraz, "'Do You Need a Head to Walk?': Rodin's Impact on Austrian Art," in *Rodin and Vienna*, Agnes Husslein-Arco and Stephan Koja, eds. (Munich: Hirmer, 2010), 143-61.
[7] "Aber auch Einzelfiguren bei Klimt deuten auf die Kenntnis des Werkes von Rodin, wie der zu unterst stehende Greis, der mit beiden Händen seinen Kopf hält und an einen der 1885-1888 entstandenen 'Bürger von Calais' erinnert oder die kniende alte Frau, die in der Figurenauffasung und in der Darstellung der Grauen des Alters der Plastik Rodins 'Cell qui fut la Belle Heaulmière' nicht unverwandt ist." Alice Strobl, "Zu den Fakultätsbildern von Gustav Klimt," *Albertina Studien* 2, no. 4 (1964), 150.
[8] Dietrun Otten, "'Rodin Looks and Says Nothing': Rodin in Vienna," Husslein and Koja, *Rodin and Vienna*, 11-29; Renée Price, "The Kiss: Gustav Klimt and Auguste Rodin," in *Gustav Klimt: The Ronald S. Lauder and Serge Sabarsky Collections*, Renée Price, ed. (New York: Prestel 2007), 233-51.
[9] Years later a Viennese society lady, Margarethe Stonborough-Wittgenstein, made inquiries through the Secession about the possibility of commissioning a portrait from Besnard. Albert Besnard to Franz Hancke, November 2, 1912, Vienna Secession Archive.

critic Berta Zuckerkandl (fig. 42), a friend of Rodin, Carrière, and other Paris artists, acted as the intermediary and interpreter on this occasion.[10] For Austrian artists the Universal Exposition was obviously the best opportunity for becoming acquainted with some of the latest international developments but also to meet important artists, dealers, and collectors. In his own words, Carl Moll did not have any "notion about French art, from its beginnings to the present—Impressionism" until he visited the Centennial Exposition in 1900.[11] Confronted with this retrospective, which was supposed to demonstrate the hegemony of French art throughout the nineteenth century, he must have had similar feelings to those expressed by Julius Meier-Graefe: "When strolling through the ceremonious halls, one feels transported to the famous Salon des Refusés in the 1860s where Manet, Monet, Degas, Sisley, Cézanne, Renoir, Pissarro, etc. hung; the infamous Impressionists who, today, dominate the market."[12] The current president of the Viennese Secession, Carl Moll, and the influential art journalist and owner of the Parisian art gallery La Maison Moderne, Julius Meier-Graefe, met at the 1900 World Exposition for the first time. It marked the beginning of a friendship that was to last until the 1930s. Meier-Graefe taught Moll how to "process the immediate sensations created by the masterworks of French Impressionism."[13] As a painter, Moll apparently had studied this technique before, as can be assumed from his painting *Before the Dinner* (fig. 43) which was awarded a medal. Meier-Graefe considered it "a really virtuoso picture, a set table with artificial lighting, with the lady of

[10] "You have to do your bit; your connections to France make you a pioneer in waking Vienna up. We know that Carrière and Rodin are friends of yours. You can be a valuable trailblazer for our cause." ("Sie müssen mittun. Sie sind durch ihre Beziehungen mit Frankreich Vorkämpferin, die Wien aus dem Schlaf rütteln soll. Wir wissen, dass Sie mit Carrière und Rodin befreundet sind. Sie können unserer Sache wertvolle Pionierarbeit leisten.") Christian M. Nebehay, *Gustav Klimt: Dokumentation* (Vienna: Galerie Nebehay, 1969), 135.
[11] Carl Moll, "Mein Leben" (unpublished typescript, 1943), 136, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.
[12] "Man glaubt sich in den berühmten Salon der Refusés der sechziger Jahre versetzt, wenn man die feierlichen Säle durchwandelt, wo die Manet, Monet, Degas, Sisley, Cezanne, Renoir, Pissarro u. s. w. hängen, die berüchtigten Impressionisten, die heute den Markt beherrschen…" Julius Meier-Graefe, "Die Kunst auf der Weltausstellung," in *Die Weltausstellung in Paris 1900*, Julius Meier-Graefe, ed. (Leipzig: Krüger, 1900), 83.
[13] Moll, "Mein Leben," 126.

the house laying out the place cards just before the guests arrive. This picture could have been just as easily painted by a Parisian, by one of the best, one would tip on Besnard."[14]

On April 3, 1905, Gustav Klimt sent a letter to the Imperial Ministry of Culture and Education asking to be released from his contract to create the *Faculty Paintings*. This was the result of year-long polemics. He repaid the advance, which he had received from the State, in order to regain control over the controversial paintings. In an interview with the Zuckerkandl, Klimt made the following statement in connection with official art policies.

> I would never—particularly under this Ministry—take part in an official exhibition, unless absolutely forced to do so by my friends. Forget the censorship. I am going to take matters into my own hands. I want to liberate myself. I want to break away from all these unpleasant, ridiculous aspects which restrict my work, and return to freedom. I refuse all official support, I will do without everything.[15]

Klimt's polemic was directed principally against the so-called generosity of government sponsorship which he believed takes "the dictatorship of exhibitions and discussions with the artists" upon itself whereas, it should have a position only as "mediator and as a commercial factor."[16] From his point of view, official organizations would support only the "weak" and "false." This demonstrative farewell to the public in the name of freedom and genuine art

[14] "Moll, der Präsident der Secession, hat ein hübsches Interieur, in dem ein Fischer seine Netze flickt, und ein wahrhaft virtuoses Bild, eine gedeckte Tafel bei künstlicher Beleuchtung, auf der die Dame des Hauses, kurz bevor die Gäste kommen, gerade die Platzkarten verteilt. Dies Bild könnte ebenso gut von einem Pariser gemacht sein, und zwar einem der besten; man würde etwa auf Besnard raten." Meier-Graefe, "Die Kunst auf der Weltausstellung," 92.

[15] "Ich werde auch niemals, unter diesem Ministerium gewiss nicht, bei einer offiziellen Ausstellung mittun, es sei denn, meine Freunde zwängen mich dazu. Genug der Zensur. Ich greife zur Selbsthilfe. Ich will loskommen. Ich will aus all diesen unerquicklichen, meine Arbeit aufhaltenden Lächerlichkeiten zur Freiheit zurück. Ich lehne jede staatliche Hilfe ab, ich verzichte auf alles." Berta Zuckerkandl, "Die Klimt-Affäre," in id., *Zeitkunst: Wien 1901-1907* (Vienna: Heller, 1908), 164-65.

[16] "Es soll der Staat nicht sich die Diktatur des Ausstellungswesens und der Künstleraussprachen arrogieren dort, wo es sein Pflicht wäre, nur als Vermittler und als kommerzieller Faktor aufzutreten un den Künstlern vollkommen die künstlerische Initiative zu überlassen." Ibid., 166.

marked Klimt's definitive transfer from government sponsorship to private patronage and a market system. His development shows, in a paradigmatic way, the various stages of the transformation taking place in the Viennese art world. In his early years, Klimt was celebrated as heir to celebrated painter star Hans Makart and received the highest recognition from official circles including the emperor; he then passed through the "juste-milieu" system of the Viennese Secession to finally come into contact with the modern dealer-critic system.[17] The Secessions of central Europe functioned principally as transitional institutions between periods of government sponsorship and private patronage of the arts. There can be no question that these changes in the Viennese artistic world—in which Klimt himself played such a fundamental role—were of major importance to both his creativity and to the development of his artistic personality. His latent wish to remove himself from the crowds to the seclusion of his realms of creativity (the atelier or nature) could not be reconciled with a system in which the professional artist was somehow forced to develop his image in relation to public opinion. Comparable to Sar Joséphin Péladan he tried to fashion himself as a prophet (figs. 44, 45). The destiny of his *Faculty Paintings*—which hold, both formally and in terms of content, a key position in Klimt's oeuvre, reflects his transformation from a potential painter prince to an exhibition artist.[18] The state originally commissioned these works as ceiling paintings for a specific location. However, through their numerous presentations, they mutated into exhibition pictures. After being rejected for permanent installation in the Moderne Galerie, the newly-founded state museum of modern art in Vienna, they eventually made their way into private collections.[19] One could even go so

[17] After the exodus of the "Klimt-group" from the Secession (see chapter 3), Klimt presented his works predominantly at the Galerie Miethke.
[18] The exhibition artist has to accept the lofty, but unsecured legacy of the court artist. Oskar Bätschmann, *Ausstellungskünstler: Kult und Karriere im modernen Kunstsystem* (Cologne: DuMont, 1997); Martin Warnke, Hofkünstler: Zur Vorgeschichte des modernen Künstlers (Cologne: DuMont, 1985).
[19] The major industrialist August Lederer, a friend and patron of Klimt's, provided him with the necessary funds (30,000 kronen) to repurchase the painting and, for this, received *Philosophy*. The paintings *Medicine* and

far as to claim that Klimt had taken the changes that had occurred in the viewing conditions of his works so much into consideration that the last-tackled painting—*Jurisprudence*—due to its flatness makes a much greater impression on a gallery wall than on a ceiling.[20]

2.2 "The Expulsion of the Money Changers from the Temple of Art"

The rhetoric arsenal of modern artists' associations usually claims that they were forged out of idealism. However, sometimes the martial myths concerning their foundation fail to give us an accurate idea of the heroism of their activities. In his poster for the First Exhibition of the Viennese Secession (fig. 46) Klimt depicts the god-fearing King's son Theseus, who is about to liberate the youth of Athens from the tyranny of the Minotaur, with one fell swing of his sword. Pallas Athena, with the apotropaic shield of Medusa, the virginal protector of the polis and art, surveys, in strict profile, "Act I in the Secessionist drama."[21] With this unmistakable allegory of victory over the enemies of the Secession and the "indifference"[22] of the prevailing taste, Klimt utilized the avant-garde attitude of a fight for liberation for the Secession's benefit. The fact that the censors intervened—on moral grounds—against the nakedness of Theseus was absolutely beneficial to the propagation of this heroic image.

Jurisprudence were purchased by his painter colleague Kolo Moser between 1910 und 1912. After changes in ownership, all three came into the possession of the Belvedere. In 1945 they were destroyed by fire at Schloß Immendorf (Lower Austria), where they had been taken for safe-keeping. Still one of the best accounts on the history of the faculty paintings is: Alice Strobl, "Zu den Fakultätsbildern von Gustav Klimt," *Albertina Studien* 2, no. 4 (1964), 138–69.

[20] In her reflections on "discursive spaces" Krauss proposed the theory that modernist works internalize their display medium and, therefore, tend to be flat. Rosalind E. Krauss, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985), 133.

[21] Carl E. Schorske, *Fin-de-siècle Vienna Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1981), 215.

[22] Moll interpreted the poster in the following way: "Theseus, the symbol of youth, has conquered indifference!" ("Theseus, die Jugendschaft, hat den Indifferentismus besiegt!") Carl Moll, "Osterstimmung im Wiener Kunstleben," *Osterbeilage der Wiener Allgemeinen Zeitung* (1898), quoted after: Marian Bisanz-Prakken, Heiliger Frühling, Gustav Klimt und die Anfänge der Wiener Secession 1895 - 1905 (Vienna: Brandstätter, 1999), 211.

If one takes more distanced look at these events, by trying to ignore the strategically applied pathos, one can hardly be convinced by the vociferously proclaimed explosive force at the time of the foundation of the association. There was no radically new style or a revolutionary work of art that had been deprived of its public success by a government authority. The exodus of a group of nineteen artists around Klimt, from the only official artists' society in Vienna, the Künstlerhaus, was much more the result of internal disputes which reached their peak in disagreements concerning the election of the board and hanging committee. A monopolistic institution like the Viennese Künstlerhaus—similar to the Paris Salon—was structurally no longer in the position of being able to adequately represent the increasing number, and interests, of its members. The hegemonious power of the representatives was increasingly perceived as influence from outside. A deregulation and liberalization of exhibition activities, connected with a loss of power for the Künstlerhaus Society, could only be justified with aesthetic arguments and mythical self-stylization. The programmatic idea of the Secession aimed at the moralistic polarization of the young and old, modernity and tradition, internationalism and provincialism, and particular of those two aspects which were at the heart of the matter—art and commerce.

The writer Hermann Bahr who claimed that he "had driven the young painters out of the society,"[23] stated in the Secession's main publication *Ver Sacrum*: "The purpose of the Secessions in Munich and Paris was to place a 'new' art alongside the 'old'. The whole affair

[23] Hansjörg Krug, "Gustav Klimt: 'Nuda Veritas' / 1899," in *Nuda Veritas Rediviva: Ein Bild Gustav Klimts und seine Geschichte*, Oskar Pausch, ed. (Vienna, Mimundus 8, 1997), 10. Bahr, as an influential member of the literary movement "Jung-Wien" had already anticipated, in 1896, a possible solution for the divergences which had become public: "There is no other alternative, some patrons of the arts will have to rent a couple of bright halls, somewhere in the city, and show the Viennese, in small intimate exhibitions, every six weeks or so, what is happening artistically in Europe." (Es wird nicht anders gehen, als dass sich endlich einige Kunstfreunde vereinigen, irgendwo in der Stadt ein paar helle Säle mieten und dort in kleinen, intimen Ausstellungen, von sechs zu sechs Wochen, die Wiener sehen lassen, was in Europa künstlerisch vorgeht.) See: Hermann Bahr, "Künstlerhaus 1896," in *Secession* (Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1900), 2.

was an argument about a better form in art […] artist against artist; it was an argument between schools, doctrines, temperaments."[24] In Vienna, however, it was still necessary to fight for the right for artistic activity. The Künstlerhaus had become a market hall, a bazaar, where dealers flaunted all kinds of wares. Bahr made what was at stake absolutely clear:

> Business or art, that is the question of our Secession. Shall the Viennese painters be damned to remain petty businessmen, or should they attempt to become artists. Those who are of the opinion that paintings are goods, like trousers or stockings, to be manufactured according to the client's wishes, should remain in the 'co-operative.' Those who want to reveal—in painting or drawing—the secrets of their soul are already in the 'society.'[25]

The most efficient instrument for undermining the credibility of the exhibition monopol sanctioned by the state, and, as a countermove, to legitimize and finance elite, private projects was represented by the dichotomy of art and money. At least, this could be learned from the collapse of the Paris Salon which, for decades, had been discredited using similar accusations. The international art presentations, which had become more and more gigantesque, and whose dissonant, spectacular character had increasingly taken on the character of a Universal Exposition, principally satisfied the nation's desire to represent itself, and hardly the interests of the individual artists since the interrelation "between a broad, diffused audience and a broad and

[24] "In München und Paris ist es der Sinn der Secessionen gewesen, neben die ‚alte' eine ‚neue' Kunst zu stellen. Das Ganze war also ein Streit in der Kunst um die bessere Form. [...] Künstler standen gegen Künstler; es war ein Streit der Schulen, der Doctrinen, der Temperamente." Hermann Bahr, "Ver Sacrum," in ibid., 12-13.
[25] "Geschäft oder Kunst, das ist die Frage unserer Secession. Sollen die Wiener Maler verurtheilt sein, kleine Industrielle zu bleiben, oder dürfen sie es versuchen, Künstler zu werden? Wer der alten Wiener Meinung ist, dass Bilder Waren sind, wie Hosen oder Strümpfe, die man nach der Bestellung der Käufer anzufertigen hat, der bleibe in der ‚Genossenschaft'. Wer malend oder zeichnend das Geheimnis seiner Seele offenbaren will, der ist schon bei der ‚Vereinigung'." Ibid., 13. In the statutes, signed by Gustav Klimt, it was demanded "that the exhibitions be placed on a purely artistic basis, free from market character," which appeared to be incompatible with the practices of the Künstlerhaus. Nebehay, *Gustav Klimt*, 135.

diffused offer"[26] had become unsettled. If marketing aimed at the optimization of bilateral satisfaction, it was exactly here that a start would have to be made. In Paris, the paradoxical situation developed that commercial galleries and private artists' societies were much more capable of creating an aura of being distanced from the market than the governmental mega-event of the Salon. The secret of success lay in the creation of exclusivity that meant a reduction of the number of works exhibited and a reform in the viewing conditions. Martha Ward writes in her brilliant essay on *Impressionist Installations and Private Exhibitions*:

> As art was shown and viewed in diverse places—the Salon, the gallery, the club, the bookstore, the studio, the apartment, the home—the distinction between public and private served to create finely gradated nuances of refinement, and the ideal private exhibition came to be represented as a haven for aesthetic appreciation that was removed from the crass commerce of the art market, the divisive polemics of criticism, and the sensationalized tastes of the "public."[27]

As will be shown, the Viennese Secession had close connections to the international art market and took advantage of these new marketing strategies. Attempts were repeatedly made to link the reproaches (which Klimt also made) concerning the activities of the Künstlerhaus with the lack of stylistic quality due to a historicism frozen in routine. Actually, the scope of the exhibits was so wide-ranging that one could find progressive and conservative works directly alongside each other.[28] Its Achilles' tendon—ignoring "schools, doctrines, and temperaments"—lay in the hardly controllable flood of submitted works which the commissioners hung, after selection by

[26] Wolfgang Kemp, *Der Betrachter ist im Bild: Kunstwissenschaft und Rezeptionsästhetik* (Cologne: DuMont, 1985), 113.
[27] Martha Ward, "Impressionist Installations and Private Exhibitions," *Art Bulletin* 73, no. 4 (December 1991): 599.
[28] In the Jubilee Exhibition in the Künstlerhaus in 1898 the exhibits included works by Monet, Rodin, Besnard, Puvis de Chavannes, Klinger und Liebermann, who were regarded by the Secession as "officers" of modern art.

the jury, like mosaics on the exhibition walls. Thousands of paintings were displayed, hung in several rows, frame to frame, to make the greatest possible use of the space available for display, with gaps left only when the purchaser claimed his purchase immediately—which appears to have been standard practice. At an early stage, Anselm Feuerbach criticized the loud polyphony of the standard forms of presentation and arrangement which the Secession was determined to rectify: "All human seeing, hearing, thinking, feeling has its limits. Anybody will close his ears when he hears ten hurdy-gurdies playing at the same time. […] Our exhibitions are pathological institutions of anxiety, in which quantity is supposed to make up for the lack of quality. On the occasion of these large art markets, I am overcome by the feeling of despondency […]"[29]

In such polyglot assemblies a work of art was regarded as an isolated entity, a "nicely packaged area,"[30] whose greatest happiness and major goal would be the one-painting exhibition. The Künstlerhaus repeatedly organized such exhibitions with great success. In 1878, twenty-three thousand visitors saw Makart's painting of the *Entry of Carl V. into Antwerp*, and, in 1882, fifty-thousand made the pilgrimage to admire Munkácsy's *Christ before Pilate*. These colossal, sensationalist paintings were usually commissioned by art dealers and then displayed—against payment—on year-long tours through the most important European and American cities. These celebrated "masters of the traveling painting," whose activities only became possible through the new transportation networks of the railways, created the idea of the work of art, without a predetermined location, whose mercantile character became increasingly apparent. These illusionary spectacles were presented in darkened rooms, where they could count on the

[29] Henriette Feuerbach, ed. *Ein Vermächtnis von Anselm Feuerbach* (Munich: Wolff, 1920), 249-50.
[30] Brian O'Doherty, *In der weißen Zelle = Inside the White Cube* (Berlin: Merve 1996, first published as three essays in *Artforum* 1976), 13.

curiosity of a mass audience. This followed in the tradition of panoramas and dioramas, and was a foretaste of the cinema. Walter Benjamin pointed out that "the simultaneous contemplation of paintings by a large group of persons, as was the case in the nineteenth century, is an early symptom for a crisis in painting which was not triggered off by photography alone but, relatively independently of this, through the demands the work placed on the masses."[31] In his painting *Nuda Veritas* (1899, fig. 47)—the painted manifesto of the Secession—Klimt replaced "the work's claims on the masses" with the demands of the work on truth, for a small circle of the chosen. An epigram by Schiller, in the upper section of the painting, proclaims: "If you cannot please all through your activities and work—please a few. It is always bad to please many." Below this, a naked figure of a maiden—completely frontal—with voluptuous red-blond hair and a piercing glance, holds a dazzling mirror demonstratively in front of the viewer. A snake winds itself around the feet of this personification of truth—brought so close to the observer—as an allusion to the mortal sin of envy. In *Ver Sacrum* (March 1898) Klimt had originally confronted the emblematic portrayal of Envy with the *Nuda Verita*s and, only in the final painting, were these two aspects merged. In the first, drawn version the work was entitled "Truth is fire and to tell the truth means to glow and burn / L. Scheffer." Klimt wanted art to be seen as an instrument of knowledge, which permitted insights outside the scope of the normal sensation of reality and which, therefore, was disconcerting for many. Bisanz-Prakken has brought the mirror of the *Nuda Veritas*—reflecting light in concentric circles—into connection

[31] "Die simultane Betrachtung von Gemälden durch ein großes Publikum, wie sie im neunzehnten Jahrhundert aufkommt, ein frühes Symptom der Krise der Malerei ist, die keineswegs durch die Photographie allein, sondern relativ unabhängig von dieser durch den Anspruch des Kunstwerks auf die Masse ausgelöst wurde." Walter Benjamin, "Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit (3. Fassung)," in id., *Gesammelte Schriften*, vol. I.2, Rolf Tiedemann, and Hermann Schweppenhäuser, eds. (Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991), 497.

with Arthur Schopenhauer's simile of a concave mirror.[32] In this text from the volume *Parerga und Paralipomena*, which was very popular at the time, Schopenhauer compares the genuine work of art with a concave mirror, "in as far as that which it conveys is not its own, tangible self, its empirical content, but something which lies outside, which cannot be grasped with the hand, the true, difficult to grasp spirit of the matter."[33]

In addition to the orientation of the work of art towards its essential spirit, hidden behind its sensuous appearance, the communicative-theoretical aspect of the simile is also relevant. According to Schopenhauer, genius itself can also be compared with a concave mirror because this concentrates light and warmth to an astonishing degree but "this only is effective in one direction and requires the observer to have a particular point-of-view." Opposed to this, a convex mirror reflects light in all directions. This metaphorical description indicates that the previously diffused effect of a work of art on the general, entertainment-seeking, public is bundled and intensified by the genius and directed at a circle of connoisseurs. This persistent courting of the observer with a "particular point-of-view" can be seen as a specific aspect of the Viennese Secession. The concept of an "ideal partnership between the creators and enjoyers,"[34] established by the society, and propagated by Klimt, which rewarded the artist's client with a

[32] Marian Bisanz-Prakken, "Programmatik und subjektive Aussage im Werk von Gustav Klimt," in *Wien 1870–1930: Traum und Wirklichkeit*, Robert Waissenberger, ed. (Vienna: Eigenverlag der Museen der Stadt Wien, 1984), 114-15.

[33] "Zweitens läßt auch jedes ächte Kunstwert sich dem Hohlspiegel vergleichen, „sofern was es eigentlich mittheilt nicht sein eigenes, tastbares Selbst, sein empirischer Inhalt ist, sondern außer ihm liegt, nicht mit Händen zu greifen, vielmehr nur von der Phantasie verfolgt wird, als der eigentliche, schwer zu haschende Geist der Sache." Arthur Schopenhauer, *Sämtliche Werke,* vol. 5, *Parerga und Paralipomena,* Paul Deussen, ed. (Munich: Piper, 1913), Chap. XXXI, § 379, 711.

[34] "Für uns heißt 'Künstlerschaft' die ideale Gemeinschaft aller Schaffenden und Genießenden." Gustav Klimt, "Eröffnungsrede der 'Kunstschau 1908,'" in Breicha, *Gustav Klimt*, 139.

participation in the creative interpretation of his work, elevated both parties above the passive, consuming mass and granted them increased distinction.

One of the peculiarities of the Viennese Secession is that the avant-garde rebellion of its protagonists remained within certain boundaries and that their work found acceptance not only among the patrons in the upper classes. The Viennese City Council provided land for the construction of the building and the State also repeatedly provided subsidies. Even Emperor Franz Joseph I was welcomed to the first exhibition, which raised the Secession to the status of a society on a par with the Künstlerhaus. Franco Borsi and Ezio Godoli had this subliminal contradiction between this aggressive rhetoric and official recognition in mind when they spoke about the "phenomenon of an instantly institutionalized avant-garde."[35] That only passionate critics, such as Karl Kraus, recognized the Secession as a new player on the art market may come as a surprise considering the society's commercial success.[36] At the very first exhibition more than half of the works exhibited were sold for a total of 85,000 Gulden which gave a profit of 3,858 Gulden. One year later, Bahr purchased the *Nuda Veritas* from his friend Klimt for the special price of 4,000 kronen (2,000 gulden), at a time where the costs for the construction of his house by Joseph Maria Olbrich amounted to close to 12,000 kronen.[37] This represents the price

[35] Franco Borsi, Ezio Godoli, *Wiener Bauten der Jahrhundertwende. Die Architektur der habsburgischen Metropole zwischen Historismus und Moderne* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1985), 73.
[36] Karl Kraus' criticism of the Secession is coupled with anti-Semitism: "Just as every aristocrat used to have his domestic Jew, every stock broker has his domestic-Secessionist. Herr Moll is, as is well known, the art dealer for jobber-broker Zierer and the coal profiteer Berl, and Herr Klimt is permitted to instruct Frau Lederer in secessionist painting. […] Who can be surprised that, with the increasing intimate relationship between the Secession and the stock-exchange, the mercantile spirit of this flock of artists is becoming increasingly active?" ("Wie einst jeder Aristokrat seinen Hausjuden hatte, so besitzt jetzt jeder Börseaner seinen Haus-Secessionisten. Herr Moll ist bekanntlich Kunstagent bei dem Börsenjobber Zierer und dem Kohlenwucherer Berl, und Herr Klimt darf Frau Lederer in der secessionistischen Malerei unterweisen. […] Wen wird es Wunder nehmen, dass mit der wachsenden Innigkeit der Beziehungen von Secession und Börse der Geschäftsgeist in dieser Künstlerschar sich immer kräftiger regt?") Karl Kraus, ("Die diesmalige Ausstellung der Secession,") *Die Fackel* 59 (mid November 1900): 19.
[37] Krug "Gustav Klimt: 'Nuda Veritas' / 1899," 12.

that Klimt could demand, only a few years later, for a single portrait.[38] It can be seen that credibility was obtained using very subtle marketing strategies, which concealed the conditio sine qua non—the commercial character of the exhibition object.[39] This impression of indifference—overlooking the pedagogical façade of the Secession—was mainly achieved through "free self-consecration" in a Schlegelian sense.[40] "Because it not only saw its personal interests, but the holy matter of art itself in acute danger, and in solemn enthusiasm for this, was prepared to take this burden upon itself and wanted nothing more than to achieve this, its own goal, using its own means; this was the reason for establishing itself under the motto VER SACRUM."[41]

2.3 "Through the Foreign to the Native"

According to Bahr, Austria was "excluded from European artistic activities in the bad period from 1880-1890."[42] Following this viewpoint, an Austrian inferiority complex, and the resulting

[38] In 1908, Klimt sold the portrait of Emilie Flöge to the Niederösterreichische Landesmuseum for the sum of 12,000 kronen with the remark: "The price is that which I receive today for a portrait commission." Wolfgang Krug, "Die Kunstsammlung des Niederösterreichischen Landesmuseums," in *Waldmüller—Schiele—Rainer: Meisterwerke des Niederösterreichischen Landesmuseums vom Biedermeier bis zur Gegenwart* (Vienna: Brandstätter, 2000), 7: Tobias G. Natter, "Fürstinnen ohne Geschichte? Gustav Klimt und 'die Gemeinschaft aller Schaffenden und Genießenden,'" in *Klimt und die Frauen*, Tobias G. Natter, Gerbert Frodl, eds. (Cologne: DuMont, 2000), 63.

[39] For information on the negation of economy in the artistic field see: Pierre Bourdieu, "La production de la croyance," *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* (February 13, 1977): 4–43.

[40] "Even in his external habits, the way-of-life of the artist should be different to that of other people. They are Brahmins, a higher caste, made noble, not by birth but through their free spiritual development." ("Selbst in den äußerlichen Gebräuchen sollte sich die Lebensart der Künstler von der Lebensart der übrigen Menschen durchaus unterscheiden. Sie sind Brahminen, eine höhere Kaste, aber nicht durch Geburt sondern durch freie Selbsteinweihung geadelt.") Friedrich Schlegel, "Fragmente III: Ideen," in *Werke in einem Band: Die Bibliothek der deutschen Klassiker* vol 23, Wolfdietrich Rasch, ed. (Vienna: Hanser 1971), 107.

[41] "Weil sie vielmehr nicht ihre persönlichen Interessen, sondern die heilige Sache der Kunst selbst für gefährdet erachtet hat und in weihevoller Begeisterung für diese jedes Opfer auf sich zu nehmen bereit war und bereit ist, und nichts will, als aus eigener Kraft ihre eigenen Ziele erreichen, darum hat sie sich unter das Zeichen des VER SACRUM gestellt." Max Burckhard, "Ver Sacrum," *Ver Sacrum* 1, no. 1 (January 1898): 3.

[42] "Vergessen Sie nun aber nicht, dass diese Mediocren bei uns auch noch allen Grund haben, jetzt ganz besonders gereizt zu sein: sie können nämlich ihre schöne Zeit nicht vergessen, die Zeit von 1880—1890, wo unser Land in Kunstsachen von Europa ausgeschaltet war." Hermann Bahr, *Rede über Klimt* (Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1901): 12.

fear that the local artistic scene could suffer from allowing international competition, blocked any serious consideration of the developing western European modernism. His fellow critic Ludwig Hevesi was of the same opinion when he stated, in retrospect, that "in the 'Felix period', as it is called today, a boycott against foreigners existed. Protective—or rather, prohibitive—taxes is putting the matter too lightly; absolutely nobody was allowed to enter in order not to ruin the market for local artists."[43] This protective isolation from the powerful nerve centers such as Paris, the artistic capital of the world, whose gallery networks not only determined the distribution of symbolic goods but also increasingly set aesthetic standards, had to lead to a marginalization of local creative activity when seen from abroad. According to Bahr, Austria was an "Asian province" and when Austrian art was mentioned in Paris, the response was "Over there? That's in Romania? Isn't it?"[44]

One major goal of the Vienna Secession was to be receptive to international artistic movements. This mission was summarized in *Ver Sacrum*:

> [The Secession] aims at achieving this by uniting Austrian artists living in this country and abroad, striving for the most vital contact possible with outstanding foreign artists, founding exhibition activities free of any market character in Austria, displaying Austrian art to its best advantage in foreign exhibitions, and by encouraging creativity at home and enlightening the Austrian public about universal artistic developments including the most important achievements in the field in foreign countries.[45]

[43] "Dazumal im Künstlerhause, in der 'Felixzeit', wie man jetzt sagt, herrschte gegen die Ausländer der Boykott. Schutzzoll, ja Prohibitivzoll ist zu wenig gesagt, es wurde überhaupt niemand hereingelassen, um den einheimischen Künstlern nicht den Markt zu verderben." Ludwig Hevesi, "Kunst und Budgetausschuss," in id., *Altkunst-Neukunst: Wien 1894-1908* (Vienna: Konegen, 1909), 291. The "Felix period" refers to the painter Eugen Felix (1836-1906) who presided over the Künstlerhaus for long periods in the 1870s and 1880s.
[44] "Wir waren eine asiatische Provinz, denn in Paris nach österreichischer Kunst gefragt, hieß es lediglich: 'Là- bas? C'est en Roumanie? N'est-ce pas?'" Bahr, *Secession*, 71.
[45] "Diese will sie dadurch erreichen, dass sie die im In- und Auslande lebenden österreichischen Künstler vereinigt, einen lebhaften Contact mit hervorragenden fremdländischen Künstlern anstrebt, ein vom Marktcharakter freies Ausstellungswesen in Österreich begründet, auf ausländischen Ausstellungen österreichische Kunst zu Geltung bringt und zur Anregung des heimischen Schaffens und zur Aufklärung des österreichischen Publicums über den

However, exhibitions completely divorced from any market character could hardly be international in their orientation. As with the Künstlerhaus, the Vienna Secession was dependent on a wide network of dealers. All major art dealers in Vienna—Artaria, Miethke, Pisko, and Artin—cooperated with the association. Eugen Artin's Art Salon was even considered a "branch of the Secession."[46] The Secession was also in constant contact with many influential international art dealers, including the most prominent Parisian galleries Durand-Ruel, Bernheim-Jeune, Kleinman, and La Maison Moderne. Not only did the participating art dealers want to profit from the exhibited works, the Secession also received a ten percent commission on the sales and announced the proceeds in each catalogue under the heading "Sale of Artworks." No matter how much the apologists tried (and they still do today) to create a dichotomy between the Künstlerhaus and the Secession, the most striking feature is the sense of continuity: the Secession built on the infrastructure and networks that the Künstlerhaus had established.

In fact, the first exhibition of the Secession was able to become a manifesto of internationalism only through established contacts in Paris and other art centers. Of the Austrians living in Paris, the landscape artist and full member Eugen Jettel played a major role in preparing this exhibition by acting as an art scout. Only artists from the Austro-Hungarian Empire could become full members of the association, but numerous corresponding members had also been attracted. Almost half of the "honorary members" hailed from the French capital, but it would be in vain to look for the names of the great Impressionist masters among them. Today, many of

---

Gang der allgemeinen Kunstentwickelung die bedeutendsten Kunstleistungen fremder Länder heranzieht." Anonymous, "Mittheilungen der Vereinigung Bildender Künstler Österreichs," *Ver Sacrum* 1, no. 1 (January 1898): 27.

[46] "Artin hat sein Local zu einer Filiale der Secession gemacht." Richard Muther, "Weihnachts-Ausstellungen 1899," in id., *Studien und Kritiken*, 5th edition (Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1900), 1:33-34.

the names of the artists who exhibited are unfamiliar to the broad public; they included Albert Bartholomé, Albert Besnard, François Rupert Carabin, Eugène Carrière, Alexandre Charpentier, Léon l'Hermitte, Pierre Lagarde, Henri Martin, Pierre Puvis de Chavannes (figs. 48 and 49), Jean François Raffaëlli, and Alfred Roll. Auguste Rodin was the most prominent Frenchman, exhibition fifteen works. According to the annual report of 1897: "The guiding principle behind this first exhibition was to give the Viennese public an overview of the creative life that had developed in foreign artistic centers over the past decade. That is the reason that—in spite of the Association's principle of organizing only small art exhibitions—more than 500 works were shown."[47]

This first exhibition was definitely not one of the typical, small-scale, elite shows whose rooms in Muther's words created the impression "it was in no way a short-term exhibition planned for a few weeks, but seemed as if one was spending some time in the private gallery of an art connoisseur."[48] Rather, it was much more a comprehensive exhibition of European artistic creativity. The prejudiced Bahr praised it as "a résumé of modern painting […] an exhibition without a single bad picture."[49] He took aim at former president Eugen Felix and the "mercantilists" of the Künstlerhaus Cooperative when he even boasted about the exhibition's financial profits, "because it shows that it is possible to deal in art—in pure art—in Vienna."[50]

[47] "Der leitende Gedanke dieser ersten Ausstellung war der, dem Wiener Publikum eine übersichtliche Kenntnis zu vermitteln von dem Kunstleben, das sich während des letzten Decenniums in den ausländischen Kunststätten abgespielt hatte. Deshalb zählte die Ausstellung auch, trotz des Principes der Vereinigung, nur kleine Kunstausstellungen zu veranstalten, über 500 Nummern." First Annual Report, Vienna Secession Archive.
[48] "Die Räume der Secession erwecken den Eindruck, als handle es sich gar nicht um eine kurzlebige, für Wochen beschickte Schaustellung, sondern als weile man in der Privatgalerie eines vornehmen Liebhabers." Richard Muther, "Wiener Kunstleben," *Die Zeit*, December 30, 1899, 201.
[49] "So eine Ausstellung haben wir noch nicht gesehen. Eine Ausstellung in der es kein schlechtes Bild gibt! Eine Ausstellung in Wien, die ein Resumé der modernen Malerei ist!" Hermann Bahr, "Die Secession," *Die Zeit*, April 2, 1898, 11.
[50] "Und dabei ein sehr guter Spaß: denn es zeigt sich, dass man mit der Kunst, mit der reinen Kunst in Wien ein Geschäft machen kann." Ibid.

The Second Exhibition took place in the Secession's own newly built premises on Karlsplatz in 1898; Ludwig Hevesi was not the only one who felt that the exhibition rooms represented the "ne plus ultra," and noted that only the latest material was on display. Regarding the French artists, he wrote:

> The first work the visitor sees on entering is the gigantic painting "Towards the Abyss" by Henri Martin where a motley crowd rolls towards an abyss following the *femme*. The artistic qualities of the painting are so groundbreaking that it even becomes possible to enjoy the programmatic theme of the work. Other first-rate French paintings include Roll's "Patient in an Invalid Chair" (each one of his paintings is different) and his green landscape, as well as A.[ntonio] de la Gandara's extremely elegant portrait of a lady. L'Hermitte's piquancy and the peculiar atmospheric landscapes by Pierre Lagarde and [Émile-René] Ménard are also noteworthy.[51]

The French were always noticeably present in the exhibitions organized by the Vienna Secession, though idealizing tendencies were still most prominent. Impressionism, in hindsight the most significant and important artistic achievement of foreign countries, made its first modest appearance only at the 1900 exhibition of graphic art, when works by Renoir and Pissarro were shown. At another exhibition in the same year, Paul Signac's "mosaic-like artistic curiosities" appeared for the first time; Hevesi immediately identified him as the "technical father" of Théo van Rysselberghe who was apparently better known in Vienna at the time.[52] Signac wrote a letter giving precise instructions on how his works were to be hung (fig. 50), but

[51] "Der erste Blick des Eintretenden fällt auf Henri Martins Riesenbild: *Vers l'abïme*, wo eine bunte Menschenmenge, dem Weibe nach, sich dem Abgrund zuwälzt. Die malerischen Eigenschaften des Bildes sind so bedeutend, daß sie selbst das Programmmäßige des malerischen Vorwurfes genießbar machen. Französische Bilder ersten Ranges sind noch Rolls *Patientin im Krankenstuhl* (er ist in jedem Bilde ein anderer) seine grüne Waldlandschaft und A. de la Gandaras überaus elegantes Damenporträt. Die Pikanterien L'Hermittes, die eigentümliche Stimmungslandschaften Pierre Lagardes und Ménards fallen auf." Ludwig Hevesi, "Weiteres vom Hause der Secession," in id., *Acht Jahre Secession*, 73.
[52] Ibid., 238.

ended with the words: "Nevertheless, most important, do it according to your own taste!"[53] The timid turn towards the French avant-garde was largely the work of Josef Engelhart—a member who had more or less ceased his artistic activities during the founding phase of the Secession—while serving as president. He travelled through Germany, France, England, and Belgium to prepare the first exhibition of the Vienna Secession, as well as to strengthen existing contacts and to create new ones. "When I came back from my trip, my head was still spinning. I had had to look at 20,000 pictures! But, I think I can be satisfied with the result. I was able to win almost all of the artists I visited for the Secession."[54]

Engelhart, who lived in the same house as Jettel during his stay in Paris in 1891-92 and made extremely negative comments on the former's dependence on Sedelmeyer, devoted his art to pictures of life in the modern city. He painted street views, cabaret scenes, and coffee house interiors, and developed a new approach to color. Inspired by his French colleagues, he discovered pastel chalk as a suitable medium for depicting fleeting impressions. His *Parisian Café* (fig. 51), showing a lack of communication between the couple that reminds one of similar works by Edgar Degas, is a characteristic example of his use of this technique. The practice he grew fond of in Paris—painting nudes in the open air—led to a scandal in 1893. The jury of the Viennese Künstlerhaus rejected the *Cherry Picker* (fig. 52) due to its "candid naturalism," thus giving the unsatisfied members another argument for a split.[55] Engelhart himself is actually the best example of the continuity between the Künstlerhaus and Secession. In his memoirs, he was

[53] "Aber vor allem machen Sie nach Ihrem Geschmack!" Paul Signac to Vienna Secession, February 13, 1900, Signac no. 9141, Vienna Secession Archive.
[54] "Als ich von meiner Reise zurückkam, dampfte mir der Kopf. Hatte ich doch 20.000 Bilder anschauen müssen! Aber mit dem Ergebnis konnte ich zufrieden sein. Fast alle Künstler, die ich aufgesucht hatte, waren für die Sezession gewonnen." Josef Engelhart, *Ein Wiener Maler erzählt: Mein Leben und meine Modelle* (Vienna: Andermann, 1943), 100.
[55] Marian Bisanz-Prakken, *Heiliger Frühling: Gustav Klimt und die Anfänge der Wiener Secession 1895-1905* (Vienna: Brandstätter, 1999): 60.

quite open about admitting that he was drawn to Paris by a Künstlerhaus exhibition with a strong representation by French artists:

> I saw works by foreign artists for the first time at the 1888 International Exhibition [at the Künstlerhaus]. With the exception of the then famous Germans […] the French made the greatest impression on me. The good taste that made itself felt in a different manner in all of their pictures was proof of their great formal assuredness. Instinctively, I felt that I had certain deficiencies in this area and, giving in to my years of longing, made a trip to Paris in 1889. When I came back, I was determined to [return and] spend some years there.[56]

In fact, modern French artists such as Rodin, Monet, and others could be seen in the Künstlerhaus long before the Secession, although they were frequently overlooked in the profusion of other works on display. Contrary to the propaganda against the Cooperative spread by the breakaway Secessionists, the Künstlerhaus had never entirely cut itself off from developments abroad. In particular, the International Art Exhibitions in 1882, 1888 and 1894 were characterized by the lively participation of French artists, to the extent that the press even referred to a gallery called the "French Hall." Indeed, Monet was awarded a small gold medal on the occasion of the Jubilee Exhibition in 1898 celebrating fifty years of the reign of Emperor Franz Joseph; the event is just another example of the artist cooperative's openness. Monet's two oil paintings *House at Argenteuil,* which was awarded a medal, and *Church at Varengeville* (fig. 53), which was given a full-page illustration in the catalogue, were sent to Vienna by Paul

[56] "Im Jahre 1888, auf der internationalen Ausstellung, sah ich zum ersten Male Werke ausländischer Künstler. Außer den damals berühmten Deutschen […] machten auf mich […] vor allem die Franzosen großen Eindruck. Der Geschmack, der sich in allen ihren Bildern auf verschiedene Weise äußerte, zeugte von großer formaler Sicherheit. Da ich in dieser Richtung bei mir selbst instinktiv einen gewissen Mangel verspürte, folgte ich meiner jahrelangen Sehnsucht und unternahm im Jahre 1889 einen Ausflug nach Paris: Ich kehrte mit dem festen Vorsatz zurück, einige Jahre dort zuzubringen." Engelhart, *Ein Wiener Maler erzählt*, 36.

Durand-Ruel.[57] In 1882, Rodin sent two major works *The Iron Age* (1877-1880) and *St. John the Baptist* (1878-80) to the Künstlerhaus for its First International Exhibition. The goals, as described in the catalogue, of stimulating local production through the artistic achievements of foreign countries seem to be almost identical with the Secession's intentions fifteen years later. Nonetheless, there is a firmly entrenched, but incorrect, belief that Rodin came to Vienna only through the Secession—most probably due to the frequently published installation photos (fig. 54).

2.4 Alexandre Rosenberg's Collection

As was the case with the Künstlerhaus, the Vienna Secession also had to rely on delegates in Paris to obtain works by French artists. On the one hand, they could hope to have works submitted by their corresponding members. On the other, it was necessary to have direct contact with important artists, collectors, and art dealers when planning ambitious exhibitions. Initially, one could count on the network of Austrians living in Paris who, as former members of the Künstlerhaus, often worked in the circles close to the Charles Sedelmeyer gallery. On April 24, 1898, Jettel informed his "dear friend Engelhart" about the opening of the Champs de Mars Exhibition, at which he was able to speak to many *membres honoraires* of the Secession and thank them for supplying works for the first exhibition.[58] He gave Engelhart a detailed report of

[57] Kolja Kramer, "Die Ausstellungspräsenz des französischen Impressionismus im Wiener Künstlerhaus und in der Wiener Secession, 1877-1903" (PhD. diss., University of Bern, 2003). Kramer transcribed for this dissertation relevant archival material from both Viennese artist associations. Four years later, Andreas Narzt published a large portion of the correspondence between Durand-Ruel, Cassirer, and Bernatzik in Andreas Narzt, "Der Briefwechsel Paul Durand-Ruels mit Wilhelm Bernatzik und Paul Cassirer," *Wien-Paris: Van Gogh, Cézanne und Österreichs Moderne*, Agnes Husslein, ed. (Vienna: Brandstätter 2007), 214-31. Since the family-owned Durand-Ruel archive in Paris is rather difficult to access, I had to rely on Narzt's publication although he does not provide a transcription of the French original.

[58] Eugen Jettel to Josef Engelhart, May 24, 1898, Engelhart no. 220.970, Manuscripts Collection, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Vienna.

new works in the show by artists such as Jean-Charles Cazin, Charpentier, Ville Valgren, Alfred Roll, Carabin, Anders Zorn, Lucien Simon, Charles Cottet, Besnard, Puvis de Chavannes, Pascal Dagnan-Bouveret, Martin, Carrière and Rodin—and their availability. Often, the desired works had already been sold—this had happened with Simon's *Breton Circus* that Jettel considered the most outstanding work shown at the exhibition. In addition, two significant paintings by Besnard, *Madame Rejane* and *Spanish Dancers*, were already reserved for upcoming exhibitions in Munich and Saint Petersburg.[59] However, he also noted that at this "exhibition, as usual, there were many good works, many interesting ones but very few that were really outstanding."[60] He gave a lengthy account of his meeting with Rodin:

> Rodin's *Balzac* is the most widely discussed work; taking both Salons together, there are newspaper articles for and against it almost every day. I am not actually an admirer of his recent work, which is even more difficult to understand than his *Victor Hugo* […] Rodin was very interested to find out how we liked his *Victor Hugo* because it has been subjected to so much hostility here and considered it important to learn how his work was judged abroad. I tried to get out of it by assuring him that his genius was admired in Vienna, but his other works were better liked and understood than the fragments of his Victor Hugo monument. This comes as no surprise seeing that we did not have the whole work.[61]

It seems unlikely that Jettel made any effort to get Impressionist paintings. Instead, another delegate, the French sculptor François-Rupert Carabin (fig. 55), played an important role in this area. As a corresponding member of the Secession, he had already been represented at the first

[59] *Mme. Rejane* by Albert Besnard was shown in the Ninth Exhibition of the Vienna Secession in 1901 (cat. no. 71).
[60] "Rodins Balzac ist die vielbesprochenste Arbeit, die beiden Salons zusammengenommen, fast täglich lange Zeitungsartikel für und gegen. Ich selbst bin kein Freund seiner letzten Arbeit, die noch viel unverständlicher ist als sein Victor Hugo […] Rodin war sehr interessiert zu erfahren, wie sein Victor Hugo bei uns gefiel, da er hier so vielen Anfechtungen ausgesetzt sei, und es für ihn von Wichtigkeit wäre, wie man im Auslande seine Arbeiten beurtheilt. Ich zog mich so gut ich konnte aus der Affäre, in dem ich ihm versicherte, dass man in Wien sein Genie bewundere, dass aber seine anderen Arbeiten besser gefielen und verstanden würden, als gerade die Fragmente seines Victor Hugo Denkmals, was ja auch nicht wundern könne, da wir kein Ensemble hätten von dem ganzen Werke." Jettel to Engelhart, May 24, 1898.
[61] Ibid. Rodin exhibited fifteen works, including four fragments of the model for the Victor Hugo Monument, in the First Exhibition of the Vienna Secession in 1898.

exhibition in the Gartenbau—with six bronzes of the *Serpentine Dancer* representing Loïe Fuller (fig. 56) among other works. With seven exhibits (Rodin only had two) in the Secession's Impressionist Exhibition of 1903, he was certainly overrepresented; this was probably more in recognition of his services to the association than because of his stylistic proximity to Impressionism. In the previously quoted letter, Jettel reports that: "Carabin is spreading propaganda for Ver Sacrum; he has already won two or three interested readers and asked me to inform him about the requirements for foreign subscriptions."[62] Both the Archduke of Hesse and Arthur von Scala from the Imperial School of Applied Arts in Vienna attempted—in vain—to hire this almost-forgotten representative of Art Nouveau as a professor. On August 20, 1899, Carabin wrote to the Vienna Secession from Paris that "as far as Claude Monet is concerned, I have a letter in which he tells me that he does not think very highly about taking part in exhibitions; however, I hope I can change his mind when I see him in person because he no longer lives in Paris but permanently in the countryside; I will let you know as soon as I have his agreement."[63]

It is clear that the Secession made efforts to get loans from Impressionist artists in the years around 1900. Unfortunately, Monet seemed to be not especially interested in exhibiting in Vienna once again, even after winning a medal at the Künstlerhaus in 1898. Nevertheless, in a letter to Carabin he said that he did not think his dealer Durand-Ruel would have anything against Monet providing the Vienna Secession with some of his works. However, a few days later, the difficulties with Monet made Carabin give up; he felt the artist was completely in the

[62] "Carabin macht Propaganda für Ver Sacrum, er hat 2 oder 3 Abonnenten gewonnen und bat mich ihm die Abonnements Bedingungen mitzuteilen für das Ausland." Ibid.

[63] "tant qu'à Claude Monet j'ai une lettre dans laquelle il m'a dit qu'il ne tient pas à exposer mais j'espère le faire revenir sur sa détermination quand je le verrai personnellement car lui non plus est à Paris il habite continuellement la campagne sitôt que j'aurai son acceptation je vous en ferai part." François Carabin to the Vienna Secession, August, 20 1899, Carabin no. 3111, Vienna Secession Archive.

hands of the dealers who took everything he produced but did not want to loan anything: "Durand-Ruel has no intention of loaning anything at all and pretends that he would not have any advantage from this."[64] It is rather difficult to understand why Durand-Ruel refused on this occasion, as he had sent works to the Künstlerhaus only a short time before. One of the reasons could be that the Parisian gallery owner had not been successful in selling any works in Vienna. All of his efforts at placing works from his gallery in major Viennese exhibitions, from the World's Exposition in 1873 to the Franz-Joseph Jubilee Exhibition in 1898, had been financially disappointing.

The Secession experienced similar problems with Edgar Degas. Carabin asked private collectors for loans rather than contact the capricious artist directly. None of his efforts bore fruit and, on September 12, 1900, he was forced to send the Secession the unpleasant news. "Concerning [works by] Degas, I still cannot promise anything. I visited Monsieur Laurent in Fontainebleau […] M. Laurent simply does not want to loan for an entire season. He loaned his two best paintings to the Centennale & Décennale at the [1900 Paris] Universal Exposition and now he only has one left."[65]

[64] "Durand-Ruel ne veut absolument rien prêter en prétendant qu'il n'a aucun avantage." Carabin to Vienna Secession, February 12, 1900, Carabin no. 3118, Vienna Secession Archive. When Carabin fell ill, the Mitchell & Kimbel transport company took care of all acquisitions negotiations: "Monsieur Carabin will write to M. Claude Monet himself. We will write to the other artists in his name. We will attempt all that is possible to assure the widest participation." ("Herr Carabin wird Herrn Claude Monet persönlich schreiben. An die anderen Künstler schreiben wir selbst in seinem Namen. Wir werden trachten, ein Möglichstes zu thun, um zahlreiche Beteiligung zu erzielen.") Mitchell & Kimbel to Vienna Secession, February 2, 1900, Mitchell & Kimbel no. 6553, Vienna Secession Archive.

[65] "Tant qu'à Degas je ne peux pas encore vous promettre. Je suis aller voir M. Laurent à Fontainebleau [...] M. Laurent ne veut pas en prêter pour un saison bien simple. C'est qu'il a prêté les deux plus beaux à l'Exposition Universelle Centenale & Décenale il ne lui en reste plus qu'un." Carabin to Vienna Secession, September 12, 1900, Carabin no. 3118, Vienna Secession Archive.

This meant that the Secession's wish of being able to present Degas in Vienna in the fall of 1900 were now shattered once and for all. A month later, however, there were signs of hope on the horizon. On October 22, 1900, Carabin reported on a visit to the collector M. Rosenberg:

> Between us, this collection is amazingly complete and includes Manet, Claude Monet, Degas, Alfred Sisley, Lépine, Jongkind, Besnard, Renoir, Boudais, Berthe Morisot etc. etc. All of them first class—they create an ensemble of around 200 canvases […] one of the most beautiful collections. See what needs to be done and contact M. Rosenberg directly if you want to exhibit his collection.[66]

Although the preserved correspondence only refers to M. Rosenberg, the address, 77 Faubourg St. Honoré, makes it possible to identify the collector. According to the Almanach du Commerce, this is Alexandre Rosenberg, the father of the prominent avant-garde gallery owners Paul and Léonce Rosenberg.[67] A catastrophe had overshadowed the beginnings of this important dynasty of art dealers who repeatedly sent works to Vienna in the years to come. The elder Rosenberg originated from the Austro-Hungarian Empire and had become one of the leading importers of grain on the Paris Exchange. Five steamers with rotten grain from Argentina led to his financial downfall in 1886, but he then used his private art collection as the basis for a new enterprise. When Rosenberg started operating as a "négociant d'objets d'art" he dealt mainly

[66] "Entre nous cette collection qui est merveilleusement complète comprend des Manet, Claude Monet, Degas, Sisley, Lépine, Jongkind, Besnard, Renoir, Boudais, Berthe Morisot etc. etc. Tous de tous a fait 1er ordre – forme un ensemble d´environ 200 toiles […] une plus belle collection. Voyez ce que vous avez à faire et mettez vous directement en rapport avec M. Rosenberg si vous voulez exposer sa collection." Carabin to Vienna Secession, October 22, 1900, Carabin no. 3128, Vienna Secession Archive.

[67] The Almanach-Bottin du Commerce de Paris lists him with "curiosité, objets d'art" from 1899 through 1906. My thanks to Monique Nonne for this information.

with Old Masters but, around 1898, he threw himself wholeheartedly into buying and selling works by the Impressionists.[68]

Actually, Rosenberg had been in contact with the Secession even before Carabin visited him. He informed the Viennese institution that he was able to call one of the "most important collections of French Impressionists" his own: "I own a first-rate Manet, 2 Degas, 16 Claude Monets, all top quality, 14 first class Sisleys, 7 superlative Renoirs, 20 outstanding Jongkinds, paintings + watercolors, 14 outstanding Boudins, 14 Lépines, 7 Besnards, 7 Pissarros. As well as Daumiers, Chérets, Caillebottes, Forain, Cottet, etc. etc."[69] While the Vienna Secession wanted to exhibit only a small selection of 35 of the best works from Rosenberg's collection, the collector insisted that all of his pictures be displayed. On November 12, 1900, the dealer wrote to the Secession: "I would like to inform you that I expressly told Monsieur Carabin that, at present, I am only interested in exhibiting the pictures I possess as an entire ensemble."[70] He gave economic reasons for reaching this decision as it would be absolutely of no advantage to him to send his best paintings, valued at half a million francs, to Vienna for the main season: "I have no personal interest in the exhibition and do not sell in Vienna."[71] Because they could not accept his terms, there was no major show of Impressionist works at the Vienna Secession in either 1900 or 1901. Indeed, as policy, the Secession refused to show entire collections of art dealers or private collectors, in contrast to the Künstlerhaus, for which this was a common practice. As a

[68] Pierre Nahon, *Les marchands d'art en France: XIXe et XXe siècles* (Paris: Éditions de la Différence 1998), 123-24.
[69] "Ich besitze einen erstrangigen Manet, 2 Degas, 16 Claude Monets, alles ersten Ranges, 14 Sisleys feinster Qualität, 7 prima Renoirs, 20 prima Jongkinds, Bilder + Aquarelle, 14 hervorragende Boudins, 14 Lépines, 7 Besnards, 7 Pissarros. Dann Daumiers, Chérets, Caillebottes, Forain, Cottet, etc. etc." Alexandre Rosenberg to Franz Hancke, October 4, 1900, Rosenberg no. 8538.a, Vienna Secession Archive.
[70] "Antwortlich Ihrer werten Zeilen mache ich Sie darauf aufmerksam, dass ich Herrn Carabin ausdrücklich sagte, dass mich nur eine Gesamtausstellung meines Bilderbesitzes im gegenwärtigen Zeitpunkt interessieren kann." Rosenberg to Hancke, November 12, 1900, Rosenberg no. 8539, Vienna Secession Archive.
[71] "Ich habe kein persönliches Interesse an der Ausstellung und habe auch keinen Verkauf in Wien." Ibid.

favor to the Secession, Rosenberg did offer to at least "lend the *Japanese Woman* & the *Woman with Oranges* by Besnard, m Lucien Simon & two fine Caillebottes."[72] After the deal with Rosenberg fell through, plans for an Impressionist exhibition had to be postponed once again. Viennese art critics were well aware of the difficulties involved. Ludwig Hevesi wrote: "The idea of exhibiting Parisian Impressionism in Vienna is one of the best our Secession has had so far. Its realization however was difficult. The collectors' doors are locked with seven bolts."[73]

2.5 Loans from Durand-Ruel

On January 17, 1903, the Viennese Secession opened the eagerly awaited 16th exhibition entitled "The Development of Impressionism in Painting and Sculpture," the first time that the movement was represented under its auspices. The president of the Secession, Wilhelm Bernatzik, was largely responsible for the organization of the event. He had once studied painting under Léon Bonnat in Paris and—by Austrian standards—found his way from Naturalism to Impressionism at a relatively early time (fig. 57). Probably in an effort to stress the hard work involved in organizing this exhibition, Bernatzik gave an interview to the *Neue Freie Presse* a few days before the opening, in which he claimed that such a collective exhibition of Impressionist art "had never been shown anywhere else." The reason, he said, was

[72] "Ich würde Ihnen aber vielleicht um Ihnen gefällig zu sein la femme japonnaise & la femme aux oranges von Besnard, meinen Lucien Simon & zwei ganz hübsche Caillebotte leihen." Ibid.
[73] "Der Gedanke, den Pariser Impressionismus in Wien auszustellen, ist einer der besten, die unsere Sezession bisher gehabt hat. Ihn auszuführen, war freilich schwierig. Die Türen der Sammler sind mit sieben Riegeln verschlossen." Ludwig Hevesi, "Edouard Manet und seine Leute," in id., *Acht Jahre Secession (März 1897-Juni 1905): Kritik—Polemik—Chronik* (Vienna: Konegen, 1906), 406.

a very simple: “In a way, a single art dealer has the whole movement in his hands, and that is Monsieur Durand-Ruel in Paris. And, he has so far resisted all temptations.”[74]

Although Durand-Ruel had virtually a monopoly on the production of some of the great masters of Impressionism for a long time, it had always been in his interest to promote the group internationally through exhibitions.[75] From the outset, one of his principal business strategies was to bind individual artists exclusively to his gallery even if—in contrast to Charles Sedelmeyer or Adolphe Goupil—he rarely drew up formal contracts with them. The cooperation between the artists and their dealer was usually in the form of a free arrangement based on common trust. Durand-Ruel often attempted to buy large blocks of works directly from the artists’ studios, from collectors, or at auctions. One example of this approach occurred in 1872 when he noticed two works by Manet in the studio of the Belgian painter Alfred Stevens. He immediately contacted Manet and on the very next day purchased twenty-three paintings from him at a price of approximately 35,000 francs.[76] Pissarro recalled a similar experience in a letter to his niece in 1881: “Durand-Ruel, one of the most prominent art dealers in Paris, visited me and bought a large selection of my paintings and watercolors; he also offered to take everything

[74] “Ein einziger Kunsthändler hatte sozusagen die ganze Bewegung in der Hand, und das ist Herr Durand-Ruel in Paris. Und der hat bisher allen Verlockungen widerstanden.” Thomas, “Impressionisten in Wien,” *Neue Freie Presse*, January 11, 1903, 9.

[75] “From 1870, the date of the first catalog we have, to the day of my great-grandfather’s death, the Paris gallery organized 197 exhibitions and the New York branch 129. This of course does not include the shows for which the catalogues have not survived, or those for which no publication was produced. In addition, there were the 11 exhibitions of the Society of French Artists organized at the London branch between 1870 and 1875, and those at the Brussels branch (4, Rue du Persil) between 1872 and 1875.” Caroline Durand-Ruel Godfroy, “Paul Durand-Ruel’s Marketing Practices,” *Van Gogh Museum Journal* 2000: *Theo Van Gogh and the 19th Century Art Trade* (December 2000): 86. On Durand-Ruel, see also Pierre Assouline, *Grâces lui soient rendues: Paul Durand-Ruel, le marchand des impressionistes* (Paris: Plon, 2002).

[76] Anne Distel, *Les collectionneurs des impressionistes: amateurs et marchands* (Düdingen: Trio, 1989), 24-25.

I produce. This means that I will have peace for some time and the means to create important works."[77]

The first purchases of works by Monet and Pissarro were registered in 1871; a few months later, Durand-Ruel also bought pictures by Degas, Renoir, and Sisley. In the expectation of an increase in prices similar to that experienced by the Barbizon School, the gallery owner accumulated many works by both Barbizon and Impressionist artists over the years and often mixed both schools in exhibitions. He acknowledged that a great deal of patience and marketing talent was needed in order to be able to sell his inventory at a profit: "In order to maintain prices, you must never be in a hurry to sell, and on the contrary, always be prepared to support the works that interest you at auctions."[78]

Of course, it is pure invention that Durand-Ruel had resisted "all temptations," as Bernatzik had put it, to loan his paintings to the Secession before their 16th exhibition dedicated to Impressionism. This notion could have been the result of the previously mentioned report by the delegate Carabin, who informed the Secession in 1900 that Durand-Ruel had absolutely no intention of sending anything to Vienna on loan. In any case, the Parisian art dealer found it necessary to ask the editor of the *Neue Freie Presse* to correct some of the mistakes that had made their way into the newspaper. Although, strictly speaking, the words that were quoted in the report actually came from Bernatzik, Durand-Ruel stated:

---

[77] "Durand-Ruel un des grands marchands de Paris est venu me voir et m'a pris une grande partie de mes toiles et aquarelles, et me propose de prendre tout ce que je ferai.—C'est la tranquillité pour quelque temps, et le moyen de faire des œuvres importantes." Janine Bailly-Herzberg, ed. *Correspondance de Camille Pissarro,* vol. 1, *1865-1885* (Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1980), 142.

[78] "Pour maintenir les prix il faut n'être jamais pressé de vendre et être toujours prêt, au contraire, à soutenir dans les ventes publiques les œuvres aux-quelles on s'intéresse." Paul Durand-Ruel, "Mémoires," in *Les archives de l'impressionnisme: lettres de Renoir, Monet, Pissaro, Sisley et autres—Mémoires de Paul Durand-Ruel—Documents,* vol. 2, Lionello Venturi, ed. (Paris: Durand-Ruel, 1939), 166.

> It is also incorrect when your reporter writes that a comprehensive exhibition of the Impressionists has not previously been shown anywhere. I have organized important exhibitions entirely devoted to works of this school in Paris, London, New York, and other cities since 1873. In 1886, I exhibited three hundred paintings, with a selection of the finest works by Manet, Degas, Puvis de Chavannes, Monet, Renoir and all the other interesting painters of the young school, in the New York Academy of Drawing. And, this exhibition laid the foundations for the growing success that has accompanied these artists in America.[79]

To a certain extent, the American triumph in 1886 had marked a turning point for Durand-Ruel and the Impressionists: his persistent attempts to establish an export market for goods that he could not sell in France finally bore fruit. The art dealer's creativity was definitely spurred on by financial pressures. He was actually forced to look for new markets abroad to offset financial difficulties at home. Linda Whiteley concluded that his support of Impressionism "was to a certain extent imposed on him by the loss of his old stock during the 1870s and by the very small amount of disposable capital available to him after the series of ambitious and finally disastrous investments during the same period. He was, certainly, like so many of the collectors he describes, 'très spéculateur'."[80] Durand-Ruel admitted that he had twice been on the brink of financial ruin, but he had never actually been bankrupt. In this, he also contradicts the sensationalist lines in the *Neue Freie Presse* that reported: "He lost all his money with Impressionism and went bankrupt twice. Today he is a multi-millionaire."[81]

---

[79] Paul Durand-Ruel to *Neue Freie Presse*, January 17, 1903, Durand-Ruel Archive, Paris. Quoted in Narzt, "Briefwechsel," 223.
[80] Linda Whiteley, "Painters and Dealers in Nineteenth-Century France, 1820-1878, with a Special Reference to the Firm of Durand-Ruel" (PhD. diss., University of Oxford, 1995), n.p.
[81] "Er verlor sein ganzes Geld im Impressionismus und wurde zweimal Bankrott. Heute ist er xfacher Millionär." Thomas, "Impressionisten in Wien," 9.

In order to supply the various national markets with goods from Paris, Durand-Ruel developed a wide network of business partners and branches. His first subsidiary outside of France was more the result of political circumstances than a business decision. In 1870, Durand-Ruel moved to London with his family to escape from the German occupation of Paris and the subsequent civil-war-like conditions of the Commune. In London, Charles-François Daubigny introduced him to Monet and Pissarro. In addition to his branch in London, he opened another one in Brussels in 1872. Although financial difficulties caused him to close both in 1875, they were the first venues outside of France where Impressionist works were exhibited.[82] The surprisingly great interest in what he had to offer—and also in an effort to get around customs regulations—led to the opening of his salon on Fifth Avenue in New York in 1887.

Significantly, Germany was the largest and most active European market for Impressionists. According to Walter Grasskamp's convincing thesis, this was mainly due to the regional fragmentation of the market."[83] A survey in 1920 showed that, in 1914, there were twice as many works of French art from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in German museums—namely two hundred— than in French institutions.[84] In 1883, Durand-Ruel sent some Impressionist works to dealer Fritz Gurlitt and to exhibitions in the Hotel Kaiserhof in Berlin. Julius Elias, a contemporary art critic, who described Durand-Ruel as the epitome of the *amateurs-marchand*, wrote: "At the beginning of the nineties, he eagerly accepted my proposal

[82] Durand-Ruel Godfroy, "Paul Durand-Ruel's Marketing Practices," 86.
[83] Walter Grasskamp, *Die unbewältigte Moderne: Kunst und Öffentlichkeit* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1989), 36.
[84] Wulf Herzogenrath, "Fakten zur Kunstszene im Deutschland der zwanziger Jahre," in *Paris-Berlin 1900-1933: Übereinstimmungen und Gegensätze Frankreich-Deutschland*, Brigitte Hilmer, ed. (Munich: Prestel 1979), 306-10. The surprising statistic for the year 1914 was published in 1920 in *Les Cahiers d'aujourd'hui*: "There are around two hundred works by French artists ranging from Ingres to the Cubists in German museums, but not even one hundred in French ones."

to come to Berlin with compact collections of Manet and Impressionism; these delectable, elite exhibitions took place in the 'Kaiserhof' and were the first of this kind."[85]

It appears that, for a while, Durand-Ruel even toyed with the idea of opening a branch of his gallery in Berlin. Yet, his partnership with the Kunstsalon Cassirer made this step unnecessary. Together with his cousin Bruno Cassirer, Paul Cassirer had founded a gallery and publishing house at Victoriastrasse 35 in 1898.[86] From that time on, they also worked as secretaries of the Berlin Secession, a relationship that frequently led to public controversy over the intertwining of art and commerce. The two cousins and business partners separated in 1901, Paul leading the art salon while Bruno taking over the publishing activities. In 1899, Durand-Ruel gave the Kunstsalon Cassirer the exclusive rights to sell his works in Germany, as can be seen clearly in a letter from Durand-Ruel to Gustav Pauli, director of the Kunsthalle Bremen.[87] Durand-Ruel answered a request for loans in the following manner: "It would be good to reach an agreement with Mr. Paul Cassirer, Victoriastrasse 35, concerning the pictures by Renoir and Pissarro you like to exhibit. Herr Cassirer has the exclusive rights to our paintings in Germany; he is currently presenting an exhibition with works by Renoir in Berlin where you will certainly be able to select the work you desire."[88]

---

[85] "Er ging zu Beginn der neunziger Jahre auf meine Anregung willig ein, mit geschlossenen Sammlungen Manets und des Impressionismus nach Berlin zu kommen; diese leckeren Eliteausstellungen fanden im 'Kaiserhof' statt, es waren die ersten dieser Art." Julius Elias, "Paul Durand-Ruel: Aus dem Leben eines modernen Kunsthändlers," *Kunst und Künstler* 10, no. 2 (1912): 106.

[86] George Brühl, *Die Cassirers: Streiter für den Impressionismus* (Leipzig: Edition Leipzig, 1991); Rahel E. Feilchenfeldt and Thomas Raff, eds. *Ein Fest der Künste: Paul Cassirer—Der Kunsthändler als Verleger* (Munich: Beck, 2006).

[87] Durand-Ruel Godfroy, "Paul Durand-Ruel's Marketing Practices," 87.

[88] Quoted in Flavie Durand-Ruel, "Paul Durand-Ruel: Freund und Händler der Impressionisten," in *Wien-Paris: Van Gogh, Cézanne, und Österreichs Moderne, 1880-1960,* Agnes Husslein-Arco, ed. (Vienna: Brandstätter, 2007), 212.

In 1902, when the Vienna Secession started planning the exhibition of Impressionism, it was not completely clear whether Cassirer's rights extended beyond the German border to include Austria. As can be seen in the preserved correspondence, this *ménage à trois* frequently caused tension between the Secession and Cassirer, who attempted to prevent the development of a direct axis between Vienna and Paris. Only if everything passed through his hands would he be able to get his share of the profits of the Secession exhibition. It must be assumed that some of the paintings that Cassirer had received from his business partner on rue Laffitte in Paris were on commission and that some were from his own stock. As seen in a letter dated June 15, 1902, it seems that Bernatzik actually visited Durand-Ruel in Paris. However, this visit was announced in a letter from Cassirer with the words: "Herr Bernatzik has the intention of interesting the Viennese in Impressionist art."[89] When planning for the exhibition came to a relative standstill that summer, Cassirer exerted pressure by drawing attention to the fact that his stock of paintings was in great demand at exhibitions in Petersburg, Dresden, Hamburg, and Frankfurt, and that only a very limited number of first-class works were available. This—and some unanswered letters—clearly annoyed the Secession president, who made it clear to Cassirer that he did not have to rely on him to realize the exhibition because "through my personal connections, I have been able to interest two private galleries in Paris that want to sell their collections in our undertaking. It is also planned that Durand-Ruel will add to the works."[90] In spite of the note of discord, Bernatzik made it clear that he intended to organize the exhibition with Cassirer alone:

[89] Cassirer to Durand-Ruel, May 29, 1902, Durand-Ruel Archive, Paris. Quoted in Narzt, "Briefwechsel," 214.
[90] "Durch persönliche Beziehungen ist es uns gelungen, zwei Privatgalerien in Paris, welche ihre Sammlungen verkaufen wollen, für unser Unternehmen zu interessieren. Eine Ergänzung der Werke durch Durand-Ruel ist geplant." Bernatzik to Cassirer, September 12, 1902, Bernatzik no. 2500, Vienna Secession Archive.

> Bringing together works from various sources, and taking differing interests concerning sales into account, are causing difficulties. I therefore come back to the verbal agreement we reached in Berlin. The selection of Impressionists you supply for our exhibition will be formed by works I select from your collection. You will complement these with various pictures I saw in Durand-Ruel's gallery. How you arrange this, is none of our business; however, it would be good if the prices are not too high—in the interest of sales.[91]

Despite this assurance, Cassirer approached Durand-Ruel and asked him not to deal directly with the Secession in this matter: "If the President contacts you, please reply that I am the one to handle this matter."[92] And—as if he had to win him over to the metropolis on the Danube—Cassirer claimed that Vienna is a very wealthy city and its population loves the new. He would personally travel to Vienna for the opening to visit collectors and to sell Impressionist paintings from the show. In an effort to justify the detour from his Berlin gallery, Cassirer went as far as to claim that he knew wealthy Viennese collectors personally. He mentioned his conditions for sales in another letter. Cassirer intended to up the prices for works from Durand-Ruel's gallery by ten percent.[93] This meant that the prices in Vienna would be twenty percent more than those asked for by Durand-Ruel in Paris as the Secession also demanded ten percent.[94]

One of the reasons for Bernatzik to travel to Berlin in October 1902 was to visit Cassirer. In an undated note, he stated, under the heading of "Visit and Arrangements with Cassirer," that he

---

[91] "Die Beschaffung des Materials aus verschiedenen Händen, ferner die Berücksichtigung divergierender Interessen beim Verkauf, machen Schwierigkeiten. Ich komme daher auf unsere mündliche Abmachung in Berlin zurück. Den Grundstock der Impressionisten, welche Sie für unsere Ausstellung liefern, bilden die von mir gewählten Werke ihrer Sammlung. Sie ergänzen dieselben durch verschiedene Bilder welche ich bei Durand-Ruel gesehen habe. In welcher Form Sie das Geschäft mit ihm machen, geht uns gar nichts an; nur wäre es gut, wenn die Preise, im Interesse des Verkaufes, dadurch nicht allzu hoch würden." Ibid.

[92] Cassirer to Durand-Ruel, September 25, 1902, Durand-Ruel Archive, Paris. Quoted in Narzt, "Briefwechsel," 215.

[93] Cassirer to Durand-Ruel, October 4, 1902, Durand-Ruel Archive. Quoted in Narzt, "Briefwechsel," 216.

[94] Cassirer sent the Secession a price list for his pictures on December 15, 1902: "The prices on the enclosed list include 10% commission for you. I will include the insurance fees on the consignment notes." Cassirer to Vienna Secession, December 15, 1902, Cassirer no. 3445, Vienna Secession Archive.

was "prepared, under certain conditions, to supply the exhibition with his pictures."[95] He admired the "famous painting of Gonzalez" (fig. 58) by Manet at Cassirer's. The Berlin art dealer wanted to "talk him into" *The Country House* by the same artist, but Bernatzik thought other works were better. He found Degas' *Woman Ironing* very interesting. Bernatzik reserved Monet's *Breakfast* as a large center piece and wanted to get some smaller works from Durand-Ruel's private residence. It was the same with one large and two small pictures by Renoir. He noted that: "He [Cassirer] told me to go into Durand-Ruel's private apartment. I should choose without saying anything. Promised to get the things."[96] This advice seems to be another example of Cassirer's pomposity rather than a trick as Kolja Kramer suggests.[97] Bernatzik would have been able to get loans from Durand-Ruel's private collection without Cassirer's help. Spurred on by the statement that Manet's *The Country House* was reserved by Hugo von Tschudi for the National Gallery in Berlin, Bernatzik visited the director to inspect the "small, exceptional collection of Impressionists."[98] He remarked that the Emperor had ordered that the collection be moved out of the ground floor and up to the remote second floor. Bernatzik even dared to ask Tschudi to loan the entire "Impressionist Hall" of the National Gallery (fig. 59), but this was turned down. Bernatzik came up with another idea for the Viennese exhibition when he inspected some works by Francisco de Goya that had recently arrived. Bernatzik, along with Tschudi, wanted to have some of Goya's paintings—who he called the "father of the Impressionists"—and some by Diego Velázquez—the "forefather of the Impressionists"—at the

[95] "Ist auf gewisse Andeutungen hin bereit die Ausstellung mit seinen Bildern zu beschicken." Bernatzik, "Visit and Arrangements with Cassirer," n. d., Bernatzik no. 1127.b, Vienna Secession Archive.
[96] "Er [Cassirer] fordert mich auf in Durand-Ruels Privatwohnung zu gehen. Soll, ohne etwas zu sagen, auswählen. Verpflichtet sich die Sachen herbeizuschaffen." Bernatzik, "Visit and Arrangements with Cassirer," n. d., Bernatzik no. 1127.c, Vienna Secession Archive.
[97] Kolja Kramer, "Eine Dreiecksbeziehung für den französischen Impressionismus: Die Impressionisten-Ausstellung 1903 in der Wiener Secession," *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 2 (2001): 48-65.
[98] "Direktor Tschudi hat in Nationalgalerie eine kleine ausgezeichnete Sammlung Impressionisten." Vienna Secession Archive Secession, Bernatzik (no date), no. 1127.b.

"start of the exhibition." Tschudi was supposed to write a brief essay on Impressionism for the catalogue.[99]

Shipping lists show that Cassirer finally sent fifteen works to Vienna—one by Degas, three each by Manet and Pissarro, and four by Sisley and Monet. Twenty-four additional works by Degas, Manet, Monet, Pissarro, Renoir, and Sisley were provided by Durand-Ruel. Originally, Cassirer had felt obliged to inform the Secession that neither he nor Durand-Ruel thought that they would have "any pecuniary advantage from the Viennese Exhibition," although the two gallery owners had supplied works from their own private collections.[100] The bottom line was that they were primarily interested in doing business, as is demonstrated by an irate letter from Cassirer to Durand-Ruel complaining about "Bernatzik's impertinence"; in Cassirer's opinion, the president wanted "to withdraw the best works and many paintings that could easily be sold" shortly before the opening.[101]

Durand-Ruel's private apartment on Rue de Rome in Paris, in the vicinity of the Gare Saint Lazare, had been open for the public by appointment since 1898. Around four hundred paintings, including many of the major works of Impressionism, could be admired in this private museum. Due to the great public interest, but in order not to interfere with his family life too much, visits were restricted to Tuesdays afternoons between 2 and 4 pm—quite consciously, a time when the Parisian museums were closed.[102] The works on rue de Rome were usually not for sale unless

[99] This did not come to pass. Julius Meier-Graefe was commissioned with an accompanying brochure.
[100] "Ich möchte auch gleich hier bemerken, daß sowohl Durand-Ruel, wie ich, uns keinen pekunären Vorteil aus der Wiener Ausstellung erhoffen,..." Cassirer to Vienna Secession, September 17, 1902, Cassirer no. 3447, Vienna Secession Archive.
[101] Cassirer to Durand-Ruel, n. d., Durand-Ruel Archive, Paris. Quoted in Narzt, "Briefwechsel," 222.
[102] Durand-Ruel Godfroy, "Paul Durand-Ruel's Marketing Practices," 89. See also Georges Lecomte, *L'art impressioniste, d'après la collection privée de Monsieur Durand-Ruel* (Paris: Chamerot and Renouard, 1892).

Durand-Ruel felt unable to resist an exorbitant offer. The *Neue Freie Presse* informed its Viennese readers that "it could be said that he has his treasures in two warehouses. His private gallery with pictures that are not for sale represents an incredible wealth; the *Dancer* by Renoir alone is valued at much more than 60,000 francs today."[103]

When the Vienna Secession asked if one or the other Renoir from the rue de Rome could be purchased for the Moderne Galerie that was opening in the same year, Durand-Ruel turned down the offer with the words: "I would be very happy to see a painting by Renoir purchased for the Moderne Galerie, but we simply do not want to part with any that form part of our private collection; that is why we have declared them not for sale."[104] It is not unlikely that the Secession had cast its eye on Renoir's *La Loge* (fig. 60); if the deal had been successful, the painting would be one of the main attractions in Vienna's Belvedere museum today.

Mixing works that were for sale with others that were not was already a well-known strategy among gallery owners. Therefore, it is astonishing to learn that Bernatzik attempted to lecture a man like Durand-Ruel on the commercial advantages of such a procedure: "Our experience shows that the presence of major works by a master, which are not for sale, greatly increases the chances of getting rid of those that are. In the end, the insurance cost for these paintings of such great value is an outright loss."[105]

---

[103] "Er hat seine Schätze gleichsam in zwei Speichern. Seine unverkäufliche Privatgalerie repräsentiert einen ungeheuren Werth; die 'Tänzerin' von Renoir allein wird heute auf weit mehr als 60,000 Francs geschätzt." Thomas, "Impressionisten in Wien," 9.

[104] "je serais très heureux de voir acquérir un tableau de Renoir pour la Galerie Modern de Vienne, mais en ce qui concerne ceux faisant partie de notre collection privée, nous n'en désirons distraire aucun; c'est pourquoi nous les avons indiqués comme non à vendre." Durand-Ruel to Franz Hancke, January 14, 1903, Durand-Ruel no. 1903, Vienna Secession Archive.

[105] Bernatzik to Durand-Ruel, December 28, 1902, Durand-Ruel Archive, Paris. Quoted in Narzt, "Briefwechsel," 220.

The large pastel *Dancers in Blue* by Degas caused a certain stir when Durand-Ruel requested that it, along with another painting by the artist, *Racing Carriage*, be returned shortly before the opening of the exhibition. The artist had made a vehement protest to the dealer over these works being included in a group exhibition of living artists, although he had consistently participated in the Impressionist group shows in Paris between 1874 and 1886. Seeing that Durand-Ruel did not want to put his long-term relationship to Degas at risk, he agreed that no paintings from his private collection were to appear in the catalogue. Durand-Ruel stated that two other works by Degas from the rue Laffitte, *The Ballet* and *In the Café-Concert*, could be shown without any repercussions as long as Cassirer was listed as the owner: "In any case, I will write to him about this and inform him that we sold him these two paintings before the exhibition so that they could appear under his name."[106] While these precautionary steps were actually not necessary because in the end only works that were not for sale were listed with the names of their owners, this process shows how easy it was to shunt stock from Paris to Berlin if needed.

Bernatzik did not want to appear to be content with this suggestion. He made strong arguments in favor of the *Dancers in Blue* remaining in the exhibition and proposed the following compromise to Durand-Ruel:

> The Degas wall needs a centre piece; the large pastel *Dancers in Blue* has to be hung there; it is a magnificent work on a large scale. If I had known of your wish when I was in Paris, I could have found a large Degas from a private collector. Now there is no time for that: it is therefore absolutely impossible for us to do without this work. Meanwhile, I will guarantee that Monsieur Degas will not find out about the exhibition of this painting. We will change the title and even name a fictitious owner if you wish. The small painting

[106] Durand-Ruel to Bernatzik, December 18, 1902, Durand-Ruel Archive, Paris. Quoted in Narzt, "Briefwechsel," 219.

> of the racing carriage is another matter. This work is so well-known and has been reproduced so often that it can be mentioned and Monsieur Degas would be pleased to know this as soon as possible. In order to convince you of our best intentions, we are prepared to do without showing it, no matter what it costs us. But that is as far as we can go; we will do this of our own free will although no regulations force us to do so.[107]

Durand-Ruel agreed to this compromise. The pastel was listed in the catalogue simply as *Dancers*; however, the Secession did not follow Durand-Ruel's suggestion to name Cassirer as the owner and only noted that it came from a "private collection." The painting *Racing Carriage* was returned to Paris as agreed.

Bernatzik had mentioned on several occasions that he would be able to arrange loans from private collectors in Paris. The catalogue mentions seven major works from the "Collection of Prof. Viau, Paris" including Cézanne's magnificent *Still Life with Compotier* (fig. 61). The dentist Georges Viau was not only a good client, but also a good friend of Durand-Ruel's. Collectors and art dealers consciously took advantage of the museum-like presentation in the Viennese Secession to increase the prices of the works that were for sale.[108] On the list of works to be sent to Vienna, Durand-Ruel discovered a painting by Albert André, whom he praised as one of "the best young artists." Consequently, the art dealer started thinking of a future exhibition in Vienna with the young artists he represented. Different from his previously successful strategy to combine Barbizon School and Impressionists, he argued this time that the generations must not be mixed: "I have all of their works, I could loan you some of them."[109]

---

[107] Bernatzik to Durand-Ruel, January 4, 1903, Durand-Ruel Archive, Paris. Quoted in Narzt, "Briefwechsel," 221.
[108] The Viennese exhibition is mentioned for each lot in the action catalog of the Galerie Durand-Ruel. *Collection de M. Georges Viau: Vente Durand-Ruel* (Paris: March 4, 1907).
[109] Durand-Ruel to Bernatzik, December 15, 1902, Durand-Ruel Archive, Paris. Quoted in Narzt, "Briefwechsel," 218.

Here, he was referring to the late Impressionists, such as Albert André, George d'Espagnat, Gustave Loiseau, Maurice Maufra, Henry Moret, who were all represented by his gallery.

2.6 The Development of Impressionism in Painting and Sculpture

The 16th exhibition of the Viennese Secession was perceived as being "the highlight or artistic event of the season" and was the subject of a great deal of attention in the media, going far beyond the borders of Austria.[110] In a letter to Durand-Ruel, Wilhelm Bernatzik spoke with great pride—and a certain amount of exaggeration—of "around one hundred articles that have been published here and abroad."[111] However, the exhibition did manage to attract 15,877 visitors.[112] This success was at least partly due to an aggressive marketing campaign that, similar to today's blockbuster exhibitions, was accompanied by public discussion of the enormous insurance costs and increases in the value of art works. In the previously mentioned interview in the *Neue Freie Presse*, Bernatzik recounted that the exhibition brought together paintings from Durand-Ruel's private collection valued at more than one million francs; one painting, Renoir's *Dancer*, was estimated at being worth more than 60,000 francs: "It was necessary for a group of insurance companies to take on this risk, and five united for this purpose. The railroad also did not want to take the risk of shipping the pictures in a single wagon—they would have hardly filled a small cart. And so, they were transported here piece by piece."[113]

---

[110] "der Clou oder das Kunstereignis der Saison." Berta Zuckerkandl, "Wien," *Die Kunst* 7, no. 8 (May 1903): 246
[111] Letter Wilhelm Bernatzik to Durand-Ruel (February 24, 1903), Durand-Ruel Archive, Paris. Quoted in Narzt, "Briefwechsel," 227.
[112] Fifth Annual Report, Vienna Secession Archive.
[113] "Da eine Assecuranz die Versicherung nicht übernehmen wollte, so thaten sich fünf Gesellschaften zu diesem Zwecke zusammen. Auch die Eisenbahn wollte es nicht riskiren, die Bilder—sie füllten kaum einen kleinen Streifwagen—in einen Waggon zu verladen. Und so mußten sie denn stückweise hierher geschickt werden." Thomas, "Impressionisten in Wien," 9.

The Mitchell & Kimbel shipping company accepted the responsibility for this priceless transport. Founded in Paris in 1849, the company had ten branch offices throughout France, and had already been used by the Künstlerhaus for their shipping needs. Moreover, the firm had cooperative agreements with other shipping countries worldwide.[114] In December 1902, Mitchell & Kimbel even provided the president of the Secession with an office in the firm's headquarters at 31 Place du Marché St. Honoré from where he could supervise preparations. The *Wiener Morgenzeitung* made fun of the exhibitions' branding and merchandising activities:

> A new catchword! New—not for the expert, but for the public. It was high time to come up with a new foreign word that people could get their teeth into, seeing that "Secession"—or, as the Viennese like to pronounce it "Setzession"—was starting to pale. Now it will be possible to buy top hats, shirt collars, and monkey knickknacks with a new trademark; there can be no doubt that the word "Impressionism," which has been pasted on all our omnibuses and at every street corner, will be picked up in a flash.[115]

Nevertheless, the author of these lines was extremely positive about this pioneering exhibition. Works by these important painters had been shown in Vienna before, but this time "they had marched into town in closed ranks and brought all of Paris with them on their canvases."[116] Commercial interests and educational affairs were closely intertwined with each other. One of the ways the Secession intended to fulfill its pedagogical functions was to invite the two

[114] Kramer, "Die Ausstellungspräsenz des französischen Impressionismus," 49.
[115] "Ein neues Schlagwort! Neu—nicht für den Fachmann, wohl aber für das Publikum. Es war höchste Zeit, für ein neues Fremdwort zu sorgen, an dem sich die Leute die Zähne ausbeißen können, da die Losung 'Secession' oder, wie es in Wien gern ausgesprochen wird, 'Setzession' mälig zu verblassen beginnt. Nun wird man endlich wieder Cylinder, Hemdkrägen und Nippesafferln unter neuer Marke kaufen können; denn es ist kein Zweifel, dass das Wort 'Impressionismus,' das seit vierzehn Tagen an allen Omnibussen und Straßenecken schwarz auf Roth klebt, rasch aufgegriffen werden wird." Ludwig Abels, "Impressionismus," *Wiener Morgenzeitung*, January 17, 1903, 8. Unfortunately, it has so far not been possible to locate a copy of the Impressionism poster. As this kind of poster was not decorative but contained text only, it was probably not saved.
[116] "Zwar haben wir schon mehrmals bedeutende Maler dieser Richtung in Wien gehabt; aber diesmal marschieren sie in geschlossener Reihe auf und bringen ganz Paris auf ihren Leinwänden mit." Ibid.

renowned experts on French art of the nineteenth century, Richard Muther and Julius Meier-Graefe, to lecture and to provide the public with insights "into the inner relationships between the works on display."[117] The press went so far as to assume that it was not only in connection with the works shown that "the three central halls had been transformed into a single lecture hall to accommodate the audience for these lectures."[118] The preserved floor plan of the following 17th exhibition (fig. 62) suggests that visitors were forced to follow a linear path through the exhibition. While it is not possible to do this exactly for the Impressionism galleries, the progressive narrative makes it even more likely that a linear sequence was chosen. The catalogue divides the 259 exhibits into five sections: Beginning and Development, Impressionism, Expansion of Impressionism, Japanese Art, and Transitions to Style.

The old school of painting—consisting of Tintoretto, Peter Paul Rubens, Jan Vermeer, El Greco, Velázquez, Juan Carreño, Goya, Eugène Delacroix, Camille Corot, Honoré Daumier and Adolphe Monticelli—was presented in the first galleries (fig. 63) to make the visitors aware of connections between the French avant-garde and the "great forebears of Impressionism" that could be followed as far back as to the sixteenth century. Jean-Jacques Caffieri, Antoine Houdon, and François Rude showed the beginning in the sphere of sculpture. Impressionism in the narrower sense was represented by works of outstanding quality by Manet, Monet, Renoir, Degas, Cézanne, Pissarro, Sisley, and Berthe Morisot (fig. 64). An individual sub-section, with the title of "Monumental Painting Influenced by Impressionism," was devoted to Puvis de Chavannes. In sculpture, Impressionism was limited to works by Jean-Baptiste Carpeaux. As

[117] "In der Secession werden am 7. und 14. Februar Vorlesungen stattfinden, welche das Publicum über den innerlichen Zusammenhang der ausgestellten Werke orientiren sollen." Anonymous, "Theater- und Kunstnachrichten," *Neue Freie Presse*, January 31, 1903, 9.
[118] "Die gegenwärtige Raumausgestaltung in der Secession wurde schon im Hinblicke auf diese Vorträge derart eingerichtet, daß sich die drei centralen Säle zu einem einzigen Vortragsraum umwandeln lassen." Ibid.

already mentioned, the majority of the paintings in this section—which was very similar to the Impressionist galleries at the 1900 Paris Exposition Décennale—were provided by Durand-Ruel and Cassirer. The organizers of the exhibition united James McNeil Whistler, Besnard, Cottet, Simon, Gaston La Touche, Jean-Louis Forain, Max Liebermann and Max Slevogt, as well as the Neo-Impressionists Seurat and van Rysselberghe, under the catch-all phrase of "Expansion of Impressionism." Sculpture was covered by Rodin, Constantin Meunier, Jules Desbois, Alexandre Charpentier, Carabin, Emile Bourdelle, Medardo Rosso, Pierre-Félix Masseau, and Gaston Toussaint. A small collection of Japanese woodcuts was followed by the final section, "Transitions to Style," with Vincent van Gogh, Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, Édouard Vuillard, Pierre Bonnard, Marice Denis, Félix Vallotton, Ker-Xavier Roussel, Odilon Redon and Paul Gauguin, as well as sculptures by Gustav Vigeland. Emil Heilbut (whose pseudonym was Hermann Helferich) wrote in *Kunst und Künstler* that "the paintings have been distributed magnificently without any overcrowding— the Impressionists create a sight such as has never before been seen in any exhibition in Europe."[119] The "gallery character" of the exhibition is especially noteworthy whereby the demands placed on the artistic use of space by the early Secession was suppressed to a large extent. That the white cube presentation was intended is also confirmed by the fact that in this case no artist was made responsible for the interior decoration.[120]

[119] "Die Ausstellung war wunderbar angeordnet, die schönste Verteilung der Gemälde hat stattgefunden, ohne Überfüllung—die Impressionisten gewähren einen Anblick wie bisher noch nirgends auf irgendeiner Ausstellung in Europa." Emil Heilbut, "Die Impressionisten-Ausstellung der Wiener Secession," *Kunst und Künstler* 1 (1902-03): 170. With 38 pages and 34 illustrations, Heilbut's article is the most extensive review of the exhibition.
[120] The change in the statutes shortly before the opening of the 16th Secession Exhibition, whereby all future exhibitions should either have an interior design or gallery character, was an attempt to smother a smoldering conflict that culminated in the resignation of the Klimt group in 1905. Sabine Forsthuber, *Moderne Raumkunst: Wiener Ausstellungsbauten von 1898 bis 1914* (Vienna: Picus, 1991), 91-116.

Ver sacrum, the Secession's journal, advertised the exhibition as a first step towards "presenting Impressionism as a self-contained phenomenon" as previously individual works had reached Vienna only sporadically.[121] The working committee, with the assistance of the art historians Meier-Graefe and Muther, set one of its major—in fact Hegelian—objectives showing that "any kind of development in the fine arts is also the result of action and reaction."[122] They hoped to foster an understanding of contemporary art by showing the public "the aspects of modern art that are a further development of what has just become classic and what is to be interpreted as a counteraction to this."[123] This virtually mechanistic logic provided each work with its sense and place in history, even if the ability to judge in the years around 1900 could no longer be founded on a normative aesthetic. In an essay given to exhibition visitors along with the catalogue, and also printed in both the *Neue Freie Presse* and *Ver Sacrum*, Meier-Graefe stated that

> In no period of history were there more pictures than in ours, and in none was the understanding of these pictures so limited and chaotic. Even among the best of friends who share most ideas, there are hardly any common opinions, in the intimate sense, about the value of any specific painter. The more individuality art creates, the more individual the way of looking at this art becomes. And the connections that explain and cultivate all of the positive impulses of our time appear to be banished.[124]

[121] "Diese Ausstellung ist wohl der erste Versuch, der gemacht wurde, den Impressionismus als abgeschlossene Erscheinung zur Anschauung zu bringen." Anonymous, "Die XVI. Ausstellung unserer Vereinigung," *Ver Sacrum* 6, no. 2 (1903): 33.
[122] "Maßgebend für die Veranstaltung dieser Ausstellung, die naturgemäß mehr Rückblicke in die Vergangenheit als Ausblicke in die Zukunft bietet, war dem Arbeitsausschuß die Erwägung, daß sich auch in der bildenden Kunst alle Entwicklung aus Aktion und Reaktion zusammensetzt,..." Ibid., 27.
[123] "was an der modernen Kunst als Fortentwicklung der soeben klassisch gewordenen und was als Gegenbewegung gegen sie aufzufassen ist." Ibid.
[124] "Es hat in keiner Zeit mehr Bilder gegeben als in der unsrigen und in keiner war das Verständnis für das Bild so beschränkt und verwildert. Es gibt kaum einen Maler, über dessen Wert man bei dem besten Freunde, mit dem man sonst alle möglichen Ideen gemein hat, verwandte Meinungen im intimeren Sinne findet. Je mehr Individualitäten die Kunst hervorbringt, desto individueller wird die Kunstbetrachtung. Und die Zusammenhänge, die sonst alle positiven Impulse unserer ökonomischen Zeit erklären und fördern, scheinen verbannt." Julius Meier-Graefe, "Der Impressionismus in Malerei und Sculptur," *Neue Freie Presse*, January 19, 1903, 1.

However, according to Meier-Graefe, the zealots of the rule of individuality forget one thing. If the aesthetic disinterestedness is driven so far that ultimately any means of communication are lost, art will be robbed of its greatest value, namely, that of being enjoyed by others. This stance also explains Meier-Graefe's concept of modern art as a process of development: "If there were really artists […] who resembled nobody before or after their own time, if masters really appeared from nowhere and then departed without leaving traces of their art on others, art would no longer exist. Art is a symbol for the noblest form of Communism."[125]

When dealing with the artistic competition between nations, Meier-Graefe declared that France—in his opinion, the last and most powerful branch of the Latin tree—was unquestionably the victor. In painting, Impressionism had attained everything possible using the means available to it; the capability of translating the impression made by nature into something purely artistic. However, this was "not a decisive victory, because painting is not the sole, decisive art form." He predicted that, in the not too distant future, German art would triumph over "Latin decadence" if it took advantage of what was a hindrance in the area of pure painting, namely the "revival of an architectonic, total work of art." Meier-Graefe felt that the ingeniousness of Impressionism resulted from its ability to take all the artistic elements that had ever existed in painting and in spite of all of the foreign components, develop the most national form of art.

> While German art is fragmented into a thousand pieces, of which not a single one gives a clear and redoubtable idea of the nerve of our nature, while the deeds of our very best artists are eclipsed by a great variety of tendencies that cultivate all kinds of interests—

[125] "Gäbe es wirklich Künstler […], die Niemandem vor oder nach ihrer Zeit ähneln, gäbe es wirklich vom Himmel gefallene Meister, die gehen, ohne in Anderen Spuren ihrer Art zu hinterlassen, so gäbe es keine Kunst mehr. Kunst ist ein Sinnbild des edelsten Communismus." Ibid.

> but least of all artistic ones—a school has developed in Paris, the Rome of our time, that, with astonishing economy, has drawn on all of the lifeblood of the past to create a great, breathtaking work.[126]

The Viennese newspaper commentators also paid particular attention to the process of historicizing the avant-garde. For example, Franz Servaes recognized a "sudden change in the weather" in the Secession exhibition. Only a short time before, he noted, the young revolutionaries of art wanted to be original geniuses who created a new form of art based entirely on nature, but now they seemed to be making great efforts to establish an "ancestors' gallery" in order to create a vital connection with the important, highly praised movements of the past. The "pose of the genius and revolutionary" was suddenly thrown overboard and one took up a position, humbly but confidently, in the eternal cycle of art history. Where were the borders? Servaes explained that Impressionism was actually an ancient art form and

> could just as easily be found with the old Egyptians, Greeks and Romans as with the Venetians of the sixteenth, the Dutch and Spaniards of the seventeenth, and the Japanese of the eighteenth centuries. The only difference is that the last mentioned are closer to us and therefore have a more immediate impact on the art of our time. Impressionism has always been the continuation of Naturalism that itself opposed Idealism and stylized Academicism. Whenever art had developed into cold, formalized dexterity, artists begin with a new study of nature in order to save themselves.[127]

---

[126] "Während die deutsche Kunst in tausend Richtungen zersplitterte, von denen nicht eine einzige den Nerv unserer Art klar und gebietend zeigt, während die Taten unserer Besten von vielgearteten Tendenzen verdunkelt wurden, die jedes mögliche Interesse, nur am wenigsten deutlich das der Kunst zu fördern vermögen, entwickelte sich in Paris, dem Rom unserer Zeit, eine Schule, die mit bewundernswerter Ökonomik alle Säfte zur Schöpfung eines überwältigen großen Werkes heranzog." Ibid., 2.

[127] "In der That ist er Impressionismus uralt und ließe sich ebenso gut bei den alten Ägyptern, Griechen und Römern, nachweisen als bei den Venezianern des sechzehnten, den Niederländern und Spaniern des siebzehnten und den Japanern des achtzehnten Jahrhunderts. Nur dass letztere Gruppen uns näher stehen und deshalb auf die Kunst unserer Zeit unmittelbar zu wirken vermochten. Der Impressionismus war stets die Fortsetzung des Naturalismus, der seinerseits den Gegenschlag gegen Idealismus und stilisierten Akademismus bedeutet. Denn stets wenn die Kunst zur kalten Geschicklichkeitsformel geworden war, begann man, um sich zu retten, mit einem neuen Naturstudium." Franz Servaes, "Secession," *Neue Freie Presse*, January 22, 1903, 1.

From the beginning, the Secession's working committee worried that the exhibition's concept could be too easily expanded, lose focus, and become diluted. Although it was understood that Impressionist approaches could be found in the artistic activities of many periods, only those artists could be considered Impressionists in the narrower sense who "made the appearance of objects the goal of their study, and achieved their artistic aims through the previously unimagined amplification of the reproduction of the impressions on the retina."[128] The feature writers of the Viennese dailies also attempted to come up with a definition for Impressionism. Was an artist "who attempted to reproduce the phenomena of nature as he sees them" an Impressionist? Or, would it be better to characterize them *ex negativo* as "the opposite of the Stylists"?[129]

Seligmann, the influential critic of the *Neue Freie Presse*, wrote that Impressionism was principally to be understood as the "opposite of stylistic art."[130] In his opinion, if it was a style of painting that depicted things as they seem to be, another style must exist that showed things as they are—something he doubted. He did not deny that the Impressionists' method was more appropriate to "the increased sensitivity, the nervous sense of unrest of the age," and a tendency to scientific exactness than those previously customary. However, Seligmann—who was a recognized painter of historical subjects in his own right—questioned whether there was any connection between the expansion of the technical means of representation, the external form or

[128] "Da man aber als Impressionisten im engeren Sinne erst die Künstler bezeichnen kann, die mit Bewusstsein und Absicht und zum Schlusse mit einer gewissen Ausschließlichkeit die Erscheinung der Dinge zum Ziele ihres Studiums machten und durch die vorher ungeahnte Steigerung in der Wiedergabe der Netzhauteindrücke ihre künstlerischen Absichten erreichten, so beschied man sich endlich dahin, mit den unmittelbaren Vorläufern und wichtigsten Beeinflussern dieser Gruppe den Anfang zu machen." Anonymous, "Die XVI. Ausstellung unserer Vereinigung," *Ver Sacrum* 6, no. 2 (1903): 28.
[129] "der die Erscheinungen der Natur wiederzugeben bemüht ist, so wie er sie sieht […] Gegensatz zu den Stilisten…" Friedrich Sierz, "Neuerer," *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, January 19, 1903, 1.
[130] Adalbert Seligmann, "Die Impressionisten: Ausstellung der Sezession Februar—März 1903," in *Kunst und Künstler von gestern und heute: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Vienna: Konegen, 1910), 44.

style, and the quality of a work of art. He believed that reproducing nature was not the purpose of art but merely a means to achieve its purpose, implying that the perfection of the means did not simultaneously represent the perfection of art. In Seligmann's words, Impressionism was a new path but not a new goal. And finally, he used a Hegelian argument to support his negative judgment: "That Impressionist innovations do not mean any substantial artistic progress per se can be seen by the fact that these two opposing directions in the development of art continuously replace each other and that, as we now observe, the Impressionist endeavors will definitely produce a relapse into the stylistic."[131]

Seligmann also doubted that most people had a better understanding of art in 1903 than they did forty years before when Impressionist pictures were ridiculed. He felt that the unprecedented prices these paintings recently fetched on the market, the spectacular acquisitions for galleries and museums, could not lead one to expect any better understanding. Further, he insisted that texts intended to enlighten the public, such as the "little tract" by Meier-Graefe that was handed out to exhibition visitors did not actually explain the misunderstood, but rather, they spread "in a confused and pompous literary style, metaphysical-aesthetic phrases" that made things everyone understands unintelligible.[132]

Although Meier-Graefe lived in Paris, records show that he corresponded with the Viennese Secession as early as 1898, and he was the person principally responsible for the concept of the

[131] "Daß impressionistische Neuerungen an sich keinen wesentlich künstlerischen Fortschritt bedeuten, ist schon daraus zu sehen, daß diese beiden entgegengesetzten Richtungen in der Entwicklung der Kunst sich fortwährend ablösen und daß, wie eben auch jetzt, die impressionistischen Bestrebungen unfehlbar einen Rückschlag ins Stilistische erzeugen." Ibid.
[132] "Das erstgenannte Traktätlein [von Meier-Gräfe in Paris] bringt in einer konfusen und geschwollenen Schreibweise metaphysisch-ästhetische Phrasen, die, anstatt Unverstandenes zu erklären, das jedermann Bekannte unverständlich zu machen." Ibid., 45-46.

Impressionist exhibition. Meier-Graefe was the one to be thanked for the show's focus on the "development" idea and also for the later substantiation of this concept in his three-volume tome "The Developmental History of Modern Art."[133] His letters to the Secession inform us that he was extremely influential in selecting the artists to be exhibited. On several occasions, he advised Bernatzik to include some works by the Italian sculptor Medardo Rosso, who had been a particular inspiration to Rodin.[134] It appears that he also recommended that the Norwegian sculptor Gustav Vigeland be integrated into the exhibition. Bernatzik was advised to acquire a neo-impressionist picture from Henry van de Velde, who had decorated Meier-Graefe's office at La Maison Moderne. Meier-Graefe's gallery in Paris provided for the exhibition a work by Toulouse-Lautrec as well as one by Vallotton—the latter was even sold in Vienna for 800 francs.[135] Meier-Graefe strongly recommended Morisot to the Secession as a "really excellent artist;" Durand-Ruel had several of her works and, in addition, "it would be really fine if you could move the borders a little bit towards the back to include a Delacroix, a Constable, a Turner—the latter, at all events—and also Watteau and Rubens from among the Old Masters. This would complete the line."[136]

Meier-Graefe also attempted to have a say in planning the lectures accompanying the exhibition. Although his book "The Modern Impressionism" had just been published in Richard Muther's

[133] Julius Meier-Graefe, *Entwicklungsgeschichte der modernen Kunst: Vergleichende Betrachtung der bildenden Künste, als Beitrag zur modernen Ästhetik*, 3 vols. (Stuttgart: Hoffmann, 1904).
[134] Meier-Graefe to Bernatzik, July 29, 1902, Meier-Graefe no. 6418, Vienna Secession Archive.
[135] La Maison Moderne to Vienna Secession, invoice dated March 10, 1903, Meier-Graefe no. 6433, Vienna Secession Archive.
[136] "Ausserdem wäre es sehr schön, wenn Sie auch nach hinten die Linien verlängern könnten, und zwar wenn Sie derselben einen Delacroix, einen Constable, einen Turner, diese letzteren unter allen Umständen, als dann von alten noch Watteau und Rubens hinzufügen. Dann ist die Linie geschlossen." Meier-Graefe to Bernatzik, September 12, 1902, Meier-Graefe no. 6420.b, Vienna Secession Archive.

Die Kunst series,[137] he advised the Secession not to engage Muther as a second lecturer because Muther "does not have any clearly focused views on the real nature of Impressionism."[138] Meier-Graefe recommended that Muther be asked to write the preface of the catalogue, or that he be made an honorary member of the Secession, because, in no way, should the Secession fall out with him. (Muther had been art critic for the Viennese weekly *Die Zeit* since 1899.) In order to have an organic account of the development of Impressionism, it was essential that Meier-Graefe have three evenings at his exclusive disposal to deliver his lectures:

> 1st Evening. The Development of Impressionism, Manet and Monet and the others (Degas, Cézanne, Vuillard, Bonnard), you could say "the whole gang." 2nd Evening. The Neo-Impressionists. Impressionism in Japan and its influence on Europe, Lautrec, Gauguin (you absolutely have to show him, I have something), of course sidelights on Degas and Whistler. 3rd Evening. The stupid thing is that, if the first two evenings are not in the same hands, it will be impossible to handle. There will only be a connection with the third part when everything that had to be said before is complete—and that is where I have doubts about Muther. Yet, this is your business. Of course, I am not speaking pro domo.[139]

According to newspaper reports, only two lectures were actually held surrounded by Impressionist works on February 7 and 14, 1903. Richard Muther spoke for one and a half hours on "The Nature and Development of Impressionism," during which he apparently directly interacted with the pictures on the wall. In his attempt to make the art of Manet and Monet

---

[137] Julius Meier-Graefe, *Der Moderne Impressionismus: mit einer kolorierten Kunstbeilage und 7 Vollbildern in Tonätzung* (Berlin: Bard, 1903).

[138] "über des eigentliche Wesen des Impressionismus keine scharf umrissenen Ansichten." Meier-Graefe to Bernatzik, October 19, 1902, Vienna Secession Archive, nos. 6426.a and 6426.b.

[139] "I. Abend. Die Entwicklung des Impressionismus, Manet und Monet und was dazu gehört (Degas, Cezanne, Vuillard, Bonnard) man sagt toute la bande. II. Abend. Die Neoimpressionisten. Der Impressionismus Japans und Einfluss auf Europa, Lautrec, Gauguin (den Sie übrigens unbedingt unterbringen müssen, ich habe etwas) natürlich Streiflichter auf Degas und Whistler. III. Abend. Das Dumme ist, dass wenn man die ersten beiden Teile nicht in eine Hand legt, die Bewältigung absolut unmöglich ist, schon der III. Teil ist nur dann im Zusammenhang, wenn vorher alles, was gesagt werden muss, da ist, und da habe ich bei Muther Zweifel. Enfin, c'est votre affaire. Ich rede selbstredend nicht pro Domo." Ibid.

understandable through historical arguments, Muther did not shrink back from making sweeping mental leaps; for example, he located the first impulses for open-air painting in the work of the sixteenth century Italian painter Piero di Cosimo. Although a professor of art history at Breslau University, Muther had a feeling for how a broad public would deal with painting. It was essential to breathe in the aroma of the artworks, to have a feeling for them and translate the nuances of these feelings into words. The suggestive should take the place of the descriptive in art history. Ludwig Hevesi reported that the lecture was enlivened by extemporizing and that coincidental colors of the moment left enough space for "his lecture on Impressionism to develop into a genuinely Impressionist achievement."[140]

Meier-Graefe continued along these lines, in the second lecture concentrating mainly on the conclusions that could be drawn from the classic Impressionists, and placing particular emphasis on van Gogh and Toulouse-Lautrec. The tension between Meier-Graefe and Muther was probably due to the fact that Muther to a certain extent was still able to accept the stylistic pluralism of the nineteenth century while Meier-Graefe created an entelechy from Delacroix through Impressionism to Post-Impressionism that viewed any deviation from this path as a failing.[141] The two lectures were received with much interest from the public; tickets sold out well in advance. The *Wiener Morgenzeitung* reported that the "auditorium, which included all members of society interested in the arts, as well as the elite of Vienna's artistic circles" listened

[140] "So war auch der Vortrag über den Impressionnismus [sic] eine richtige impressionnistische Leistung." Ludwig Hevesi, "Vorträge über den Impressionnismus," In id., *Acht Jahre Secession (März 1897-Juni 1905): Kritik—Polemik—Chronik* (Vienna: Konegen, 1906), 418.
[141] On the "'Überwindung' Muthers" see: Eduard Hüttinger, *Porträts und Profile: Zur Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte* (St. Gallen: Erker, 1992), 49-52.

in rapt attention.[142] Most important, the Minister of Education Wilhelm von Hartel was present on both occasions, leading to hopes that the state would make purchases at the exhibition.

Two days after Meier-Graefe's lecture, the president of the Secession informed the Galerie Durand-Ruel in Paris of the disappointing sales up to that point, which he considered to be a result of the "financial crisis triggered by political incidents." The Secession, he said, was still negotiating over a number of paintings from the gallery including Sisley's *Lady with a Parasol*, Monet's *Monsieur Paul* and Degas' *The Ballet*, and, even though sales did not fulfill expectations, one could still hope that the government will acquire some of the great Impressionists.[143] Eventually, Monet's *Monsieur Paul* (fig. 65) was purchased for 8,000 francs for the state's Moderne Galerie that had been founded in the same year, and a private collector acquired Pissarro's *Farm* for 7,000 francs.[144] The exhibition was not an immediate financial success for Durand-Ruel, but it was a decisive event for positioning the brand of Impressionism in Europe. After the end of the Viennese show, one third of the works provided by Durand-Ruel went to the next venue in Budapest where the international spread of French Impressionism continued. On July 1, 1903, the Fifth Annual Report of the Secession recorded: "You will probably be interested to know that this exhibition, which received so much attention abroad, is now being copied. This year, an Impressionist exhibition following exactly the same program will be shown in Brussels."[145]

---

[142] Ludwig Abels, "Muther in der Secession," *Wiener Morgenzeitung*, February 10, 1903, 7.
[143] Bernatzik to Durand-Ruel, February 16, 1903, Durand-Ruel Archive, Paris. Quoted in Narzt, "Briefwechsel," 225.
[144] Works valued at a total of 49,350 gulden changed owners. See Fifth Annual Report, Vienna Secession Archive.
[145] "Es wird Sie vielleicht interessieren zu erfahren, dass diese Ausstellung, welche im Auslande allgemeine Aufmerksamkeit erregte, Nachahmung gefunden hat. In Brüssel findet in diesem Jahre ganz nach demselben Programme eine Ausstellung des Impressionismus statt." Ibid.

2.7 "As logically and purposefully as a historical drama"

Only when order was imposed upon the confusing diversity of contemporary art practices could the exhibition shake off its market-like character and attain educative value. In this respect, the Vienna Impressionist Exhibition of 1903 was a model event that proved exceptionally influential. It established the primacy of French modern art within a European development. But history can only be molded into an arrow-like form via generous selection, with artistic expressions outside this *via triumphalis* being necessarily relegated to oblivion. The art of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, in its unregulated diversity, simply did not fit into this established master narrative. Despite its European orientation, no artist from the Royal and Imperial Monarchy gained admittance to the Vienna Impressionist Exhibition.

Prior to that exhibition, Richard Muther, in his function as a staff writer on fine art for the Viennese weekly *Die Zeit,* had frequently lambasted incoherent presentations both at the Künstlerhaus and at the Secession. In such cases, he ironically suggested that exhibition reviews should be conducted in alphabetical order, as there was no logical relationship between the individual works that was greater than that between the letters A, B, and C. "One need not be an artist at all in order to mount a good exhibition. But one does need to have knowledge," Muther asserted. "This was something in which the gentlemen of the Secession, just like the members of the Cooperative, seemed to be completely lacking. One must realize that the staging of an exhibition is fundamentally the same as the composition of a painting or the authorship of a good article."[146]

[146] "Man braucht, um eine gute Ausstellung zustande zu bringen, ja gar kein Künstler zu sein. Aber man muß Kenntnisse haben. Die scheinen den Herren der Secession ganz ebenso wie den Mitgliedern der Genossenschaft zu fehlen. Man muß sich auch bewußt sein, daß die Inscenierung einer Ausstellung im Grunde dasselbe ist, wie die Composition eines Bildes oder die Abfassung eines guten Artikels." Richard Muther, "Die Ausstellung der

An exhibition must be understood as a narrative, and the lack of a golden thread running through exhibitions was considered the reason for the misery of art criticism. "For we authors, as well," claims Muther, "are artists and chafe at writing about things which, in their tangled, haphazard confusion, do not permit a decent composition."[147] At another point in *Die Zeit,* he voices a general complaint about the unpleasant situation of art criticism. He wrote that, thirty years prior, criticism had had an easy time of it, since it was enough to recount the text presented by the images. Works which the critic found to be literary were described according to their representational contents. Then came the era of large international exhibitions, at which the task of discussing paintings could be circumvented by losing oneself in general historical expositions on French, English, or Belgian art. Now this, too, was no longer possible. Historical completeness in laying down the pictorial material was no longer an objective, the task rather being to unite the art works in the various zones to a harmonious ensemble according to decorative considerations.[148]

Secession," *Die Zeit*, November 30, 1901, 138. Karl Kraus fired back with an ironic comment on the disjointed nature of the metaphors which Muther had chosen: "Mr. Muther is not only a critic of paintings, but also—as he assured the readers of the article from which this sentence is taken—an artist by virtue of his being an author. He, too, produces images, but he seems not to understand that which the 'Secession' is so good at, namely their spatial arrangement. Three images squeezed into the one sentence: naturalism is food, neo-idealism is a wake, and neo-idealistic artworks are stillborn children—it seems that Muther the artist would do quite well to engage in his own Secession from the stylistic company of Isi Singer, Kanner and Burckhart." ("Herr Muther ist nicht nur Bilderkritiker, sondern, wie er in dem Artikel, dem dieser Satz entnommen ist, versicherte, als Schriftsteller auch ein Künstler. Auch er producirt Bilder, aber er scheint sich auf das, was die 'Secession' so gut kann, auf ihre räumliche Anordung, nicht zu verstehen. Drei Bilder in einem Satz zusammengedrängt: Der Naturalismus ist eine Kost, der Neuidealismus ist ein Fahrwasser und die neuidealistischen Kunstwerke sind todtgeborene Kinder – es scheint, dass dem Künstler Muther eine Secession von der stilistischen Genossenschaft der Isi Singer, Kanner und Burckhard sehr wohl thäte.") Karl Kraus, "Artifex," *Die Fackel* 88 (December 16, 1901): 27.

[147] "Denn auch wir Schriftsteller sind Künstler und ärgern uns, über Dinge zu schreiben, die in ihrem wirren, planlosen Durcheinander keine vernünftige Composition gestatten." Ibid.

[148] Richard Muther, "Wiener Ausstellungen," *Die Zeit*, March 17, 1900, 168. Republished as "Frühlingsausstellungen 1900" in Richard Muther, *Studien und Kritiken*, 5th edition (Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1900), 1:53-81.

This decorative ordering principle may have applied to many exhibitions of the Vienna Secession, but the Impressionist Exhibition of 1903, with its broad arc of historic development, was of a different character. In Richard Muther's influential book on *The History of Modern Art* (1893/94), the final chapter bore the title "Fiat Lux."[149] There the Impressionist movement was portrayed as the final word in art's long battle of liberation. The privileged status of French painting within a European development emerged from the desire for a logical order of history that could lay claim to absolute necessity. In his review of a book by Roger Marx on the *Exposition centennale de l'art français*, Muther praised once again the amazing skill shown by the French in putting their artists in a favorable light. Had German and Austrian artists had the good fortune of having been born in France, they would have been held in higher esteem, he argued. At the Centennial Exhibition of 1900, the works were ordered such that everyone who walked through the galleries could get an idea of the historical development: "One saw that France had been the leading country in all questions of art during the nineteenth century, that all the problems posed by the nineteenth century received their classical solutions here, that elsewhere there may have been personalities of great caliber, but that only in Paris had there been a kind of art that developed as logically and purposefully as a historical drama."[150]

In 1901 Richard Muther accused the Vienna Secession of "megalomania." He argued that besides the merit of having brought foreign art to Austria, the association had not yet made an

[149] Richard Muther, *Geschichte der Malerei im 19. Jahrhundert*, 3 vols. (Munich: Hirth, 1893-94). English translation: *The History of Modern Painting*, 3 vols. (London: Henry and Co., 1895-96).
[150] "Man sah, daß Frankreich während des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts das führende Land in allen Kunstfragen war, daß alle Probleme, die das neunzehnte Jahrhundert stellte, hier ihre classische Lösung erhielten, daß es anderwärts wohl Persönlichkeiten größten Calibers, doch nur in Paris eine Kunst gab, die so folgerichtig und zielbewußt wie ein historisches Drama sich entwickelte." Richard Muther, "Roger Marx: Exposition centennale de l'art français 1800-1900," *Die Zeit*, January 12, 1901, 30.

authentic contribution to the development of a European modernism.[151] Of all the Secessionist painters, Muther considered Klimt to be the only one who could possibly withstand comparison to the great foreigners. But even he, said Muther, was not among the powerful ones who would introduce a new age; Klimt, as well, was derived from Besnard and Rossetti, Toorop and Knopff. A "small eastern corner of the world" was not, not by a long shot, the world. Just what characterized the Austrian note in the orchestra of a modernism in the European context was to remain something of a mystery. Muther attempted to make out the genuinely Austrian peculiarities vaguely in the "musical and dream-like" and "painterly and sensual."[152] To his predecessor at *Die Zeit*, Hermann Bahr, they revealed themselves above all in Klimt's Schubert painting (fig. 66): "This calm, this mildness, this shimmering upon bourgeois satisfaction—that is our Austrian essence!"[153] In search of an Austrian artistic identity two model periods emerged: while the liberal bourgeoisie privileged the Viennese Biedermeier as source for modern art, the catholic aristocracy tended to promote the Baroque tradition as "dynastic-transnational national style."[154] As mentioned above, the latter was used as a model for Baumann's Austrian Pavilion at the 1900 Exposition Universelle.

[151] Richard Muther, "Kunst und Größenwahn," *Die Zeit*, April 6, 1901, 8-10. Republished in Muther, *Studien und Kritiken*, 2:254-67.
[152] Richard Muther, "Die Ausstellung der Secession," *Die Zeit* 270, December 2, 1899, 138. Republished in Muther, *Studien und Kritiken*, 1: 1-27.
[153] Hermann Bahr, "Secession," *Die Zeit*, March 25, 1899, 185. Republished in: Hermann Bahr, *Secession* (Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1900), 122-27. According to Bahr, Klimt's Schubert is "the most beautiful picture ever painted by an Austrian." Hermann Bahr, "Malerei," *Die Zeit*, March 18, 1899, 171. Republished in Ibid., 117-21.
[154] Peter Stachel, "Albert Ilg und die 'Erfindung' des Barocks als österreichischer 'Nationalstil'," in *Barock—ein Ort des Gedächtnisses: Interpretament der Moderne/Postmoderne*, Moritz Csáky, Federico Celestini, and Ulrich Tragatschnig, eds. (Vienna: Böhlau, 2007), 101-52. Eva Michel, "Inventing Tradition: Die Rezeption der Alten Meister und das 'Barocke' in der österreichischen Malerei des 20. Jahrhunderts—Topos und künstlerische Strategie" (PhD. diss., University of Vienna, 2009).

3 The Value of Modern Art: Importing French Paintings, 1903-1914

3.1 Carl Moll: "Minister of the Arts Without Portfolio"

Carl Moll, turn-of-the-century Vienna's esteemed painter, frenetic organizer, and "cultural manager," was one of international modern art's most vehement advocates—although he himself practiced a painting style that was at first glance rather conservative. The example that he personally set makes clear how the Vienna of 1900, in contrast to many other European cultural centers, was a place where local artistic traditions could coexist and even merge with an imported modernism, which in this case came primarily from France.[1] The simultaneity of differing worldviews was an everyday phenomenon in turn-of-the-century Vienna: what other city could have been home to such different minds as those of Emperor Franz Joseph, Sigmund Freud, Leon Trotsky, and Adolf Hitler at the same time?[2]

It was above all as director of Vienna's influential Galerie Miethke that Moll played a key role in the dissemination of modern French painting in Vienna. Although Moll was an uncompromising proponent of modernism, he was not accepting of all that was new. When Arnold Schönberg asked him in 1910 whether he could exhibit his paintings at Miethke, Moll wrote to the composer that his pictures were not suited for exhibition there: "My petit bourgeois opinion is that, when addressing an audience, one must be expressive in an artistic form, as well. It seems to me that your form of artistic expression as a painter is still very much in its nascence. And I

[1] See for example, Carl E. Schorske, *Fin-de-siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (New York: Vintage Books, 1981), and Tobias G. Natter, *Die Galerie Miethke: Eine Kunsthandlung im Zentrum der Moderne* (Vienna: Jewish Museum, 2003).
[2] Wolfgang Maderthaner, "Von der Zeit um 1860 bis zum Jahr 1945," in *Wien: Geschichte einer Stadt,* vol. 3, *Von 1790 bis zur Gegenwart*, Peter Csendes and Ferdinand Opll, eds. (Vienna: Böhlau, 2006), 251.

fear that your hopes will also remain unfulfilled in the material sense, if you allow yourself a misstep here."[3]

Moll was writing not only as Galerie Miethke's artistic director, but also as an art dealer--who, despite the general hostility toward new French art, was most certainly conscious of its commercial value. He made repeated trips to France and Germany in order to acquire interesting and valuable works for the (small) Viennese market.

Moll took one of these trips with Gustav Klimt. In Paris, they met Hugo von Tschudi, the director of the National Gallery in Berlin. Tschudi made numerous purchases of modern French art, but was ultimately frustrated by the reluctance of the German emperor to support his choice. In a 1909 postcard to his close friend Emilie Flöge, Klimt wrote: "Went to a private gallery with Tschudi yesterday afternoon—Cézanne—Manet—very beautiful!"[4] Unfortunately, it is not possible to trace exactly which gallery Klimt visited with Tschudi and Moll, but it is known that a few days earlier Tschudi met Henri Matisse for the first time at the Salon d'automne, after which he accompanied him back to his studio.[5] It is quite probable that Tschudi, who up to then had been purchasing above all French Impressionists for Germany, had called Moll's and

[3] "Meine spießbürgerliche Meinung ist nun aber dass man sich auch in künstlerischer Form ausdrücken muss, wenn man zur Öffentlichkeit spricht. Ihre künstlerische Ausdrucksform als Maler erscheint mir noch sehr im Anfangsstadium. Ich fürchte auch, dass sich ihre Hoffnungen in materieller Hinsicht nicht erfüllen werden, wenn Sie einen falschen Schritt tun." Carl Moll to Arnold Schönberg, June 18, 1910, Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna; quoted in: Natter, *Die Galerie Miethke*, 80.
[4] "Gestern Nachmitt[a]g mit Tschudi Privatgallerie besucht—Cezanne—Manet—sehr schön!" postcard Gustav Klimt to Emilie Flöge, October 19, 1909, reprinted in Tobias Natter, Franz Smola, Peter Weinhäupl, eds. *Klimt persönlich: Bilder—Briefe—Einblicke* (Vienna: Brandstätter, 2012), 353.
[5] Barbara Paul, *Hugo von Tschudi und die moderne französische Kunst im Deutschen Kaiserreich* (Mainz: P. von Zabern, 1993), 304.

Klimt's attention to the Fauvist painter.[6] Klimt, however, was more taken by the Asian art at the Musée Guimet, which he found "very interesting," and even the Musée du Luxembourg did not particularly impress him: "Lux[embourg] nothing exciting!"[7] For Moll, however, this stay in Paris once again proved to him the superiority of French art, and he wrote to the architect Josef Hoffmann in Vienna: "Little squares were yesterday, naturalism is what counts."[8] The definition of "naturalism" used here is, as Alice Strobl has suggested, "probably rather an exaggeration of naturalism that manifests itself in strongly expressive works."[9] In Moll's own art, on the other hand, none of this expressive tendency is visible.

It is impressive how Moll's *Self-Portrait in the Studio* (fig. 67), of ca. 1906, illustrates the muddle of contradictions and ambivalences generally characteristic of fin-de-siècle Vienna, as well as the contradiction between Moll the impresario and Moll the artist. In this picture, Moll represented himself sitting at his desk, properly attired in a suit and bowtie. He appears to be busy with office work, as if it were also clear to Moll the artist that Moll the organizer and gallery director was capable of doing more important work at his desk than at his easel. In the foreground are two prominent artworks that Moll had brought to Vienna as an organizer of exhibitions and which were evidently, at least for a short time, part of his private collection: Van Gogh's *Portrait of the Artist's Mother* (fig. 68) and George Minne's *Kneeling Youth* (fig. 69).

Stylistically, Moll—as so often in his oeuvre—works with diverse constellations of lights and

[6] Franz Smola, "Zum Stilwandel 1909: 'Aus ist's mit den Quadratln, naturalistisch ist Trumpf,'" in *Klimt persönlich: Bilder—Briefe—Einblicke*, 233–39.
[7] "Gestern Museé Guimet—sehr interessant." Gustav Klimt to Emilie Flöge, October 23, 1909, quoted in *Klimt persönlich: Bilder—Briefe—Einblicke,* 356. "Gestern Luxembourg und Musée des Arts decoratifs— Lux.[embourg] viel Holler!" Gustav Klimt to Emilie Flöge, October 21, 1909, quoted in ibid. 354.
[8] The square as basic form of ornamentation was considered passé. Christian M. Nebehay, *Gustav Klimt: Dokumentation* (Vienna: Galerie Nebehay, 1969), 500.
[9] Alice Strobl, *Gustav Klimt: Die Zeichnungen*, vol. 2, *1904-1912* (Salzburg: Galerie Welz, 1982), 200.

shadows, consciously depicting spatial depth; in this, he differed from most of the other Secessionists of the so-called Klimt group who preferred to stress the flatness of the canvas. Oskar Kokoschka also discerned the spatial qualities in Minne's *Kneeling Youth*: "In the brittle shapes, in the introversion of his [Minne's] sculptures, I believed to see an abandonment of Art Nouveau's two-dimensionality."[10] Minne exhibited the first version of his fountain with the kneeling youths at the Vienna Secession in 1900; it received so much attention that the artists association decided to devote an entire issue of their periodical *Ver Sacrum* the following year to Minne's works. The first sentence of the essay on Minne began by stating that "one read and heard peculiar things in Vienna about the Minne exhibition; depressingly peculiar, grotesque, and unfortunately just as coarse as if we were still in the era of the Crusades."[11] It continued by posing the worried question: "And what about that much-touted progress?"[12] Moll asked himself this question often enough over the course of his battle against the Habsburg capital's conservative press. It was probably as part of this Minne exhibition that he purchased the eighty-centimeter-tall plaster model of the kneeling youth that is visible in the self-portrait. The work had been submitted to the exhibition by La Maison Moderne in Paris. Julius Meier-Graefe, that gallery's founder and proprietor, had contacted Moll, the Secession president, in the spring of 1900 regarding loan items for an exhibition. A letter from early in their correspondence reads, "In principle, we can already say the following today, that we'd like to exhibit the complete Minne, namely the fountain and various other sculptures by him."[13]

---

[10] "In den spröden Formen, in der Innerlichkeit seiner [George Minnes] Skulpturen, glaubte ich eine Abkehr von der Zweidimensionalität des Jugendstils zu sehen." Oskar Kokoschka, *Mein Leben* (Munich: Bruckmann, 1971), 56.
[11] "Man hat merkwürdige Sachen in Wien über die Minne-Ausstellung gelesen und gehört; deprimierend merkwürdig, grotesk und leider so roh, als wären wir noch in der Zeit der Kreuzzüge." Anonymous, "George Minne," *Ver Sacrum* 4, no. 2 (1901): 31.
[12] "Wo bleibt der berühmte Fortschritt?" Ibid.
[13] "Im Prinzip können wir Ihnen schon heute folgendes sagen, wir möchten Minne komplet [sic] ausstellen, nämlich den Brunnen und diverse andere Skulpturen von ihm." Julius Meier-Graefe, no. 6356, Vienna Secession Archive, Vienna.

Moll purchased the Van Gogh painting[14] depicted in this picture's upper left-hand edge from Paul Cassirer in Berlin in 1905, by which time he had already become artistic director at Galerie Miethke; he also acquired from Cassirer two additional van Goghs (*Olive Grove* and *Garden of the Hospital in Arles*) for the gallery. One year later, the Galerie Miethke presented forty-five works by van Gogh, and this showing had a demonstrable influence on important young artists in the Habsburg capital. The year 1906 most likely also witnessed the creation of Moll's self-portrait. The iconography of artists' self-portraits at the turn of the twentieth century was still largely conservative, limited to portrayals before the easel at the studio with brush and palette in hand. Richard Gerstl, in a self-portrait of 1904, departed from this traditional three-quarter frontal view of the artist in his studio and took a decisive step into modernism by portraying himself as a messiah-like figure, half-naked before an ethereally blue background with an aureole.[15] Moll goes at once less far and farther by portraying himself as an arts manager—anticipating the present-day reality of many artists, who are forced to invest more time in writing grant applications than in doing actual creative work. The painting represents a brutally accurate depiction of Moll's tragedy. Though esteemed by society as a painter, he nonetheless knew that his true calling was more in arts management. It is telling that the portraits of him done by his painter-colleagues likewise refrain from showing him wielding a brush, though Kokoschka at

[14] The painting in question is *Portrait of the Artist's Mother* (1888, Norton Simon Museum of Art, Pasadena, CA). In a letter to his brother Theo, Vincent briefly described the creation of the portrait of his mother, Anna Cornelia van Gogh-Carbentus (1819–1907): "I'm working on a portrait of our mother because the black photograph was making me too impatient. Ah, what portraits we could make from life with photography and painting! I always have hopes that a great revolution still awaits us in portraiture. I'm writing home to have our father's portrait too. Myself, I don't want black photographs, and yet I still want to have a portrait. The one of our mother, a no. 8 canvas, will be ashy, on a green background, and her clothes *carmine*. I don't know if it will be a good resemblance, but I want an impression of blond colouring, at least. You'll see it one day, and if you like I'll do one for you too. It will be in heavy impasto again." Vincent van Gogh, Arles, to Theo van Gogh, Paris, October 9 or 10, 1888, letter no. 700, Vincent van Gogh: The Letters, Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam, http://vangoghletters.org/vg/letters/let700/letter.html (accessed March 26, 2011).

[15] Richard Gerstl, *Semi-Nude Self-Portrait* (ca. 1904, Leopold Museum, Vienna).

least implied the presence of an easel in his portrayal.[16]

The obvious contradictions between Moll's dedicated efforts to promote European modernism in Vienna and his own painting, rooted in the traditions of the nineteenth century, reflects the culture of simultaneity that prevailed in turn-of-the-century Vienna. "One had faith and was skeptical, one was naturalistic and precious, robust and morbid," wrote Robert Musil in his seminal novel fragment *The Man Without Qualities*:

> Admittedly these were contradictions and very different battlecries, but they all breathed the same breath of life. […] This illusion, which found its embodiment in the magical date of the turn of the century, was so powerful that it made some hurl themselves enthusiastically upon the new, as yet untrodden century, while others were having a last fling in the old one, as in a house that one is moving out of anyway, without either one or the other party feeling that there was much difference between the two attitudes.[17]

Carl Moll tied together all of these phenomena and contradictions in his own person, as was noted frequently by the conservative art critic Adalbert F. Seligmann. Writing on the Kunstschau (Art Exhibition) of 1908, for example, Seligmann commented:

> A room with paintings by C. Moll. [...] Standing before these pictures, it is more difficult than ever to understand how Moll the theoretician, who ferociously defends the likes of [Paul] Gauguin, [Maurice] Denis, and van Gogh, can coexist peacefully with Moll the

[16] See for example: Maximilian Florian, *Portrait of Carl Moll* (1943, Belvedere, Vienna), or Herbert Boeckl, *Portrait of Carl Moll I* (1943, Belvedere, Vienna). Oskar Kokoschka, *Portrait of Carl Moll* (1913, Belvedere, Vienna). Since his marriage to the widow of Emil Jakob Schindler in 1895, he had been the stepfather to her daughter Alma, later the wife of Gustav Mahler. The year after Mahler's 1911 death, Moll introduced his stepdaughter to Kokoschka, and this meeting gave rise to a passionate affair.

[17] "man war gläubig und skeptisch, naturalistisch und preziös, robust und morbid"; "Dies waren freilich Widersprüche und höchst verschiedene Schlachtrufe, aber sie hatten einen gemeinsamen Atem [...]. Diese Illusion, die ihre Verkörperung in dem magischen Datum der Jahrhundertwende fand, war so stark, daß sich die einen begeistert auf das neue, noch unbenützte Jahrhundert stürzten, indes die anderen sich noch schnell im alten wie in einem Hause gehen ließen, aus dem man ohnehin auszieht, ohne daß sie diese beiden Verhaltensweisen als sehr unterschiedlich gefühlt hätten." Robert Musil, *The Man Without Qualities*, Eithne Wilkins and Ernst Kaiser, trans. (London: Secker and Warburg, 1953), 59.

> painter, who both feels and depicts in an amicably modest and thoroughly traditional way. I think that if some artist were to bring him these paintings for an exhibition, the Miethke art salon's artistic director [i.e., Moll himself] would pat him on the shoulder and say: "These things are indeed quite nicely painted, but they're not for us. Why don't you take them to the Christmas exhibition of the Artists' Society; they're sure to find a buyer there right away."[18]

It can no longer be judged whether Seligman's comment is just a polemic, or whether Seligman—who wrote scathing reviews in the *Neue Freie Presse* of nearly all of the exhibitions Moll organized for Galerie Miethke—was also acting out of concrete personal motives. It is known, at any rate, that Seligmann—himself a historicist painter—had mounted his own exhibition at the gallery in January 1903 (at which he sold at least five paintings).[19] Moll became the gallery's artistic director in autumn 1904, and it was obvious that as long as he was responsible for the gallery's exhibiting policy, Seligmann could abandon all hope of mounting further exhibitions there. While the painter Moll was personally quite partial to historicism, the collector and arts manager Moll had long since arrived in the twentieth century, a transition demonstrated by much more than just the van Gogh in his studio and the major van Gogh exhibition at Miethke. In Austria, Moll was confronted with a lack of understanding for the expressive formal language of van Gogh among the educated bourgeoisie and the local press, but even in Germany a museum's purchase of a painting by van Gogh had also led to the scandal remembered throughout the German-speaking world as the Vinnen Controversy.

---

[18] "Ein Saal mit Bildern von C. Moll. [...] Man versteht vor diesen Bildern weniger als je, wie der Theoretiker Moll, der für Gauguin, Denis, van Gogh Lanzen bricht, sich mit dem in liebenswürdig bescheidenen, ganz nach alter Weise empfindenden und darstellenden Maler Moll vertragen kann. Ich glaube, der artistische Leiter des Kunstsalon Miethke [d.i. Moll selbst] würde einem Künstler, der ihm diese Bilder zur Ausstellung brächte, auf die Schulter klopfen und sagen: "Die Sachen sind ja sehr hübsch gemacht, aber nichts für uns. Geben Sie's doch in die Weihnachtsausstellung der Künstlergenossenschaft; dort werden sie gewiß gleich verkauft sein." A. F. S. [Adalbert Franz Seligmann], "Die Kunstschau 1908," *Neue Freie Presse*, June 2, 1908, 14.

[19] See Natter, *Galerie Miethke*, 193.

3.2 The Vinnen Controversy

The author, publisher, and patron of the arts, Alfred Walter Heymel, predicted that one day the history of art would have a single person to thank for explaining, as no one else had previously done, the intentions of the artists active around 1910—that person was Carl Vinnen. Today, the situation no longer appears as clear-cut as Heymel described it one hundred years ago, but the so-called "Vinnen-controversy" produced a great number of statements on the Franco-German cultural transfer that record the profound anxieties and aspirations of the artistic world as it was becoming more international. This controversy about the value of modern art and the role of the market spread beyond the German border, sparking heated discussions in the imperial city of Vienna.

In 1911, the painter Carl Vinnen from Worpswede initiated a "Protest of German Artists" against the "foreign infiltration" of German art collections by French paintings. His comments were triggered by the purchase of van Gogh's *The Poppy Field* (fig. 70) for the Kunsthalle in Bremen, resulting in a heated controversy in which almost all of the actors in the art world of Germany (and some in Austria) became involved. Altough van Gogh was actually Dutch, since he lived and worked in France, he was always identified in the German-speaking world as a French artist and included in any discussion of modern French art. The controversy began in December 1909 when the Kunsthalle's director Gustav Pauli exhibited *The Poppy Field* and six other works by van Gogh—all loaned by Paul Cassirer—within the installation of the permanent collection. The museum purchased the painting shortly before Christmas for 30,000 marks.[20] In the widely read Christmas number of the *Bremer Weserzeitung*, the museum director wrote: "One thing is certain;

[20] Wulf Herzogenrath and Dorothee Hansen, eds., *Van Gogh: Felder. Das Mohnfeld und der Künstlerstreit* (Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz, 2002), 14.

with the purchase of *The Poppy Field*, the Kunsthalle has made an exceptionally good deal, as this is one of the most distinctive works by van Gogh and one that is full of character."[21]

However, many sections of German cultural life had been less positive about Pauli's acquisition policy for some time, and Vinnen was voicing these frustrations. In a "word of warning to the Kunstverein," that—due its length—had to be split and published on two days in the *Bremer Nachrichten*, Vinnen turned against what he considered a "major invasion of French art,"[22] which was causing German artists to lose large sums in the art market as a result of unrealized sales. The article soon was the subject of debate in all the important German-language newspapers. Standing at the core of the controversy were questions of the canon-forming effect of the market, and of the necessity to take measures to preserve a national artistic identity as a reaction to the new forces in the art system. In contrast to the state-run institutional system, in which all affairs were masterminded by established art associations and academies, Vinnen's supporters believed that the spreading French "dealer-critic" system threatened to deprive highly-decorated artists of their authoritative powers.

The controversy grew in April 1911, when the Eugen Dietrich publishing house in Jena issued Vinnen's reworked newspaper article, along with declarations of support from 123 artists and seventeen art writers, under the title of *Ein Protest deutscher Künstler* (A Protest by German Artists). By this time, the protest was no longer connected solely with the events in Bremen, but had taken on greater meaning throuout Germany. In the short foreword entitled "Was wir wollen"

[21] "Das Eine ist sicher, daß man in dem von der Kunsthalle angekauften ‚Mohnfeld' einen außerordentlich guten Griff getan hat, denn wir haben es hier mit einem der charaktervollsten und charakteristischsten Werke Van Goghs zu tun." Gustav Pauli, "Kunst, Wissenschaft und Literatur," *Bremer Weser-Zeitung*, December 24, 1910.
[22] "Mahnwort an den Kunstverein […] große Invasion französischer Kunst." Carl Vinnen, "Ein Mahnwort an den Kunstverein," *Bremer Nachrichten*, January 3, 1911.

(What We Want) Vinnen stated: "We don't want a Chinese wall, or protective tariffs for our art, nor a chauvinist hyper-German attitude, and we do not want to cordon off anything of value just because it comes from the other side of the border."[23] He was completely aware of the politically explosive nature of his statement and intended to take the wind out of his critics' sails with this opening. Vinnen also wanted to use this to rebuff the "unwelcome allies in our own camp […] who might believe that their own reactionary system was being approved of."[24] However, what Vinnen really opposed is less clearly defined; he describes it fuzzily as a "struggle against a pressure group and their allies, the aesthetes and the snobs, that have become all too powerful."[25]

In the following chapter of the publication entitled "*Quousque tandem*?" (How Long?), Vinnen appealed to a humanistic, well-educated audience to join him and his fellow combatants in their struggle against a conspiracy of "modern art writers" who had long created "an independent power basis" that influenced the development of art as much as the artists themselves.[26] These writers, he asserted, would lead the future generation in a wrong direction. He took as an example the activities of the Sonderbund—a West German artists' group that sought a "close annexation to extravagant French artists, Matisse and the rest, and by doing so would fall from one extreme into the next."[27] In this way, he believed that the former pre-eminence of Rhenish

[23] "Wir wollen keine chinesische Mauer, keinen Schutzzoll für unsere Kunst, keine chauvinistische Deutschtümelei, kein Absperren gegen Wertvolles, bloß weil es von jenseits der Grenze kommt." Carl Vinnen, ed. *Ein Protest deutscher Künstler* (Jena: Diederichs, 1911), 1.
[24] "Vielleicht noch nötiger [war es], uns zu schützen gegen unwillkommene Verbündete im eigenen Lager, gegen künstlerische Minderwertigkeit, die eine Rechtfertigung ihrer Schwäche herauslesen möchte, gegen die Offiziellen, die glauben könnten, ihr reaktionäres System gebilligt zu sehen." Ibid.
[25] "Kampf gegen eine in Deutschland so übermächtig gewordene Interessentengruppe und deren Bundesgenossen, die Ästheten und die Snobs!" Ibid.
[26] The title refers to Cicero's famous speech against Catalina in which he stood up for the continuance of the Roman Republic with the words "Quo usque tandem abutere, Catilina, patientia nostra?" (How long, o Cataline, will you abuse our patience?) Ibid., 2.
[27] "In der an sich nicht unrichtigen Erkenntnis, daß die rheinische Kunst aus ihrer einstigen Vormachtstellung ins Hintertreffen geraten ist, sucht ein dort gegründeter Künstlerverein 'Sonderbund', der in der Rheinprovinz und

art would be lost. Vinnen thought that the character of the German people could be found in "profound study, imagination, and sensitive feelings."[28] In contrast, copying French art was regarded as a kind of pressure to force one's personal feelings into foreign stylistic channels. The norms were determined by art critics who glorified anything new, and chased after permanently changing trends: "Today it's Courbet, tomorrow Cézanne, Gauguin, van Gogh, maybe it will be Matisse on the day after tomorrow."[29] The new generation of artists, he believed, would have no time for serious work and careful deliberation.[30] However, concerns about German national character were merely one aspect of Vinnen's criticism. Concrete economic interests played a much more important role.

Vinnen's criticism not only targeted the "aesthetic theoreticians" but also the "French art dealers" who had become too powerful. They, he wrote, "have held out their hands and, under the pretext of promoting artistic objectives, flooded Germany with a mass of French pictures"[31] that were

---

darüber hinaus viele einflußreiche Gönner besitzt, innigen Anschluß an die jüngsten Pariser Extravagisten, Matisse und andere, so aus einem Extrem ins andere fallend." Ibid., 3.

[28] "Aber die Eigenart unseres Volkes liegt letzten Endes auf anderem Gebiete. Vertiefung, Phantasie, Empfindung des Gemütes,..." Ibid., 8. It is interesting that these "typical German" characteristics of "profound study, imagination and sensitive feelings" can be traced back to Madame de Staël's influential treatise "De l'Allemagne" (1810), intended to motivate France, which she thought was going through a period of intellectual drought, to new feats through the wealth of new, lively thoughts in politically disunited Germany. However, Napoleon had the first edition pulped; the book was then published in London in 1813 and became a European bestseller. Johann Wolfgang von Goethe, was of the opinion that "the Germans will hardly recognize themselves in the book," but Madame de Staël had now turned Germany into the "country of poets and thinkers." Johann Wolfgang von Goethe to Sara von Grotthuß, February 17, 1814, quoted in Ernst Lautenbach, ed., *Lexikon Goethe-Zitate* (Munich: Iudicium, 2004), 915.

[29] "So gehen sie [die kräftigsten Talente] unter, weil die ewig wechselnden neuen Eindrücke, heute Courbet, morgen Cézanne, Gauguin, van Gogh, übermorgen vielleicht schon Matisse, stets als seligmachend in eben dieser Presse gepriesen, sie gar nicht zum ruhigen Nachdenken, zum ernsten Arbeiten kommen lassen." Ibid., 11.

[30] Naturally, the rapid succession of fashions, models, and movements that Vinnen describes and criticizes here are fundamental characteristics of the modern age, which he—indirectly—described rather accurately. It is ironic that critical, polemical views in the media often described the nature of modern art better than some of the hymns of praise. See, for example, Peter Vergo, "Gustav Klimts 'Philosophie' und das Programm der Universitätsgemälde," *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Galerie* 22/23 (1978/79): 71.

[31] "Aber die Spekulation hat sich dieser Frage bemächtigt, deutsche und französische Kunsthändler haben sich die Hand gereicht, und unter dem Deckmantel, künstlerische Zwecke zu fördern, wird Deutschland mit großen Massen französischer Bilder überschwemmt." Ibid., 6.

usually of poor quality. This development created a vicious circle in which the laudatory articles of "artistic literature" led to even more bad pictures making their way from France to Germany. An amazing statistic later published in *Les Cahiers d'aujourd'hui*, provides support for Vinnen's thesis. It was estimated that in 1914 "approximately two hundred French works of art—from Ingres to the Cubists—were in the possession of German museums, while there were not even one hundred in comparable French institutions."[32] The regionally fragmented German market was obviously larger and more receptive than the centralized French one.[33] According to Vinnen, the press went into raptures over these new French paintings, which made it possible for the art dealers "to palm off their wares at exorbitant prices to German collectors."[34] However, in his opinion most of the paintings that came onto the German market were "studio leftovers" that had neither been bought by "American stock-exchange lords" nor the French themselves.[35] In his article, Vinnen is forced to admit that he once approved of the Bremen Kunsthalle's purchase of a painting by Claude Monet. In 1906, the museum had paid 50,000 marks for the artist's *Lady in a Black-and-Green Dress* (*Camille*). Although Vinnen considered this price justified due to the painting's artistic value, he expressed his regrets that "recently 30-40,000 marks have been paid in Germany for perfunctory sketches by van Gogh, that it is not possible to bring enough leftovers from the ateliers of Monet, Alfred Sisley, Camille Pissarro, and the others onto the German market to satisfy the demand, and that, in general, the prices for French art have been forced up to such an extent that it seems that we are experiencing an overvaluation that the

[32] "Von französischer Kunst von Ingres bis zu den Kubisten befinden sich etwa zweihundert Werke in deutschem Museumsbesitz, aber nicht einmal hundert in französischem." Wulf Herzogenrath, "Fakten zur Kunstszene im Deutschland der zwanziger Jahre," in *Paris-Berlin, 1900-1933: Übereinstimmungen und Gegensätze Frankreich-Deutschland*, Brigitte Hilmer, ed. (Munich: Prestel, 1979), 306.
[33] Walter Grasskamp, *Die unbewältigte Moderne: Kunst und Öffentlichkeit* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1989), 36.
[34] "Durch die Schleusen der Kunstliteratur kommt diese Bilderflut ins Land und hier berauscht sich an ihr wieder die Literatur aufs neue; diese Begeisterung in der Presse verhilft nun wiederum den Händlern, zu exorbitanten Preisen die Bilder an deutsche Sammler loszuwerden." Vinnen, *Ein Protest deutscher Künstler*, 6.
[35] "Es sind durchschnittlich die Überreste, die uns gegönnt werden, nämlich das, was das Heimatland und die großen amerikanischen Börsenfürsten übriggelassen haben." Ibid.

German people should not tolerate for much longer."[36] This "artificial boom" had led to skyrocketing prices, which—in Vinnen's view—meant that German art was losing millions of marks in potential support every year.

In the final section of his treatise, Vinnen presented data on the German import and export of paintings for the year 1909. According to these figures, the import of foreign paintings and drawings exceeded the export of German works by 7.6 million marks; the main supplier of art works was Austria (at 9 million marks) with France trailing far behind in second place (2.4 million marks). In order to provide greater substantiation to his thesis that the German market was being overrun with French paintings, Vinnen claimed—without giving any sources—that the Austrian figures "included a high percentage of French pictures that had been imported via Vienna."[37] In reality, it was the other way around: as shown in chapter two, French art made its way to Vienna through a network of German art dealers including Paul Cassirer.

This summary of the controversy gives a clear indication of Vinnen's political position on the art market, which he repeatedly qualified in his essay (for example, he wrote that "in no way did [he] want to belittle" the artistic standing of van Gogh, Gauguin, or Cézanne, and "far be it from me to deny the great value that the stimulation provided by the high culture of French art has had on

[36] "Wenn wir nun aber sehen, wie z. B. neuerdings in Deutschland für flüchtige Studien van Goghs [...] 30-40.000 Mark anstandslos bezahlt werden, wie nicht genug alte Atelierreste von Monet, Sisley, Pissarro usw. auf den deutschen Markt gebracht werden können, um die Nachfrage zu befriedigen, so muß man sagen, daß im allgemeinen eine derartige Preistreiberei französischer Bilder stattgefunden hat [...], daß hier eine Überbewertung vorzuliegen scheint, die das deutsche Volk nicht auf die Dauer mitmachen sollte." Ibid., 7.

[37] "Die Hauptziffer kommt dabei auf das Konto Österreichs, das uns [Gemälde und Zeichnungen] für über 9 Millionen M.[ark] sandte—allerdings dürfte in dieser Ziffer ein hoher Prozentsatz über Wien eingeführter französischer Bilder enthalten sein." Ibid., 78.

our own.")[38] In retrospect, it is necessary to ask to what extent would—consciously or not—"for the first time in the cultural sphere, emotions" be aroused in Germany "that could soon develop into something worse."[39] However, the success of the protest was not exclusively founded on a widespread, anti-modern nationalist stance. Vinnen's style of argumentation—making no statement without reservations—left much room for interpretation.[40] The ambiguity was actually so great that the editor of the *Monatshefte für Kunstwissenschaft*, Georg Biermann, signed *A Protest of German Artists* with the following words: "Here is my approval, I hope that this worthy cause meets with much success."[41] Only a short time later, however, he supported also the initiative against Vinnen's protest.

As the result of an initiative by the artist Franz Marc,[42] a compilation of written comments were published under the title of *The Response to A Protest of German Artists* in the same year. [43] Georg Biermann now added his name to this book and sincerely regretted his earlier support of Vinnen, writing that "through the signature I gave out of optimistic goodwill, I have come into strong conflict with my own activities and most personal convictions."[44] He realized that he was

[38] "So würde heute wohl kaum ein junger Kritiker wagen, jedes noch so fragwürdige Bild van Goghs, Gauguins oder Cézannes, deren Künstlerschaft ich im übrigen durchaus nicht schmälern möchte, nicht für ein Kunstwerk allererster Größe, sondern nur für ein technisches oder künstlerisches Experiment zu erklären." Ibid., 5. "Fern liegt mir, den großen Nutzen der Befruchtung durch die hohe Kultur der französischen Kunst auf die unserige zu leugnen,..." Ibid., 6.

[39] "zum ersten Mal auch im Bereich des Kulturellen Emotionen" in Deutschland geweckt wurden, „die sehr bald in Schlimmeres umschlagen sollten." Günther Busch, *Entartete Kunst: Geschichte und Moral* (Frankfurt am Main: Societäts-Verlag, 1969), 34.

[40] Almuth zu Jeddeloh-Sayk, "Studien zu Leben und Werk von Carl Vinnen (1863-1922): Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des 'Protestes deutscher Künstler' von 1911" (PhD diss., Universität Bonn, 1986), 95.

[41] "Hier haben Sie meine Zustimmung, möchte die gute Sache Erfolg haben." Georg Biermann, Leipzig, in Vinnen, *Ein Protest deutscher Künstler*, 69.

[42] Franz Marc to August Macke, April 12, 1911, quoted in Wolfgang Macke, ed., *August Macke—Franz Marc: Briefwechsel* (Cologne: DuMont Schauberg, 1964), 52.

[43] *Im Kampf um die Kunst: Die Antwort auf den "Protest deutscher Künstler": Mit Beiträgen deutscher Künstler, Galerieleiter, Sammler und Schriftsteller* (Munich: Piper, 1911).

[44] "Diese Broschüre mit ihren vielfach unklaren, weit über ihr Ziel hinausschiessenden Tendenzen ist mir erst in ihrer fertigen Form zu Gesicht gekommen, und ich bedauere es heute aufrichtig, dass ich mich durch eine aus

not alone in regretting having supported what seemed to be a worthy cause. His voice had been raised against the widespread overvaluation of poor quality art in general and of German art in particular. It seems likely that Biermann was not the only one to have rashly signed Vinnen's confused protest, as Klimt assumed in his short contribution to *The Response* that "One or the other artist who was taken in and joined the protest probably seriously regrets it now."[45]

In contrast to Vinnen's protest, the response was entirely composed of individual contributions; there was no editor, introductory foreword, or any other kind of opinion of priority. Yet, it is worth noting that the text was set in an Antiqua font in contrast to the Gothic type of the Protest, which may have been a hint to the contributors rejection of German nationalist arguments.[46] In the index, the contributions were classified according to artists, writers, and art dealers.

The polemical contribution by Berlin publisher and gallery owner Paul Cassirer dealing with Vinnen's economic argument is one of the most interesting pieces in the volume. Cassirer felt that he himself had been personally attacked by the accusation of the "machinations of the evil art dealers […] (this should probably be '*the* evil art dealer' because I have had to carry out this

---

optimistischem Wohlwollen herausgegebene Unterschrift zu meinem eigenen Wirken und meiner innersten Überzeugung in starken Widerspruch gesetzt habe." Ibid., 138.

[45] "Dass auch der eine oder andere Künstler aufgesessen ist und mitprotestiert hat, dürfte diesen selbst recht leid tun." Ibid., 61.

[46] However, it would be false to conclude a German national attitude from the difference in fonts. In Germany, the Gothic style of print was replaced by Antiqua for certain publishing activities at the end of the nineteenth century. Nevertheless, Gothic remained the usual type for many publications until after the First World War, after which Antiqua became prominent in the wake of new forms of typography. In the National Socialist period, Gothic initially experienced a renaissance because it was regarded as German. An edict of the NSDAP [National Socialist German Workers' Party] regime in January 1941 declared that the Schwabacher font, which was similar to Gothic, was a "Jewish type", and subsequently declared Antiqua the "norm font." See Beatrice and Helmut Heiber, *Die Rückseite des Hakenkreuzes: Absonderliches aus den Akten des Dritten Reiches* (Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1993), 224-25.

business alone for ten years.)"[47] Cassirer's "On Ignorant Artists" begins by dealing with what he considered the astonishing naïveté of the artistic community. Artists, he explained, not only lacked any kind of understanding of the business of selling works of art but also had "a peculiar ignorance" about their own material situation.[48] In any case—and here, he targets the argument about the millions of marks that German artists lose to French artists each year—the situation on the market for art was entirely different from the market for other goods: "It is completely normal that, when we import grain into Germany, the price for German grain falls. However, according to Cassirer this is not necessarily the case with paintings; their import can have the opposite result."[49] He stressed that the quantity of the art consumption of a nation is not constant. Rather, the demand can be increased enormously through the development of a passionate group of collectors acting internationally, and ultimately, local artists can benefit from this as well.

Cassirer reacted especially vehemently to the statistics that Vinnen had included in the appendix to his protest, asserting that they had been interpreted incorrectly. "Even if Carl Vinnen had been able to read the statistics, even if he had taken the trouble to make some inquiries, these statistics show nothing at all he should have known that, with these statistics, he would be unable to prove

[47] "In keiner Stadt Deutschlands hat die Seuche des französischen Imports so gewütet wie in Berlin, und nirgends sind so viel französische Bilder, nirgens muss demnach dem deutschen Künstler das Leben so schwer gworden sein wie hier in Berlin, und nirgends kann er unter den 'Machenschaften der bösen Kunsthändler' (soll wohl heissen d e s bösen Kunsthändlers, denn leider habe ich 10 Jahre allein diese Arbeit machen müssen —) mehr gelitten haben als hier." Paul Cassirer, "Vom unwissenden Künstler," in *Im Kampf um die Kunst*, 158.

[48]" Ibid., 154. Cassirer's Viennese counterpart, Miethke, argued in a similar fashion when he denied that the artists he represented had any kind of entrepreneurial talent: "It was up to me to see that the prices stayed high, and not pressure the artists. That is one of the main duties because, in no way, can the artist help himself. He will always remain at the mercy of the prevailing conditions." ("An mir war es, die Preise hoch zu halten, den Künstler nicht drücken zu lassen. Dies ist eine Hauptaufgabe, denn der Künstler kann für sich selbst nichts dazu thun. Er bliebe ewig ein Spielball der Verhältnisse.") Quoted in B. Z. [Berta Zuckerkandl], "Aus dem Leben eines berühmten Kunsthändlers: Interview mit Herrn Miethke," *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*, January 29, 1905, 3.

[49] "So ist es selbstverständlich—dass, wenn wir Getreide nach Deutschland einführen—der Preis des deutschen Getreides fällt. Bei Bildern ist dies aber durchaus nicht selbstverständlich, sondern der Import von Bildern kann das umgekehrte Resultat haben." Ibid., 156.

anything."[50] And Cassirer's terse riposte to Vinnen's claim that a high percentage of the works imported via Vienna were actually produced in France was, "No French pictures at all are imported through Austria."[51] With his highly sophisticated rhetoric, Cassirer disproved one after another of Vinnen's arguments and finally professed that he had personally considered it a "cultural act" to introduce French art to Germany: when he had started this activity with his cousin twelve years earlier, they had absolutely no financial incentive, and would actually have done even better business with German artists such as Andreas and Oswald Achenbach.[52]

Three of the seventy-five contributors to the response were Austrians—Moll, the art historian Hans Tietze, and, as already mentioned, Klimt. Tietze's was the longest and most ambitious article in which—while maintaining a sense of distance—he was able to place the emotional debate in an art historical context, to use economic arguments to refute the claims that the art dealers were increasing their wealth, and to ironically point out the focus lacking in Vinnen's line of reasoning. In Tietze's opinion, French paintings would keep their market value for many years to come as the worldwide demand for them was growing.[53] Fashionable German painters would achieve top prices in the short run, but would ultimately sink into insignificance because they had only a German, not a global, audience. This clearly showed that, "on closer examination,

[50] "Selbst wenn Carl Vinnen die Statistik hätte lesen können, selbst wenn er sich die Mühe gegeben hätte, Nachforschungen anzustellen: aus dieser Statistik ist nicht das Geringste zu ersehen, mit dieser Statistik, musste er wissen, konnte er nichts beweisen." Ibid, 160-61.
[51] "Es existiert überhaupt keine Einfuhr französischer Bilder über Österreich." Ibid.
[52] Ibid., 164.
[53] Tietze was completely up to date in his investigation into the connections between supply and demand. Adam Smith had already delved into this matter in *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* (1776), but it was not until the late nineteenth century that this theory was further developed and became applicable to the real economy. The Austrian economist Carl Menger and the Frenchman Léon Walras finally formulated the theory of supply-and-demand price that is still valid today and observed the balance point where both curves cross. See Joseph Schumpeter, *Ten Great Economists from Marx to Keynes* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1952). At the end of the ninteenth century, economists began to observe the influences individual markets had on each other. It would be worthwhile to make a more thorough study of how the actors from the cultural sphere in the Vinnen controversy came up with similar results a short time later without being aware of the economic sources.

so-called national virtues could often be disadvantageous internationally."[54] Further, the typically German aspects of German art were precisely those that the world beyond German borders was unable to appreciate, therefore preventing an international career. "Whether one considers it a virtue or national fault, there is always a unique quality that does not belong to all mankind; only what it shares can be appreciated and the broad public can only consider those works that transcend national limitations as having worthwhile qualities; local art however lies on the path leading to what is merely of folksy interest."[55]

This barb applied equally to Tietze's homeland of Austria, but definitely not to France, whose great nineteenth-century masters wielded such a powerful influence on contemporary art throughout Europe, so that every nation considered them their "artistic forebears."[56] Art dealers had to be perceptive to discover those artists who could find their place in the history of art as, sooner or later, their followers would disappear from the art market. Tietze recognized that, in particular, the Parisian art dealer Paul Durand-Ruel possessed this special talent and regretted that Austria had missed out on the chance to buy the great French masters at an early stage. Durand-Ruel, he wrote, "exhibited a large collection of paintings by French masters from Corot to Monet and Pissarro at the 1873 World Exposition in Vienna, but sold none. The paintings that

[54] "Wir dürfen nicht verkennen, dass nationale Vorzüge genauer betrachtet oft internationale Mängel sind, dass das an einem Künstler das Deutsche ist, was nicht die ganze Welt zu würdigen vermag." Tietze, *Im Kampf um die Kunst*, 133.
[55] "Ob man es nationale Tugend oder Nationalfehler nennen mag, immer ist es eine Eigenschaft, die nicht der ganzen Menschheit eignet; nur was dieser gehört, kann von ihr gewürdigt werden und nur jene Kunstwerke kommen für die Allgemeinheit in Betracht, die über die national beschränkenden Züge hinaus wertvolle Qualitäten besitzen; Heimatkunst aber liegt schon auf dem Wege zum bloß volkstümlichen Interesse." Ibid.
[56] Ibid.

cost a couple of hundred francs at the time are now worth millions and would form an unparalleled gallery."[57]

As shown in chapter one, Tietze was actually wrong about the works by Monet and Pissarro at the 1873 exposition, but even their predecessors, the Barbizon artists, were difficult to sell in Vienna. Hugo Othmar Miethke had painful memories of this fact a few years later: "A group of magnificent Corots, which [Durand-Ruel] sent to me here at the World Exposition—at ridiculous prices—simply were not sold. Today, however, Durand-Rueil [sic] is enormously successful with the Impressionists."[58] However, as Tietze stated, it was not even certain that, in 1911, Austria would have been able to recognize the value of this treasure, as Austria's art dealing with France was simply inadequate: "All of Europe is convinced that French painting, ranging from the Barbizon School and going as far as Monet, was of the greatest significance for Europe, […] only Austria remained somewhat immune to this infection."[59]

Cassirer also remarked on the Austrian art market's aesthetic distance from France: "With the exception of Miethke, no Austrian art dealer has so far paid attention to French art."[60] Moll was the artistic director of the Galerie Miethke from 1904 to 1912 and had direct negotiations with

[57] "Derselbe Durand-Ruel, von dem ich früher sprach, stellte 1873 bei der Weltausstellung in Wien eine grosse Kollektion von Bildern französischer Meister von Corot bis Monet und Pissarro aus, von denen er nicht eines verkaufte; die Bilder, die damals ein paar hunderttausend Frank gekostet hätten, sind heute viele Millionen wert und würden eine Galerie ohnegleichen bilden." Ibid. In this case, it appears that Tietze is mistaken; no other source of information on the 1873 World Exposition mentions paintings by Monet and Pissarro.

[58] "Eine Reihe herrlicher Corots, welche er [Durand Ruel] mir zur Weltausstellung hier gesandt hatte—zu lächerlichen Preisen—wurde absolut nicht gekauft. Heute allerdings glückt Durand-Rueil [sic] derselbe Coup mit den Impressionisten im vollsten Maße." Berta Zuckerkandl, "Aus dem Leben eines berühmten Kunsthändlers: Interview mit Herrn Miethke," 5.

[59] "Dass die französische Malerei von der Schule von Barbizon bis etwa Monet von der größten Bedeutung für ganz Europa war, darüber ist ganz Europa einig, [...] nur Österreich ist von dieser Infektion ziemlich frei geblieben." Tietze, *Im Kampf um die Kunst*, 130-31.

[60] "Außer Miethke in Wien gibt es keinen österreichischen Kunsthändler, der sich bisher mit französischer Kunst beschäftigte." Cassirer, *Im Kampf um die Kunst*, 161.

Cassirer in this matter, including those he undertook for the 1906 van Gogh exhibition in Vienna. Five works by van Gogh had been shown previously in the Secession's Impressionist exhibition in 1903. *The Plain at Auvers* (fig. 71) was purchased by the Secession on that occasion and donated to the Moderne Galerie in Vienna, which was at that time still in its founding stages. [61] In his contribution to the *The Response to A Artist's Protest*, Moll refered to this episode when he reported on the reaction of the Viennese public to the first van Goghs shown in the city:

> The critics scoffed and the public joined in the chorus, only a few painters stood silent and astonished in front of what was for them a new phenomenon. Of course, neither the state nor any private person even considered buying such a ridiculed painting. That is when we artists collected the sum—it was 2,000 francs—and bought a lovely landscape and donated it discretely to the state.[62]

This was also the reason that the artists in Vienna did not protest as those in Bremen had done when *The Poppy Field* was purchased, because as Moll explained, "You don't look a gift horse in the mouth."[63] However, another event that took place shortly after the legendary Impressionist exhibition did cause a scandal in the art world of the Hapsburg capital. As already stated, Moll became the artistic director of the Galerie Miethke in 1904; this appointment was enough to shake the foundations of the Secession for many years to come.

[61] This painting was titled *Fields* (*Champs de blé*) in the catalog of the Kunsthalle Bremen.
[62] "Die Kritik höhnte, das Publikum bildete den begleitenden Chor, nur ein paar Maler standen stumm und staunend vor der ihnen neuen Erscheinung. Natürlich dachten weder Staat noch Private daran, sich so ein verhöhntes Bild zu kaufen. Da sammelten wir Maler unter uns den Betrag—es waren 2000 Francs—, kauften eine schöne Landschaft und schenkten sie in der Stille dem Staate." Moll, *Im Kampf um die Kunst*, 62.
[63] "In Wien protestierten die anderen Künstler nicht, denn—einem geschenkten Gaul schaut man nicht ins Maul." Ibid.

3.3 The Exodus of the Klimt group from the Secession

The Galerie Miethke, probably Austria's most important modern art gallery, experienced a definite repositioning in 1904 when its founder Hugo Othmar Miethke retired from his professional activities at the age of seventy-one and sold the enterprise to the jeweler Paul Bacher, one of Gustav Klimt's friends. Even the German media, including the *Kunstchronik*, found this a newsworthy occurrence.[64] Bacher entrusted the artistic management of the business to Carl Moll, who took up this position in November 1904. Miethke himself had offered Moll a position as partner in 1892, but Moll refused at the time on the grounds that it was more important for him to create art than to deal in it.[65] But, by now, Moll's involvement in the affairs of the Secession had made him realize that he had a great managerial talent and had already developed important international contacts that would be of enormous help to him as the artistic director of the Galerie Miethke.

Moll became a member of the Künstlerhaus in 1890 and in the next several years was active on several committees (the Jury for the State Medals, the Committee for the World Exposition in Antwerp, the Steering Committee, the Admissions Committee, and the Twenty-Five Years of the Künstlerhaus Jubilee Festival Committee).[66] However, compared to others, he was not excessively involved. The cumulation of activities in 1893 is rather distinctive. Klimt, who became a member of the Cooperative one year after Moll, took on many more positions, but these were evenly divided over the years between 1891 and 1896. In spite of this, Moll's organizational talents were noticed in the Künstlerhaus where he voluntarily did all he could—

[64] Anonymous, "Vermischtes," *Kunstchronik n.s. 16, no.* 7 (December 9, 1904): 109.
[65] Carl Moll, "Mein Leben," 97, typescript, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.
[66] Wladimir Aichelburg, *Das Wiener Künstlerhaus, 1861-2001*, vol. 1, *Die Künstlergenossenschaft und ihre Rivalen Secession und Hagenbund* (Vienna: Österreichischer Kunst- und Kulturverlag, 2003), 142-43.

and with great willingness to make sacrifices—for what was called "young" art.[67] When these "youngsters" finally founded the Vienna Secession in 1897, Moll became one of the major figures, with Josef Engelhart and Klimt, in this renewal of Vienna art world. Moll was responsible for the Secession's international relations and represented the association in numerous institutions abroad.

However, signs of tension soon became apparent within the Secession; they were mainly founded on "differing opinions of art" ("painterly" opposed to "decorative" or "impressionists" against "interior designers").[68] If one looks closer, one can see that there were also considerable economic motives for the conflict, with the artists around Klimt (Moll, Josef Hoffmann, Kolo Moser, etc.) taking the side of business. The conflict was heightened by the establishment of the Wiener Werkstätte in 1903, after which the group around Engelhart demanded that artists either give up their dealings with the Wiener Werkstätte or resign from the Secession. The Engelhart group argued that craft articles were produced in factories and not for exhibitions. As an article in the Vienna *Fremden-Blatt* newspaper reported, even before the conflict had been resolved Moll made the recommendation to the General Assembly that works by members of the Secession "also be shown outside of the exhibition rooms of the Secession. Namely, that Secessionists be permitted to exhibit in the Galerie Miethke."[69] There was strong opposition to this proposal in the plenum as there were fears that this would create competition for the Secession. As chairman, Engelhart recommended that Moll "decide between the art gallery and

[67] Ibid., 298.
[68] Horst-Herbert Kossatz, "Der Austritt der Klimt-Gruppe: Eine Pressenachschau," *Alte und moderne Kunst* 141 (1975): 26; and Natter, *Die Galerie Miethke*, 65. Seeing that there has been no art historical appraisal of the reasons for the Klimt group leaving the Secession, it can be assumed that these were probably not artistic.
[69] "auch außerhalb der eigentlichen Ausstellungsräume der Secession exponiert werden sollten. Und zwar sollten Angehörige der Secession in der Galerie Miethke ausstellen dürfen." *Fremden-Blatt*, June 14, 1905, 12.

our association."[70] However, this proposal was rejected. The group of Moll supporters then left the room, which led to the headline of "Split in the Viennese Secession: Resignation of Seven Founding Members" in the *Neues Wiener Tagblatt* on the following day.[71] The publication of this internal conflict probably caused the split to be firmly cemented.[72] It is said that Klimt attempted—in vain—to draw attention to the situation in Berlin where that city's Secession had entered into a cooperative agreement with Cassirer's private gallery around the same time.[73] The majority of the Secessionists did not consider Moll's attempts to provide the Secession with an additional exhibition site and sales opportunities in the Galerie Miethke to be advantageous. However, this possibility now became even more important for the so-called Klimt group, who had resigned and could no longer exhibit in the Secession.

Although, legally and morally, the Secession was essentially in the right position with its clear separation between art and business and the incompatibility of the two similar positions Moll held in the organization and the Galerie Miethke, the artists around Klimt were actually the ones who personified the original artistic ideas of the Secession in a superior way. This split led to the Galerie Miethke becoming the new focal point for modern art in Vienna and, subsequently, the entire Hapsburg Empire. Now that Moll was able to make decisions without the approval of the Secession's plenum, he immediately began to adapt the gallery's image to the latest artistic

[70] "sich zwischen Kunsthandlung und unserer Vereinigung zu entscheiden." Josef Engelhart, *Ein Wiener Maler erzählt: Mein Leben und meine Modelle* (Vienna: Andermann, 1943), 124.
[71] "Spaltung in der Wiener Secession: Austritt von sieben Gründern," *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, June 11, 1905, 13.
[72] Kossatz, "Der Austritt der Klimt-Gruppe," 23.
[73] Natter, *Die Galerie Miethke*, 65; and Peter Paret, *The Berlin Secession: Modernism and Its Enemies in Imperial Germany* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983). Josef Engelhart, who was just as close to NS regime as Carl Moll (and Carl Moll was so close that, at the age of 84, he—along with his daughter and her husband the convinced National Socialist Dr. Richard Eberstaller—committed suicide after the Red Army entered Vienna in 1945) wrote in his memoirs: "In Berlin at the time, Liebermann drove the Berlin Secession into the arms of the Jewish art dealer Cassirer." ("In Berlin hatte zu dieser Zeit Liebermann die Berliner Sezession dem jüdischen Kunsthändler Cassirer in die Arme getrieben.") Engelhart, *Ein Wiener Maler erzählt*, 124.

developments. Koloman Moser was responsible for the design of a new company logo, as well as the revamping of the main exhibition hall: "The call for 'light, more light!' has now made itself heard in the old palace on Dorotheergasse. The elegant, large exhibition hall, which Herr Miethke had installed years ago, was formerly kept in a kind of brownish-red Renaissance semi-darkness. Now it dazzles in the brightest of whites, in the untinted, unadulterated white of its mortared walls."[74]

In December 1905, Miethke opened a similarly radical "white cube" on Vienna's most elegant shopping street, the so-called "Graben"; at the time, it was probably the most modern exhibition space in central Europe (Fig. 72). This branch was opened with the first large-scale exhibition of the Wiener Werkstätte. From that time on, the Galerie Miethke presented a new show every six weeks on average, and united prime quality old masters with avant-garde productions of contemporary modern art. This combination of modern art gallery and old masters dealer made Miethke a unique enterprise in Europe. From the beginning, its aim was to position the greatest Austrian artists on the same level as those in the international arena.[75] Just as Leonardo did not have to cross the Alps in the fifteenth century to receive inspiration from Dutch artists, Austrian artists no longer had to make the voyage to Paris to be able to study the latest artistic movements. Now, this could be achieved by taking a stroll to Miethke at Dorotheergasse 11.

[74] "Der Ruf 'Licht, mehr Licht!' ist nun auch in das alte Palais in der Dorotheergasse gedrungen. Der vornehme, große Ausstellungssaal, welchen Herr Miethke vor Jahren einbauen ließ, war bisher in seiner Stimmung im braunroth-goldenen Renaissance-Halbdunkel gehalten. Jetzt erstrahlt er im hellsten Weiß, im ungetönten, ungebrochenen Weiß der Mörtelwand." B. Z. [Berta Zuckerkandl], "Bei Miethke—Waldmüller-Ausstellung" *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*, November 18, 1904, 2.
[75] Natter, *Die Galerie Miethke*, "Die Ausstellungen 1896 bis 1914," 184-226.

3.4 Exhibitions of French Art in the Galerie Miethke

Following the resignation of the Klimt group from the Secession, the Galerie Miethke became the most important mediator of modern French art in the Austrian artistic sphere, due mainly to the efforts of Moll. According to Tietze, "In a certain manner, Carl Moll is the most remarkable personality in the artistic life in turn-of-the-century Vienna […] For many years, in his capacity as artistic director of the Galerie Miethke, Moll attempted to keep Vienna in contact with the major international artistic movements."[76] As Berta Zuckerkandl noted in an article for the *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*, the classics of modern French painting were exhibited here more often, and in greater numbers, than in any other gallery in the Hapsburg Empire. "The Miethke Gallery's Carl Moll brought us the major, significant products of the developments in Impressionism, the torchbearers of a new artistic ideal, Gauguin and van Gogh. He is also to be thanked for making us aware of the value of such an outstanding personality as [Honoré] Daumier, and of such a singular character as [Henri de] Toulouse-Lautrec.[77] Here, Zuckerkandl provided a list of the most important exhibitions of those years. In 1903—before Moll's period as director—an exhibition of prints was shown with the Trieste painter Arturo Rietti, who was living in Vienna at the time, as the main artist. In addition, works by Denis, Manet, Edvard Munch, Félicien Rops, Toulouse-Lautrec, Gauguin, and Pissarro were presented—a number of them for the first time in Vienna. Even the usually critical *Neue Freie Presse* called it "an

[76] "Carl Moll ist in einem gewissen Sinn die bemerkenswerteste Erscheinung im Wiener Kunstleben an der Wende des 19. zum 20. Jahrhundert [...]. Als künstlerischer Leiter der Galerie Miethke hat Moll jahrelang versucht, Wien den Zusammenhang mit den Strömungen der großen Weltkunst zu erhalten." Hans Tietze, " Carl Moll zum 60. Geburtstag," *Die bildenden Künste* 7/8 (1921): 125.

[77] "Die großen, wichtigen Entwicklungsresultate des Impressionismus, die Fackelträger eines neuen Kunstideals, 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 und eingeprägt wurden." B. Z. [Berta Zuckerkandl], "Die Kunst 1910," *Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung*, April 4, 1910, 4-5.

exhibition that has to be seen!"[78] In 1905—now, with Moll in charge—a firm decision was made to show "modern French graphic works," that brought Felix Vallotton, Odilon Redon, Edgar Degas, and Auguste Renoir, as well as Toulouse-Lautrec, to Vienna.

However, the major van Gogh exhibition in January 1906 was the real landmark. Although the critics of the Viennese dailies showed just how difficult it was for them to come to grips with this radical artist, most of the reviews were not unfavorable—the reviewers were simply unable to cope. Ludwig Hevesi, made an attempt with "Lines trembling with fear, colors boiling like hellish tar pitch," and found himself unintentionally close to Expressionist poetry with these remarks.[79] Connections were often made between van Gogh's work and his tragic life, for example, "His method of expressing himself artistically consumed him, he wore out his capital of vitality in this struggle."[80] A sunflower painting attracted particular attention and Ludwig Hevesi claimed that "each and every petal [flickers] around like a golden flame in the air."[81] The positive reception of this sunflower painting made itself felt in the art of Vienna, as can be seen in the works of Egon Schiele and Klimt in particular. However, the sunflower motives Otto Wagner used for his suburban railway decorations can not have been inspired by van Gogh, or at least not by the Miethke exhibition, as Wagner had designed these prior to 1898. Hevesi was also enthusiastic—and, simultaneously, perplexed—about the never-before-seen intensity of the colors in another van Gogh painting, and proclaimed "Why are these colors fighting for air like

[78] "Also eine Ausstellung (ich kann's nicht zurücknehmen), die man gesehen haben muss!" S., "Galerie Miethke," *Neue Freie Presse*, March 29, 1903, 12.
[79] "Linien schlottern vor Angst, Farben sieden wie höllisches Pech." Ludwig Hevesi, "Aus dem Wiener Kunstleben: Vincent van Gogh," *Kunst und Kunsthandwerk* 9 (1906): 72.
[80] "Seine Art, sich künstlerisch zu entäußern, war eine verzehrende, sein Kapital an Lebenskraft erschöpfte sich in diesem Ringen." *Hohe Warte* 2 (1905/06): 99.
[81] "Warum züngelt jedes einzelne Blatt dieser gewaltigen provenzalischen Sonnenblumen […], einer goldenen Flamme gleich, in der Luft umher?" Ludwig Hevesi, "Vincent van Gogh: Galerie Miethke," in id., *Altkunst-Neukunst: Wien 1894-1908* (Vienna: Konegen, 1909), 527.

this? Why do the trees swallow up so much blue?"[82] Here, Hevesi was referring to *The Poppy Field* that was shown in Vienna in 1906, before being purchased a few years later by the Bremen Kunsthalle and triggering the Vinnen dispute already discussed.[83]

Although the Viennese press had shown itself overtaxed but fascinated by van Gogh's art, there were hardly any positive reviews of the Gauguin exhibition one year later. Moll went to great lengths to make the local audience understand the Frenchman's art, and included in the exhibition catalogue a foreword by the German art educator Rudolf Adalbert Meyer, who was then living in Paris. Meyer praised Gauguin as an artist who "has once again made us understand the appeal of simple, primitive art."[84] In addition, the president of the Deutscher Künstlerbund, Harry Graf Kessler, gave a lecture entitled "On New Tendencies in Art: Paul Gauguin and His Circle" that was advertised and promoted in the press. The lecture was a great success and Kessler received much applause, but this did not change the overall attitude to modern art in general—and Gauguin in particular—because the audience was mainly composed of "representatives of the avant-garde in art," including Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Klimt, Koloman Moser, and Josef Hoffmann.[85] The so-called critics of modern art did not even bother to attend

[82] "Warum schnappen diese Farben so nach Luft? Warum schlucken jene Bäume so viel Blau?" Ibid.
[83] In his study of the early van Gogh reception in Germany, Walter Feilchenfeldt, the partner in Paul Cassirer's art salon in Berlin, was able to identify all the paintings shown at the Viennese Miethke exhibition. Walter Feilchenfeldt, *Vincent van Gogh and Paul Cassirer, Berlin: The Reception of van Gogh in Germany from 1901 to 1914* (Zwolle: Waanders, 1988), 145.
[84] "Er ist einer der Künstler, die uns den Reiz primitiver schlichter Kunst wieder erschlossen haben." Rudolf Adalbert Meyer, "Foreword," *Gauguin Exhibition Catalogue of the Galerie H. O. Miethke* (Vienna: Galerie H. O. Miethke, 1907), 11.
[85] "Vertreter und Vertreterinnen der modernsten Kunstrichtung." *Neues Wiener Tagblatt*, March 22, 1907. Hugo von Hofmannsthal, probably the most famous writer of his day, was an admirer of modern French art and one of Miethke's regular clients. "For me," he wrote to Maximilian Harden in 1905, "contemporary painting, and here I mean French painting from Manet to Maurice Denis and van Gogh, is one of those things that make my life more enjoyable." ("Die gegenwärtige Malerei, ich meine damit die französische Malerei von Manet bis Maurice Denis und van Gogh, ist für mich eines der Dinge, die mir das Leben überhaupt verschönen.") Quoted in Ursula Renner, *"Die Zauberschrift der Bilder": Bildende Kunst in Hofmannsthals Texten* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach, 2000),

and become better informed. On the day of the lecture, Seligmann, of the *Neue Freie Presse*, published his cynical opinion on Gauguin:

> Seeing that, here and there, the outlines of these patches of color show a certain similarity with human figures, trees, clouds, etc., such as three- or four-year-old children depict, a purely external, superficial relationship to works of painting is established which means that reporting on it becomes the responsibility of the experts in the fine arts. This is absolutely inappropriate, as you will soon see. This is because anyone who sees and feels things artistically, and is capable of thinking clearly, will immediately recognize that, here, he is being confronted with ridiculous dilettantism of the lowest level that is absolutely not worth considering.[86]

Seligmann's audience, the liberal upper-middle classes, was confronted with his views on art for three decades, so by this time his influence was immense.

In 1900, the *Neue Freie Presse* had a print run of 55,000 copies—the largest of any daily newspaper in the Hapsburg Empire. The official government paper, the *Wiener Zeitung*, printed 30,000 copies, the Foreign Ministry's *Fremden-Blatt* 12,000, the German-National *Volksblatt* 45,000, and the *Arbeiterzeitung* (founded in 1889) 24,000. Ten years later, the *Neue Freie Presse* had lost ground slightly and had an edition of 50,000 copies, the *Wiener Zeitung* remained stable

---

436. The man of letters not only had a floral still life by van Gogh in his villa in Rodaun but also one of Picasso's early self-portraits.

[86] "Da nun die Umrisse dieser Farbenflecken hie und da eine gewisse Aehnlichkeit mit menschlichen Figuren, Bäumen, Wolken u.s.w. zeigen, etwa in der Art, wie drei- oder vierjährige Kinder dergleichen darzustellen pflegen, so wird dadurch eine rein äußerliche Verwandtschaft mit Werken der Malerei hervorgerufen, und die Berichterstattung über die besagten Gegenstände fällt in das Ressort des Referenten für bildende Kunst. Ganz mit Unrecht, wie man gleich sehen wird. Denn jedermann, der malerisch zu sehen, zu empfinden und zu denken gewöhnt ist, wird sich auf den ersten Blick klar sein, daß er es hier mit der niedrigsten Stufe eines läppischen und gänzlich indiskutablen Dilettantismus zu tun zu hat." Adalbert F. Seligmann, "Jungfranzösische Kunst," *Neue Freie Presse*, March 19, 1907, 1. As already mentioned above, Seligmann was a historicizing artist himself and this could often be recognized in his reviews as he states in the introduction to the collection of his essays: "This author does not deal with the works he criticizes as a statistician, a historian, a philosopher, or sensitive man of letters, but as a practicing expert. Very little literature on art has been written from this position." ("Der Verfasser steht dem, was er bespricht, nicht als Statistiker, Historiker, Philosoph oder empfindsamer Literat gegenüber, sondern als ausübender Fachmann. Nur ein verschwindend geringer Teil der Kunstliteratur ist von diesem Standpunkt aus geschrieben.") Adalbert F. Seligmann, *Kunst und Künstler von gestern und heute: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Vienna: Konegen, 1910), III.

with 30,000, and the *Fremden-Blatt* was no longer published. Interestingly, at a circulation of 25,000 the *Deutsches Volksblatt* lost almost half of its readers, whereas the *Arbeiterzeitung* showed a major increase and now had the largest circulation of 54,000.[87] These figures demonstrate that the opinion of the traditionally liberal upper-middle classes was to a large extent formed by the *Neue Freie Presse*. Although all of the other newspapers followed the model of the *Neue Freie Presse* by giving considerable space to cultural essays in the feature section, none of them was able to compete with it in terms of cultural influence. The *Neue Freie Presse* most famous journalists enjoyed a very powerful and envied position in the social and intellectual life of Vienna. According to Micheal Pollak, the fact that they reached tens of thousands of readers on a daily basis made them better known than playwrights and novelists, whose audiences were much smaller.[88]

Eduard Hanslick, the music critic of the *Neue Freie Presse*, was famous in his day because of his polemical campaigns against modern composers such as Richard Wagner, Franz Liszt and Pyotr Ilyich Tchaikovsky. There has been extensive research on Hanslick's position in the musical life of the Hapsburg metropolis,[89] yet so far no studies have been made on Seligmann's role in the reception of modern French art in Vienna. Whether Seligmann's denunciation of Impressionism was always successful in convincing the Viennese bourgeoisie of the movement's inferiority is a

[87] Kurt Paupié, *Handbuch der österreichischen Pressegeschichte, 1848-1959,* vol. 1, *Wien* (Vienna: Braumüller, 1960).
[88] Michael Pollak, *Wien 1900: Eine verletzte Identität* (Konstanz: Universitätsverlag, 1997), 91-92.
[89] Michael Jahn, *Was denken Sie von Wagner? Mit Eduard Hanslick in der Wiener Hofoper. Kritiken und Schilderungen* (Vienna: Der Apfel, 2007); Werner Abegg, *Musikästhetik und Musikkritik bei Eduard Hanslick* (Regensburg: G. Bosse, 1974); Markus Gärtner, *Eduard Hanslick versus Franz Liszt* (Hildesheim: G. Olms, 2005); Cornelia Viktoria Hain, "Die rhetorischen Figuren in Eduard Hanslicks Bruckner-Rezensionen" (master's thesis, University of Vienna, 2006).

moot point. One of the classic strategies for slandering modern art is to pretend that its artists are pathological; Seligman went one step further and applied this to the audience as well.[90]

> Seeing that there are some people—not many, but a few—people carrying out various professions, with varying levels of education—often above average—who claim that they experience strong emotions when looking at these objects […] one is tempted to assume that the optical attraction that these products exude makes its way along different cerebral paths and awakens different association than is the case with so-called paintings.[91]

Seligman may have panned the Gauguin exhibition, but it was still a financial success.[92] Miethke could be content with good sales figures in spite of these invectives in the media. Viennese artists especially enthused over Gauguin's mistrust of European culture—Klimt was particularly delighted with his "primitive" style.[93] Writers such as Arthur Schnitzler and Paul Stefan visited the exhibition on several occasions, reportedly full of astonishment.[94]

A few years later, in 1914, this astonishment reached the level of a genuine scandal when the Galerie Miethke brought works by Pablo Picasso to Vienna. By this time, Moll was no longer

---

[90] Something similar could be observed in the scandal over Klimt's Faculty Paintings, when Hermann Bahr commented that "I believe that other critics besides artists and the public would have to judge them [the faculty paintings], because that's pathological. And the most dangerous thing is that this madness is contagious." ("Ich glaube, darüber [über die Fakultätsbilder] müssten bereits Andere urtheilen als Künstler und Publicum, denn das ist pathologisch. Und das Gefährliche daran ist, dass dieser Wahnsinn ansteckend wirkt.") Hermann Bahr, *Gegen Klimt* (Vienna: Eisensteiner and Co., 1903), 30. See also Stefan Kutzenberger, "Because That's Pathological! Manifestations of Madness in 1900 Vienna in the Works of Klimt and Musil," in *Crime and Madness in Modern Austria: Myth, Metaphor and Cultural Realities*, Rebecca Thomas, ed. (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2008), 42-75.

[91] "Da es jedoch Menschen gibt—nicht viele aber immerhin einige—Menschen aus verschiedenen Berufskreisen, von verschiedenen zum Teil über das Durchschnittsmaß hinausgehenden Bildungsgraden, die behaupten, es würden durch die Betrachtung dieser Gegenstände in ihnen intensive Empfindungen erweckt, [...] so ist man genötigt, anzunehmen, daß die optischen Reize, die von diesen Gebilden ausgehen, auf anderen Gehirnbahnen verlaufen, andere Assoziationen erwecken, als die von Werken der sogenannten Malerei." Seligmann, "Jungfranzösische Kunst," 1.

[92] Elise Eckermann, *"En lutte contre une puissance formidable": Paul Gauguin im Spannungsfeld von Kunstkritik und Kunstmarkt* (Weimar: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 2003).

[93] Ludwig Hevesi, *Acht Jahre Secession (März 1897-Juni 1905): Kritik—Polemik—Chronik* (Vienna: Konegen, 1906), 517.

[94] Natter, *Die Galerie Miethke*, 138.

director of the gallery; this position was now held by the art historian Hugo Haberfeld, who had become co-director with Moll in 1907. On the occasion of the "Édouard Manet and Claude Monet" exhibition in 1910, the *Neue Freie Presse* even expressly used the plural form when it mentioned the "enterprising artistic directors" of the gallery.[95] However, a power struggle gradually developed between Haberfeld and Moll, and in 1912 it was settled in Haberfeld's favor. Moll left the gallery and Haberfeld became its sole director on July 31.[96] This change in management led to a paradigm shift in the exhibition activities: the graduates of the still-young academic discipline of art history made their way into the labor market and took the place of painters who had been active as gallery and museum directors. In this way, Haberfeld became a model for the modern world of art when he presented Picasso—probably the most sought-after avant-garde artist—in Vienna shortly before the start of the First World War.

It was possible for Vienna to understand pre-Cubist Picasso. For example, the *Cicerone* stated that "from a distance" two of Picasso's early drawings exhibited in Vienna "reminded one of the Pre-Raphaelites with their austere chastity and severity."[97] These drawings were part of the "New Art" exhibition in the Galerie Miethke in 1913. Other voices in the press overlooked the young Picasso among the many other artists shown, ranging from Georges Braque to Matisse and Fernand Léger to Maurice de Vlaminck. Criticism of the ambitious theme of providing the greatest possible overview of the most recent tendencies was probably justified, as inclusiveness

[95] "Man muß den rührigen artistischen Leitern Leitern des Miethkeschen Kunstsalons dankbar sein, daß sie den Wienern jetzt einige Proben Manetscher Kunst zu kosten geben, nachdem hier bloß in der Impressionistenausstellung der Secession vor sieben oder acht Jahren Werke dieses Künstlers zu sehen waren." A. F. S. [Adalbert Franz Seligmann], "Manet—Monet. Galerie Miethke," *Neue Freie Presse*, May 13, 1910, 1.
[96] Werner Schweiger, "Damit Wien einen ernsten Kunstsalon besitze: Die Galerie Miethke unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Carl Moll als Organisator," *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 2 (1998): 64-85; and Natter, *Die Galerie Miethke*, 77.
[97] "Gleich einer der Führer der Jungfranzosen, Picasso, war nur durch zwei schöne frühe Zeichnungen vertreten, deren herbe Keuschheit und Strenge von ferne an italienische Prärafaeliten anklingt." K. R. "Ausstellungen, Wien: 'Die neue Kunst' in der Galerie Miethke," *Der Cicerone* 5, no. 4 (1913): 149.

risked drifting into arbitrariness—and this is precisely what seems to have happened. In his review, Arthur Roessler reckoned that Manet's oil sketch of the *Bar in the Folies-Bergères* and Renoir's *Ice Rink in the Bois de Boulogne*, together with works by Paul Signac, Cézanne, and van Gogh, were intended to create the right atmosphere for the next generation of French artists: "Most of the Viennese will consider most of the artists Miethke is showing as being stammering, stuttering bunglers, or being evil and sick, blunderers or swindling mystagogues."[98] That is why it was clever that the Galerie Miethke decided to show works by, what had become, classic Impressionists along with those by the most avantgarde artists.[99]

Even before the 1913 Miethke show, seven works by Picasso had been shown in the Secession in 1903, though none received any attention in the media or found any buyers.[100] Matters were completely different in 1914, at the Galerie Miethke where, the press recorded, "the first monographic exhibition of the founder of Cubism in Vienna was opened with the lively participation of Viennes art circles."[101] The exhibition catalogue listed fifty-seven works and several more were submitted later. However, it is not possible to identify in particular which works were shown—in keeping with the Secession's tradition of not commenting on artworks, the catalogue gives only the title, without providing information on the medium or year of creation.

[98] "Die meisten Wiener werden die jetzt bei Miethke ausgestellten Maler für Stammelnde, Stotternde und Stümpernde oder für Krankhafte und Bösartige halten, für Patzer oder schwindelhafte Mystagogen..." A. R. [Arthur Rössler], "Expressionistenausstellung (Galerie Miethke)," *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, January 20, 1913, 1.
[99] Ibid.
[100] Gabriele Hammel-Haider, "'Moderne Galerie in Wien'—'Neue Galerie in der Stallburg'—und nun?" in *Museumsraum Museumszeit: Zur Geschichte des österreichischen Museums- und Ausstellungswesens*, ed. Gottfried Fliedl, Roswitha Muttenthaler, and Herbert Posch, 189-93 (Vienna: Picus 1992).
[101] "In der Galerie Miethke wurde heute [February 13] unter lebhafter Beteiligung der Wiener Kunstkreise die Picasso-Ausstellung eröffnet, die den Begründer des Kubismus zum erstenmal in Wien kollektiv zeigt." Anonymous, "Theater- und Kunstnachrichten," *Neue Freie Presse*, February 14, 1914, 13.

In his position as director of the Galerie Miethke, Haberfeld had built up a well-functioning international network of art dealers, and was therefore able to show the major portion of the works from the Picasso exhibition organized by the Galerie Thannhauser in Munich. The show subsequently went to Berlin and Dresden where—as in Vienna—Picasso's works met with misunderstanding. The critics asked the same—somewhat feeble—questions that are still common today: Does the art dealer make the artist? Is an art dealer justified in going against the public's taste in his exhibitions? The critic of the *Kunstchronik*, writing about the Dresden venue of the show, was of the opinion: "Of course, it is understandable that the two art salons, which have made great efforts to show good contemporary art for the last two decades, now feel that they have to show the very newest efforts; however, this does not prevent the overall impression from being extremely depressing and out of place."[102]

In his position as art critic of the *Neue Freie Presse*, Seligmann did not feel the necessity to understand Picasso's "attempts at a new type of spatial depiction" and immediately positioned the artist on the brink of insanity: "The mathematician, the psychologist—maybe even the neurologist—could possibly be interested in this kind of thing. These experiments have absolutely no connection with art and this is, therefore, not the place to talk about them."[103] However, at the beginning of the same short review of art exhibitions in Vienna, Seligmann mentioned another exhibition where—almost as a matter of course—he discovered French

[102] "Gewiss ist es verständlich, dass die beiden Kunsthandlungen, die sich seit zwei Jahrzehnten bemühen, gute zeitgenössische Kunst zu zeigen, nun auch einmal das Streben der Allerneuesten vorführen wollen, aber nichtsdestoweniger ist der Eindruck höchst deprimierend und deplaciert." Emil Waldmann, "Kunstausstellungen: Dresden," *Kunst und Künstler* 12, no. 6 (1914): 344.
[103] "Der Mathematiker, der Psychologe—wohl auch der Neurologe—kann sich möglicherweise für derartiges interessieren. Irgendwelchen wesentlichen Zusammenhang mit Kunst haben diese Experimente nicht, und es ist darum hier nicht der Ort, darüber zu sprechen." A. F. S. [Adalbert Franz Seligmann], "Kunstausstellungen," *Neue Freie Presse*, February 20, 1914, 13.

influences: "At Halm & Goldmann (Opernring 17)[104], one can see, along with the very skilful and frequently quite tasteful etchings by Ferdinand Michl—some of which we know already with their telltale Japanese and modern French influences (Raffaelli, Toulouse-Lautrec, Heller, et al.)—extremely charming pastel drawings by Henri Leriche (Paris)."[105]

Toulouse-Lautrec, whom Seligmann mentions only in passing here, had been violently attacked in print by the critic on the occasion of the major exhibition of his works at the Galerie Miethke in the fall of 1909: "Toulouse-Lautrec was a caricature himself; a crippled, ugly dwarf. His work is exactly the same; deformed, distorted, and convulsive. And, as some people say about hunchbacks, malicious and full of wit but without a scrap of humor."[106] In other newspapers this exhibition—which was to be the largest of Toulouse-Lautrec's works to be shown in Vienna until the 1960s—was treated more positively.[107] *Die Zeit*, for example, considered that "this is the most rewarding and interesting of all the French art that has been collectively shown in

[104] In 1907, after forty years on Babenbergerstrasse, the publisher and bookshop Halm & Goldmann purchased Max Tintner's art salon that had been located at Opernring 17 since 1875. Here, the activities as bookseller and art dealer continued uninterrupted. *Oesterreichisch-ungarische Buchhändler-Correspondenz: Organ des Vereines der österreichisch-ungarischen Buchhändler: Festnummer anlässlich des 50jährigen Bestehens 1860-1910* (1910): 82.
[105] "Bei Halm & Goldmann (Opernring 17) sieht man neben den zum Teil schon bekannten, japanische und modernere Pariser Einflüsse (Raffaelli, Toulouse-Lautrec, Heller u. a.) verratenden, sehr geschickt gemachten, meist recht geschmackvollen Radierungen von Ferdinand Michl ganz ausnehmend reizende Kreidezeichnungen von Henri Le Riche (Paris)." *Neue Freie Presse*, February 20, 1914, 13.
[106] "War ja Toulouse-Lautrec selber eine Karikatur, ein verkrüppelter, hässlicher Zwerg. So aber ist auch seine Kunst; auch sie gleichsam verwachsen, verzerrt und verzerrend, wie man's manche Buckligen nachzusagen pflegt, boshaft und voller Geist, aber ohne einen Funken von Humor." A. F. S. [Adalbert F. Seligmann], "Zwei Karikaturisten," *Neue Freie Presse*, October 27, 1909, 1. Here, Seligmann compares the works of Wilhelm Busch (exhibited in the Hagenbund) with those by Toulouse-Lautrec (at Miethke's). While Seligmann considered Busch's art as the triumph of the spirit over the body, the French artist was "the opposite of this. It is gripping and terrifying to see how talent and audacious willpower vainly charge against the walls that surround the sensitivity and creativity of this artist with his deficient technical prowess and background of baseness and depravity." ("das Gegenteil davon. Es ist ein aufregendes und grauenhaftes Schauspiel, zu sehen, wie Talent und kühnes Wollen vergeblich gegen die Wälle anstürmen, mit denen eine in vielen Punkten unzulängliche technische Vorbildung und ein Milieu von Niedrigkeit und Verkommenheit das Empfinden und Schaffen des Künstlers umgrenzt haben.") Ibid., 3.
[107] Fritz Novotny, *Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec: Wiener Festwochen* (Vienna: Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst, 1966).

Vienna in recent times."[108] While the Viennese feature writers differed in their treatment of Toulouse-Lautrec, they were unanimous in their judgment of the Picasso exhibition in the Galerie Miethke five years later. A comment in the *Reichspost* summed up the critics' attitude: "Why is this sort of nonsense repeatedly exhibited in our art salons?"[109]

Making the public aware of the newest tendencies in avant-garde art was Haberfeld's main goal, but eventually this mission started to threaten the gallery financially. While Moll's philosophy of "supporting the modern and looking for the necessary means in the past"[110] proved to be an extremely practical entrepreneurial mix of old masters of the first category and progressive exhibitions of contemporary modern art, Haberfeld quite simply seems to have overtaxed the Viennese public with the new. At the beginning of the First World War, the Galerie Miethke had hardly any financial reserves and therefore lacked the funds necessary for a new start in 1918.

3.5 The "Viennese Luxembourg"

In 1913, Ludwig Hevesi was relieved to be able to write, "It is in the hands of the Minister of Education von Hartel to fulfill the long-held dream of a Viennese Luxembourg."[111] The initiative to found a modern art gallery modeled on the Musée du Luxembourg in Paris had received its first official mention only less than ten years earlier,[112] but the roots of the idea can be traced

[108] "Von den Franzosen, die man in den letzten Jahren in Wien kollektiv vorgeführt hat, ist dieser der reizvollste und interessanteste." *Die Zeit*, October 20, 1909.
[109] "Warum werden solche Narreteien in Kunstsalons immer wieder ausgestellt?" J. R., "Aus dem Wiener Kunstleben," *Reichspost*, March 6, 1914, 457.
[110] "Die Gegenwart fördern und die Mittel dazu in der Vergangenheit suchen." Moll, "Mein Leben," 180.
[111] "Dem Unterrichtsminister von Hartel war es vorbehalten, den alten Traum von einem Wiener Luxembourg zu erfüllen…" Ludwig Hevesi, "Die Moderne Galerie in Wien," *Kunstchronik*, n.s. 14, no. 29 (June 12, 1903): 457.
[112] On February 21, 1894, professor Deininger informed an extraordinary plenary assembly of the Cooperative of Viennese Artists that a society to found a gallery of modern art was being established. On April 9 of the same year, the subject was discussed at a meeting of the Künstlerhaus: Minister Freiherr von Chlumetzky was considering the

back to the middle of the nineteenth century, when Austrian artists started expecting more active support from the state. As early as 1861, the Viennese artists' societies drew the government's attention to the fact "that the support of art is part of the state's responsibility to society."[113] From that time on, petitions were repeatedly drawn up, indicating that artists were slowly beginning to emancipate themselves from their aristocratic patrons and expected governmental programs to foster the arts. Naturally, the desire for a regulated acquisitions policy quickly led to the plan for a state museum of modern art.

Carl Moll was one of the most fervent champions of this project and wrote a letter to Minister Ritter von Hartel in an effort to convince him that Vienna was desperately in need of such a museum:

> The artistic developments of our time find their greatest support in the institution of public galleries, in the cultivation of art by the state. In addition to the historical collections in the Louvre, Paris possesses an impressive collection of masterworks of our time in the Musée du Luxembourg. Berlin has its National Galleries, Munich the Old and New Pinakotheks, Hamburg its Kunsthalle; every town in Germany has its own museum, its international collection of the artworks of today. Vienna still lacks this most important basis for its artistic life. The picture gallery of the supreme Imperial house is almost completely of a historic character, we do not possess a state gallery.[114]

---

plan to found a modern art gallery. Heinz Mlnarik, "'Wien entbehrt dieser wichtigsten Grundlage für sein Kunstleben': Von der Gründung der Modernen Galerie zur Österreichischen Galerie," *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 2 (1992): 38.

[113] "So richteten die Wiener Künstlerverbände 1861 ein Memorandum an die Regierung, worin sie daran erinnerten, daß die Förderung der Kunst ein Teil der staatlichen Verantwortung gegenüber der Gesellschaft sei." Jeroen Bastiaan van Heerde, *Staat und Kunst: Staatliche Kunstförderung 1895-1918* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1993), 42.

[114] "Die Kunstentwicklung unserer Zeit findet ihre wertvollsten Stützpunkte in der Institution öffentlicher Galerien, in der staatlichen Kunstpflege. Paris besitzt neben den historischen Sammlungen des Louvre im Musée du Luxembourg eine imposante Vereinigung der Meisterwerke der Jetztzeit. Berlin hat seine Nationalgalerien, München neben der Alten die Neue Pinakothek, Hamburg seine Kunsthalle, jede Stadt Deutschlands sein Museum, seine internationale Sammlung von Kunstwerken unserer Zeit. Wien entbehrt dieser wichtigsten Grundlage für sein Kunstleben. Die Gemäldegalerie des allerhöchsten Kaiserhauses trägt einen fast ausschließlich historischen Charakter, eine staatliche Galerie besitzen wir nicht." Carl Moll to Wilhelm Ritter von Hartel, April 12, 1901, Künstlerhaus Archives, Vienna; cited in Mlnarik, "'Wien entbehrt dieser wichtigsten Grundlage für sein Kunstleben': Von der Gründung der Modernen Galerie zur Österreichischen Galerie," 38.

The Musée du Luxembourg was actually the first museum in the world that was explicitly concerned with purchasing contemporary art. Both Hevesi and Moll regarded this museum as the ideal. The Luxembourg became a public gallery as early as 1750, when part of the French royal painting collection was made accessible to the public in the Palais du Luxembourg. However, the museum was dissolved in the turmoil of the French revolution and eventually served as a prison. In 1801, the Senate decided to re-establish the Musée du Luxembourg. It was opened one year later explicitly as a museum for contemporary artists and accordingly named Musée olympique de l'École vivante des beaux-arts (Olympic Museum for the Contemporary Schools of Fine Art). The state was supposed to purchase major works from living artists considered worthy of being hung in this "*temple de la Gloire*."[115]

At first, the palace became a collecting point for looted art from Napoleon's campaigns; this included Austrian art that, as was the case with most of the other looted works, was later returned.[116] After the Congress of Vienna in 1814/15, Louis XVIII decreed that the Luxembourg be used for the exhibition of contemporary art as originally planned, and the Peter Paul Rubens paintings that had been there since the seventeenth century were transferred to the Louvre.[117] One had to be dead and a celebrated artist to be hung in the royal galleries of the Louvre, but now the Musée du Luxembourg was intended to act as intermediate stage between the Salon and the Louvre. According to the 1823 collection catalogue, 103 paintings were exhibited in the museum, including works by Jacques-Louis David, then in exile in Brussels, Eugène Delacroix,

[115] It is surprising that, to date, little has been published on the history of the Musée du Luxembourg. For available sources, see Gérard Monnier, *L'art et ses institutions en France: de la Révolution à nos jours* (Paris: Gallimard, 1995); Geneviève Lacambre, ed. *Le Musée du Luxembourg en 1874* (Paris: Éditions des Musées Nationaux, 1974); and Barbara Sauer, "Der lange Weg zur Modernen Galerie in Wien" (master's thesis, University of Vienna, 2008).
[116] Heinrich Schwarz, "Joseph Rosa und das Musée Napoléon," *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Galerie* 56 (1968): 7-14.
[117] Monnier, *L'art et ses institutions en France*, 95.

and Ingres.[118] However, as was the case with most museums, the acquisitions policy of the Musée du Luxembourg was frequently a matter of coincidence. In the last third of the ninteenth century, the struggle between traditional and modernist styles became more intense, although works from both camps were purchased. The youngest artists mentioned in the 1894 catalogue were Émile Friant and Jules-Alexis Muenier. Both were born in 1863, showing that works by artists in their early thirties were already included in this museum of modern art.[119] The records also show that, starting in 1892, efforts were undertaken to acquire Impressionist art, as evidenced by the purchase of works by Sisley and Renoir. Degas was approached by museum officials, but refused to sell to the state. In 1894, Gustave Caillebotte donated his personal art collection, a gift that resulted in a large number of Impressionist works coming into the museum's possession. They were even given their own hall where, as Pissarro remarked, they were poorly lit, miserably framed, and thoughtlessly hung.[120] The museum relied on generous donations such as this, as it had barely funds for acquisitions and efforts to make purchases with private help were rarely successful. These difficulties show that it was also difficult for the French state's museum of contemporary art to pursue a clear collecting policy. In order to provide the most balanced overview of contemporary art possible, the practice of showing no more than four pictures by a single artist came into being.[121]

In his letter to Minister von Hartel, Moll referred to the National Gallery in Berlin along with the Musée du Luxembourg. The term *Nationalgalerie* has two meanings in Germany: on the one

[118] C. P. [Charles-Paul] Landon, *Musée royale du Luxembourg, recréé en 1822 et composé des principales productions des artistes vivants* (Paris: Bureau des annales du musée, 1823). See Lacambre, *Le Musée du Luxembourg en 1874*: 8; and Monnier, *L'art et ses institutions en France*, 96.
[119] Sauer, "Der lange Weg zur Modernen Galerie in Wien," 74.
[120] Peter Gay, *Bürger und Boheme: Kunstkriege des 19. Jahrhunderts* (Munich: C. H. Beck, 1999), 266.
[121] Ibid., 267.

hand, it is a museum that displays artworks in the possession of the nation and, on the other, it is also a place where the nation cultivates its image of itself through art.[122] Hans Tietze made a similar observation in one of his last articles: "The name "Nationalgalerie" can either refer to the owner or the content of the collection in question. As is the case in Italy and France, it can simply be the name for a collection that is owned and administered by the state, […] The name can also—and this is especially the case in the German-speaking world—be used intentionally to distinguish it from international."[123]

The founding of the National Gallery dates to January 18, 1861, when the Berlin banker and art collector Joachim Heinrich Wilhelm Wagener died and left his his collection of 262 paintings to the Prussian state. In a decree dated February 27, 1861, Wilhelm II accepted the donation and added twenty more paintings from the royal collection, stating, "The Prussian state had unexpectedly come into the possession of a gallery of modern art that no other public museum, worldwide, could claim to have."[124] On the king's birthday, March 22, 1861, the Wagener collection as part of the National Gallery was opened in the building of the Academy of Arts on Unter den Linden boulevard. The collection was transferred to a new building on the Museum Island in 1876.

[122] Paul Ortwin Rave, *Die Geschichte der Nationalgalerie Berlin* (Berlin: Nationalgalerie, 1968), 4.
[123] "Der Name Nationalgalerie oder Nationalmuseum kann entweder den Besitzer oder den Inhalt der betreffenden Sammlung im Auge haben. Er kann einfach—wie es etwa in Italien oder Frankreich der Brauch ist—jede Sammlung bezeichnen, die vom Staat besessen oder verwaltet wird […]. Der Name kann aber auch—wie besonders im deutschen Sprachraum—das Wort National im geflissentlichen Gegensatz zu international verwenden." Hans Tietze, *Die großen Nationalgalerien: Meisterwerke der Malerei aus den großen Museen der Welt* (Zürich: Phaidon, 1954), 277.
[124] "Der preußische Staat war unvermutet in den Besitz einer Galerie moderner Bilder gelangt, wie sie anderwärts noch nirgends in der Welt als ein öffentliches Museum bestand." Rave, *Die Geschichte der Nationalgalerie Berlin,* 22. Here, particular reference is made to the competitive situation with Munich.

Seeing that the German emperor William II completely disapproved of modern art, various tricks were necessary to purchase works by Arnold Böcklin—and later, the Impressionists—for the National Gallery.[125] Under Hugo von Tschudi's directorship, from 1896 to 1907, however, there was a break from seeing classical aesthetics as a way to a national art. Paintings of historical subjects lost their prominence and Tschudi began his travels; these led him to Paris where he purchased the first paintings by the French Impressionists for the German National Gallery.[126] Emperor Wilhelm II was not amused, and demanded that all future acquisitions and endowments be presented to him for approval. He stressed that works from all periods and nations had a place in the Gemäldegalerie (Paintings Gallery), but the national gallery of contemporary art was to do without foreign art.[127] However, Tschudi continued his struggle for an international museum and was able to use funds made available through an endowment by Max Liebermann to purchase three sculptures by Auguste Rodin for the National Gallery between 1896 and 1905. And, although Wilhelm II declared all the French artists shown to him were completely worthless, Tschudi was still able to prove that "they had a right to exist in the state's collections and not be known only to a small circle of private collectors. Supported and encouraged by his example, several [German] museums—namely, those under communal administration—have flung their doors wide open to modern art," even though he was able to include only a few modern paintings in the German National Gallery, even after a hard struggle.[128]

[125] Angelika Wesenberg and Ruth Langenberg, eds., *Im Streit um die Moderne: Max Liebermann, der Kaiser, die Nationalgalerie* (Berlin: Nicolai, 2001), 11.
[126] Ernst Schwedeler-Meyer, *Hugo von Tschudi: Gesammelte Schriften zur neueren Kunst* (Munich: Bruckmann, 1912), 26.
[127] Ibid., 24.
[128] "ihre staatliche Existenzberechtigung auch außerhalb des kleinen Kreises der Privatsammler nachzuweisen suchte. Unterstützt und vorwärts getrieben durch sein Beispiel haben manche Museen, namentlich solche unter städtischer Leitung, ihre Tore der modernen Kunst weit geöffnet." Ibid., 9.

While France had had a state museum for contemporary art since the beginning of the nineteenth century, and Germany since the mid-nineteenth century, there was nothing comparable in the Hapsburg Empire. However, the chances of founding such a museum were actually not unfavorable, seeing that, compared with the German emperor, Austria's Kaiser Franz Josef possessed a neutral attitude on the matter and even a positive attitude toward fostering art in general, especially as a symbol for unity of the multi-ethnic state. As he wrote in a "supreme manuscript" dated April 16, 1901, "I have always been pleased to foster the fine arts […] and especially the founding of institutions to cultivate these arts has been one of my most pleasant duties as regent."[129] The personal involvement of the most esteemed regent naturally fortified the artists' societies in their efforts to establish a state gallery. Immediately after its foundation, the Secession had begun buying works and donating them to the state for the planned museum of contemporary art; until 1901, acquisitions included pictures by Giovanni Segantini, Pascal Dagnan-Bouveret, Antonio de La Gandara, Ludwig von Hofmann, Alfred Roll, Auguste Rodin, and others" as an indication of the kind of acquisitions that were desirable. Despite official support for the construction of such a museum in the Hapsburg capital, the commission established by the ministry to build the museum ran into financial and real estate difficulties.[130] As it was becoming increasingly unlikely that a new building would be constructed, the decision was finally made on April 4, 1902, to make the empty rooms in the Lower Belvedere palace available as a temporary location for the Moderne Galerie.[131]

---

[129] "Ich habe die bildenden Künste [...] stets mit Freude gefördert, und insbesondere erschien Mir die Gründung von Pflegestätten für diese Künste als eine Meiner schönsten Regentenpflichten." Van Heerde, *Staat und Kunst*, 182.
[130] Mlnarik, "'Wien entbehrt dieser wichtigsten Grundlage für sein Kunstleben': Von der Gründung der Modernen Galerie zur Österreichischen Galerie," 43.
[131] The museum is still located in the (Upper and Lower) Belvedere. In 1907, Seligmann already feared that this provisional arrangement would be long lasting: "We are living in Austria, in the land of the provisional!" ("Wir leben ja in Österreich, im Lande der Provisorien!") Adalbert F. Seligmann, "Die Moderne Galerie," in id., *Kunst und Künstler von gestern und heute: Gesammelte Aufsätze* (Vienna: Konegen, 1910), 245.

After that, progress was surprisingly rapid, and the Moderne Galerie was opened in the newly adapted Baroque building on May 2, 1903 (fig. 73). The exhibited works were mainly composed of acquisitions from the Imperial-Royal Ministry for Culture and Education,[132] loans from the city of Vienna and the province of Lower Austria, and donations from private individuals and institutions. In 1851 the ministry had already provided funds for purchasing contemporary artworks; these had been deposited in the Academy of Fine Arts. The demands of the various artists' societies for a museum for contemporary art at the beginning of the twentieth century were therefore treated relatively benevolently, as shown in the budget report for 1903: "The question of erecting a modern gallery in the empire's capital city of Vienna can not be postponed any longer as its need has long been felt. Seeing that the number of works in the state's possession has now reached a significant quantity it is essential to display them and make them available to the public."[133]

The Secession also played a major role in the development of the collection; its donations of international art made it one of the most important partners. Rodin's bust of *Henri de Rochefort-Luçay*, Giovanni Segantini's *The Evil Mothers*, and van Gogh's *Plain of Auvers* were among the donations. Monet's *Monsieur Paul*, Axel Gallén-Kallela's *Spring*, Klimt's *On Attersee*, Adolf Hoelzel's *White Poplars*, and other works were purchased by the state at Secession exhibitions. The opening of the Moderne Galerie was widely covered in the press. It was unanimous in its

[132] The abbreviation "k.k." (*kaiserlich-königlich*, meaning imperial-royal) was already common in the eighteenth century; after the reconciliation of 1867, it was used for all government offices and institutions in the western half of the monarchy (in contrast to *königlich-ungarisch*, meaning royal-Hungarian, used in the eastern sector). The abbreviation "k.u.k.," on the other hand, was used for the joint offices and institutions of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy (army, foreign office, finance ministry).

[133] "Die Frage der Errichtung einer modernen Galerie in der Reichshaupt- und Residenzstadt Wien kann nicht länger hinausgeschoben werden, da sich das Bedürfnis danach längst fühlbar gemacht hat, indem die im Staatsbesitze befindlichen Kunstwerke eine solche Zahl erreicht haben, daß sie öffentlich aufgestellt und dem Publikum zugänglich gemacht werden müssen." From the budget report for 1903, quoted in Seligmann, "Die Moderne Galerie," 242.

praise of the collection, but rejected the combination of baroque-style rooms with contemporary artworks. A catalogue of the 196 works in the Moderne Galerie was published at the time of the opening.[134] As can be seen in figure 74, most of the works were Austrian (or from the Hapsburg Empire), the next greatest number were German, and France was in third position with eight works in the collection.

The French artworks included in the catalogue were Luigi Loir, *Place de la République*, 1901, oil on canvas, donation of Ernst Mauthner, 1902; Monet, *Monsieur Paul*, 1882, oil on canvas, acquired by the Secession, 1903; Roll, *Nude Study*, chalk on paper, dedication: Secession, 1901; Pierre George Jeanniot, *Soldier and Girl*, colored chalk on paper, dedication: Secession, 1900; Pascal Dagnan-Bouveret, *Study of Hands*, red chalk on paper, dedication: Secession, 1900; Jeanniot, *Seated Girl*, chalk drawing, dedication: Secession, 1900; Jeanniot, *Idle Soldier*, chalk drawing, dedication: Secession, 1900; Rodin, *Rochefort*, plaster, dedication: Secession, 1899.

As can be seen, the Secession's donations made up the majority of the internationally relevant objects. This supports the idea that the Moderne Galerie was not intended to bring together the country's art treasures, but had been established to become a showplace for the art created in its own country (something it had in common with both its French and German models). The name "Moderne Galerie" was chosen deliberately, as a "National Gallery" would have been impossible in the multinational Hapsburg monarchy. Initially, the opening of the Moderne Galerie in the Lower Belvedere did not have any impact on acquisition funds or policy. In 1900, the ministry had 60,000 kronen at its disposal for the purchase of contemporary art; in 1903 this had only

[134] *Katalog der Modernen Galerie in Wien* (Vienna: Moderne Galerie, 1903).

increased insignificantly to 65,000 kronen.[135] However, after it had gradually become clear that a new building for the Neue Galerie was unlikely to materialize in the foreseeable future, the annual acquisitions budget was increased to 300,000 kronen in 1913, and the fifth edition of the catalogue had already increased to include 319 entries. (The percentages of foreign and local art remained almost unchanged.)[136]

A building inspector and restorer had been responsible for the management of the museum until 1909, when the ministry decided to appoint a director. This was not least due to the fact that the press had frequently started calling for a uniform purchasing policy and gallery administration.[137] The "expert authority on prints and drawings of the sixteenth century"[138] and former custodian of the imperial engraving collection in the court library, Friedrich Dörnhöffer, lived up to the expectations placed in him by the various artistic camps. His organization of the Austrian pavilion at the 1911 International Art Exhibition in Rome made his ideal of a modern gallery completely clear. Franz Martin Haberditzl, who became Dörnhöffer's successor in 1916, summarized it in the following manner: "The International Art Exhibition in Rome makes it possible to gain insight into some aspects of Dörnhöffer's program: Austrian contemporary art in a small, extremely select collection of works of purely artistic character, brought together to form a well-organized totality."[139]

---

[135] 60,000 kronen from the year 1900 would buy 200,000 euros today. The kronen were converted to shillings, then to reichsmarks, then again to shillings and finally to euros, taking into account the increase in the consumer price index between 1891 and 2011. Thanks to Christa Magerl, Österreichisches Institut für Wirtschaftsforschung (Austrian Institute for Economic Research). Seligmann, "Die Moderne Galerie," 242; Van Heerde, *Staat und Kunst*, 184.

[136] Van Heerde, *Staat und Kunst*, 184.

[137] Mlnarik, "'Wien entbehrt dieser wichtigsten Grundlage für sein Kunstleben': Von der Gründung der Modernen Galerie zur Österreichischen Galerie," 51.

[138] "vorzügliche Kenner der Graphik des 16. Jahrhunderts." Seligmann, "Die Moderne Galerie," 247.

[139] "Auf der Internationalen Kunstausstellung in Rom kann ein Teil von Dörnhöffers Programm für kurze Zeit veranschaulicht werden: die österreichische Kunst der Gegenwart in einer kleinen, ungemein gewählten Sammlung

This concept of providing a concentrated overview of Austrian art of the time also probably led to Dörnhöffer's recommendation in 1912 that the Moderne Galerie be renamed Österreichische Staatsgalerie (Austrian State Gallery). In a lecture, the Minister of Education Max Hussarek gave the following reasons for renaming the institution: "The state should think about modern art first of all—the major artistic movement that we are actually involved in (approximately, the past two generations)—and secondly remember Austria's artistic past."[140]

3.6 The Impact of van Gogh in Fin-de-siècle Vienna

While many French modernist artists influenced the artistic production in turn-of-the-century Vienna, van Gogh had probably the most visible impact. Frequently, the Viennese artists' involvement with van Gogh is not found in the technical aspects of painting but rather in a general artistic stance, in the indissoluble connection between art and life, that showed itself in the broad reception of the publication of van Gogh's letters. The first individual letters appeared in 1904 in the *Kunst und Künstler* journal, followed in 1906 by a 144-page book published by Paul Cassirer.[141]

The first time a work by van Gogh was seen in Vienna was probably in the 1901 Secession, when Henry van de Velde's famous art nouveau desk was shown with an album including a

---

von Werken rein künstlerischen Charakters zu einem organisierten Ganzen zusammenzufassen." Franz Martin Haberditzl, *Moderne Galerie in der Orangerie des Belvedere* (Vienna: Verein der Museumsfreunde, 1929).

[140] "Der Staat sollte sich erstens auf die moderne Kunst—die große künstlerische Bewegung, in der wir stehen (also etwa die beiden letzten Generationen)—und zweitens auf die österreichische künstlerische Vergangenheit besinnen." Quoted in Van Heerde, *Staat und Kunst*, 186.

[141] Margarete Mauthner, ed. and trans., *Vincent van Gogh: Briefe* (Berlin: Cassirer, 1906).

colored print by van Gogh on it.[142] Two years later, five works by van Gogh were shown at the pioneer Impressionist exhibition (at which the Secession purchased the *Plain at Auvers* and donated it to the Moderne Galerie), and three years after this, in 1906, the major, landmark exhibition of van Gogh's works took place in the Galerie Miethke. Aside from these exhibitions, ultimately, thirteen pictures by van Gogh could be found in Viennese collections up to the beginning of the First World War: Moll owned three, as did the Galerie Miethke; the private collectors Josef Redlich and Oskar Reichel each had one and Carl Reininghaus possessed four.[143] In comparison, fourteen pictures were included in six Swiss collections, while Germany could boast a total of 156—even under the Nazi regime that had branded van Gogh as a degenerate artist—and this fact led to the statement "van Gogh's art was and is Germanic by nature."[144]

Austrian writers reacted in fascination to the powerful art of van Gogh; there is particular evidence of this in the works of Hugo von Hofmannsthal, Rainer Maria Rilke, and Karl Kraus.[145] Robert Musil's obsession went so far that Walter Fanta, the publisher of Musil's complete works, was able to reconstruct the plan for a "van Gogh novel" from the papers left behind after the author's death in 1942.[146] It is less easy to throw light on the reception of van Gogh in the realm of the fine arts, where it is not always possible to differentiate between genetic and typological comparisons, between influence and a similar, albeit independent, stylistic development. Richard Gerstl appears to have been one of the first Viennese artists to recognize the significance of van

[142] Hevesi, *Acht Jahre Secession,* 406.
[143] Feilchenfeldt, *Vincent van Gogh and Paul Cassirer*, 158.
[144] Hermann Stenzel, *Die Welt der deutschen Kunst: Entwicklung, Wesensart und Inhalt des germanischen Kunstschaffens* (Munich: Oldenbourg, 1943), 99. See also Ron Manheim, "The 'Germanic' Van Gogh: A Case Study of Cultural Annexation," *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 4 (1989): 277-88.
[145] Almut Krapf-Weiler, "Zur Wirkungsgeschichte Vincent van Goghs in Wien," in *Vincent van Gogh und die Moderne, 1890-1914*, Roland Dorn and Georg-Wilhelm Költzsch, eds. (Freren: Luca, 1990), 415.
[146] Walter Fanta, Klaus Amann, and Karl Corino, eds., *Robert Musil: Klagenfurter Ausgabe Kommentierte digitale Edition sämtlicher Werke, Briefe und nachgelassener Schriften,* DVD (Klagenfurt: Robert Musil-Institut der Universität Klagenfurt, 2009).

Gogh, and he followed similar paths in his own style of painting.[147] In their catalogue of Klimt's works, Fritz Novotny and Johannes Dobai noted van Gogh's influence on Klimt starting in 1906.[148] However, it is hardly possible today to determine the extent to which the increased number of depictions of sunflowers in Klimt's—as well as Schiele's—work, and the thick and dynamic application of paint in some sections of Klimt's paintings, such as *Avenue in the Park of Schloss Kammer* (fig. 75), were directly influenced by van Gogh.[149] Nevertheless, one of Schiele's paintings—*Bedroom in Neulengbach*—definitely be traced back to van Gogh.

Egon Schiele left the Austrian provinces in 1906 and came to Vienna where—at the age of sixteen—he immediately passed the entrance examination for the academy of fine art. It is uncertain whether he saw the van Gogh exhibition in the Galerie Miethke in the same year. But, at the latest, he definitely saw the paintings by van Gogh that were shown in the 1909 Vienna Internationale Kunstschau [International Art Show], organized on the initiative of Klimt. The Kunstschau included a great number of French artists, among them Matisse, Henri Manguin, Ker-Xavier Roussel, Maurice Vlaminck, Pierre Bonnard, and Gauguin, with eleven paintings by van Gogh in Hall 14: *The Bedroom*, *Olive Grove*, *The Nurse*, *Hospital in Arles*, *Sunset over the Rhone*, *Rowing Boats*, *Woman's Head*, *Flowers*, *The Drinker*, *Portrait*, and *Sun*.[150] The nineteen-year-old Schiele also presented his paintings to a large audience for the first time at this event.

---

[147] However, in his Gerstl monograph, Klaus Albrecht Schröder does not mention any specific van Gogh influence. Klaus Albrecht Schröder, *Richard Gerstl* (Vienna: Kunstforum der Bank Austria, 1993). Nevertheless, there is evidence that Klimt, as well as Gerstl and Kokoschka, visited the 1906 van Gogh exhibition in Vienna. Werner Hofmann, *Moderne Malerei in Österreich* (Vienna: Wolfrum, 1965), 104; and Almut Krapf-Weiler, "Zur Wirkungsgeschichte Vincent van Goghs in Wien," 416. In her unconvincing historical novel *Wahnsinns Liebe* (Insane Love) (München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 2003), Lea Singer [Eva Gesine Baur] has Richard Gerstl go to Miethke's van Gogh exhibition, leaving completely overwhelmed.

[148] Fritz Novotny and Johannes Dobai, *Gustav Klimt* (Vienna: Galerie Weltz, 1967), 386-87.

[149] Marian Bisanz-Prakken, "Gustav Klimt," in *Vincent Van Gogh und die Moderne, 1890-1914*, Roland Dorn and Georg-Wilhelm Költzsch, eds. (Freren: Luca, 1990), 418.

[150] *Katalog der Internationalen Kunstausstellung in Wien 1909* (Vienna: Rosenbaum, 1909).

The exhibition was a confrontation with international contemporary art, which triggered largely negative reactions and a lack of understanding on the part of both the audience and critics. The French artists, representatives of the Fauves and the Nabis, were particularly targeted by the press and their paintings described as, for example, "smears of the most foolhardy sort."[151] Seligmann, as at the previous exhibitions in the Secession and Galerie Miethke, wrote that the paintings by van Gogh and Gauguin represented the "lowest borderline to dilettantism." He recommended that the visitors go through Hall 6, where works by Jan Toorop and Oskar Kokoschka were exhibited, "with their eyes closed, if possible."[152] Schiele, who was exhibiting with the Klimt group for the first time, was lambasted by the press just as Kokoschka had been in 1908.

It was probably there that the collector and patron Carl Reininghaus first saw works by Schiele, whom he began to collect in the following year, paying handsomely from the very beginning. Reininghaus's support not only secured the career of the artist but, with his international collection of contemporary art, Reininghaus also influenced Schiele's artistic development. At his regular visits to the collector's soirées, Schiele not only became acquainted with new clients but also with the works in his host's famous collection.[153] Van Gogh's painting *Bedroom in Arles*—also exhibited in the 1909 Kunstschau—probably made a particularly strong impression on the young Austrian artist who painted an extremely personal version of this work in 1912—his own *Bedroom in Neulengbach* (fig. 76).

[151] Adalbert F. Seligmann, "*Kunstschau*," *Neue Freie Presse*, April 29, 1909, 2.
[152] Ibid.
[153] Ulrike Tropper, "Das kreative Milieu von Graz um 1900: Ein Beitrag zum Kulturleben der Jahrhundertwende" (PhD. diss., Graz University, 1994), 108-17; and Tobias G. Natter, *Die Welt von Klimt, Schiele und Kokoschka: Sammler und Mäzene* (Cologne: Dumont, 2003), 165-77.

There are three similar versions of van Gogh's *Bedroom in Arles*; Reininghaus owned the one that is now in the Art Institute of Chicago (fig. 77). For the painting of his own bedroom—also in a house in the provinces—Schiele adopted van Gogh's perspective of the unspectacular, bare room seen from the foot of the bed. Schiele subsequently came into contact with the painting of van Gogh's bedroom once again in the winter of 1914, in an international art competition organized by Reininghaus. With its unusually high prize award of 3,000 kronen and its prominent jury (Klimt, Josef Hoffmann, Rudolf Junk, and Reininghaus himself), the competition attracted artists from France, including Raoul Dufy, Marie Laurencin, and Moise Kissling. The most celebrated Austrian participants were Schiele, Anton Faistauer, Albert Paris Gütersloh, Max Kurzweil, and Wilhelm Thöny. In order to give the exhibition greater merit, and to set high standards for the submitted works, Reininghaus showed famous works from his own collection—namely, van Gogh's *Bedroom in Arles*, three works by Renoir, *Woman with Pigs* by Gustave Courbet, and a portrait of a man by Cézanne—alongside the competing paintings. Although—or maybe because—Schiele had the closest relationship to Reininghaus of all the artists taking part, he ended up with nothing. Faistauer won first prize and Gütersloh won the second prize of 1,000 kronen. There are no records documenting whether Schiele was comforted when Reininghaus later purchased the painting *Encounter* (now lost), which he had submitted in an unfinished state. It was specifically the so-called Neukunstgruppe, Schiele and Feistauer among them, who endorsed van Gogh and Gauguin in their quest for evocative color and form (fig. 78).

Although not comparable to the volume of Germany, there was quite some import of French modernist painting to Vienna before the outbreak of World War One—greatly helped by

galleries such as Miethke. However, very little was acquired by local collectors and the institutional system turned out to function as a one-way-street. The close-knit Viennese art world continued to rely on direct patronage rather than international dealer networks. With the exception of Schiele, who showed a few works at the Paris branch of Arnot in 1914, private galleries at the French capital did not represent Viennese artists. The "ideal community of creators and art lovers" which Klimt famously praised in his opening speech of the 1908 Kunstschau was to a large extent reality—at least for the artistic elite.[154] The prevalence of portraiture in Viennese modern painting reflects this pre-modern culture of commissions.

[154] "Für uns heißt Künstlerschaft die ideale Gemeinschaft aller Schaffenden und Genießenden." The speech was published as preface to the *Katalog der Kunstschau Wien 1908* (Vienna: Kunstschau with Holzhausen, 1908).

4 Art Markets and State Sponsorship in the Interwar Period, 1918-1937

4.1 "The Center They All Want to Flee From"

The year 1918 not only meant the end of the First World War and the termination of 645 years of Hapsburg rule, it was also the year in which Gustav Klimt, Egon Schiele, Koloman Moser, and Otto Wagner died. In addition, Oskar Kokoschka had left Vienna in 1917 and moved to Dresden. The Viennese art world found it difficult to overcome this sudden loss of the city's most creative artists and this situation led to the Austrian provinces increasing in artistic importance in the years between the two world wars. Of course, the art academies, the major museums, the most important art associations and dealers remained in the capital, but many artists withdrew to the countryside. There they established their own artist's societies in order "to prove that art is not a monopoly of a metropolis and that all artistic and cultural stimuli and rejuvenation processes have their roots in the country."[1]

Having experienced the horrors of war, the collapse of the monarchy, and a great number of utopian conflicting social movements, the Viennese were left with an existential feeling of insecurity that was also reflected in art and the art market. Artistic production in the interwar years was unprecedented in its variety because of the lack of a determinative center. A great deal of knowledge and sensitivity was needed to cope with so much diversity—and this level of knowledge no longer existed within the general public. Private patronage had completely died out after the First World War, and the low level of education among the nouveau riche and those

[1] "Beweis zu erbringen, dass die Kunst kein Monopol der Großstadt ist und jeder künstlerische und kulturelle Auftrieb und Verjüngungsprozeß vom Land ausgeht." Hans Hammerstein, *Erinnerungen und Betrachtungen* (Linz: Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv, 1999), 107.

who had made their fortunes as war profiteers meant that those members of society with the greatest purchasing power had little interest in art and little understanding of it. The novelist Robert Musil made fun of this situation, writing "Don't waste too much time on art!"[2] The nouveau riche often thought of art as nothing more than a speculative commodity. The art dealer Otto Nirenstein had the idea of organizing a "circle of serious, modern painters" in order to represent prominent artists who "sell and have visitors to their exhibitions no matter what."[3] His plan shows that it had become necessary to find—and even create—buyers of modern art.[4]

Nirenstein, with his Neue Galerie, and Lea Bondi, who ran the Galerie Würthle, were two of the few art dealers who did not simply react to the modest wishes of their clients but also seriously attempted to establish international contacts, especially in France. They tried to arouse curiosity and interest in the unfamiliar, and often exhibited French art in their galleries. Going in the other direction—making Austrian artists known in France—was a much more difficult matter. State patronage had reached rock bottom after the First World War, and artists experienced major financial difficulties in the 1920s and 1930s. The Austrian minister of education, Emil Schneider, was responsible for art as well as education; one of his slogans was "Don't appoint any more professors, and don't spend a dime on art sponsorship."[5] Among the country's elite were heated discussions about who was to blame for the precarious situation of artists. The governor of Upper

[2] "Verschwenden Sie nicht viel Zeit an die Kunst!" Robert Musil, "Intensismus (aus einem unveröffentlichten Kunsthandbuch für reichgewordene Leute)," in *Gesammelte Werke,* vol. 7, Adolf Frisé, ed. (Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1978), 681.
[3] "Kreis ernster moderner Maler […] ohnehin verkaufen und ohnehin Besucher in ihren Ausstellungen haben." Otto Nirenstein to Arnold Clementschitsch, September 29, 1932, Neue Galerie no. 53/1-5, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.
[4] Peter Melichar, "Der Wiener Kunstmarkt der Zwischenkriegszeit," *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* 17, nos. 2-3, *Kunstmarkt* (2006): 257.
[5] "Keine Professoren mehr ernennen, keinen Heller mehr ausgeben für Zwecke der Kunstförderung." Minutes of the Council of Ministers of the First Republic, May 18, 1925, quoted in Melichar, "Der Wiener Kunstmarkt der Zwischenkriegszeit," 253.

Austria, for example, thought that most people were not interested in art because it had "lost touch with life and with the great mass of the population."[6]

In a period of economic depression and hyperinflation, the government placed a low priority not only on contemporary art, which was seen as difficult, but also on classical high art. For example, the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna had 360,702 visitors in 1891, a number that leveled out to approximately 300,000 around 1900. By 1918, the number of annual visitors sank to 165,000, and then continuously declined until it reached a mere 114,712 in 1935.[7] Moreover, after the collapse of the monarchy and the founding of the republic, the former Hapsburg collections were seriously endangered. The successor states of the monarchy and the victors of the First World War made claims to the collections during the peace negotiations in Saint-Germain. The government of the young Austrian republic also considered selling or pawning works of art in order to alleviate the suffering of its population, especially in the famine winters from 1919 to 1921. In this precarious setting, a commission was established with the purpose of "guaranteeing the maximum use of artistic property without any cultural danger."[8] A law against the exploitation of the state's artistic property had already been passed, but not executed. However, the law ultimately was unnecessary because the works in mind would have had little success in an international art market already flooded with offers from impoverished Russian, German, and Austrian aristocrats. Moreover, there were very few buyers.[9] The art historian Hans Tietze, who had been entrusted with the reorganization of the Viennese museums, remarked that certain

[6] "Den Kontakt mit dem Leben und mit den breiten Massen der Bevölkerung verloren." Anonymous, "Wirtschaftsnot und Kunst," *Nachrichtenblatt des Zentralverbandes bildender Künstler Österreichs zur Wahrung ihrer Standes- und Wirtschaftsinteressen* 1-2 (1933): 2.
[7] Melichar, "Der Wiener Kunstmarkt der Zwischenkriegszeit," 259.
[8] "die volle Ausnützung des Kunstbesitzes ohne kulturelle Gefährdung zu gewährleisen." Austrian State Archive, AVA, MU/UA, Sign. 15, Fasz. 3145, File 31118.
[9] Verena Perlhefter, "Eine einleuchtende Einheitlichkeit? Hans Tietze und die Museumsreform von 1919," *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 1 (Spring 2001): 60-73.

treasures "make one rich because one has them, not because one gives them up. The value of our Viennese museums does not lie in the sum that could be obtained for them, but in the profit they provide" to the citizens.[10]

Although many galleries and museums mounted interesting special exhibitions on international artistic practices, Tietze was probably right that many exhibition activities took place "without actually having any connection to the vital interests of the general public."[11] He had often noted that "art was breaking away from its social foundation."[12] Further, he felt that as a result of the global economic crisis, Austrians were less and less interested in consuming art, particularly as art production was much higher than immediate demand: "The sudden decline in the market's receptiveness has had a catastrophic effect on production that has now become stigmatized as superfluous and unwelcome. This consumer strike has naturally hit modern movements most harshly; both their economic and moral raisons d'être have been eroded. Once again, art is lamenting and crying that nobody wants it any more!"[13]

In this period of insecurity, Austrian artists turned their eyes toward Paris more than ever before, and attempted—if at all possible—to study or even live in the French metropolis. Tietze wrote,

[10] "die reich machen dadurch daß man sie hat, nicht dadurch, daß man sie hergibt. Nicht in der Summe, die man aus ihnen herausholen könnte, liegt der Wert unserer Museen, sondern im Ertrag, den sie liefern." Hans Tietze, "Eine Museumskommission für Österreich," *Kunstchronik und Kunstmarkt* 55, n.s. 31, no. 9 (November 28, 1919): 175.
[11] "ohne eigentlichen Zusammenhang mit den Lebensinteressen der Allgemeinheit." Hans Tietze, "Die Kunst in unserer Zeit," *Flugschriften der Gesellschaft zur Förderung Moderner Kunst in Wien* 1 (1930): 3.
[12] "Loslösung der Kunst von ihren sozialen Unterlagen." Ibid.
[13] "Das plötzliche Nachlassen der Aufnahmefähigkeit des Marktes wirkt jetzt katastrophal auf die Produktion, die das Stigma des Überflüssigen, Unwillkommenen enthält. Dieser Verbraucherstreik trifft naturgemäß die sogenannten modernen Richtungen am härtesten; mit der wirtschaftlichen scheint ihre moralische Existenzberechtigung untergraben. Wieder einmal klagt und weint die Kunst sehr; ihrer begehrt nun niemand mehr!" Hans Tietze, "Die Reaktion in der Kunst," *Kunstchronik und Kunstmarkt* 59, n.s. 35, no. 1 (April 3, 1925): 7.

"They are all trying to get away. Vienna has become the center they all want to flee from."[14] This situation led to an increase in the positive reception of French art, though the interest was less in contemporary post-Cubist trends than in the styles of the previous generation. Herbert Boeckl, Anton Faistauer, Franz Wiegele, and Anton Kolig, followed in the footsteps of Paul Cézanne.

This reorientation of Austrian art towards Paris was actively supported by the French government. For centuries, France had been traditionally anti-Hapsburg. However, after the First World War France felt compelled to establish a certain friendship with little Austria, if only to differentiate Austria from Germany, which was hated throughout the country.[15] The threat of a united Greater Germany had been warded off by the Saint-Germain treaty's ban on annexation, but active efforts were nonetheless undertaken to confirm Austria's integrity and independence and to increase the country's standing in Europe.[16] In 1920, the French envoy in Vienna received the following order from Paris, which was intended to strengthen Austrian identity:

> We place all our interest in Vienna. Though it no longer has its former importance in politics, it still remains one of the main centers of German culture. Its prestige, which comes from centuries of tradition, will naturally decrease but will not disappear entirely as long as the Viennese preserve the reputation in the arts, literature, even in fashion, that they have justly attained in central Europe. It would be a great advantage if Vienna's magnetism could counteract Berlin's

[14] "Alle streben sie aber hinaus, allen ist Wien das Zentrum geworden, das sie fliehen." Hans Tietze, "Gemeindepolitik und moderne Kunst," *Der Kampf* 20, no. 8 (1927): 375.
[15] Jacques Le Rider, "La contribution française à la définition d'une identité culturelle autrichienne," *Les études germaniques en France, 1900-1970*, Michel Espagne and Michael Werner, ed. (Paris: CNRS, 1994), 403-7, 413-18.
[16] Jacques Le Rider, "Verselbständigung eines Wunschbildes: Der französische Beitrag zur Bestimmung der kulturellen Identität Österreichs," "*Ein Frühling, dem kein Sommer folgte*"*? Französisch-österreichische Kulturtransfers seit 1945*, ed. Thomas Angerer and Jacques Le Rider (Vienna: Böhlau, 1999), 25-40; Otto Pfersmann and Friedrich Koja, eds. *Frankreich—Österreich: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmung und wechselseitiger Einfluß seit 1918* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1994).

> attraction for not only a large section of Germany but also for most of the neighboring countries.[17]

Indeed, a great deal was actually undertaken in order to stress Austria's cultural individuality as distinct from Germany's. Additionally, almost as a consolation for the major difficulties resulting from the strict regulations of the Saint-Germain peace treaty, great efforts were made to actively involve Austrian art and artists in a dialogue with French art. For example, Germany was not even invited to participate in the 1925 Paris Exposition. In contrast, the Austrian contribution was treated favorably, and the official international exhibition guide went so far as to state that "Vienna is attempting to remain—after Paris—the capital of luxury goods."[18] The secretary of the French Socialist Party at the time was similarly friendly, albeit a little patronizing, when thinking back to Vienna in the years between the wars: "How charming. We used to call it 'Little Paris.'"[19]

4.2 Propagating French Art

In order not to fall behind Paris and the rest of Europe in cultural affairs following the painful loss of the crown estates, the Society for the Promotion of Modern Art (Gesellschaft zur

[17] "Wir haben alles Interesse daran, daß Wien, nachdem es seine Bedeutung in der Politik nicht bewahren kann, dafür eines der Hauptzentren der deutschen Kultur bleibt. Das Prestige, das ihm seine jahrhundertealte Tradition verleiht, wird zwar abnehmen; doch wird es nicht verschwinden, wenn sich die Wiener in den Künsten, der Literatur, ja selbst der Mode den Ruf erhalten, den sie sich in Mitteleuropa zu Recht erworben haben. Es wäre von großem Vorteil wenn Wiens Ausstrahlung der Anziehung entgegenwirkt, die Berlin nicht nur auf den Großteil Deutschlands ausübt, sondern auch auf die meisten Nachbarstaaten." Robert Julien, "L'image de l'Autriche perçue par le Quai d'Orsay entre 1918 et 1922," *Austriaca: cahiers universitaires d'information sur l'Autriche.* Special Issue: *Relations franco-autrichiennes, 1870-1970. Actes du colloque du Rouen 29 févier-2 mars 1984,* Felix Kreissler, ed. (June 1986): 108.

[18] "Munich travaille dans le bon marché, mais Vienne prétend rester la capitale—après Paris—de l'objet de luxe." *Guide international des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes: exposition Paris avril—octobre 1925.* (Paris: Perfect Publicity, 1925), 45.

[19] "Wie nett. Wir nannten es früher Klein-Paris." Eric Kandel, *Auf der Suche nach dem Gedächtnis: Die Entstehung einer neuen Wissenschaft des Geistes* (Munich: Siedler, 2006), 170.

Förderung moderner Kunst) organized the first post-war International Art Exhibition at the Vienna Secession in 1924. The project as a whole was in keeping with the aims of a society that was willing to "accept and assimilate all things foreign and, in this way, tear down invisible barriers" in order to give new impulses to local production.[20] Yet this was an extremely difficult project to realize because of the tremendous costs and the poor economic situation. In addition to works by many German artists, works by artists living and working in France Georges Braque, André Derain, Othon Friesz, Albert Gleizes, Marcel Gromaire, Auguste Herbin, Henri Le Fauconnier, Fernand Léger, Jean Metzinger, Jules Pascin, Pablo Picasso, Georges Rouault, Maurice de Vlaminck, and Henri Laurens were also displayed in the halls of the Secession (fig. 79). According to the catalogue, the 181 exhibits by eighty-three artists were intended to give the interested public an overview of the characteristic modern artistic developments in the participating countries. The organizers could not claim to give an integrated picture of "international art," if only because representatives from England and Italy were completely missing. However, they did not shy away from trying to sell the inhomogeneous appearance of the exhibition as an "expression of the real intellectual atmosphere of this erratic, fermenting age."[21] Private collectors, such as Felix Steinitz from Vienna, lent pictures to the show. Additionally, as most of the pictures were for sale, approximately fifteen prominent galleries from Austria and abroad—mainly Paris and Berlin—took part as lenders, including the Parisian dealer Léonce Rosenberg. The dealer's favorite artist, Fernand Léger, accepted an invitation to premier his experimental film *Ballets Méchaniques* at the legendary International Exhibition of New Theatre Techniques (*Internationale Ausstellung neuer Theatertechniken*), which was being

[20] "Aufnahme und Assimilierung alles Fremden unsichtbare Schlagbäume abzubauen." Hans Ankwitz-Kleehoven, "Die österreichische Kunstausstellung 1900-1924 im Künstlerhaus," *Wiener Zeitung*, October 25, 1924.
[21] "treuen geistigen Austruck dieser widerspruchsvollen, gärenden Zeit." *Internationale Kunstausstellung* (Vienna: Secession, 1924), n.p.

held at the same time in the Vienna Konzerthaus (fig. 80).[22] There Léger met Friedrich Kiesler, the main organizer of this festival event, and afterward sent a postcard with a motif of the Ringstraße to Rosenberg in Paris, telling him of the wonderful reception he had received in Vienna. "Enormous efforts for modern theatre. Russian, German, Italian. Very European milieu. There is nothing comparable in France."[23]

Both the Theater Festival and the International Exhibition of New Theater Techniques ended in a deficit. Only seven thousand paying visitors attended the exhibition, and the hoped-for international guests did not materialize. There was even a knife attack on a self-portrait by the German artist Max Beckmann. The daily press reporting on the exhibition was occasionally hostile, and even went so far as to speak about the "signs of decay of a declining epoch whose disarray, chaos, and stupidity is revealed in the field of art and sculpture."[24] Sales also fell short of expectations. After the exhibition had closed, Emil Frankl, president of the Society for the Promotion of Modern Art, informed the ministry of education that at least part of the losses should be covered by the government.

> As the steadily increasing number of visitors up to the end indicates, [the exhibition] was a great moral success. Although it finished with a financial deficit, this was in no way due to lack of public interest. Rather, it can be attributed mainly to the unfortunate economic situation, which affected sales so that the

[22] Barbara Lesák, "Die 'Internationale Ausstellung neuer Theatertechnik' in Wien 1924," in *Politik der Präsentation: Museum und Ausstellung in Österreich, 1918-1945*, Herbert Posch and Gottfried Fliedl, ed. (Vienna: Turia and Kant, 1996), 119-42.
[23] "Enorme Anstrengung für das moderne Theater. Russisch, Deutsch, Italienisch. Sehr europäisches Milieu. Es gibt nichts Vergleichbares in Frankreich." Fernand Léger to Léonce Rosenberg, postcard, September 21, 1924, fonds Léonce Rosenberg, Fernand Léger no. 9600.979/980, Bibliothèque Kandinsky, Centre Pompidou, Paris.
[24] "Verfallserscheinungen einer untergehenden Epoche, deren Unordnung, Chaos und Unvernunft sich auch auf dem Gebiet der Malerei und Plastik enthüllt." M. E., *Der Tag*, September 12, 1924.

> percentages, which are normally a major source of income at such events, were completely missing.[25]

After post-war international exhibition activity had recommenced with the *Internationale Kunstausstellung* and the *Internationale Ausstellung neuer Theatertechniken*, the Association of the Friends of Viennese Museums (Verein der Wiener Museumsfreunde) commissioned Carl Moll to prepare an exhibition for the Secession, one that was intended to be "a manifestation of the prestige and superiority of French painting."[26] In organizing this show, Moll did not turn his attention to contemporary art but rather to a great tradition. *The Major Masters of French Art in the Nineteenth Century* (Die führenden Meister der französischen Kunst im neunzehnten Jahrhundert), shown in the Secession in 1925, brought together an impressive selection of highlights from French public museums such as the Louvre and Luxembourg as well as from Parisian galleries, including Durand-Ruel and Vollard. Surprisingly, a considerable number of masterpieces came from Viennese private collections, including four paintings by van Gogh, a study for Manet's *Bar aux Folies Bergères* (fig. 81), Renoir's *Girl Reading*, and a landscape by Cézanne, and works by other French artists loaned by the Hermann Eissler. In his essay for the exhibition catalogue, Moll pointed to Wilhelm Bernatzik's legendary 1903 Impressionism exhibition, and complained about Austria's notorious backwardness regarding modern art.

[25] "Ihr moralischer Erfolg ist, wie der bis zum Ende steigende Besuch erwies, ein sehr großer gewesen. Wenn sie trotzdem mit einem finanziellen Defizit abschließt, so liegt die Schuld nicht an dem mangelnden Interesse des Publikums, sondern hauptsächlich an dem Umstand, dass die ungünstige Gestaltung der finanziellen Lage das Zustandekommen von Verkäufen verhindert hat, so dass die Gewinnteile, die sonst eine normale Einnahmsquelle derartiger Veranstaltungen zu bilden pflegen, vollständig entfielen." Emil Frankl to the Austrian Ministry of Education, November 14, 1924, AVA, Bundesministerium für Unterricht, GZ. 27/190 12, Austrian State Archive, Vienna.

[26] Carl Moll to André Dezarrois, December 20, 1924, X expo, 1925, peinture française, carton 1, Archives des Musées Nationaux, Paris.

> At the time, the peak of Impressionism was only thirty years past. That is how long our Vienna, which is cut off from the rest of the world, needed to become aware of this major movement in European art. Since then, another twenty-two years have passed by and, during this period, our hometown has remained just as naïve--with the exception of a few modest and hardly noticed attempts—as it ever was. We were satisfied with ourselves. It remains to be seen whether that was to our advantage and the artistic awareness of wider circles."[27]

According to Tietze, the main strength of Moll's exhibition was its superb overview of French artistic developments of the past century, a presentation that would not be possible in a single museum in the world, not even in Paris. However, Tietze noted, despite the fact that Manet's *The Balcony* and Renoir's *The Loge*, both from Durand-Ruel's private collection, were on display, absolutely first-rate masterworks showing artists in all their greatness were rather rare. Faced with the unexpectedly large crowds, Tietze attempted to find an explanation for the Viennese people's negative attitude toward Impressionism.[28] On the one hand, the art reviews that fortified the public in its prejudices had to be mentioned. Tietze found it difficult to believe that, as late as 1925—fourteen years after the "Vinnen controversy"—Adalbert F. Seligmann was still able to slander Cézanne, van Gogh, and Gauguin as "art dealer shams," and in no less than the newspaper of Austria's liberal bourgeoisie, the *Neue Freie Presse*.[29] Going even further, he created a connection between the lack of understanding and the essential differences in artistic talents:

---

[27] "Damals lag der Höhepunkt des Impressionismus gerade dreißig Jahre zurück. So lange hatte unser weltabgeschiedenes Wien gebraucht, um von dieser großen Bewegung der europäischen Kunst Kenntnis zu erlangen. Seitdem sind wieder zweiundzwanzig Jahre verflossen, und in dieser Zeit blieb unsere Vaterstadt, von einzelnen bescheidenen und kaum bemerkten Bemühungen abgesehen, ebenso weltfern wie vorher. Wir waren uns selbst genug. Ob zu unserem Vorteil, ob zum Vorteil der künstlerischen Gesittung weiterer Kreise, sei dahingestellt." Franz Ottman, and Carl Moll, eds. *Die führenden Meister der französischen Kunst im neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Vienna: Secession with Krystallverlag, 1925), 5.
[28] Hans Tietze, "Ausstellung französischer Kunst in Wien," *Kunstchronik und Kunstmarkt* 59, n.s. 35, no. 8 (May 23, 1925): 136-38.
[29] "Kunsthändlermache." Ibid.

> Even in the Baroque period, Austria—at the time, in sharp political opposition to France—defended itself against its cultural and artistic influence that had subjugated most of the courts in Germany. This did not change much in the years that followed. Even in the time when Prussia was one of France's strongest enemies, it showed a penchant for French art; it is no coincidence that Friedrich II was the most important collector of works by Watteau and his contemporaries, seeing that painters typical of Berlin—from Chodowiecki to Liebermann and the Roman Café—have always revealed a closer relationship to French art in their striving for color and realism than Viennese painters at any time in history.[30]

Although turn-of-the-century cultural transfers were mainly a result of the efforts undertaken by progressive Austrian artists and international art dealers, as seen in the Impressionism exhibition of 1903, the initial heroic efforts after the First World War show that Vienna's artistic and financial infrastructure was too weak to support major exhibitions. Because French politicians were keen to see a culturally independent Austria and, above all, to present France internationally as the leading artistic nation, that country was especially active in the area of cultural politics in foreign countries after the war.

A third major exhibition of French art was shown in the Vienna Künstlerhaus in 1926, organized by the French Association of Artistic Activities (L'association française d'action artistique, also known as the AFAA). This non-profit organization, founded by politicians, diplomats, artists, collectors, museum directors, and financiers, was established in 1922 to promote French culture,

[30] "Schon im Barock hat sich Österreich—damals noch dazu im schärfsten politischen Gegensatz zu Frankreich—gegen dessen kulturellen und namentlich künstlerischen Einfluß zur Wehr gesetzt, der fast alle deutschen Höfe unterjochte; in der Folgezeit ist dies nicht viel anders geworden. Berlin hat selbst in den Zeiten, da Preußen in voller Feindschaft zu Frankreich stand, eine besondere Vorliebe für die französische Kunst gezeigt; es ist kein Zufall, dass Friedrich II. der größte Sammler von Werken Watteaus und seiner Zeitgenossen gewesen ist, denn die spezifisch Berliner Maler haben von Chodowiecki bis Liebermann und dem romanischen Café in ihrem Streben nach Farbe und Realistik mehr Verwandtschaft mit der französischen Kunst gezeigt als die Wiener Malerei zu irgendeiner Zeit." Ibid., 136-37.

and in addition to propagating French art abroad, it also aimed to promote foreign art in France, and cultural and artistic exchange in general. Over the years, however, the institutionalization of bilateral cultural activities led to a shift away from artistic exchanges and toward language instruction, the reciprocal recognition of examinations, and improving working conditions for teachers and students in the relevant country. By 1936, only a single paragraph in the sixteen articles of a newly arranged cultural agreement between France and Austria dealt with the "exchange of works of art," a category which in addition to exhibitions also included concerts, guest theater performances, movies, and even radio programs.[31] Between 1930 and 1938, the art historian Louis Réau, author of the monumental *Histoire de l'expansion de l'art français*, directed the Institut Français in Vienna.[32] Artistic aspects had played the most significant role in the early years of the AFAA. The association sponsored the export of artworks, which led to an important exhibition of the French avant-garde in Vienna in 1926. Neither the city nor the state government would have had the wherewithal to organize such an exhibition, a sentiment echoed by the *Tagblatt* newspaper:

> Poor people are usually forced to cook with water. But we lucky devils even manage to profit from our internationally recognized poverty. Everybody, from the right and the left, is fighting for our souls, and this has led to not only having a fine show of a century of German painting but also an exhibition of modern French art delivered to us at absolutely no cost and even postpaid.[33]

[31] "275. Übereinkommen mit der Französischen Republik über die kulturellen und künstlerischen Beziehungen." *Bundesgesetzblatt für den Bundesstaat Österreich*, August 12, 1936, 717-21.
[32] Isabelle Dubois, "Louis Réau, Médiateur malgré lui? Les Primitifs Allemands 1910," in *Distanz und Aneignung: Kunstbeziehungen zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich, 1870-1945*, Alexandre Kostka and Françoise Lucbert, ed. (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004), 161-76.
[33] "Arme Leute kochen sonst mit Wasser. Aber bei uns Glückspilzen schlägt sogar unsere weltbekannte Bedürftigkeit zu unserem Vorteil aus. Denn da man sich von rechts und links um unsere armen Seelen rauft, geschieht es, dass man uns, neben der schönen Jahrhundertschau deutscher Malerei, gleichzeitig eine französische Ausstellung moderner Kunst gratis und franko ins Haus liefert." "Französische Kunst der Gegenwart: Ausstellung im Künstlerhause," *Tagblatt*, 6 April 1926.

This outstanding exhibition, *Französische Kunst der Gegenwart French* (French Contemporary Art), which opened in the Vienna Künstlerhaus (fig. 82) in March 1926, was intended to provide an "overview of vanguard trends in French contemporary art."[34] The show included works by Léger, Picasso, Braque, Robert Delaunay, André Derain, Raoul Dufy, Charles-Édouard Jeanneret (also known as Le Corbusier), André Lhote, Amédée Ozenfant, Henri Matisse, Jean Metzinger, Georges Valmier, and Maurice de Vlaminck. Many advanced architectural and city-planning projects by Gabriel Guévrékian, Frantz Jourdain, Jean Lurçat, Robert Mallet-Stevens, and Le Corbusier were also exhibited in a separate hall.

On the Austrian side, the Society for the Promotion of Modern Art was partly responsible for this impressive exhibition. Founded in February 1923, with Tietze as its *spiritus rector*, the society had set for itself the goal of "picking up the thread of the connections with other centers of art that the war had torn apart."[35] On the one hand, the society believed it was important for Austrian artists to be given the opportunity to present their works abroad; one example of this was an exhibition of recent Austrian art in the Rhineland. On the other hand, it also noted that Viennese artists should become aware of "parallel or opposite artistic activities in other nations that could either provide confirmation or contradiction to their own artistic efforts."[36] This dialectic between confirmation and contradiction is one of the main characteristics of any research into "influences" as, in keeping with S. S. Prawer's definition, comparative studies

[34] "Überblick über die Bestrebungen des Vortrupps der heutigen französischen Kunst." Gesellschaft zur Förderung der modernen Kunst in Wien, *Französische Kunst der Gegenwart* (Vienna: Künstlerhaus with Krystallverlag, 1926), 3.
[35] "Die Gesellschaft zur Förderung moderner Kunst in Wien betrachtet es als eine ihrer Aufgaben, die durch den Krieg abgerissenen Verbindungen mit anderen Kunstzentren wieder anzuknüpfen." Ibid.
[36] Ibid.

function "through an investigation of contrast, analogy, provenance, or influence."[37] As we will later demonstrate, this oscillation between attraction and rejection also becomes obvious in the reports made by those Austrian artists who travelled to France.

The unanimously positive reviews of the exhibition barely address artistic interactions between France and Austria; rather, they more often expressed a general admiration both for the courage of young French artists and for the state in promoting them so aggressively. "The fact that the French artistic authorities do not shy away from taking the position of young, up-and-coming talents, that they are proud of making the future paths to be followed in France known in foreign countries, is worthy of our greatest admiration."[38] However, most of the numerous press reviews simply paraphrased the foreword in the exhibition catalogue, which had been written by the board of the Society for the Promotion of Modern Art. The people mostly responsible for this society included Tietze and the entrepreneur Emil Frankl, father of the painter Gerhart Frankl, as well as art dealers such as Bondi.[39] The *Tagblatt* reported on the "rather large number" of visitors who attended,[40] while the *Wiener Zeitung* merely summarized speeches given by the French ambassador to Austria, D. M. de Beaumarchais, and the federal president, Michael Hainisch. According to the paper, Beaumarchais stated in his address that young artists in France were seeking new paths to follow that—whether right or wrong—would definitely contribute to progress. The newspaper did not mention the section of Beaumarchais's speech in which he

[37] S. S. Prawer, *Comparative Literature Studies: An Introduction* (London: Duckworth, 1973), 8. See also Harold Bloom, *Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997).
[38] "insbesondere verdient die Tatsache, daß sich die französische Kunstverwaltung nicht scheut, sich auf die Seite junger, aufstrebender Talente zu stellen, daß sie stolz darauf ist, auch die zukünftigen Wege Frankreichs dem Auslande bekanntmachen zu können, ernsteste Beachtung." Dr. E. H. B., "Ausstellung moderner französischer Kunst," *Tagblatt*, March 4, 1926.
[39] Alexandra Caruso, "Leben in der Kunst—eine moderne Inszenierung: Hans Tietzes 'Gesellschaft zur Förderung moderner Kunst'" (master's thesis, University of Vienna, 2008).
[40] *Tagblatt*, March 7, 1926.

characterized France as a land of artistic tradition, and first-rate selections of this tradition had been included in the Secession's exhibition the previous year. On the other hand he also stressed that his homeland was a "Land of new ideas, of experiments, of constant progress. It does not want to rest on its laurels, in this or any other area, and—in spite of its great achievements in the past—intends to continue to work, to struggle, to deal with those problems that concern and worry the world at large. It is the prerogative of young people to continuously ask unsettling questions, to continue to seek new paths."[41] In his speech, the Austrian president admitted that while he did not understand art well enough to be able to judge the exhibition, he was nonetheless pleased to be able to see some of the most recent works of French art.[42]

In contrast to the newspaper articles, which simply reprinted press releases or the catalogue foreword,[43] the art critic Arthur Roessler made a rather original contribution in a lengthy essay in the *Wiener Neueste Nachrichten*. His main observation was that the works in the exhibition represented "painted and drawn protests against Impressionism and therefore against naturalism

[41] "Land der Neuerungen, der Experimente, des nie ruhenden Fortschritts [sei]; es will—so wenig wie auf irgend einem anderen Gebiete—auf seinen künstlerischen Lorbeeren ruhen, es will—trotz seiner früheren großen Leistungen—weiter arbeiten, weiter kämpfen, teilhaben an den Problemen, die die Gegenwart überall in der Welt beschäftigen und beunruhigen. Es ist das Vorrecht der Jugend, immer wieder unbequeme Fragen aufzuwerfen, immer wieder neue Wege zu suchen." Opening Addresses, Minutes, Vienna Künstlerhaus Archive.
[42] "Die jüngsten Franzosen im Künstlerhause," *Wiener Zeitung*, March 6, 1926.
[43] Most newspaper articles simply reprinted press releases or the catalogue forward. So far, I have been able to identify the following newspaper articles dealing with the exhibition: "Eine Ausstellung des jungen Frankreich in Wien: Malerei, Architektur, Kunstgewerbe," *Die Stunde*, March 20, 1926; Dr. E. H. B. [Ernst H. Buschbeck], "Ausstellung moderner französischer Kunst," *Tagblatt*, March 4, 1926; "Eröffnung der Ausstellung 'Französische Kunst der Gegenwart'," *Tagblatt*, March 7, 1926; "Ausstellung moderner französischer Kunst," *Die Presse*, March 7, 1926; "Eröffnung der Ausstellung 'Französische Kunst der Gegenwart'," *Journal*, March 7, 1926; Arthur Roessler, "Französische Kunst der Gegenwart," *Wiener Neueste Nachrichten*, March 17, 1926; "Theater und Kunst: Ausstellung französischer Kunst der Gegenwart im Künstlerhause," *Wiener Zeitung*, March 4, 1926; Viktor Trautzl, "Moderne französische Kunst im Künstlerhause," *Reichspost*, March 4, 1926; Henri Laugier, "Die Ausstellung französischer Kunst der Gegenwart im Künstlerhause," *Neue Freie Presse,* March 6, 1926; "Die jüngsten Franzosen im Künstlerhause," *Wiener Zeitung*, March 6, 1926; Hermann Menkes, "Französische Kunst von heute: Die Ausstellung im Künstlerhaus," *Neues Wiener Journal*, March 21, 1926; Ludwig W. Abels, "Was die kleinen Mädchen malen: Zur Ausstellung der Pariser Schulen," *Neues Wiener Journal*, March 23, 1926; Alfred Markowitz: "Französische Kunst der Gegenwart," *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, March 31, 1916; Ernst H. Buschbeck, "Französische Kunst der Gegenwart: Ausstellung im Künstlerhause," *Tagblatt*, April 6, 1926.

and materialism."[44] He did not see anything in the exhibition with which he was not already acquainted: "Protests against the so-called artistic and the superficial, and manifestos for Expressionism and Cubism, making an immanent conformity apparent."[45] In the opinion of Roessler even in the mid-1920s the latest products from Paris were still the result of a counter-Impressionist movement and therefore restricted to a kind of introspection. Hermann Bahr had already used a similar approach in his 1916 book *Expressionism* to show that something like a spiritual or inward way of seeing was actually possible.[46] In an article in the *Neue Freie Presse*, Henri Laugier, curator of the exhibition and former director of the sub-secretariat of the French Ministry of Fine Arts and Technical Education, also remarked on the introspective qualities of the art on display, asking "What are the hidden goals of an art that turns itself away from the model of nature and follows a path of pure introspection?"[47] He answered this question by stating that art is not simply the affair of a few insiders, and its goal should instead be the pleasure of all those who look at it. Surprisingly, he felt that abstraction, as one aspect of modern painting, would actually help to accomplish this goal.

In addition to painting, graphic arts, and architecture, the exhibition also included works by Parisian children, aged nine to thirteen years, those boys and girls who, according to one critic,

[44] "gemalte und gezeichnete Proteste gegen den Impressionismus, als gegen den Naturalismus und Materialismus." Arthur Roessler, "Französische Kunst der Gegenwart," *Wiener Neueste Nachrichten*, March 17, 1926.
[45] "Proteste gegen das sogenannte Malerische, das Äußerliche und Manifeste für den Expressionismus und Kubismus, die Sichtbarmachung einer immanenten Gesetzmäßigkeit." Ibid.
[46] Christian Huemer, "Nuda Veritas im neuen Kleid: Hermann Bahrs Expressionismuskonzept," *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 1 (Spring 2003): 14-31, 82-90.
[47] "Welche Ziele sind einer Kunst gesteckt, die, vom Naturvorbilde abgewandt, den Weg der reinen Innerlichkeit geht?" Henri Laugier, "Die Ausstellung französischer Kunst der Gegenwart im Künstlerhause," *Neue Freie Presse*, March 6, 1926. According to the exhibition catalogue, Laugier had designed the plan of the exhibition.

"saw the light of day during the war that murdered so many men and tortured so many souls!"[48] This extra exhibition of children's art was praised by the press and was unanimously considered to be a highly successful idea. Ludwig W. Abels even went so far as to say that more than the works of the masters, the "charming mirror held up by the children" showed the Paris "whose charming nature, culture, hustle and bustle, we are so fond of and—in this way—will surely regain our affection!"[49] The lengthy essay in the *Arbeiter-Zeitung* also ended by mentioning the connection between these drawings and the art of the "greats," stating that the art of the children "already displays the wonderful culture of color that, as a part of the legacy of French art, can be seen throughout the exhibition."[50]

Although the Viennese art establishment thought that France was courageous to officially present its youngest, most radical, and most avant-garde talents, the French authorities had acted carefully behind the scenes. A telegram informs us that Ambassador Beaumarchais had inquired whether the French president would be prepared to accept the honorary patronage of the exhibition. The reply from the president's office was negative: "Faced with the progressive tendencies of the pictures, I feel it would be more advantageous to reserve the patronage of the President of the Republic for another occasion."[51] However, fears that this exhibition of post-Cubist tendencies could be rejected by the Viennese public as too modern proved to be

[48] "Knaben und Mädchen, die während des männermordenden und seelenschändenden Krieges das Licht der Welt erblickten!" Ludwig W. Abels, "Was die kleinen Mädchen malen. Zur Ausstellung der Pariser Schulen," *Neues Wiener Journal*, March 23, 1926.
[49] "herzigen Kinderspiegelchen […] das uns mit seiner Liebenswürdigkeit, seiner Kultur, seinem, bunten Treiben ans Herz gewachsen war und—auf diesem Weg—sicher unsere Zuneigung wieder gewinnen wird!" Ibid.
[50] "bereits die große Farbenkultur verrät, die sich als ein Erbe der französischen Kunst in der Ausstellung allenthalben zeigt." Alfred Markowitz, "Französiche Kunst der Gegenwart," *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, March 31, 1926.
[51] "angesichts der sehr fortschrittlichen Tendenz der Bilder halte ich es für vorteilhafter, wenn die Patronanz durch den Präsidenten der Republik für eine andere Gelegenheit reserviert bliebe." Quoted in Barbara Porpaczy, *Frankreich-Österreich, 1945–1960: Kulturpolitik und Identität* (Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2002), 48.

unfounded. As the Parisian *Journal des débats* reported with delight, the echo in the press was absolutely positive regardless of which camp it came from.[52]

Most of the artworks in the show had been lent by commercial galleries, and therefore many of them were for sale. Profits from the exhibition, however, did not meet expectations. In view of the country's strained financial situation, prices appeared to be excessively high. Picasso's painting *Guitar* (fig. 83) from Paul Rosenberg's gallery was, at 68,750 francs, the most expensive picture by far.[53] Paul's brother Léonce, who had sent twelve works to Vienna on this occasion, must have been rather surprised when one collector expressed genuine interest in buying Auguste Herbin's *Landscape, Petit Jésus-Cassis* and *Cape Cavaille-Cassis*. He informed the client that he would be given a twelve percent reduction in price.[54] The sobering situation for art and artists in the 1920s was parodied in an anonymous publication, *Der Götz von Berlichingen: Eine lustige Streitschrift gegen Alle* (The Götz of the Iron Hand: An Amusing Pamphlet Against Everybody). A caricature in the pamphlet took aim at the "modern French art" in the Künstlerhaus simply as meaningless entertainment distracting visitors from the acute

[52] "Non seulement l'ensemble de la presse viennoise, sans distinction de parti et, si j'ose dire, de parti pris, a salué avec sympathie l'exposition d'Art français contemporain, mais elle a élogieusement dégagé tout ce qu'apportait de nouveau le mouvement postcubiste dont on lui présentait une collection française sans équivalent jusqu'ici." Marcel Dunan, "L'Exposition d'art français contemporain à Vienne," *Journal des débats politiques et littéraires*, April 14, 1926, 2.

[53] A list of prices has been published in the exhibition catalog.

[54] "Quoique les prix des tableaux de Herbin aient sérieusement augmenté, en raison de l'importante demande qui se manifeste de plus en plus en faveur de ses œuvres, je consens volontiers, pour permettre à cet artiste de pénétrer dans une collection viennoise, à accorder à l'acheteur qui veut bien s'intéresser aux deux tableaux *paysage du petit Jésus* à *Cassis* et *le cap Cavaille* par Herbin une réduction de 12 % (douze pour cent) sur mes prix de demande, soit: 1936 francs pour le premier et 3080 francs pour le second ou 5,000 francs net pour les deux tableaux." Léonce Rosenberg to Kurt Rathe, April 3, 1926, fonds Léonce Rosenberg, Vienna 1926, no. 10422.2213, Bibliothèque Kandinsky, Centre Pompidou, Paris.

problems of everyday life (fig. 84). The caption under the drawing explains: "How the starving Austrian hunger artist Jeremiah Belly Banger helps satisfy his unbearable hunger."[55]

4.3 Vienna as Capital of Luxury Goods

One of the immediate impulses for the avant-garde exhibition at the Künstlerhaus in 1926 was the contact between Austrian and French artists at the Paris Exposition of 1925 (the official title was L'Exposition international des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes [The International Exposition of Modern Industrial and Decorative Arts]), where the Austrian contribution met with considerable success. When he visited Vienna the year after the exhibition, the architect André Lurçat was still completely under the impression of the works displayed there by Josef Hoffmann, Oskar Strnad, Franz Cižek, Eugen Steinhof, and their pupils at the School of Applied Arts. He was surprised to discover that their work—which was creating such a stir throughout the world—was still criticized in their homeland and that the Austrian arts and crafts objects which had charmed Parisian audiences could not be found in major Viennese stores.[56] However, Austrian architecture was in no way lacking in self-confidence, as can be seen in another newspaper article by Roessler in which he compared modern French and Austrian architecture, determining that the "buildings created by German and Austrian architects […] quite clearly—and this is a completely unbiased statement, free of any kind of nationalist exaggeration—are the more imaginative in design and more progressive."[57] Roessler's comments show that, in spite of the

[55] "Wie sich der österreichische Hungerkünstler Jeremias Magenkracher hilft, damit ihm der quälende Appetit vergeht." *Der Götz von Berlichingen: Eine lustige Streitschrift gegen Alle*, April 12, 1926.
[56] "Eine Ausstellung des jungen Frankreich in Wien: Malerei, Architektur, Kunstgewerbe," *Die Stunde*, March 20, 1926.
[57] "in die Zukunft weisenden Bauwerke deutscher und österreichischer Baukünstler, [...] zweifellos—es ist das eine von aller nationalistischen Übertreibung freie, ja nüchterne Tatsachenfeststellung—die gestaltungsreicheren und fortgeschritteneren sind." Arthur Roessler, "Französische Kunst der Gegenwart," *Wiener Neueste Nachrichten*, March 17, 1926.

artistic success, the commercial failure of the Austrians in the Paris exhibition was not the fault of Hoffmann and other participating designers, as some claimed, but instead resulted from an organizational failing: because there were no prices set and no models available, it was not possible to calculate any estimates, so that orders were not forthcoming.[58]

The Paris Exposition was a compromise that had resulted from ongoing discussions since 1907 to hold another International Exhibition in Paris. In 1925, France reaffirmed its *mission civilisatrice* and once again reclaimed its leadership in the post-war cultural sphere. In contrast to the 1900 Paris Universal Exposition, which was probably the most ambitious, most expensive, and most unprofitable world's fair, in 1925 it was decided not to present all of man's activities but to concentrate only on a specific area, the decorative arts. It was hoped that the international competition would lead to a modernization of the arts and crafts sector that could also give new impulses to the economy through the amalgamation of art, industry, and commerce. Austria was more than willing to accept the challenge as it felt that it was in a vanguard position in this field, owing to a long history of supporting the applied arts.

Its history dated back to 1864, when Austria had established the Austrian Museum of Art and Industry (Österreichisches Museum für Kunst und Industrie), the first of its kind in continental Europe, complete with an arts and crafts school. After the museum's founding it did not take long for the desired results to take effect, and the arts and crafts sector rapidly gained in importance throughout the entire Hapsburg monarchy. However, with the founding of the Secession in 1897, the widespread historical style quickly lost influence and instead reduced

[58] "Eine Ausstellung des jungen Frankreich in Wien: Malerei, Architektur, Kunstgewerbe," *Die Stunde*, March 20, 1926.

modern objects began making their way into Viennese homes. Official Austria reacted quickly to this development and, within a few years, appointed many Secessionist professors to the arts and crafts school. In 1900, Karl Kraus observed—cynically, but not erroneously—that "almost simultaneously with this revolution in artistic circles, those in power initiated a revolution from above for the arts and crafts […], in this area we are officially modern in Austria."[59] The director of the Austrian Museum of Applied Arts, who played a significant role in the organization of the 1925 exhibition in Paris, stated that, upon closer inspection, the tradition of "industrial arts" in Austria could be traced back to the early Middle Ages. He was even able to fabricate a "hereditary genius" for decoration, as well as for music, in the Austrian people.[60] The president of the Chamber of Commerce was more prosaic, however. He considered that the economic crisis in Central Europe had made this exhibition more important for Austria than for other countries. In order to stimulate the luxury industry, the Republic invested ten million kronen.[61]

The Austrian contribution to the exhibition was divided between the Galeries de l'Esplanade des Invalides, the Grand Palais, and the Pavillon d'Autriche designed by Hoffmann. After being greeted by Anton Hanak's monumental bronze statue *The Human Flame* (*La Flamme Humaine*), visitors were confronted with a hodgepodge of objects made of ceramic, glass, metal, and paper, as well as tapestries designed by Albert Paris Gütersloh (fig. 85). After passing through the popular Viennese Café with a terrace overlooking the Seine, they followed a path through the Austrian pavilion and ended in a room decorated by Peter Behrens. The innovative designs of the

[59] "Fast gleichzeitig mit dieser Revolution in Künstlerkreisen ward von oben eine Umwälzung im Kunstgewerbe angebahnt [...]; auf diesem Gebiete sind wir in Oesterreich officiell modern." Karl Kraus, ("Umschwung im Wiener Kunstgeschmack,") *Die Fackel* 29 (mid January 1900): 18, 20.
[60] *L'Autriche à l'exposition internationale des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes—Paris 1925* (Vienna: La Commission exécutive, 1925), 55.
[61] Ibid., 23.

Bauhaus and De Stijl had more or less been banned from the exposition, since Germany had not been invited to participate. Consequently, the most highly acclaimed and imitated products were those of the Wiener Werkstätte. Even the purist *Pavillion of the New Spirit* (*Pavillon de l'Esprit Nouveau*) by Le Corbusier—who received a comprehensive photographic documentation at the exhibition of modern French art in the Vienna Künstlerhaus in 1926—was only granted a place on the outskirts of the grounds. In the context of this celebration of "department store modernism," Friedrich Kiesler's visionary *City in Space* (*Raumstadt*) in the Grand Palais also did not receive the public recognition it deserved through its historical relevance. The exhibition guidebook noted that while Munich was now working in the "low-price sector," Vienna had remained the capital of luxury goods.[62]

4.4 Trade Relations in the Years Between the Wars

Many Austrian artists sought their fortune in Paris in the years between the wars. Many of them became well integrated into the Parisian art world and sometimes were even given solo shows in private galleries. Willy Eisenschitz, Joseph Floch, and Wilhelm Thöny exhibited at Galerie Berthe Weill; Jean Egger at Galerie Sloden; Oskar Kokoschka at Galerie George Petit; Georg Merkel at Galerie Zak; and Alfred Wickenburg at Galerie du Taureau. Even during these years, which were so plagued by inflation and depression, there were still some individual galleries in the two metropolises that cooperated with each other.

In contrast to the Miethke and Pisko galleries, discussed in chapter 3, Würthle, an enterprise that originally specialized in art reproductions, coped best with the sweeping changes that had taken

[62] *L'Autriche à l'exposition internationale des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes—Paris 1925*, 45.

place with the First World War. Bondi became an authorized signatory of the gallery in 1919 and concentrated on the art market, while Nirenstein was responsible for the company's own Verlag Neuer Graphik publishing operation. The gallery's dealings focused on contemporary German, French and—above all—Austrian artists.[63] Nirenstein separated from the Galerie Würthle in May 1922 and opened his own art business, the Neue Galerie, in November 1923.[64]

In 1923, the Galerie Würthle started working with the German Galerie Flechtheim; the first collaboration brought works by Picasso, Matisse, Braque, Léger, Dérain, Friesz, Kees van Dongen, Pascin, Dufy, Frans Masareel, Juan Gris, and Marie Laurencin to Vienna in October of that year. Galerie Würthle's connection to Flechtheim's distribution network also led to a commercial relationship with the Galerie Simon in Paris, an offshoot of Kahnweiler after his return from exile in Swizzerland during the war. This meant that Galerie Würthle was able to offer paintings, drawings, and prints by artists such as Braque, Cézanne, Derain, Laurencin, Léger, Matisse, Picasso, and Vlaminck—something no other enterprise in Vienna in the 1920s was able to do.[65]

It appears that Nirenstein had previously attempted to establish contacts with France, either while working for or shortly after leaving Würthle. A letter from the Parisian art dealer Léon Marseille is evidence that Nirenstein had purchased a painting for his collection. Marseille wrote, "I gladly agree to sell for 370 francs the watercolor by Signac that you wanted for your private

[63] Susanna Bichler, "1865–1995: Ein Überblick," in *Galerie Würthle, gegründet 1865* (Vienna: Galerie Würthle with Remaprint, 1995), 9.
[64] The Neue Galerie museum that was opened in New York in 2002 was named in honor of this.
[65] Marie-Catherine Tessmar-Pfohl, "Die Neue Galerie von 1923 bis 1938: Kunsthandel und Kunstpolitik im Wien der Zwischenkriegszeit" (master's thesis, University of Vienna, 2003), 28.

collection."[66] This letter is the first known documentation of a business relationship between Nirenstein and the French dealer who specialized in Impressionism, late-Impressionism, and contemporary art. The first shipments from Marseille included drawings and watercolors by Delacroix, Antoine-Louise Barye, Camille Pissarro, Gauguin, Signac, and Manolo; the earliest sales records concern a landscape drawing by Pissarro and two ink drawings by Signac that Nirenstein bought for himself.[67]

As another letter from Marseille shows, Nirenstein had very definite ideas about his gallery's position on the Viennese market even before it opened. Marseille wrote, "I had never, no matter what, considered the house Würthle a depository—I have a representative in Austria, which is you, and I shall never have others without notice to you and accordance with you (if that becomes necessary)."[68] It seems that Nirenstein definitely wanted to be Signac's exclusive agent in Austria and feared competition from his former workplace, the Galerie Würthle. From the very beginning, Nirenstein defined his gallery in terms of the market in Paris. He frequently travelled to Paris to visit his exclusive partner Marseille as well as other dealers, and even bought a lithograph by Cézanne from Ambroise Vollard.[69]

Just as Nirenstein represented Marseille in Vienna, Marseille was responsible for Nirenstein in Paris. However, when discussing plans for an exchange of exhibitions between the two countries,

[66] "j'accepte bien volontiers de vous laisser à 370 francs l'aquarelle de Signac que vous désirez pour votre collection personnelle." Léon Marseille to Otto Nirenstein, September 26, 1922, Neue Galerie no. 580/1, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.
[67] Tessmar-Pfohl, "Die Neue Galerie von 1923 bis 1938," 34.
[68] "Je n'ai jamais confié quoi que ce soit à la maison Würthle à titre de dépôt—j'ai un représentant en Autriche, qui est vous, et je n'en aurais jamais d'autre sans vous en prévenir et être d'accord avec vous (si cela devenait necessaire)." Léon Marseille to Otto Nirenstein, October 27, 1923, Neue Galerie no. 580/8, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.
[69] Tessmar-Pfohl, "Die Neue Galerie von 1923 bis 1938," 140.

Nirenstein quite frankly stated that "a major French exhibition would create a shock in all the superficial levels of society in Vienna. On the other hand, nobody in Paris would be at all interested in an Austrian exhibition, especially seeing that the French taste is so different in the case of modern art."[70] By making clever purchases and keeping a close eye on the market, the Neue Galerie always had a stock of works by Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec, Matisse, Auguste Rodin, Gauguin, Picasso, Pierre Bonnard, Honoré Daumier, and others. However, the big seller was Signac, for whom Nirenstein had prophesized great success in late 1923 when he asked Marseille for a shipment, "in case you have lovely paintings by Signac that are not too expensive."[71] The regular invoicing between the galleries shows that sales were good and, even though the fluctuations in the exchange rate created difficulties, business seems to have been more than satisfactory. Yet Nirenstein never had any clients financially strong enough to pay seven thousand kronen for a Cézanne. In 1924, the Neue Galerie presented a highly successful Signac show, which was subsequently sent to Dresden, Prague, Munich, and Berlin. The Viennese press was impressed by the early works of the 64-year-old artist, who had created an original lithograph for the catalogue of the exhibition. Seligman, the notorious art critic, was the only one to find Signac's works not modern enough, writing in his critique in the *Neue Freie Presse* that "today, these things appear to be rather old-fashioned and uninteresting."[72]

Nirenstein's Neue Galerie organized exhibitions of van Gogh, in 1928, and Renoir, in 1931, and made a last major contribution to Viennese exhibition activities in the years between the wars, in

[70] "schließlich ist für Wien eine große französische Ausstellung eine Sensation aller verschmockten Gesellschaftskreise, umgekehrt wird sich in Paris kein Mensch um eine österreichische Ausstellung kümmern, die noch dazu dem französischen Geschmack so entgegenläuft, wie es bei der modernen Malerei der Fall ist." Otto Nirenstein to Alfred Flechtheim, November 27, 1924, Neue Galerie no. 587/20, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.
[71] "falls Sie schöne Gemälde von Signac haben, die nicht zu teuer sind." Otto Nirenstein to Léon Marseille, January 31, 1925, Neue Galerie no. 580/51, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.
[72] "Heute muten diese Dinge recht veraltet und uninteressant an." A.F.S. [Adalbert F. Seligmann], "Kunstausstellungen," *Neue Freie Presse*, May 26, 1924, 2.

1933, with a show of French Impressionism. In collaboration with the Berlin dealer Paul Cassirer, Nirenstein brought to Vienna paintings by Cézanne, Manet, Toulouse-Lautrec, Delacroix, Degas, Renoir, and Berthe Morisot, along with works on paper by Corot, Cézanne, Courbet, Millet, van Gogh, and others. The show, which Nirenstein considered "probably one of the most important artistic events in Vienna since the war,"[73] was from a commercial perspective an absolute flop. According to the dealer, "nothing was sold and the exhibition was also hardly visited."[74]

In the year before the outbreak of the Second World War, the eternal competitor of the Neue Galerie managed to organize a truly progressive show for the last time. In February of 1938, shortly before the German "annexation" of Austria, the Galerie Würthle opened an exhibition of works by modern French masters. The number of exhibits even surpassed that of the 1926 exhibition in the Vienna Künstlerhaus. The list of names of the fifty-six artists who were represented reads like a who's who of contemporary French painting. Official France was not involved in this enterprise.[75]

Later that year Nirenstein was forced to leave Vienna, and he went into exile in New York by way of Paris. It now also became impossible for Bondi to remain in Vienna, and she immigrated to London in 1938. Her gallery was "aryanized" and taken over, along with its entire stock, by Salzburg dealer Friedrich Welz, for a negligible sum.

[73] "wohl zu den wichtigsten künstlerischen Ereignissen, die es in Wien seit Kriegsende gegeben hat." Neue Galerie no. 448, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.
[74] "es wurde nicht nur nichts verkauft, sondern die Ausstellung auch sehr schwach besucht." Otto Nirenstein to Alfred Kubin, April 6, 1933, Neue Galerie no. 581/248, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.
[75] Porpaczy, *Frankreich-Österreich, 1945–1960*, 45.

4.5 Übervater Cézanne

Although official France and official Austria, as well as both countries' commercial galleries and art dealers, were extremely active in promoting international—in this case, French—art in Austria in the interwar years, it is obvious that French art exerted its greatest influence on Austrian artists through direct contact. In 1922, Tietze had characterized recent French art using two models: on the one hand was Picasso, whose Cubism had led to a new plastic feeling and a new form of French classicism; on the other was Matisse, with his colorist facility and Cézanne behind him. In that "peaceful concentration within French art [… in] the processing of tremendous stimuli […] in the conquest of genial force," Tiezte wrote, contemporary French art was "significant and full of importance" for Austrian art.[76]

It can be seen that Austrian art had more contact with France in the years between the wars than has been generally perceived. Before the war, the Secession and the avant-garde galleries run by Pisko, Arnot and—above all—Miethke had been mainly responsible for the propagation of French art, but now the state entered the scene as one of the driving forces behind cultural exchange. It is therefore inaccurate to speak of Austria as being artistically isolated; rather, a more or less conscious decision was taken to follow an individual path in modern art bypassing the central theme in Western Europe, abstraction.[77] Almost all significant Austrian painters, sculptors, and architects active in the years between the wars spent some time in the artistic metropolis of Paris. The painter Anton Faistauer, who had once founded the Neukunstgruppe

[76] "ruhigen Sammlung innerhalb der französischen Kunst Aufarbeitung der ungeheuren Anregungen […] Überwindung des Kraftgenialischen […] wichtig und bedeutungsvoll." Hans Tietze, "Zeitgenössische französische Kunst in den Wiener Sammlungen," *Die bildenden Künste* 5 (1922): 1.
[77] Astrid Kury, "Ein österreichischer Sonderweg? Zur Frage der Abstraktion in der bildenden Kunst der Wiener Moderne," in *Moderne als Konstruktion: Debatten, Diskurse, Positionen um 1900*, Antje Senarclens de Grancy and Heidemarie Uhl, ed. (Vienna: Passagen, 2001), 153–67.

with Schiele and other artists, noted in his 1923 book *Neue Malerei in Österreich* (New Painting in Austria) that Klimt and his generation had mainly looked to the Slavic north, the Balkans, and Orient for inspiration. It was only the generation after Klimt that "focused on the West, dealt with problems of form and space, and naturally rejected the tradition of Klimt, even if it could provide some impulses for them, because this was all available in the West in its purest form."[78] Franz Wiegele, Anton Kolig, Herbert Boeckl, Arnold Clementschitsch, and Felix Esterl, a group of Carinthian painters known as Nötscher circle who were first exposed to French art in Viennese exhibitions, found a great deal of inspiration for their own work in the colorist questions that had been raised by French Impressionism and post-Impressionism. With the help of scholarships and private funding, all the members of this circle were able to visit France and experience this art at first hand.

Carl Moll arranged for Kolig to receive a scholarship for a two-year stay in Paris with the help of the Kathi Fröhlich Foundation and private patrons. In November 1912, Kolig moved into an atelier at rue Vandamme in the 14th arrondissement along with his wife Katharina, their son Thaddäus, and Wiegele, his brother-in-law. Quite clearly, the two artists were more fascinated by the old masters in the Louvre than by the contemporary movements. Wiegele was forced to confess that "the Louvre is unbearable. I am sick with envy. My work has come to a standstill."[79] Kolig's feelings were similar, and he wrote a letter to his friend and patron, the ministry official Richard Schaukal, stating that he was considering copying Giorgione's famous painting *Fête*

[78] "die nach Klimt folgende Malerei hat eine durchaus westliche Orientierung, nimmt das Form- und Raumproblem ausschließlich auf und lehnt naturgemäß klimtische Tradition ab, auch wo für sie etwas zu holen wäre, da sie dies im Westen in Reinkultur findet." Anton Faistauer, *Neue Malerei in Österreich: Betrachtungen eines Malers* (Zurich: Amalthea, 1923), 6.
[79] "Der Louvre ist nicht zu ertragen. Ich bin ganz krank vor Eifersucht. Meine Arbeit steckt vorläufig." Ibid., 56

Champêtre.[80] Kolig's belief that modern art had to have a solid foundation in tradition was typical for most of the Austrian artists in Paris. "I found the modern French artists extremely impressive. Above all, almost all of them follow in the tradition of the Louvre," he wrote.[81] In Wiegele's eyes these "modern French artists" included Manet, who had died in 1883, and Cézanne, who was deceased in 1905. The fact that he considered them to be the most significant of the French modernists, and virtually ignored contemporary artistic activities, shows that he accepted only what coincided with the understanding of art he had before moving to Paris. Similarly, most other Austrian artists experienced no real surprises or changes in their artistic development after living in France.

There are only a few extant paintings dating from Kolig's brief stay in France, including *Still Life with Tortoise* (fig. 86), from 1913, the *Portrait of the Artist's Wife with Flowers*, from 1912, and a portrait of an unknown woman.[82] His other pictures were lost as a result of his hurried return to Carinthia at the outbreak of the First World War. Kolig kept a tortoise as a pet in France and wrote that he wanted "to paint [it] fancifully so that it will be easier to see if it wants to run away."[83] By painting his pet, the artist brought a personal element to his still life but, to a large degree, he suppressed narrative associations. He does relate to the motifs, but they are merely points of departure for investigating and developing autonomous pictorial means largely independent of immediate observation. The application of color aims at a firm, closed, and uniform painting surface and its autonomy from illusionary space draws attention to the two-

[80] Anton Kolig to Richard Schaukal, Paris, March 22, 1913, no. 224.384, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Vienna.
[81] "Die modernen Franzosen habe ich von ganz großer Kraft gefunden. Vor allem fügen sich fast sämtliche in die Tradition des Louvre." Faistauer, *Neue Malerei in Österreich*, 56.
[82] Otmar Rychlik, *Anton Kolig (1886–1950): Das malerische Werk* (Vienna: Brandstätter, 2001), 64.
[83] "ganz phantastisch bemalen […] um sie auch leichter zu ersehen, wenn sie durchbrennen will." Anton Kolig to Richard Schaukal, April 29, 1913, no. 224.385, Wiener Stadt- und Landesbibliothek, Vienna.

dimensionality of the medium. Because this tension between the values of the surface and space is also characteristic of Cézanne's paintings, it seems clear that Kolig studied Cézanne most intently in Paris. In his letters, he wrote that he was fascinated by the exceptionally brilliant landscapes and still lifes by Cézanne that he had seen in the Bernheim, Gagnat, and Pellerin galleries. Overall, Kolig considered his "Parisian cure" as an extremely important phase in his artistic development. The stimuli he received there "strengthened" him and led him to himself.[84]

After returning to Carinthia, Kolig set up a small atelier in Nötsch next to his father-in-law's locksmith's workshop. His brother-in-law did not come back until years later, after living for a time in Zurich. In a 1919 article for the journal *Die bildenden Künste*, Tietze described how Wiegele had dealt with French influences:

> The training in French art is unmistakable; Cézanne is clearly behind this colorful lightness, this ability to 'materialize.' But the imitation is not at all schematic as it is with some others of this generation; this foreign stimulus has been transformed into a completely personal form of expression. Cézanne appears to have been modified by [Ferdinand Georg] Waldmüller.[85]

In neither Wiegele's nor Kolig's works does the light dissolve the firmness of the massive bodies, a quality that suggests that the artists were more similar to the Austrian Biedermeier painter Georg Friedrich Waldmüller than to the Frenchman. In contrast to the radical new start made by the international avant-garde, the Nötsch circle aimed at a careful renewal of tradition, a mission that was also reflected in Kolig's idea of a workshop. Although he often spoke of Nötsch as "the

---

[85] "Die Schulung an französischer Kunst ist unverkennbar; dieser farbigen Leichtigkeit, dieser Fähigkeit zu 'verwirklichen', ist Cézanne Pate gestanden. Aber die Nachahmung ist nicht schematisch wie bei manchem andern dieser Generation, die fremde Anregung ist ganz in persönlichen Ausdruck umgewandelt; Cézanne erscheint durch Waldmüller kontrolliert." Hans Tietze, "'Frauenbildnis' von Franz Wiegele," *Die bildenden Künste* 6 (1919): 136.

Carinthian Barbizon," his aim was less to establish a colony of artists than to organize a guild according to historical models such as the German Bauhütte, complete with a master, journeymen, and apprentices. While the modern urban artist would have to exist in an anonymous market, his workshop would be financed by private patrons and through monumental design projects.[86]

In July 1919, Boeckl visited the Nötsch colony for the first time. There he became acquainted with the basic coloristic aspects of French art, something that he would be able to study on the spot a few years later. More than most others, Boeckl was able to appropriate and creatively adapt French art to develop his own individual style. None other than Schiele, who in as late as 1918 was still playing with the idea of going to France to learn how to paint properly, is to be thanked for Boeckl's first study period in Paris. Shortly before Schiele was snatched away by the Spanish flu in October 1918, he visited the fall exhibition in the Künstlerhaus Klagenfurt, in which Boeckl exhibited a portrait of his friend Bruno Grimschitz, later director of the Belvedere in Vienna. Schiele was impressed by the talent of the artist four years his junior, and made the Viennese art dealer Gustav Nebehay aware of Boeckl's work. In 1920, Nebehay concluded an exclusive contract with Boeckl, which relieved the artist of his pressing financial worries and made it possible for him to study in Berlin, Sicily, and Paris.

At the beginning of 1923, Boeckl travelled to Paris, where he moved into an apartment on impasse de Ruet in the 14th arrondissement. This brief study period, which was so important for his development as an artist, is well documented through correspondence and a sketchbook that

[86] Christian Huemer, "At the Fount of Modernism: Carinthian Painters in Paris," in *Hermits-Cosmopolitans: Modern Painting in Carinthia 1900-1955*, Agnes Husslein-Arco and Matthias Boeckl, eds. (Vienna: Springer, 2004), 141–53.

was recently rediscovered in private hands.[87] However, like Wiegele and Kolig, Boeckl was inundated with a stream of impressions in Paris that made it difficult for him to concentrate on his work. That spring he was forced to admit to his wife Maria, who had stayed behind in Vienna that "I am finding it very, very difficult to work. Yesterday, I made the first halfway decent drawings in my sketchbook. I know the reasons for this and why I am inhibited. Getting rid of them is not an easy matter."[88] Boeckl's sketchbook reveals his artistic confrontation with Paris. The album contains fifty sheets filled with architectural motifs including buildings, streets and squares, and the racetrack at Longchamp, as well as three studies after Théodore Géricault's *Start of the Race with Wild Horses* in the Louvre (fig. 87). In these drawings, evidence of Cézanne's influence can be seen in the absence of any clear modeling or isolating contours.

As he had done one year earlier in the pictures he created in Berlin, Boeckl made a conscious decision to show unspectacular buildings, backyards, industrial ruins, and scenes from the outskirts in his portrayals of the modern metropolis. As in Schiele's works, most of Boeckl's cityscapes are deserted. However, in contrast to Schiele, Boeckl was not aiming to suggest the anthropomorphism of the architecture but rather to concentrate on its structure. It is clear that the dormant architect within him came to life with these urban pictures.[89] Even before his stay in France, Boeckl's handling of color followed in the tradition of Gustave Courbet and early Cézanne. His study in Paris in 1923 therefore only marked a turning point. He gradually moved

[87] The unpublished sketchbook was once in the possession of Otto Benesch, the director of the Graphische Sammlung Albertina in Vienna. A stamp in the book shows that Boeckl purchased the linen-bound album from "Peinture Moreaux / A-Lamorelle / Paris / 106 Boule Montparnasse."
[88] "Ich arbeite sehr, sehr schwer. Gestern habe ich in mein Skizzenbuch die erste halbwegs gute Zeichnung gemacht. Wohl sind mir Ursachen und Hemmungen bekannt. Sie zu beseitigen ist nicht leicht." Herbert Boeckl to his wife Maria, May 14, 1923, private collection.
[89] After his application for admission to the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna had been rejected, Boeckl studied architecture at the Technische Universtiät for some time. Shortly before the war, he became acquainted with the circle around Adolf Loos before devoting himself entirely to painting as a self-taught artist.

away from the expressionist approach to the motif that had taken him to the borderline with abstraction in paintings such as the *Jays* (fig. 88) to a tectonically structured pictorial language based on the visible. One of Cézanne's goals had been to renew the classical art of Nicholas Poussin on the basis of nature. That Boeckl made a pen-and-ink drawing after Poussin's *Massacre of the Innocents* (fig. 89) in the Musée Condé in Chantilly is just another indication that he had recognized the "father of modern art" as his personal artistic travelling companion.

While, after a period of study in Paris in 1924, Boeckl's countryman Gerhard Frankl self-consciously declared that "French art is dog shit," Boeckl showed himself full of enthusiasm for the Cubists after his return to Austria, and even traveled to Sicily the following year to attend a lecture by the Futurist poet Tommaso Marinetti.[90] However, these contacts with the avant-garde left no trace upon his work.[91] Why Cézanne became the dominant artist figure for Boeckl and other artists of his generation, and not Picasso, Delaunay, Marcel Duchamp, the Surrealists, or the Futurists can be explained by ideological as well as formal reasons.

Cézanne's concept of art was based on an artistic transformation of reality, and how the example in nature could be changed into "pure" painting contained almost religious dimensions. In a discussion held in front of Paolo Veronese's *Wedding at Cana* in the Louvre, Cézanne supposedly compared the painter's activity with Christ's ability to change water into wine: "Water changes into wine, the world into painting. One becomes immersed in the truth of

[90] "Die zeitgenössische französische Kunst ist Hundemist." Gerhard Frankl to Christine Büringer, October 7, 1924, quoted in Edwin Lachnit, *Ringen mit dem Engel: Anton Kolig, Franz Wiegele, Sebastian Isepp, Gerhart Frankl* (Vienna: Böhlau, 1998), 202.
[91] Claus Pack, *Der Maler Herbert Boeckl* (Vienna: Schroll, 1964), 24.

painting."[92] Many years later, Boeckl himself referred to the Roman Catholic church's teaching on transubstantiation in a speech entitled "Verwandlung und Wandlung" (Metamorphosis and Change), in which he encouraged artists to "separate what can decompose from what can not, the mortal from the immortal, the lasting from the lost."[93]

The omnipresent art historian Tietze was always skeptical of artists' uncritical admiration for and imitation of French painting. Although he played a major role in stimulating international exchange activities through his writing, he feared that they were only "emergency measures" that disclosed the plight of Vienna's art world but did nothing to relieve the market's poor condition. For him, it was impossible for modern art to thrive in Vienna: "The few dealers who invested some energy in living artists have either closed down completely or contritely gone back to selling old Viennese cups. In this way, Vienna has lost a promising economic possibility; it is destined to be an artistic center for the countries of Eastern Europe, a place where it is just as natural to buy art—and that means works by living artists and not antiques—as it is in the West in Paris."[94]

In comparison, contemporary French art was the product of two hundred years of tradition. France's "education in taste and economic organization" had made the country an art power.

---

[92] "Das Wasser verwandelt sich in Wein, die Welt ist in Malerei verwandelt. Man taucht ein in die Wahrheit der Malerei," Michael Doran, ed., *Gespräche mit Cézanne* (Zurich: Diogenes, 1982), 166.

[93] "das Verwesbare vom Unverwesbaren zu trennen, das Sterbliche vom Unsterblichen, das Bleibende vom Verlorenen." Herbert Boeckl, "'Verwandlung und Wandlung': Rede anlässlich der Inauguration zum Rektor der Akademie der bildenden Künste in Wien am 23. November 1962," *Forum: Österreichische Monatsblätter für kulturelle Freiheit 10, no. 109* (January 1963).

[94] "Ein paar Händler, die sich mit einiger Energie für lebende österreichische Künstler eingesetzt haben, haben entweder ganz zugesperrt oder sind reumütig zu Alt-Wiener-Tassen oder klassischer Graphik zurückgekehrt. Damit verliert Wien eine vielversprechende wirtschaftliche Möglichkeit; es ist bestimmt, ein Kunstzentrum für den östlichen Teil Europas zu sein, ein Ort, wo man so selbstverständlich Kunst—das sind Werke lebender Künstler und nicht Antiquitäten—einkaufen sollte und würde wie im Westen in Paris." Hans Tietze, "Gemeindepolitik und moderne Kunst," *Der Kampf* 20, no. 8 (1927), 375.

More than the superior quality of its masters, the École de Paris had an art market and a public to thank for its reputation as an ideal for artists from all countries. Tietze wrote that these artists were "prepared to relinquish their individual national character and have no higher aim than to make their products indistinguishable from their Parisian models."[95]

4.6 Making Austrian Art History at the Musée des Écoles Étrangères Contemporaines

After years of preparation, the *Exhibition of Austrian Art* (L'Exposition d'art autrichien) opened in the Jeu de Paume in Paris on April 30, 1937 (fig. 90). With almost nine hundred objects from private and public collections on display, the exhibition was intended to give the Parisian public an overview of Austrian painting, sculpture, and decorative arts dating from the Gothic period through the Baroque and the Biedermeier periods to the present day. To achieve this, three hundred tons of cultural assets were loaded onto four railroad cars and transported to the French capital. It was impossible to present all aspects of Austrian art, but "all of those Austrian creations that were transportable" were included.[96]

According to Federal Minister Hans Pernter, who gave the opening address, this major exhibition was the result of a French-Austrian cultural agreement. Such agreements were a new instrument in international cultural politics and were intended to intensify cooperation in the intellectual realm and create closer links between the nations through the exchange of cultural treasures. He considered the fine arts the most universal means to achieve this exchange because they were not

[95] "dass diese bereit sind, die ihrer Volksart entsprechenden Eigentümlichkeiten preiszugeben und keinen höheren Ehrgeiz kennen als den, ihre Erzeugnisse den Pariser Vorbildern bis zur Verwechslung anzunähern." Hans Tietze, "José Clemente Orozco als Graphiker," *Die Graphischen Künste* 56 (1933): 76.
[96] "du moins de tout ce que l'art autrichien a créé de transportable." Jean Mistler, "Avant-Propos," in *Exposition d'art autrichien* (Paris: Jeu de Paume, 1937), 5.

subjected to any linguistic restraints. In his speech, he discovered much common ground in the history of the two countries, dating back to the age of Charlemagne, whereby Austria's historical role as an intermediary between occidental art and that of the Danube region was especially significant. The title of the exhibition shows that, in the end, the intention was to document the development of a genuine Austrian artistic style. One year before Germany's "annexation" of Austria, a definite attempt was undertaken to elaborate the cultural differences to that neighboring country by stressing Latin influences in history. Minister Pernter made it absolutely clear that "no matter how deep the roots of Austrian art reach into the German soil, it is no less true that the combination of fundamental German elements with the contribution made by Latin countries, whether from the west or south, has led to the unique, independent development of Austrian art. This development can be traced back over more than one thousand years in this exhibition."[97]

At the time, the minister's self-assured statement could only be interpreted as a desperate attempt to establish Austria's cultural independence. Thomas Angerer's studies on French-Austrian politics before the "annexation" in March 1938 provide us with a sober depiction of just how hopeless Austrian efforts—as well as French attempts to rescue an independent Austria—had already become at the time of the Exhibition of Austrian Art.[98]

[97] "So tief die Wurzeln der österreichischen Kunst auch in den deutschen Boden unseres Landes hineinversenkt sind, so ist es doch nicht minder wahr, daß die Verbindung fundamentaler deutscher Elemente mit dem lateinischen Beitrag, möge er nun aus dem Westen oder aus dem Süden gekommen sein, zu jener eigentümlichen Bildung und unabhängigen Entwicklung der österreichischen Kunst geführt hat, die in dieser Ausstellung durch eine Periode von mehr als tausend Jahren sich verfolgen läßt." Anonymous, "Die Eröffnung der österreichischen Kunstausstellung in Paris," *Neue Freie Presse*, May 3, 1937, 10.
[98] Thomas Angerer, "Die französische Österreichpolitik vor dem 'Anschluss' 1938," *Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 40 (1992): 29-59.

In the years between the wars, Paris was the scene of an entire series of spectacular retrospective exhibitions dealing with the specific features of various national schools from their beginnings to the present. This new type of exhibition was an expression of active French cultural politics that understood art exhibitions as an important means of bilateral diplomacy. The Jeu de Paume in the Jardin des Tuileries was the location chosen for most of these exhibitions. Constructed under Napoleon III, the building had been used for temporary exhibitions since 1909, but it gained a higher profile as a museum for the art of foreign countries in the 1920s. Under the patronage of both the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the French Directorate of Museums, exhibitions such as *Dutch Art: Ancient and Modern* (1921), *Belgian Art: Ancient and Modern* (1923), *Swiss Art from Holbein to Hodler* (1924), *Romanian Art: Ancient and Modern* (1925), *Argentine Art* (1926) were presented there. The list of what we would now call blockbuster exhibitions of this kind is long; it was also possible to study the development of Canadian, Danish, Swedish, Japanese, Italian, and finally Austrian art in the Jeu de Paume. The initiator of the series, Léonce Bénédite, proudly wrote that "Art culture there has been offered with elements unequalled in the world. The most famous paintings, unique masterpieces, which men deeply venerate, some of them having never left the place they had been at first meant for, have come each year. They have formed in the heart of Paris, in our charming Jeu de Paume, a short-lived museum which is not to be seen again but which will endure in memory."[99]

It made sense that parallel to this series of exhibitions, the Musée du Luxembourg's collection of foreign art was transferred to the Jeu de Paume and organized according to national schools. Since 1922 the latter was known as the Luxembourg's annex for non-French art. However, this

[99] Léonce Bénédite, *The Luxembourg Museum (Jeu de Paume Museum Annex, Tuileries Garden): Its Paintings, Pastels, Aquarelles, and Drawings: Foreign Schools* (Paris: H. Laurens, 1924), 15.

transfer resulted in a certain ambivalence: the Jeu de Paume collection contained only contemporary works while, in keeping with the diplomatic agenda, the temporary exhibitions on display there sometimes had little connection with art of the present day. Conflicts developed when the museum's limited gallery space made it necessary for contemporary art to disappear into storage to make room for the larger, politically motivated retrospectives. The situation seems to have been resolved with the official opening of the Museum of Contemporary Foreign Schools (Le Musée des Écoles Étrangères Contemporaines) in 1932. Yet, even after this museum was founded, exhibitions of historical works still continued, as was demonstrated by the Exhibition of Austrian Art.

An 1894 inventory of works by foreign artists included in the Luxembourg contains only a single Austrian work, the painting *Interior of a Barn* (*Intérieur d'étable*) by Otto von Thoren, a member of the Sedelmeyer circle in Paris.[100] In Bénédite's 1924 catalogue, published after the transfer of what was still a rather modest collection to the Jeu de Paume, we do not find a single Austrian work among the 420 listed. The Luxembourg's collection activities had for decades concentrated almost entirely on French art. Bénédite wrote that "the Luxembourg Museum was said to be 'national' not only because it was a museum of the nation, but because it was to be devoted to people of French origin."[101] Bénédite can be thanked for the museum's acceptance of foreign schools. As curator of the Luxembourg since 1892, he had attempted to expand the collection by undertaking trips to America, England, Germany, Belgium, Italy, and other countries to make acquisitions. In 1900, after he had repeatedly complained that purchase opportunities had been ignored in the past, he managed to set aside twenty-five thousand francs

[100] Geneviève Lacambre, "1893: Les écoles étrangères en France: La politique nouvelle du Luxembourg," *Quarante-huit/Quatorze* 6 (1994): 67-74.
[101] Bénédite, *The Luxembourg Museum*, 6.

from the budget for Salon purchases to buy twenty works by foreign artists at the Paris Universal Exposition. Art works were also donated to the museum by private collectors and artists. For example, the British painter George Frederic Watts had even refused payment in order to have his work in the Luxembourg galleries, which he considered to be a high honor. Bénédite was convinced that "we know well the art of our country only if we compare with our neighbor's."[102] However, it seems safe to assume that the motif for this sudden openness towards foreign schools was intended to stress French art's claim to leadership and its formative influence on establishing the international artistic canon.

Despite Minister Pernter's suggestion that the creation of the *Exhibition of Austrian Art* was triggered by the 1936 French-Austrian cultural agreement promoting the exchange of works of art through exhibitions, the exact beginnings of the exhibition are rather obscure. Rather, the idea of the exhibition can be dated to the mid-1920s, when the concentration of French exhibitions in Vienna led to closer cooperation between cultural politicians and museum experts from both countries. At that time, French politicians of the highest standing, such as Prime Minister Edouard Herriot and Chamber President Paul Painlevé, were members of the Comité France-Autriche. Consequently, Painlevé stimulated a discussion on a "retrospective exhibition of Austrian fine arts from the nineteenth century."[103] The local artists' societies hoped that there would be "a private exhibition of Austrian art that is alive today" along with the official retrospective art show. However, the unclear subsidy situation meant that this project could not be fulfilled. In 1927, after several years of planning, Herriot was finally able to initiate a first exhibition of Austrian art. This show was devoted to the artistic and cultural circles around

[102] Ibid., 14.
[103] Bernadette Reinhold, "Die Exposition d'art autrichien im Jeu de Paume in Paris 1937," in *Wien-Paris: Van Gogh, Cézanne und Österreichs Moderne, 1880-1960*, Agnes Husslein-Arco, ed. (Vienna: Brandstätter 2007), 308.

Emperor Maximilian I, with the aim of demonstrating the historic artistic relationship between Austria and France (fig. 91). The French government, once again, took over responsibility for the exhibition's costs. The final French report on the extremely successful show states that Maximilian had been a true diplomat and made a peaceful conquest on the banks of the Seine. The Austrian envoy spoke of a "new step on the path towards the reconciliation of our two countries" and that the exhibition had "rendered a valuable service to Austrian interests."[104]

The first concrete plans for an exhibition featuring contemporary Austrian art can be found in a 1923 letter from Henri Verne, general director of the French National Museums, to André Dézarrois, curator of the Jeu de Paume. It stated that "Professor Tietze from Vienna recently expressed the wish to organize an exhibition of Viennese art comprising representative paintings, sculpture, and works of decorative art from the Baroque and Biedermeier periods, as well as the present day. Professor Tietze would be pleased if this exhibition could be held in the Musée du Jeu de Paume." [105] This request made it relatively clear that Baroque, Biedermeier, and modern art were all to be the central components of the exhibition, although the plan was not finally realized until many years later. Another proposal presented by the Society for the Promotion of Austrian Art Abroad (Gesellschaft zur Förderung der österreichischen Kunst im Ausland) recommended that the "recognized peak periods of Austrian creativity" be presented and that the "concept of Austrian art be interpreted as comprehensively as possible."[106] In this proposal also, the arts and crafts that had been so successful at the Paris Exposition of 1925 were intended to

[104] Ibid.
[105] "Le Professeur Tietze de Vienne, a formulé récemment le désir d'organiser, au mois de mai 1931, une exposition d'art viennois, comprenant des œuvre de peinture, de sculpture et d'art décoratif représentatives de l'art baroque, de l'art Biedermeier, et de l'art contemporain. Le Professeur Tietze serait heureux si cette exposition pouvait avoir lieu au Musée du Jeu de Paume." Henri Verne to André Dézarrois, July 22, 1923, X expo 1937-30 avril Art autrichien, carton 29, Archives des Musées Nationaux, Paris.
[106] Reinhold, "Die Exposition d'art autrichien im Jeu de Paume in Paris 1937," 308.

play a major role. For some time, the organizers from the two countries considered holding the exhibition in the Museum of Decorative Arts (Musée des Arts Décoratifs), before finally agreeing on the Jeu de Paume. In any case, Verne presented the decision to hold a retrospective exhibition of Austrian art to his colleagues on October 31, 1935, and stressed that this retrospective exhibition should not detract from the real purpose of the Jeu de Paume—namely, that of presenting contemporary art from foreign countries.[107]

In February 1936, Alfred Stix, the director of the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, was named commissioner of the exhibition, and a few months later the exhibition machinery started to move. After all, it was necessary to organize 650 works from 120 lenders. Stix was determined to offer a "portrayal of the really important, independent Austrian epochs that would provide an insight into the soul of the Austrian people to the extent that this can be achieved through artistic means."[108] While preparations were being made, the organizers found it helpful to base their concept on other extremely successful retrospectives that had been held beforehand—especially a large 1935 show of Italian art. The show filled two exhibition halls when it was presented in Paris in the summer of 1935. The section entitled "Art from Cimabue to Tiepolo" was displayed in the Petit Palais and "Italian Art of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries" was shown in the Jeu de Paume. With this pompous spectacle, Benito Mussolini's Fascist Italy showed how great art could be made to serve politics and used to foster bilateral relationships, and the exhibition became a celebration of the spiritual unity between the two

[107] "La Direction des Musée Nationaux a accepté ce projet à titre tout à fait exceptionnel, sous condition qu'il ne constitue pas un précédent, le Jeu de Paume, Musée des Ecoles Etrangères contemporaines, n'étant pas destiné à ces expositions d'un caractère historique." Extrait du procès-verbal de la Séance du Comité des Conservateurs, October 31, 1935, X expo 1937-30 avril Art autrichien, carton 29, Archives des Musées Nationaux, Paris.
[108] Report to the Ministry of Education, September 7, 1937, AVA, Unterricht, V2, Fasz. 15, 2960, Gz 27.273/6a, Austrian State Archive, Vienna.

Latin nations.[109] The organizers of the *Exhibition of Austrian Art* attempted to minimize the German elements in Austrian art and culture and rather to stress connections with Italy and France. While Italy took the Renaissance as its role model for constructing a national identity and establishing international prestige, the Austrian clerico-fascist "Ständestaat" stressed its Baroque heritage.

In his foreword to the exhibition catalogue, Stix placed Austria at the heart and cultural center of the Danube region.[110] Because, he wrote, the area was a border region of the Roman Empire, the many peoples passing through it had made a fruitful contribution to the area's development. Austria's geographical position made it a melting pot of Western cultural influences in the heart of Europe. The "natural" German influences in Austria were no stronger than the connections to Italy; moreover, French art from the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries also exerted a formative influence. However, it would be a great mistake to simply believe that Austrian art is a kind of mixture. It is much more the case that, seen from a distance, no particular movement in "European art" is completely independent in a manner of speaking; Stix claimed that Austrian art would represent a kind of prototype of the art of Western Europe. However, he suggested, throughout the centuries Austrian art was characterized by a "lyrical tone" that could be both light-hearted and solemn, corresponding with the Austrian temperament, but not superficial and reckless. The twenty-nine paintings and drawings by Klimt displayed at the exhibition revealed "Austria's longtime attraction to the East through their penchant for an ornate and bizarre accompaniment to figures, created by ornaments reminding the viewer of golden Byzantine

[109] Emily Braun, "Leonardo's Smile," in *Donatello Among the Blackshirts*, Claudia Lazzaro and Roger J. Crum, eds. (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005),173-86.
[110] Alfred Stix, "Préface," *Exposition d'art autrichien* (Paris: Braun, 1937), 9-11.

mosaics and Russian icons."[111] Stix admitted—probably to take the wind out of the French critics' sails—that it was difficult to position Klimt's work in the overall development of European painting. He categorized Schiele, Kokoschka, and Mopp (Max Oppenheimer) as representatives of a specifically Austrian form of "Expressionism that never went as far in its abstraction of natural forms as the parallel movement in Germany."[112] He did not even deal with the "mixed cohorts of contemporary art" that came after them, as he felt "it would be necessary for history to make way for criticism" to describe them.[113]

In his foreword to the catalogue, Jean Mistler continued with Stix's thesis of a melting pot that combined Germanic and Latin influences to create an original synthesis, repeatedly stressing the relative independence of Austrian from German art. According to Mistler, the lyricism of the colors and bold palette of Kokoschka—who was then living in Berlin—could be seen as continuing in the line of "Austria's great Baroque tradition" and as evidence that "Nordic expressionism had become enriched with Venetian colors."[114] The forewords written for Jeu de Paume exhibition catalogues generally tended to regard Latin influences as more significant than the Germanic—no matter what nationality or school was being discussed. Art historian Mathilde

[111] "l'ancien poussée vers l'Est de l'Autriche, il recourut avec prédilection, pour accompagner la figure humaine, à une ornementation fastueuse et bizarre, qui n'est pas sans rappeler les mosaïque byzantines et les icônes russes." Ibid., 11.
[112] "l'expressionisme, qui n'alla jamais aussi loin dans l'abstraction de la forme naturelle des choses que le mouvement parallèle en Allemagne." Ibid.
[113] "Ce qui les suit, c'est la cohorte bigarrée de l'art vivant. Pour la présenter, l'histoire devra faire place à la critique." Ibid.
[114] "la grande tradition du baroque autrichien […] enrichit d'un coloris vénitien l'expressionisme nordique." Mistler, "Avant-Propos," 6.

Arnoux argued that this Latin focus, as well as the conspicuous lack of exhibitions on German painting in the years between the wars, stems from France's germanophobia.[115]

The 1937 *Exhibition of Austrian Art* conspicuously focused on specific artists and epochs; it had never been the intention to provide a comprehensive overview of artistic developments. According to one critic, "each individual work should be like a pearl in a chain" and give evidence of the most essential and characteristic aspects of its creator's artistry.[116] The tour of the exhibition started on the ground floor of the Jeu de Paume with an early-thirteenth-century chalice and paten from the St. Peter Monastery in Salzburg, followed by several examples of late Gothic panel painting and carved altarpieces. The organizers devoted a great deal of space to painting and sculpture from the Baroque period, which was recognized in Paris as much as in Vienna as being the most unique and magnificent chapter in Austrian art history. The exhibition review published in *La Liberté* found it unfortunate that this Baroque art travelled so poorly because it usually was site-specific.[117] Photographs of buildings designed by the great eighteenth-century Austrian architects Johann Bernhard Fischer von Erlach, Johann Lucas von Hildebrandt, and Jakob Prantauer were used to illustrate the idea of a total work of art. One hall was filled with sketches for frescoes by Franz Anton Maulpertsch, who created a furor in his day as the "Austrian Tiepolo." After several galleries dedicated to the Baroque period, there was virtually no transition to the Biedermeier period of "Alt-Wien," which was represented by a great deal of furniture, porcelain, and glassware. Fifteen paintings by Georg Friedrich Waldmüller

[115] Mathilde Arnoux, "L'absence d'expositions de peinture allemande dans les musées parisiens dans l'entre-deux-guerres—Essai de synthèse," University of Paris, Histoire culturelle et sociale de l'art, http://hicsa.univ-paris1.fr/documents/pdf/CIRHAC/Mathilde%20Arnoux.pdf (accessed November 20, 2011).
[116] "'Chaque œuvre dois être la perle d'un écolier,' afin de bien fixer les caractéristiques essentielles et fortes du génie créateur dont elle veut être le témoignage." Anne Fouqueray, "L'art autrichien au musée du Jeu de Paume," *Le Journal*, May 2, 1937.
[117] René Chavance, "Au Musée du Jeu de Paume: L'art autrichien," *La Liberté*, May 2, 1937.

were staged magnificently in a hall of their own, a showing that could almost be considered a retrospective of the artist in its own right.

While the first half of the nineteenth century was well represented, the second half was practically ignored—the historicism of the Ringstrasse era was regarded as "decadent," as was the Stimmungsimpressionismus (lyric impressionism) that had been so strongly influenced by French models. It was not without reason that the art historian Bernadette Reinhold assumed "the historical, antiquated approach of the curators could not (yet) allow for an appreciation of the precursors of modern Austrian art or, quite simply, that they simply did not want to be compared with the wealth of French art of the period."[118] In a public lecture the co-organizer of the show Ernst Buschbeck had revealed that the plan was to display nothing that existed on the same or a higher level of quality in Paris.[119]

The exhibition's selection of modern art was displayed on the first floor. It started with eleven paintings by Klimt, including masterpieces such as the two portraits of Adele Bloch-Bauer, from 1907 and 1912. It was the first time that Klimt received so much exposure in Paris since winning a gold medal for the painting *Philosophy* at the 1900 Paris Exposition Universelle. Paul Westheim, a German-Jewish publisher of expressionist art who was at the time living in exile in Paris, attempted to put himself in the position of a French visitor when he wrote that

[118] "der kunsthistorisch-museale Blick der Kuratoren eine Würdigung der Vorläufer der österreichischen Moderne (noch) nicht leisten konnte, oder dass man sich dem Reichtum der französischen Kunst dieser Zeit schlicht nicht stellen wollte." Reinhold, "Die Exposition d'art autrichien im Jeu de Paume in Paris 1937," 312.
[119] "Jedenfalls ist immer die Überlegung ausschlaggebend, nichts zu zeigen, was in Frankreich gleich- oder gar höherwertig bekannt ist, dafür wird aber auf höchstqualifizierte Arbeiten, die charakteristisch für Österreich sind und nur hier zu finden sind, Gewicht gelegt." Anonymous, "Was Oesterreich in Paris zeigen wird," undated newspaper clipping, 357/1937, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.

> In order to do complete justice to Klimt's importance, one has to study his drawings (in a room off the main hall). His paintings … I'm not so sure … I mean, if the appropriate organ exists for them in France. There is so much in them that is not as much made of flesh and blood as out of carved ivory and does not really belong to the period; a period in which Schnitzler created Anatol, a figure drawn from everyday life, a period when Paris did not have the Wiener Werkstätte but Seurat and Cézanne, van Gogh and Gauguin.[120]

The press frequently commented on the decorative craftsmanship of Klimt's work. This connection was made clear in the exhibition, where his cartoon for the wall decorations in the Palais Stoclet in Brussels was surrounded by ceramics, porcelain, glass, jewelry, and fabrics from the Wiener Werkstätte. Schiele was the only other artist to be represented to a similar degree as Klimt. In fact, a third of the 290 catalogue numbers in the modern section were arts and crafts objects. However, many of the press reviews were merely stunted lists of misspelled names. The abbreviated reviews were partly due to the fact that the catalogue was not published until two weeks after the exhibition had opened.

According to one reviewer, "extreme and excessive" art that could have created a sensation was missing, in keeping with the "Austrian's temperament."[121] The organizers even jokingly considered creating a scandal in order to boost attendance. Commissioner Stix complained that the fact that Austrian art was completely unknown internationally was the cause of the exhibition's lack of success with the public. He stated that to the best of his knowledge the

[120] "Man muss, um Klimts Bedeutung ganz würdigen zu können, seine Zeichnungen (in einem Seitenraum) sehen. Seine Bilder [...] Ich weiss nicht [...] Wollte sagen, ich weiss nicht, ob man in Frankreich dafür ein Organ haben wird. Es ist da vieles drin, was nicht so sehr aus Fleisch und Bein als aus geschnitztem Elfenbein und überhaupt nicht zeitbedingt ist, aus einer Zeit, in der Schnitzlers ‚Anatol' eine aus dem Leben gegriffene Figur war, einer Zeit auch, in der man in Paris zwar nicht die 'Wiener Werkstätte,' aber Seurat und Cézanne, van Gogh und Gauguin bereits hatte." Paul Westheim, "Oesterreichische Kunst: Zur Ausstellung im Jeu de Paume," *Pariser Tageszeitung*, May 13, 1937, 4.

[121] "dem Wesen des Österreichers entsprechend, Extremes und Exzessives, das den Snobisten reizen könnte, fehlen." Anonymous, "Wie Paris auf die österreichische Kunst reagiert," undated newspaper clipping, 357/1937, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.

Louvre did not contain a single important work by an Austrian artist, so that "with the exception of very few art historians, the names of the artists we presented [in the exhibition] were completely foreign—even to the most well-informed connoisseurs."[122]

An entire room was devoted to Austrian artists living in Paris, including Joseph Floch, Georg Merkel, Lily Steiner, Wilhelm Thöny, and Victor Tischler. Jean Egger, who had died of pulmonary tuberculosis three years before at age 37, had only one work in the exhibition, a small-format *Head of a Woman*. This meager representation was despite the intervention of his father as well as his friend, Le Corbusier's sister-in-law Lotti Jeanneret.[123] After moving to the metropolis on the Seine, Egger was the one Austrian artist who had managed to establish a broad, solid network of patrons in a very brief period. Egger took advantage of a common strategy among modern Viennese artists, that of making portraits of prominent personalities in order to build up a stock of well-off clients. His acquaintanceship with Sophie Szeps-Clémenceau, Bertha Zuckerkandl's sister, made it possible for him to create portraits of her and her husband Paul Clémenceau, as well as the French minister of war Paul Painlevé (fig. 92), General Ferdinand Foch, and many other important persons.[124] Egger was also one of the few Austrians to be given a solo exhibition in Paris in those economically difficult days. In 1930, the Galerie Sloden (fig. 93) on elegant Faubourg Saint-Honoré exhibited more than twenty oil paintings by the artist.

Thöny also managed to create a portrait of Cardinal Jean Verdier (fig. 94) for the exhibition. The catholic Ständestaat celebrated the cardinal's visit towards the end of the exhibition as an

[122] "alle Namen, die wir brachten sind selbst sehr Gebildeten mit Ausnahme sehr weniger Kunsthistoriker vollkommen fremd." Report to the Ministry of Education.
[123] Josef Egger to Alfred Stix, January 22, 1937, 375/1937, Belvedere Archive, Vienna.
[124] Matthias Boeckl, *Jean Egger, 1897-1934* (Götzens: Kunstinitiative Tirol, 2000).

important event. In general, the Austrian artists living in Paris showed a much greater affinity for French artistic movements than the ones that stayed at home. Stix felt obligated to defend himself against accusations that the exhibition had favored international over traditional Austrian styles within the Austrian artistic community: "If one disregards the Parisian Austrians, who had to be shown for tactical reasons, one can discern specifically Austrian traits, similar to those in Austrian Gothic art, in works from Klimt to Boeckl even if specific stylistic characteristics of the period can be felt in both cases; but this is definitely no stronger with modern artists than with those of former times."[125]

Taken as a whole, the echo in the press was extremely positive. However, there were some doubts about whether the exhibition had definitely proven the existence of a specifically Austrian artistic practice reaching back over a thousand years. Occasionally, the exhibition was described as being confusing and lacking in homogeneity, and that art was a victim of geography and history, incapable of really achieving independence.[126] Somewhat condescendingly, comparisons were made between "petit vin de pays" as opposed to the French "grands crus classés."[127] The final result was that the total number of visitors—and therefore the propaganda and financial success—failed to meet expectations. The organizers had hoped for thirty to fifty thousand visitors but it was estimated that only twenty to twenty-five thousand actually came. Many explanations were put forward for this: the unexpected prolongation of the previous Catalan art

[125] "Wenn man von den österreichischen Parisern absieht, die aus taktischen Gründen gebracht werden mussten, so ist von Klimt bis Böckl das spezifisch Österreichische mindestens so stark zu spüren wie bei den öst. Gotikern wenn auch gewisse verbindende Merkmale des Zeitstils hier wie dort zu bemerken sind, gewiss aber bei den Modernen nicht stärker als bei den Alten." Report to the Ministry of Education, September 7, 1937, AVA, Unterricht, V2, Fasz. 15, 2960, Gz 27.273/6a, Austrian State Archive, Vienna.
[126] "Manifestation assez confuse et sans grande unité. On y sent un pays profondément artiste, certes, et sensible à toutes les formes de la beauté, mais victime, en matière d'art de sa géographie et des son histoire, incapable d'atteindre à une réelle indépendance, balloté sans cesse entre un courant venu d'Italie et un courant venu d'Allemagne." Lucie Mazauric, "L'art autrichien au jeu de Paume," *Le vendredi*, May 7, 1937.
[127] George Besson, "Art autrichien," *Humanité*, May 8, 1937.

exhibition, roadwork in the immediate vicinity of the Jeu de Paume, an exceptional heat wave, and, above all, the competition with the Paris World's Fair, which was attracting crowds of visitors at the same time. In any case, the organizers did not consider that the disappointing outcome was a result of the lower quality of Austrian artistic production but, rather, was caused by the inadequate communications between the institutions involved: "Austrian art is unknown internationally and therefore has no esteem. Things can only improve; and they will improve. The exhibition definitely made a contribution but it is only the first step. It is now necessary for our own museums to begin collecting fervently and for serious research to be undertaken."[128]

While Commissioner Stix perceived "a certain apathy among circles on the left," the attacks from the right were actually becoming stronger. A critic from Nazi Germany stated that "one would have much preferred not to have seen the first floor at all. Can anybody still think it is worth looking at Impressionists and Expressionists today?"[129] A few weeks after the *Exhibition of Austrian Art* closed its doors in Paris, the *Degenerate Art Exhibition* opened in Munich. Many of the private collectors who had lent exhibits for the Paris show as a result of appeals to their "patriotic feelings" found themselves persecuted and expropriated only a few months later. For example, almost all of the works by Klimt were provided by Ferdinand Bloch-Bauer and Serena Lederer, those by Schiele were lent by Lederer and by Nirenstein's Neue Galerie. Today, the exhibition catalogue reads like a list of owners and objects that were soon to become the victims

[128] "Die österreichische Kunst ist international unbekannt und daher auch mit keinerlei Wertung behaftet. Das kann erst allmählich besser werden und es wird besser werden. Dazu hat die Ausstellung sicher beigetragen jedoch nur als erster Schritt. Notwendig ist eifriges Sammeln in unseren eigenen Museen und ernste Forscherarbeit." Report to the Ministry of Education, September 7, 1937, AVA, Unterricht, V2, Fasz. 15, 2960, Gz 27.273/6a, Austrian State Archive, Vienna.

[129] "Das, was in diesem ersten Stock gezeigt wird, möchte man überhaupt lieber nicht gesehen haben, von wenigen kunstgewerblichen Arbeiten abgesehen. Wer findet heute noch die Malarbeiten der Impressionisten und Expressionisten sehenswert." "Pariser Frühling," *Essener Nationalzeitung*, May 23, 1937.

of art looting in Austria. And, a few years later, the Jeu de Paume would turn into the central collecting and distribution point for cultural assets expropriated by the Nazis in occupied France.

Conclusion

Today, searching for French modern art in Austrian museums is nearly as frustrating as searching for Austrian modern art in French museums. On both sides only an insignificant number of works imported from the other country entered their permanent collections. However, the transnational circulation of symbolic goods during the investigated period was much more dynamic and productive than this sobering fact suggests. As has been shown in this dissertation, networks of private and government agencies organized a number of important exhibitions to promote local artists abroad and to stimulate their reception on the international art market. In regard to France and Austria, the power structure was imbalanced nevertheless. While Paris managed to establish itself as the center of the modern art market with exports on a large scale to several capitals on the globe, Vienna faced tremendous difficulties in its attempt to become a major player in the European art world and to move from the periphery closer to the Western center.

For a few years, between the military defeat against Prussia in 1866 and the 1873 World Exposition, a breathtaking economic development justified hopes of the liberal bourgeoisie for Vienna to become the leading art center in the German-speaking world. Viennese dealers were stunned by the enormous demand for pictures exceeding by far local production. As new research suggests, the origin of Vienna's lasting image as "the world capital of music" emerged during the same period.[1] Inscriptions of this self-image in the city's fabric are noticeable from the late 1860s onwards. They manifest themselves in representative buildings for music such as

[1] Martina Nußbaumer, *Musikstadt Wien: Die Konstruktion eines Images* (Freiburg: Rombach, 2007); Lutz Musner, *Der Geschmack von Wien: Kultur und Habitus einer Stadt* (Frankfurt a. M.: Campus, 2009).

Hofoper (Court Opera), Musikverein (Music Society), Konzerthaus (Concert House), in a series of monuments for composers on the Ringstraße (Schubert, Beethoven, Mozart, etc.), but also in a temporal event like the *Internationale Ausstellung für Musik- und Theaterwesen* (*International Exhibition for Music and Theater*) in the Prater 1892. During the long economic depression that followed the *Gründerzeit* crash of 1873, complaints about the bourgeois support of music and theater at the expense of the visual arts were frequently voiced.

Although Austrian artists continuously complained about insufficient government support, Ludwig Hevesi called the reign of Franz-Joseph I in his 1903 book on *Austrian Art of the Nineteenth-Century* "our Louis-Quatorze-era"—a period in which art flourished due its use as a vehicle for shaping the identity of the state. The critic recognized a profound revolution towards the modern. Yet, the "dawn of a new style irradiating onto the tower of Saint Stephens cathedral," he noted, "did not come from the east but from the west this time."[2] While the Vienna Secession intensified imports of French modern art and even played a crucial role in the canonization of Impressionism, there was no institutional support for the implementation of Austrian modern art on the Parisian market. Even the Miethke gallery, Vienna's Durand-Ruel, as it was called, functioned solely as a one-way street. A powerful gallery-system comparable to the one established in Paris during the second half of the nineteenth century never developed in Vienna where private patronage and artists associations continued to play a much more significant role. In 1889 Hevesi remarked that "Paris only recognizes and thinks highly of a single artist from Vienna and one from Berlin: *Pettenkofen* and *Menzel*; all the others play no role at all on the

[2] "Und heute sehen wir, daß die ebenso gründliche Umwälzung zum Modernen auch Oesterreich ergriffen hat, die Morgenröte eines neuen Stils, diesmal nicht von Osten, sondern von Westen her, bestrahlt den Stefansturm." Ludwig Hevesi, *Österreichische Kunst im 19. Jahrhundert, vol. 2, 1848-1900* (Leipzig: Seemann, 1903), 115.

market."[3] In the early decades of the twentieth century not a single Austrian painter enjoyed this privilege.

In the course of this study, it became increasingly clear that the role of Vienna in the Western art world would be best examined in relation to both Paris *and* Berlin. Not only was Austrian art usually compared to that of France and Germany at major international competitions such as the Universal Expositions, but many French modernist works reached Vienna in a roundabout way via Berlin. Paul Cassirer who controlled the German market for Durand-Ruel's Impressionists even tried to prevent a direct axis between Paris and Vienna. And after the collapse of the Habsburg Empire, the French government intensified its cultural connections to Austria in a strategic attempt to keep Germany and Austria apart. Thus, although it is beyond the scope of this dissertation, a lot could be gained by deliberately broadening the topic to cultural transfers within the triangle Paris—Berlin—Vienna.[4]

A profound study of transnational market dynamics would also need to rely a little less on exhibition reviews. While it can be argued that exhibitions are the most important spaces of cultural transfers because—as has been noted as early as 1893—"young artists gain first-hand information in exhibitions" rather than in academies,[5] Patricia Mainardi's warning about the

[3] "Ueberhaupt kennt und schätzt Paris nur einen einzigen Wiener und einen einzigen Berliner Maler: *Pettenkofen* und *Menzel*; alle anderen sind nicht marktfähig." Ludwig Hevesi, "Pettenkofen," *Pester Lloyd*, March 23, 1889.
[4] A case for triangular cultural transfers has been made in Katia Dmitrieva, Michel Espagne, eds. *Transferts culturels triangulaires France-Allemagne-Russie* (Paris: Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l'homme, 1996).
[5] "Es sind nur die Kraftvollen unter den Künstlern, denen jetzt, in der Situation von heute, die Erziehung zufällt; sie treten nicht in den Akademien, sondern nur in den Ausstellungen den Eleven nahe. Und so hat sich das Verhältnis zu Ungunsten der Akademien verschoben: der junge Künstler lernt erster Hand auf den Ausstellungen." Hermann Helferich, "Kunstakademien," *Die Zukunft* 5 (1893), 220. Quoted in Rotraud Schleinitz, *Richard Muther—ein provokativer Kunstschriftsteller zur Zeit der Münchener Secession* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1993), 169. On the role of exhibitions for the modern artist see also: Oskar Bätschmann, *Ausstellungkünstler: Kult und Karriere im modernen Kunstsystem* (Cologne: DuMont, 1997).

danger of studying critical reception has to be taken seriously. Indeed, one can find and prove almost anything, if such accounts are used to support a preconceived thesis.[6] Patterns of the art market must emerge from a large mass of facts. Import-export documents, dealer stock books, auction results, etc. transcribed into a research database should serve as basis of the analysis. Krzysztof Pomian once wrote—and it still holds for art market studies done within the discipline of art history today—that "the gaze of the historian [was directed] towards extraordinary events […] historians resembled collectors: both gathered only rare and curious objects, disregarding whatever looked banal, everyday, normal […] History was an idiographic discipline, having as its object that which does not repeat itself."[7] To understand the business of art, the research focus needs to shift from the exceptional event to everyday practice. This dissertation, then, stands as a "first draft" of a larger project, which will be to bring the resources of our new era of electronic information to bear on the European art market of the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Yet such a project will only be manageable in a team effort and with significant financial resources.

[6] Patricia Mainardi, *Art and Politics of the Second Empire: The Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867* (New Haven: Yale Unversity Press, 1987), 2.
[7] Krzysztof Pomian, "L'histoire des structures," in: Jacques Le Goff, Roger Chartier, Jacques Revel, eds. *La nouvelle histoire* (Paris: 1978), 115-16. Quoted in: Franco Moretti, *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for Literary History* (London: Verso 2007), 3.

Bibliography

Archives

Academy of Fine Arts Archive, Vienna:
- List of students 1865

Archives of the Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest:
- Contract between Charles Sedelmeyer and Mihály Munkácsy 1878

Archives des Musées Nationaux, Paris:
- Exposition d'art autrichien 1927
- Exposition d'art autrichien 1937

Arnold Schönberg Center, Vienna:
- Carl Moll

Austrian State Archive, Vienna:
- Allgemeines Verwaltungsarchiv

Belvedere Research Center, Vienna:
- Carl Moll, "Mein Leben" (unpublished typescript), 1943
- Exposition d'art autrichien 1937
- Neue Galerie
- Werner J. Schweiger

Bibliothèque Kandinsky, Centre Pompidou, Paris:
- Léonce Rosenberg

City Hall of the 16th District in Paris:
- Death certificate of Charles Sedelmeyer

Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles:
- Goupil & Cie / Boussod, Valadon & Cie stock books

Vienna City Archive:
- Josef Engelhart
- Richard Schaukal

Vienna Künstlerhaus Archive:
- August Schaeffer, "50 Jahre Künstler-Genossenschaft" (unpublished typescript)
- Charles Sedelmeyer
- Französische Kunst der Gegenwart 1926
- Internationale Kunstausstellung 1882
- Österreichischer Kunstverein

Vienna Secession Archive:
- Annual Reports
- Albert Besnard
- Wilhelm Bernatzik
- François Carabin
- Paul Cassirer
- Paul Durand-Ruel
- Julius Meier-Graefe
- Mitchell & Kimbel
- Alexandre Rosenberg
- Paul Signac

Newspapers

Arbeiter-Zeitung (Vienna)
Bremer Nachrichten
Bremer Weser-Zeitung
Essener Nationalzeitung
Le Figaro (Paris)
Fremden-Blatt (Vienna)
Der Götz von Berlichingen: Eine lustige Streitschrift gegen Alle (Vienna)
Humanité (Paris)
Journal des débats politiques et littéraires (Paris)
Die Kunst (Vienna)
La Liberté (Paris)
Morgen-Post (Vienna)
Neue Freie Presse (Vienna)
Neue Illustrierte Zeitung
Neues Wiener Journal
Neues Wiener Tagblatt
Pariser Tageszeitung
Pester Lloyd
Die Presse (Vienna)
Reichspost (Vienna)
Salzburger Volksblatt
Die Stunde (Vienna)
Der Tag (Vienna)
Tagblatt (Vienna)
Tages-Presse
Le vendredi (Paris)
Wiener Allgemeine Zeitung (Vienna)
Wiener Morgen Zeitung (Vienna)
Wiener Neueste Nachrichten (Vienna)

Books, articles, dissertations

Abegg, Werner. *Musikästhetik und Musikkritik bei Eduard Hanslick.* Regensburg: G. Bosse, 1974.

Aichelburg, Wladimir. *Das Wiener Künstlerhaus, 1861-2001.* Vol. 1. *Die Künstlergenossenschaft und ihre Rivalen Secession und Hagenbund.* Vienna: Österreichischer Kunst- und Kulturverlag, 2003.

Angerer, Thomas. "Die französische Österreichpolitik vor dem 'Anschluss' 1938." *Vierteljahreshefte für Zeitgeschichte* 40 (1992): 29-59.

Anonymous. "Die XVI. Ausstellung unserer Vereinigung." *Ver Sacrum* 6, no. 2 (1903): 27-34.

Anonymous. "George Minne." *Ver Sacrum* 4, no. 2 (1901): 31-41.

Anonymous. "Mittheilungen der Vereinigung Bildender Künstler Österreichs." *Ver Sacrum* 1, no. 1 (January 1898): 27-30.

Anonymous. "Aus dem Oesterreichischen Kunstverein (Schluß)." *Kunstchronik* 8, no. 38 (July 4, 1873): 604-7.

Anonymous. "Personal- und Atelier-Nachrichten." *Die Kunst für Alle* 15, no. 21 (August 1, 1900): 500.

Anonymous. "Sammlungen und Ausstellungen: Die Organisation der Wiener internationalen Ausstellung." *Kunstchronik* 17, no. 26 (April 13, 1882): 419.

Anonymous. "Vente Sedelmeyer à Vienne." *La chronique des arts et de la curiosité* 7 (February 15, 1873): 59.

Anonymous. "Vermischtes." *Kunstchronik* n.s. 16, no. 7 (December 9, 1904): 109.

Anonymous. "Wirtschaftsnot und Kunst." *Nachrichtenblatt des Zentralverbandes bildender Künstler Österreichs zur Wahrung ihrer Standes- und Wirtschaftsinteressen* 1-2 (1933).

Arnoux, Mathilde. "L'absence d'expositions de peinture allemande dans les musées parisiens dans l'entre-deux-guerres – Essai de synthèse." University of Paris, Histoire culturelle et sociale de l'art. http://hicsa.univ-paris1.fr/documents/pdf/CIRHAC/Mathilde%20Arnoux.pdf (accessed November 20, 2011).

Assouline, Pierre. *Grâces lui soient rendues: Paul Durand-Ruel, le marchand des impressionistes.* Paris: Plon, 2002.

L'Autriche à l'exposition internationale des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes—Paris 1925. Vienna: La Commission exécutive, 1925.

B., A. “Korrespondenz.” Kunstchronik 16, no. 33 (May 26, 1881): 530-33.
Bätschmann, Oskar. *Ausstellungskünstler: Kult und Karriere im modernen Kunstsystem.* Cologne: DuMont, 1997.

Bahr, Hermann. *Gegen Klimt.* Vienna: Eisensteiner and Co., 1903.

Bahr, Hermann. “Künstlerhaus 1896.” In *Secession*, 1-5. Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1900.

Bahr, Hermann. *Rede über Klimt.* Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1901.

Bahr, Hermann. *Secession*. Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1900.

Bahr, Hermann. “Ver Sacrum.” In *Secession*, 11-14. Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1900.

Baignières, Arthur. “Der Salon von 1882.” *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 17 (1882): 349-54, 374-79.

Bailly-Herzberg, Janine, ed. *Correspondance de Camille Pissarro.* Vol. 1, *1865-1885.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1980.

Bayersdorfer, Adolph. “Gustave Courbet: Ein Steckbrief.” In *Adolph Bayersdorfers Leben und Schriften.* Hans Mackowsky, edited by August Pauly, and Wilhelm Weigand, 121-28. Munich: Bruckmann, 1902.

Becker, Benno. “Die Ausstellung der Secession in München.” *Die Kunst für Alle 22* (August 15, 1893): 343-44.

Bénédite, Léonce. “Les arts à l’exposition universelle de 1900: L’exposition décennale: La peinture étrangère.” *Gazette des beaux-arts,* 3rd period, 24 (September 1, November 1, December 1, 1900): 177-94, 483-504, 577-92.

Bénédite, Léonce. *The Luxembourg Museum (Jeu de Paume Museum Annex, Tuileries Garden): Its Paintings, Pastels, Aquarelles, and Drawings: Foreign Schools.* Paris: H. Laurens, 1924.

Benjamin, Walter. “Das Kunstwerk im Zeitalter seiner technischen Reproduzierbarkeit (3. Fassung).” In id., *Gesammelte Schriften.* Vol. I.2, edited by Rolf Tiedemann and Hermann Schweppenhäuser, 470-508. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1991.

Bényi, László. *Paál László 1846-1879*. Budapest: Képzo□mu□vészeti Kiadó, 1983.

Bichler, Susanna. “1865–1995: Ein Überblick.” In *Galerie Würthle, gegründet 1865,* 9-16. Vienna: Galerie Würthle with Remaprint, 1995.

Bilski, Emily D., and Emily Braun, eds. *Jewish Women and Their Salons: The Power of Conversation*. New York: Jewish Museum with Yale University Press, 2005.

Bisanz-Prakken, Marian. “Gustav Klimt.” In *Vincent van Gogh und die Moderne, 1890-1914,* edited by Roland Dorn and Georg-Wilhelm Költzsch, 417-20. Freren: Luca, 1990.

Bisanz-Prakken, Marian. *Heiliger Frühling, Gustav Klimt und die Anfänge der Wiener Secession 1895–1905.* Vienna: Brandstätter, 1999.

Bisanz-Prakken, Marian. “Programmatik und subjektive Aussage im Werk von Gustav Klimt.” In *Wien, 1870–1930: Traum und Wirklichkeit,* edited by Robert Waissenberger, 110-120. Vienna: Eigenverlag der Museen der Stadt Wien, 1984.

Bloom, Harold. *Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1997.

B.[ode], “Zwei Tote.” *Der Cicerone* 17 (September 1925): 876-78.

Bode, Wilhelm. *Mein Leben*. 2 vols. Berlin: Reckendorf, 1930.

Boeckl, Herbert. “‘Verwandlung und Wandlung’: Rede anlässlich der Inauguration zum Rektor der Akademie der bildenden Künste in Wien, am 23. November 1962.” *Forum: Österreichische Monatsblätter für kulturelle Freiheit* 10, no. 109 (January 1963).

Boeckl, Matthias. *Jean Egger, 1897-1934.* Götzens: Kunstinitiative Tirol, 2000.

Boehm, Gottfried, Roland Dorn, and Franz A. Morat, eds. *Carl Schuch 1846-1903.* Mannheim: Städtische Kunsthalle, 1986.

Boros, Judit. “A Hungarian Painter in Paris: Mihály Munkácsy’s Career between 1870 and 1896.” In *Munkácsy in the World.* Budapest: Hungarian National Gallery, 2005, 33-60.

Borsi, Franco, and Ezio Godoli. *Wiener Bauten der Jahrhundertwende. Die Architektur der habsburgischen Metropole zwischen Historismus und Moderne.* Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1985.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art and Literature*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1993.

Bourdieu, Pierre. “La production de la croyance.” *Actes de la recherche en sciences sociales* (February 13, 1977): 4–43.

Braun, Emily. “Leonardo’s Smile.” In *Donatello Among the Blackshirts,* edited by Claudia Lazzaro and Roger J. Crum, 173-86. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2005.

Breuss, Susanne. *Window Shopping: Eine Fotogeschichte des Schaufensters.* Vienna: Wien Museum, 2010.

Brühl, George. *Die Cassirers: Streiter für den Impressionismus.* Leipzig: Edition Leipzig, 1991.

Burckhard, Max. “Ver Sacrum.” *Ver Sacrum* 1, no. 1 (January 1898): 1-3.
Busch, Günther. *Entartete Kunst: Geschichte und Moral.* Frankfurt am Main: Societäts-Verlag, 1969.

Caruso, Alexandra. “Leben in der Kunst—eine moderne Inszenierung: Hans Tietzes ‘Gesellschaft zur Förderung moderner Kunst’.” Master’s thesis, University of Vienna, 2008.

Celestini, Federico, and Helga Mitterbauer, eds. *Ver-rückte Kulturen: Zur Dynamik kultureller Transfers*. Tübingen: Stauffenburg, 2003.

Champfleury. *L’hôtel des commissaires-priseurs*. Paris: Dentu, 1867.

Charles Sedelmeyer’s Collection von Gemälden österreichischer und ungarischer in Paris lebender Künstler ausgestellt im Künstlerhaus, Giselastraße 10. Vienna: Sedelmeyer, 1884.

Cottier, Maurice. *Exposition Universelle de Vienne en 1873: Section Française: Rapport sur les beaux-arts*. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1875.

Crary, Jonathan. *Suspension of Perception: Attention, Spectacle and Modern Culture*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1999.

Debray, Régis. *Transmitting Culture*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1997.

Distel, Anne. *Les collectionneurs des impressionistes: amateurs et marchands.* Düdingen: Trio, 1989.

Dmitrieva, Katia, and Michel Espagne, eds. *Transferts culturels triangulaires France-Allemagne-Russie*. Paris: Éditions de la Maison des sciences de l’homme, 1996.

Doran, Michael, ed. *Gespräche mit Cézanne*. Zurich: Diogenes, 1982.

Dubois, Isabelle. “Louis Réau, Médiateur malgré lui? Les Primitifs Allemands 1910.” In *Distanz und Aneignung: Kunstbeziehungen zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich, 1870-1945,* edited by Alexandre Kostka and Françoise Lucbert, 161-76. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2004.

Durand-Ruel, Flavie. “Paul Durand-Ruel: Freund und Händler der Impressionisten.” In *Wien-Paris: Van Gogh, Cézanne, und Österreichs Moderne, 1880-1960,* edited by Agnes Husslein-Arco, 205-13. Vienna: Brandstätter, 2007.

Durand-Ruel, Paul. “Mémoires.” In *Les archives de l’impressionnisme: lettres de Renoir, Monet, Pissaro, Sisley et autres –Mémoires de Paul Durand-Ruel—Documents.* Vol. 2., edited by Lionello Venturi. Paris: Durand-Ruel, 1939.

Eckermann, Elise. *"En lutte contre une puissance formidable": Paul Gauguin im Spannungsfeld von Kunstkritik und Kunstmarkt.* Weimar, Germany: Verlag und Datenbank für Geisteswissenschaften, 2003.

Eggers, Friedrich. "Die deutschen Kunstvereine." *Deutsches Kunstblatt* 7, no. 39 (September 25, 1856): 337-41.

Eitelberger, Rudolf von. "Die Kunstentwicklung des heutigen Wien." In *Gesammelte kunsthistorische Schriften.* Vol. 1, *Kunst und Künstler Wiens der neueren Zeit,* edited by Rudolf von Eitelberger, 1-36. Vienna: Braumüller, 1879.

Eitelberger, Rudolf von. *Briefe über die moderne Kunst Frankreichs: Bei Gelegenheit der Pariser Ausstellung im Jahre 1855.* Vienna: Kaiserlich-Königliche Hof- und Staatsdruckerei, 1858.

Eitelberger, Rudolf von. "Oeffentliche Kunstpflege." In *Kunst und Kunstgewerbe auf der Wiener Weltausstellung 1873*, edited by Carl von Lützow, 262-277. Leipzig: Seemann, 1875.

Elias, Julius. "Paul Durand-Ruel: Aus dem Leben eines modernen Kunsthändlers." *Kunst und Künstler* 10, no. 2 (1912): 105-7.

Engelhart, Josef. *Ein Wiener Maler erzählt: Mein Leben und meine Modelle.* Vienna: Andermann, 1943.

Espagne, Michel. *Les transferts culturels franco-allemands*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1999.

Espagne, Michel, and Michael Werner, eds. *Qu'est-ce qu'une littérature nationale*? *Approches pour une théorie interculturelle du champ littéraire*. Paris: Editions de la maison des sciences de l'homme, 1994.

Espagne, Michel, and Michael Werner, eds. *Transferts: les relations interculturelles dans l'espace franco-allemand, XVIIIe-XIXe siècle.* Paris: Editions recherche sur les civilisations, 1988.

Exposition internationale des beaux-arts à Vienne 1882: France: Catalogue des ouvrages de peinture, sculpture, gravure, architecture. Paris: Hôtel de Cluny, 1882.

Exposition universelle de Vienne 1873: France: Oeuvres d'art et manufactures nationales, edited by Commissariat Général. Paris: Hôtel de Cluny, 1873.

Faistauer, Anton. *Neue Malerei in Österreich: Betrachtungen eines Malers.* Zurich: Amalthea, 1923.

Fanta, Walter, Klaus Amann, and Karl Corino, eds. *Robert Musil: Klagenfurter Ausgabe Kommentierte digitale Edition sämtlicher Werke, Briefe und nachgelassener Schriften.* DVD. Klagenfurt: Robert Musil-Institut der Universität Klagenfurt, 2009.

Feilchenfeldt, Rahel E., and Thomas Raff, eds. *Ein Fest der Künste: Paul Cassirer–Der Kunsthändler als Verleger.* Munich: Beck, 2006.

Feilchenfeldt, Walter. *Vincent van Gogh and Paul Cassirer, Berlin: The Reception of van Gogh in Germany from 1901 to 1914.* Zwolle: Waanders, 1988.

Felber, Ulrike, Elke Krasny, Christian Rapp and Smart Exports. *Österreich auf den Weltausstellungen 1851-2000.* Vienna: Brandstätter, 2000.

Feuerbach, Anselm. *Ein Vermächtnis.* Berlin: Meyer & Jessen, 1910.

Feuerbach, Henriette, ed. *Ein Vermächtnis von Anselm Feuerbach.* Munich: Wolff, 1920.

Fleck, Robert. "Gibt es einen österreichischen Expressionismus in der bildenden Kunst?" In *Expressionismus in Österreich: Die Literatur und die Künste*, edited by Klaus Amann and Armin A. Wallas, 113-22. Vienna: Böhlau, 1994.

Forsthuber, Sabine. *Moderne Raumkunst: Wiener Ausstellungsbauten von 1898 bis 1914.* Vienna: Picus, 1991.

Fried, Michael. *Absorption and Theatricality: Painting and Beholder in the Age of Diderot.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Frimmel, Theodor. *Geschichte der Wiener Gemäldesammlungen*. Leipzig: Georg Heinrich Meyer, 1899.

Frodl, Gerbert, ed. *Geschichte der bildenden Kunst in Österreich.* Vol. 5, *19. Jahrhundert*. Munich: Prestel, 2002.

Frodl, Gerbert. *Hans Makart: Monographie und Werkverzeichnis*. Salzburg: Residenz Verlag, 1974.

Frodl, Gerbert, and Verena Träger, eds. *Stimmungsimpressionismus: A European Phenomenon*. Vienna: Österreichische Galerie Belvedere, 2004.

G-r., B. "Die Kunsthandlung von Miethke und Wawra." *Kunstchronik* 8, no. 5 (November 15, 1872): 78-79.

Galenson, David W., and Robert Jensen. "Careers and Canvases: The Rise of the Market for Modern Art in Nineteenth-Century Paris." *Van Gogh Studies* 1 (2007): 137-66.
Galerie Durand-Ruel. *Collection de M. Georges Viau: Vente Durand-Ruel.* Paris: March 4, 1907.

Gärtner, Markus. *Eduard Hanslick versus Franz Liszt.* Hildesheim: G. Olms, 2005.

Gardey, François. "Sarah Bernhardt, Zola et Rex." *Gazette des beaux-arts, 6th period,* 84 (November 1974): 324-26.

Gay, Peter. *Bürger und Boheme: Kunstkriege des 19. Jahrhunderts.* Munich: C. H. Beck, 1999.

Gesellschaft zur Förderung der modernen Kunst in Wien. *Französische Kunst der Gegenwart.* Vienna: Künstlerhaus with Krystallverlag, 1926.

Godfroy, Caroline Durand-Ruel. "Paul Durand-Ruel's Marketing Practices," *Van Gogh Museum Journal 2000*: *Theo Van Gogh and the 19th Century Art Trade* (December 2000): 82-89.

Grasskamp, Walter. *Die unbewältigte Moderne: Kunst und Öffentlichkeit.* Munich: C. H. Beck, 1989.

Greenhalgh, Paul. *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions, and Word's Fairs, 1851-1939*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.

Guide international des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes: exposition Paris avril—octobre 1925. Paris: Perfect Publicity, 1925.

Haberditzl, Franz Martin. *Moderne Galerie in der Orangerie des Belvedere.* Vienna: Verein der Museumsfreunde, 1929.

Hagemeister, Karl. *Carl Schuch: Sein Leben und seine Werke*. Berlin: B. Cassirer, 1913.

Hain, Cornelia Viktoria. "Die rhetorischen Figuren in Eduard Hanslicks Bruckner-Rezensionen." Master's thesis, University of Vienna, 2006.

Haja, Martina. "Der österreichische Stimmungsimpressionismus." In *Landschaft im Licht: Impressionistische Malerei in Europa und Nordamerika 1860-1910*, edited by Götz Czymmek, 156-63. Cologne: Wallraf-Richartz-Museum with Greven & Bechtold, 1990.

Hammel-Haider, Gabriele. "'Moderne Galerie in Wien'—'Neue Galerie in der Stallburg'—und nun?" In *Museumsraum Museumszeit: Zur Geschichte des österreichischen Museums- und Ausstellungswesens,* edited by Gottfried Fliedl, Roswitha Muttenthaler, and Herbert Posch, 189-93. Vienna: Picus 1992.

Hammerstein, Hans. *Erinnerungen und Betrachtungen*. Linz: Oberösterreichisches Landesarchiv, 1999.

Heiber, Helmut, and Beatrice Heiber. *Die Rückseite des Hakenkreuzes: Absonderliches aus den Akten des Dritten Reiches.* Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag, 1993.

Heilbut, Emil. “Die Impressionisten-Ausstellung der Wiener Secession.” *Kunst und Künstler* 1 (1902-03): 169-207.

Helferich, Hermann [Emil Heilbut]. “Kunstakademien.” *Die Zukunft* 5 (1893): 219-23.

Herzogenrath, Wulf. “Fakten zur Kunstszene im Deutschland der zwanziger Jahre.” In *Paris-Berlin, 1900-1933: Übereinstimmungen und Gegensätze Frankreich-Deutschland,* edited by Brigitte Hilmer, 306-10. Munich: Prestel 1979.

Herzogenrath, Wulf, and Dorothee Hansen, eds. *Van Gogh: Felder. Das Mohnfeld und der Künstlerstreit.* Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz, 2002.

Hevesi, Ludwig. *Acht Jahre Secession (März 1897-Juni 1905): Kritik—Polemik—Chronik.* Vienna: Konegen, 1906.

Hevesi, Ludwig. “Edouard Manet und seine Leute.” In id., *Acht Jahre Secession (März 1897-Juni 1905): Kritik—Polemik—Chronik*, 406-412. Vienna: Konegen, 1906.

Hevesi, Ludwig. “Kunst und Budgetausschuss.” In id., *Altkunst-Neukunst: Wien 1894–1908,* 288-93. Vienna: Konegen, 1909.

Hevesi, Ludwig. “Die Moderne Galerie in Wien.” *Kunstchronik*, n.s. 14, no. 29 (June 12, 1903): 457-62.

Hevesi, Ludwig. *Österreichische Kunst im 19. Jahrhundert*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Seemann, 1903.

Hevesi, Ludwig. “Vincent van Gogh: Galerie Miethke.” In id., *Altkunst-Neukunst: Wien 1894-1908,* 526-29. Vienna: Konegen, 1909.

Hevesi, Ludwig. “Vorträge über den Impressionnismus.” In id., *Acht Jahre Secession (März 1897-Juni 1905): Kritik—Polemik—Chronik*, 417-19. Vienna: Konegen, 1906.

Hevesi, Ludwig. “Weiteres vom Hause der Secession.” In id., *Acht Jahre Secession (März 1897-Juni 1905): Kritik—Polemik—Chronik*, 68-74. Vienna: Konegen, 1906.

Hevesi, Ludwig. “Aus dem Wiener Kunstleben.” *Kunst und Kunsthandwerk* 9 (1906): 64-73.

Hofmann, Werner. *Moderne Malerei in Österreich.* Vienna: Wolfrum, 1965.

Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. “Die Malerei in Wien.” *Neue Revue* 5, no. 1 (Dezember 20, 1893): 22-24.

Hofmannsthal, Hugo von. *Prosa III*, edited by Herbert Steiner. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer, 1964.

Huemer, Christian. “Charles Sedelmeyer (1837-1925): Kunst und Spekulation am Kunstmarkt in Paris.” *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 2 (Fall 1999): 4-19.

Huemer, Christian. “Charles Sedelmeyer‘s Theatricality: Art and Speculation in Late 19th-Century Paris.” In *Artwork through the Market: The Past and the Present,* edited by Ján Bakoš, 109-24. Bratislava: Slovak Academy of Sciences, 2004.

Huemer, Christian. “Crossing Thresholds: The Hybrid Identity of Late Nineteenth-Century Art Dealers.” In *Crossing Cultures: Conflict-Migration-Convergence,* edited by Janie Anderson, 1007-11. Melbourne: Miegunyah Press, 2008.

Huemer, Christian. “‘Une exposition (in)complète:’ Courbet in Vienna, 1873.” *Nineteenth-Century Art Worldwide* 11, no. 2 (Summer 2012), http://www.19thc-artworldwide.org/index.php/summer12/christian-huemer-courbet-in-vienna

Huemer, Christian. “At the Fount of Modernism: Carinthian Painters in Paris.” In *Hermits-Cosmopolitans: Modern Painting in Carinthia 1900-1955*, edited by Agnes Husslein-Arco and Matthias Boeckl, 141–53. Vienna: Springer, 2004.

Huemer, Christian. “Globetrotting Wall Paintings: Munkácsy, Sedelmeyer, and Vienna’s Künstlerhaus.” In *Munkácsy: Magic & Mystery*, 74-84. Vienna: Künstlerhaus, 2012.

Huemer, Christian. “Impressionism and the Viennese Art Market.” *Centropa* VIII, no. 1 (January 2008): 105-18.

Huemer, Christian. “Narrative der Moderne: Zur Kunstkritik in der *Zeit*.” In *Die Wiener Wochenschrift* Die Zeit *(1894-1904) und die zentraleuropäische Moderne*, edited by Lucie Merhautová and Kurt Ifkovits, 181-93. Prague: Masaryk Institute and Archive of ASCR, 2013.

Huemer, Christian. “Nuda Veritas im neuen Kleid: Hermann Bahrs Expressionismuskonzept.” *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 1 (Spring 2003): 14-31, 82-90.

Huemer, Christian. “On the Reception History of Paul Cézanne in Austrian Modernism.” *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 2 (Fall 2006): 72-87, 127-34.

Hüttinger, Eduard. *Porträts und Profile: Zur Geschichte der Kunstgeschichte.* St. Gallen: Erker, 1992.

Illustrirter Katalog der ersten internationalen Kunst-Ausstellung im Künstlerhause. Vienna: Künstlerhaus, 1882.

Internationale Kunstausstellung. Vienna: Secession, 1924.

Jahn, Michael. *Was denken Sie von Wagner? Mit Eduard Hanslick in der Wiener Hofoper. Kritiken und Schilderungen.* Vienna: Der Apfel, 2007.

Jeddeloh-Sayk, Almuth zu. “Studien zu Leben und Werk von Carl Vinnen (1863-1922): Unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des ‘Protestes deutscher Künstler‘ von 1911.” PhD. diss., Universität Bonn, 1986.

Jensen, Robert. *Marketing Modernism in Fin-de-Siècle Europe*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994.

Johnson, Julie M. "The Art of the Woman: Women's Art Exhibitions in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna." PhD. diss., University of Chicago, 1998.

Johnson, Julie M. *The Memory Factory: The Forgotten Women Artists of Vienna 1900.* West Lafayette: Purdue University Press, 2012.

Julien, Robert. "L'image de l'Autriche perçue par le Quai d'Orsay entre 1918 et 1922." *Austriaca: cahiers universitaires d'information sur l'Autriche.* Special Issue: *Relations franco-autrichiennes, 1870-1970. Actes du colloque du Rouen 29 févier-2 mars 1984,* edited by Felix Kreissler (June 1986): 83-112.

Im Kampf um die Kunst: Die Antwort auf den "Protest deutscher Künstler." Mit Beiträgen deutscher Künstler, Galerieleiter, Sammler und Schriftsteller. Munich: Piper, 1911.

Kandel, Eric. *Auf der Suche nach dem Gedächtnis. Die Entstehung einer neuen Wissenschaft des Geistes.* Munich: Siedler, 2006.

Katalog der Internationalen Kunstausstellung in Wien 1909. Vienna: Rosenbaum, 1909.

Katalog der Kunstschau Wien 1908. Vienna: Kunstschau with Holzhausen, 1908.

Katalog der Modernen Galerie in Wien. Vienna: Moderne Galerie, 1903.

Kemp, Wolfgang. *Der Betrachter ist im Bild: Kunstwissenschaft und Rezeptionsästhetik.* Cologne: DuMont, 1985.

Klimt, Gustav. "Gemeinschaft der Schaffenden und Geniessenden, aus der Eröffnungsrede der 'Kunstschau 1908.'" In *Gustav Klimt, Die Goldene Pforte: Wesen-Werk-Wirkung,* edited by Otto Breicha, 137-39. Salzburg: Galerie Welz, 1978.

Koja, Stephan, and Sylvia Mraz. "'Do You Need a Head to Walk?': Rodin's Impact on Austrian Art." In *Rodin and Vienna,* edited by Agnes Husslein-Arco and Stephan Koja, 143-61. Munich: Hirmer, 2010.

Kokoschka, Oskar. *Mein Leben.* Munich: Bruckmann, 1971.

Kossatz, Horst-Herbert. "Der Austritt der Klimt-Gruppe: Eine Pressenachschau." *Alte und moderne Kunst* 141 (1975): 23-26.

Kostka, Alexandre, and Françoise Lucbert, eds. *Distanz und Aneignung: Kunstbeziehungen zwischen Deutschland und Frankreich 1870-1945*. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 2004.

Kramer, Kolja. “Die Ausstellungspräsenz des französischen Impressionismus im Wiener Künstlerhaus und in der Wiener Secession, 1877-1903.” PhD. diss., University of Bern, 2003.

Kramer, Kolja. “Eine Dreiecksbeziehung für den französischen Impressionismus: Die Impressionisten-Ausstellung 1903 in der Wiener Secession.” *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 2 (2001): 48-65.

Krapf-Weiler, Almut. “Zur Wirkungsgeschichte Vincent van Goghs in Wien.“ In *Vincent van Gogh und die Moderne, 1890-1914,* edited by Roland Dorn and Georg-Wilhelm Költzsch, 411-16. Freren: Luca, 1990.

Kraus, Karl. “Artifex.” *Die Fackel* 88 (December 16, 1901): 27.

Kraus, Karl. (“Die diesmalige Ausstellung der Secession.”) *Die Fackel* 59 (mid November 1900): 19-20.

Kraus, Karl. (“Umschwung im Wiener Kunstgeschmack.”) *Die Fackel* 29 (mid January 1900): 16-20.

Krauss, Rosalind E. *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1985.

Kršnjavi, Izidor. “Die Internationale Kunstausstellung in Wien: I Österreich-Ungarn.” *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 17 (1882): 242-53.

Kršnjavi, Izidor. “Die Internationale Kunstausstellung in Wien: III Deutschland.” *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 17 (1882): 340-48.

Kršnjavi, Izidor. “Die Internationale Kunstausstellung in Wien: IV Frankreich—Belgien.” *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 17 (1882): 366-73.

Krug, Hansjörg. “Gustav Klimt: ‘Nuda Veritas’ / 1899.” In *Nuda Veritas Rediviva: Ein Bild Gustav Klimts und seine Geschichte,* edited by Oskar Pausch, 9-27. Vienna: Mimundus 8, 1997.

Krug, Wolfgang. “Die Kunstsammlung des Niederösterreichischen Landesmuseums.” In *Waldmüller—Schiele—Rainer: Meisterwerke des Niederösterreichischen Landesmuseums vom Biedermeier bis zur Gegenwart,* 6-17. Vienna: Brandstätter, 2000.

Kury, Astrid. “Ein österreichischer Sonderweg? Zur Frage der Abstraktion in der bildenden Kunst der Wiener Moderne.” In *Moderne als Konstruktion: Debatten, Diskurse, Positionen um 1900,* edited by Antje Senarclens de Grancy and Heidemarie Uhl, 153–67. Vienna: Passagen, 2001.

Kutzenberger, Stefan. “Because That’s Pathological! Manifestations of Madness in 1900 Vienna in the Works of Klimt and Musil.” In *Crime and Madness in Modern Austria: Myth, Metaphor*

and Cultural Realities, edited by Rebecca Thomas, 42-75. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Press, 2008.

Lacambre, Geneviève. "1893: Les écoles étrangères en France: La politique nouvelle du Luxembourg." *Quarante-huit/Quatorze* 6 (1994): 67-74.

Lacambre, Geneviève, ed. *Le Musée du Luxembourg en 1874.* Paris: Éditions des Musées Nationaux, 1974.

Lachnit, Edwin. *Ringen mit dem Engel: Anton Kolig, Franz Wiegele, Sebastian Isepp, Gerhart Frankl.* Vienna: Böhlau, 1998.

Landon, C. P. [Charles-Paul] *Musée royale du Luxembourg, recréé en 1822 et composé des principales productions des artistes vivants*. Paris: Bureau des annales du musée, 1823.

Lautenbach, Ernst, ed. *Lexikon Goethe-Zitate.* Munich: Iudicium, 2004.

Le Rider, Jacques. "La contribution française à la définition d'une identité culturelle autrichienne," in *Les études germaniques en France, 1900-1970,* edited by Michel Espagne and Michael Werner, 403-7, 413-18. Paris: CNRS, 1994.

Le Rider, Jacques. "Verselbständigung eines Wunschbildes: Der französische Beitrag zur Bestimmung der kulturellen Identität Österreichs." In *"Ein Frühling, dem kein Sommer folgte"? Französisch-österreichische Kulturtransfers seit 1945,* edited by Thomas Angerer and Jacques Le Rider, 25-40. Vienna: Böhlau, 1999.

Lecomte, Georges. *L'art impressioniste, d'après la collection privée de Monsieur Durand-Ruel.* Paris: Chamerot and Renouard, 1892.

Lefort, Paul. "Exposition universelle: Les écoles étrangères de peinture (1er article): L'Autriche-Hongrie." *Gazette des beaux-arts*, 2nd period, 18 (August 1, 1878): 196-208.

Lesák, Barbara. "Die 'Internationale Ausstellung neuer Theatertechnik' in Wien 1924." In *Politik der Präsentation: Museum und Ausstellung in Österreich, 1918-1945,* edited by Herbert Posch and Gottfried Fliedl, 119-42. Vienna: Turia and Kant, 1996.

Lützow, Carl von. "August Carl von Pettenkofen" *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* n.s.1 (1890): 85-93, 124-128.

Macke, Wolfgang, ed. *August Macke—Franz Marc: Briefwechsel*. Cologne: DuMont Schauberg, 1964.

Maderthaner, Wolfgang. "Von der Zeit um 1860 bis zum Jahr 1945." In *Wien: Geschichte einer Stadt.* Vol. 3, *Von 1790 bis zur Gegenwart,* edited by Peter Csendes and Ferdinand Opll, 175-544. Vienna: Böhlau, 2006.

Mainardi, Patricia. *Art and Politics of the Second Empire: The Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867*. New Haven: Yale Unversity Press, 1987.

Mainardi, Patricia. *The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Mainardi, Patricia. "L'exposition complète de Courbet." In *Courbet: artiste et promoteur de son oeuvre,* Jörg Zutter and Petra ten-Doesschate Chu, eds., 101-57. Paris: Flammarion 1998.

Manheim, Ron. "The 'Germanic' Van Gogh: A Case Study of Cultural Annexation." *Simiolus: Netherlands Quarterly for the History of Art* 4 (1989): 277-88.

Mauthner, Margarete, ed. and trans. *Vincent van Gogh: Briefe.* Berlin: Cassirer, 1906.

Mayo Roos, Jane. "The Commune, the Column, and the Topping of Courbet." In *Early Impressionism and the French State (1866–1874)*, 147–59. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Meier-Graefe, Julius. *Entwicklungsgeschichte der modernen Kunst: Vergleichende Betrachtung der bildenden Künste, als Beitrag zur modernen Ästhetik.* 3 vols. Stuttgart: Hoffmann, 1904.

Meier-Graefe, Julius. "Die Kunst auf der Weltausstellung." *Die Weltausstellung in Paris 1900*, edited by Julius Meier-Graefe, 81-104. Leipzig: Krüger, 1900.

Meier-Graefe, Julius. *Der Moderne Impressionismus: mit einer kolorierten Kunstbeilage und 7 Vollbildern in Tonätzung.* Berlin: Bard, 1903.

Melichar, Peter. "Der Wiener Kunstmarkt der Zwischenkriegszeit." *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften* 17, nos. 2-3, *Kunstmarkt* (2006): 244-71.

Meyer, Andrea. "Rudolf von Eitelberger." *Französische Kunst—Deutsche Perspektiven 1870–1945: Quellen und Kommentare zur Kunstkritik,* edited by Andreas Holleczek and Andrea Meyer, 36-42. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 2003.

Meyer, Bruno and Alfred Woltmann. "Plastik und Malerei," in Kunst und Kunstgewerbe auf der Wiener Weltausstellung 1873, edited by Carl von Lützow, 278-414. Leipzig: Seemann, 1875.

Meyer, Rudolf Adalbert. "Vorwort," in *Paul Gauguin*. Vienna: Galerie H. O. Miethke, 1907.

Michel, Eva. "Inventing Tradition: Die Rezeption der Alten Meister und das 'Barocke' in der österreichischen Malerei des 20. Jahrhunderts–Topos und künstlerische Strategie." PhD. diss., University of Vienna, 2009.

Mistler, Jean. "Avant-Propos." In *Exposition d'art autrichien*, 5-6. *Paris: Jeu de Paume*, 1937.

Mitterbauer, Helga, and Katharina Scherke, eds. *Kulturelle Transfers um 1900 und in der Gegenwart.* Vienna: Passagen, 2005.

Mlnarik, Heinz. "'Wien entbehrt dieser wichtigsten Grundlage für sein Kunstleben': Von der Gründung der Modernen Galerie zur Österreichischen Galerie." *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 2 (1992): 38-53.

Monnier, Gérard. *L'art et ses institutions en France: de la Révolution à nos jours.* Paris: Gallimard, 1995.

Moretti, Franco. *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for Literary History*. London: Verso 2007.

Morowitz, Laura. "A Passion for Business: Wanamaker's, Munkácsy, and the Depiction of Christ." *Art Bulletin* 91, no. 2 (June 2009): 184-206.

Musil, Robert. "Intensismus (aus einem unveröffentlichten Kunsthandbuch für reichgewordene Leute)." In *Gesammelte Werke.* Vol. 7, edited by Adolf Frisé, 659-97. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt, 1978.

Musil, Robert. *The Man Without Qualities*, translated by Eithne Wilkins and Ernst Kaiser. London: Secker and Warburg, 1953.

Musner, Lutz. *Der Geschmack von Wien: Kultur und Habitus einer Stadt*. Frankfurt am Main: Campus, 2009.

Muther, Richard. "Frühlingsausstellungen 1900." In id., *Studien und Kritiken.* Vol. 1, 53-81. 5th edition, Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1900.

Muther, Richard. *Geschichte der Malerei im 19. Jahrhundert*. 3 vols. Munich: Hirth, 1893-94. English translation: *The History of Modern Painting*, 3 vols. London: Henry and Co., 1895-96.

Muther, Richard. "Weihnachts-Ausstellungen 1899." In id., *Studien und Kritiken.* Vol. 1, 28-40. 5th edition, Vienna: Wiener Verlag, 1900.

Nahon, Pierre. *Les marchands d'art en France: XIXe et XXe siècles.* Paris: Éditions de la Différence, 1998.

Narzt, Andreas. "Der Briefwechsel Paul Durand-Ruels mit Wilhelm Bernatzik und Paul Cassirer." In *Wien-Paris: Van Gogh, Cézanne und Österreichs Moderne,* edited by Agnes Husslein, 214-31. Vienna: Brandstätter 2007.

Natter, Tobias G. "Fürstinnen ohne Geschichte? Gustav Klimt und die Gemeinschaft aller Schaffenden und Genießenden." In *Klimt und die Frauen,* edited by Tobias G. Natter and Gerbert Frodl, 57-74. Cologne: DuMont, 2000.

Natter, Tobias G. *Die Galerie Miethke: Eine Kunsthandlung im Zentrum der Moderne.* Vienna: Jewish Museum, 2003.

Natter, Tobias G. *Die Welt von Klimt, Schiele und Kokoschka: Sammler und Mäzene.* Cologne: Dumont, 2003.

Natter, Tobias, Franz Smola, and Peter Weinhäupl, eds. *Klimt persönlich: Bilder—Briefe—Einblicke.* Vienna: Brandstätter, 2012.

Nebehay, Christian M. *Gustav Klimt: Dokumentation.* Vienna: Galerie Nebehay, 1969.

Nossig, Alfred. "Pariser Kunstbrief." *Kunst-Salon von Amsler & Ruthardt Berlin* 4 (February 1893): 117-20.

Novotny, Fritz. *Henri de Toulouse-Lautrec: Wiener Festwochen.* Vienna: Österreichisches Museum für Angewandte Kunst, 1966.

Novotny, Fritz. *Hundert Jahre österreichischer Landschaftsmalerei*. Vienna: Jaffé, 1948.

Novotny, Fritz, and Johannes Dobai. *Gustav Klimt.* Vienna: Galerie Weltz, 1967.

Nußbaumer, Martina. *Musikstadt Wien: Die Konstruktion eines Images*. Freiburg: Rombach, 2007.

O'Doherty, Brian. *In der weißen Zelle = Inside the White Cube.* Berlin: Merve, 1996.

Otten, Dietrun. "'Rodin Looks and Says Nothing': Rodin in Vienna." In *Rodin and Vienna*, edited by Agnes Husslein-Arco and Stephan Koja, 11-29. Munich: Hirmer, 2010.

Ottman, Franz, and Carl Moll, eds. *Die führenden Meister der französischen Kunst im neunzehnten Jahrhundert.* Vienna: Secession with Krystallverlag, 1925.

Pack, Claus. *Der Maler Herbert Boeckl.* Vienna: Schroll, 1964.

Paret, Peter. *The Berlin Secession: Modernism and Its Enemies in Imperial Germany.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1983.

Paul, Barbara. *Hugo von Tschudi und die moderne französische Kunst im Deutschen Kaiserreich.* Mainz: P. von Zabern, 1993.

Paupié, Kurt. *Handbuch der österreichischen Pressegeschichte, 1848-1959.* Vol. 1, *Wien.* Vienna: Braumüller, 1960.

Pecht, Friedrich. "Die deutschen und die französischen Bauernmaler." *Internationale Ausstellungs-Zeitung: Beilage der ‚Neuen Freien Presse.'* (June 29, 1873): 1-3.

Pemsel, Jutta. *Die Wiener Weltausstellung von 1873: Das gründerzeitliche Wien am Wendepunkt*. Vienna: Böhlau, 1989.

Perlhefter, Verena. "Eine einleuchtende Einheitlichkeit? Hans Tietze und die Museumsreform von 1919." *Belvedere: Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 1 (Spring 2001): 60-73.

Pfersmann, Otto, and Friedrich Koja, eds. *Frankreich—Österreich: Wechselseitige Wahrnehmung und wechselseitiger Einfluß seit 1918.* Vienna: Böhlau, 1994.

Plach, Georg, ed. *Versteigerung der grossen Gallerie und der übrigen Kunst-Sammlungen von F. J. Gsell zu Wien* (Vienna: Plach, 1872).

Plakolm-Forsthuber, Sabine. "Tina Blau und die Frauenbewegung." In *Pleinair: Die Landschaftsmalerin Tina Blau*, 37-52. Vienna: Jewish Museum, 1996.

Pohl, Sieghard. "Courbet und die Wiener Kritik 1873." In *Courbet und Deutschland,* edited by Werner Hofmann and Klaus Herding, 586–87. Cologne: DuMont, 1978.

Pollak, Michael. *Wien 1900: Eine verletzte Identität.* Konstanz: Universitätsverlag, 1997.

Pomian, Krzysztof. "L'histoire des structures." In: *La nouvelle histoire*, edited by Jacques Le Goff, Roger Chartier, and Jacques Revel, eds., 115-16. Paris: 1978.

Porpaczy, Barbara. *Frankreich-Österreich, 1945–1960: Kulturpolitik und Identität.* Innsbruck: Studienverlag, 2002.

Prawer, S. S. *Comparative Literature Studies: An Introduction.* London: Duckworth, 1973.

Price, Renée. "The Kiss: Gustav Klimt and Auguste Rodin." In *Gustav Klimt: The Ronald S. Lauder and Serge Sabarsky Collections,* edited by Renée Price, 233-51. New York: Prestel, 2007.

Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph. *Du principe de l'art et de sa destination sociale*. Paris: Garnier frères, 1865.

R., K. "Ausstellungen, Wien: 'Die neue Kunst' in der Galerie Miethke." *Der Cicerone* 5, no. 4 (1913): 149-50.

Ranzoni, Emerich. *Malerei in Wien mit einem Anhang über Plastik*. Vienna: Lehmann & Wentzel, 1873.

Ranzoni, Emil. "In der Kunsthalle." *Internationale Ausstellungs-Zeitung: Beilage der ‚Neuen Freien Presse'* (June 22, 1873): 1-3.

Rave, Paul Ortwin. *Die Geschichte der Nationalgalerie Berlin.* Berlin: Nationalgalerie, 1968.

Reffait, Christoph. “Le roman de la Bourse dans la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle: généalogie et logique d’un discours romanesque.” PhD. diss., Université de Paris IV, 2003.

Reinhold, Bernadette. “Die Exposition d’art autrichien im Jeu de Paume in Paris 1937.” In *Wien-Paris: Van Gogh, Cézanne und Österreichs Moderne, 1880-1960,* edited by Agnes Husslein-Arco, 307-17. Vienna: Brandstätter 2007.

Renner, Ursula. “Die Zauberschrift der Bilder”: *Bildende Kunst in Hofmannsthals Texten.* Freiburg im Breisgau: Rombach, 2000.

Riat, Georges. *Gustave Courbet Peintre.* Paris: H. Floury, 1906.

Rosenberg, Adolf. “Munkacsy’s ‘Christus vor Pilatus.’” *Kunstchronik* 19, no. 22 (March 13, 1884): 359-64.

Rychlik, Otmar. *Anton Kolig (1886–1950): Das malerische Werk.* Vienna: Brandstätter, 2001.

S. “Korrespondenzen, Wien.” *Die Dioskuren: Deutsche Kunst-Zeitung* 18, no. 19 (May 11, 1873): 150-1.

Sármány-Parsons, Ilona. “Munkácsy, the Melancholic Colourist: Viennese Opinions of the Hungarian Master.” In *Munkácsy in the World*, 103-14. Budapest: Hungarian National Gallery, 2005.

Sauer, Barbara. “Der lange Weg zur Modernen Galerie in Wien.” Master’s thesis, University of Vienna, 2008.

Schaeffer, August. “Vorwort”: *Originalgemälde moderner Meister aus der Kollektion Ch. Sedelmeyer in Paris*, 3-5. Vienna: Anton Stöckl, 1907.

Schlegel, Friedrich. “Fragmente III: Ideen.” In *Werke in einem Band: Die Bibliothek der deutschen Klassiker*, edited by Wolfdietrich Rasch, 89-108. Vienna: Hanser, 1971.

Schleinitz, Rotraud. *Richard Muther—ein provokativer Kunstschriftsteller zur Zeit der Münchener Secession.* Hildesheim: Olms, 1993.

Schopenhauer, Arthur. *Sämtliche Werke.* Vol. 5, *Parerga und Paralipomena.* Edited by Paul Deussen. Munich: Piper, 1913.

Schorske, Carl E. *Fin-de-siècle Vienna Politics and Culture.* New York: Vintage Books, 1981.

Schröder, Klaus Albrecht. *Richard Gerstl.* Vienna: Kunstforum der Bank Austria, 1993.

Schumpeter, Joseph. *Ten Great Economists from Marx to Keynes.* London: Allen and Unwin, 1952.

Schwarz, Heinrich. “Joseph Rosa und das Musée Napoléon.” *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Galerie* 56 (1968): 7-14.

Schwedeler-Meyer, Ernst. *Hugo von Tschudi: Gesammelte Schriften zur neueren Kunst.* Munich: Bruckmann, 1912.

Schweiger, Werner. “Damit Wien einen ernsten Kunstsalon besitze: Die Galerie Miethke unter besonderer Berücksichtigung von Carl Moll als Organisator.“ *Belvedere:Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 2 (1998): 64-85.

Sedelmeyer, Charles, ed. *Christ before Pilate by M. de Munkácsy*. Paris: Sedelmeyer, 1886.

Sedelmeyer, Charles, ed. *Christ on Calvary*. Paris: Sedelmeyer, 1887.

Sedelmeyer, Charles. *M. von Munkácsy: Sein Leben und seine künstlerische Entwicklung.* Paris: Sedelmeyer, 1914.

Sedelmeyer, Karl. *Catalog der Öhlgemälde, Kupferstiche, Antquitäten etc.* Vienna, December 3, 1866.

Seligmann, Adalbert F. *Kunst und Künstler von gestern und heute: Gesammelte Aufsätze,* Vienna: Konegen, 1910.

Smola, Franz. “Zum Stilwandel 1909: ‘Aus ist’s mit den Quadratln, naturalistisch ist Trumpf.’” In *Klimt persönlich: Bilder—Briefe—Einblicke,* edited by Tobias Natter, Franz Smola, and Peter Weinhäupl, 233–39. Vienna: Brandstätter, 2012.

Stachel, Peter. “Albert Ilg und die ‘Erfindung’ des Barocks als österreichischer ‘Nationalstil’.” In *Barock—ein Ort des Gedächtnisses: Interpretament der Moderne/Postmoderne*, edited by Moritz Csáky, Federico Celestini, and Ulrich Tragatschnig, 101-52. Vienna: Böhlau, 2007.

Stenzel, Hermann. *Die Welt der deutschen Kunst: Entwicklung, Wesensart und Inhalt des germanischen Kunstschaffens.* Munich: Oldenbourg, 1943.

Stix, Alfred. “Préface.” *Exposition d’art autrichien,* 9-11. Paris: Braun, 1937.

Strobl, Alice. *Gustav Klimt: Die Zeichnungen.* Vol. 2, *1904-1912.* Salzburg: Galerie Welz, 1982.

Strobl, Alice. “Klimt’s Studies for the Faculty Paintings Philosophy, Medicine and Jurisprudence.” In *Gustav Klimt: The Beethoven Frieze and the Controversy over the Freedom of Art,* edited by Stephan Koja, 27-47. Munich: Prestel, 2006.

Strobl, Alice. “Zu den Fakultätsbildern von Gustav Klimt.” *Albertina Studien* 2, no. 4 (1964): 138–69.

ten-Doesschate Chu, Petra ed. *Letters of Gustave Courbet*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Tessmar-Pfohl, Marie-Catherine. “Die Neue Galerie von 1923 bis 1938: Kunsthandel und Kunstpolitik im Wien der Zwischenkriegszeit.” Master’s thesis, University of Vienna, 2003.

Tietze, Hans. “Ausstellung französischer Kunst in Wien.” *Kunstchronik und Kunstmarkt* 59, n.s. 35, no. 8 (May 23, 1925): 136-38.

Tietze, Hans. “ Carl Moll zum 60. Geburtstag.” *Die bildenden Künste* 7/8 (1921): 123-28.

Tietze, Hans. “‘Frauenbildnis’ von Franz Wiegele.” *Die bildenden Künste* 6 (1919): 136-37.

Tietze, Hans. “Gemeindepolitik und moderne Kunst.” *Der Kampf* 20, no. 8 (1927): 373-78.

Tietze, Hans. *Die großen Nationalgalerien: Meisterwerke der Malerei aus den großen Museen der Welt.* Zürich: Phaidon, 1954.

Tietze, Hans. "José Clemente Orozco als Graphiker.” *Die Graphischen Künste* 56 (1933): 75-82.

Tietze, Hans. “Die Kunst in unserer Zeit.” *Flugschriften der Gesellschaft zur Förderung Moderner Kunst in Wien* 1 (1930): 3-5.

Tietze, Hans. “Eine Museumskommission für Österreich.” *Kunstchronik und Kunstmarkt* 55, n.s. 31, no. 9 (November 28, 1919): 175-77.

Tietze, Hans. “Die Reaktion in der Kunst.” *Kunstchronik und Kunstmarkt* 59, n.s. 35, no. 1 (April 3, 1925): 6-10.

Tietze, Hans. “Zeitgenössische französische Kunst in den Wiener Sammlungen.” *Die bildenden Künste* 5 (1922): 1-22.

Torner, Christian. “Ausstellungen einzelner Gemälde vom späten 18. bis zum Ende des 19. Jahrhunderts: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte bürgerlicher Kunst, Kultur und Mentalität in Europa.” PhD. diss., European University Institute, Florence, 1997.

Tropper, Ulrike. “Das kreative Milieu von Graz um 1900: Ein Beitrag zum Kulturleben der Jahrhundertwende.” PhD diss., Graz University, 1994.

van Heerde, Jeroen Bastiaan. *Staat und Kunst: Staatliche Kunstförderung 1895-1918.* Vienna: Böhlau, 1993.

Varnedoe, Kirk. *Vienna 1900: Art, Architecture, and Design*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1986.

Vasari, Giorgio. *Le vite de' più eccellenti pittori, scultori e architettori* 1, XXIII. Florence: Edition Torrentiniana, 1550.

Vergo, Peter. "Gustav Klimts 'Philosophie' und das Programm der Universitätsgemälde." *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Galerie* 22/23 (1978/79): 69-100.

Vincenti, Carl von. *Wiener Kunst-Renaissance: Studien und Charakteristiken*. Vienna: Carl Gerold's John, 1876.

Vinnen, Carl, ed. *Ein Protest deutscher Künstler.* Jena: Diederichs, 1911.

Wagner, Anne M. "Courbet's Landscapes and their Market." *Art History* 4, no. 4 (December 1981): 410-31.

Wagner, Anselm. "Otto Wagners Straßenkehrer: Zum Reinigungsdiskurs der modernen Stadtplanung." *bricolage: Innsbrucker Zeitschrift für europäische Ethnologie* 6 (2010): 36–61.

Waldmann, Emil. "Kunstausstellungen: Dresden." *Kunst und Künstler* 12, no. 6 (1914): 344-45.

Ward, Martha. "Impressionist Installations and Private Exhibitions." *Art Bulletin* 73, no. 4 (December 1991): 599-622.

Warnke, Martin. *Hofkünstler: Zur Vorgeschichte des modernen Künstlers.* Cologne: DuMont, 1985.

Weissenhofer, Anselm. "Der neuere Wiener Kunstverein." *Monatsblatt des Vereins für Geschichte der Stadt Wien* 15, no. 1012 (October-December 1929): 49–54.

Werner, Michael, and Bénédicte Zimmermann. "Vergleich, Transfer, Verflechtung: Der Ansatz der Histoire croisée und die Herausforderung des Transnationalen." *Geschichte und Gesellschaft 28* (2002): 607-36.

Wesenberg, Angelika, and Ruth Langenberg, eds. *Im Streit um die Moderne: Max Liebermann, der Kaiser, die Nationalgalerie.* Berlin: Nicolai, 2001.

White, Harrison C., and Cynthia A. White. *Canvases and Careers: Institutional Change in the French Painting World*. New York: Wiley, 1965; new edition, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1993.

Whiteley, Linda. "Painters and Dealers in Nineteenth-Century France, 1820-1878, with a Special Reference to the Firm of Durand-Ruel." Ph.D. diss., University of Oxford, 1995.

Wild, Barbara. "Charles Sedelmeyer: Ein österreichischer Kunsthändler macht Karriere in Paris." *Parnass* 14, no. 3 (September 1994): 76-80.

Wolff, Albert. *La capital de l'art*. Paris: Havard, 1886.

Zemen, Hubert. *August Pettenkofen 1822-1889: Sein künstlerischer Nachlass.* Vienna: Privatdruck, 2008.

Zola, Emile. *Carnets d'enquêtes: Une ethnographie inédite de la France*. Edited by Henri Mitterand. Paris: Plon, 1986.

Zuckerkandl, Berta. "Die Klimt-Affäre." In id., *Zeitkunst: Wien 1901-1907*, 163-68. Vienna: Heller, 1908.

Zuckerkandl, Berta. "Wien." *Die Kunst* 7, no. 8 (May 1903): 246