

Antonela CORBAN*

The *Goldfish* and Other Klimtian Reactions to Viennese Art Criticism¹

Abstract: The paintings Gustav Klimt created for the University of Vienna, namely *Philosophy*, *Medicine*, and *Jurisprudence*, caused a scandal among the art critics and among the Viennese public at the end of the 19th and the beginning of the 20th century. The controversies held in the very auditoria of the university or the violent reactions in the newspapers regarding these paintings made the artist react in a most particular manner: he responded with a shocking piece, *Goldfish*, which treated each of the above mentioned groups with indifference, more precisely – and literally – by ignoring them, nay, by turning his back on them. This painting caused, in turn, an unending series of controversies, which ultimately lead to the rejection of Klimt's panels by the university and to their withdrawal by the artist.

Keywords: art criticism, tradition, modern art, beauty and ugliness

Viennese art criticism at the end of the 19th century

If we were to ask the question “What’s the use of criticism?” or “What is good criticism?”, as Baudelaire did in his review of *The Salon of 1846*, we would find that many of the answers that were acceptable then are equally acceptable now. Before it turned into an instrument of analysis, assessment and appreciation of the work of art, it was first a way of expressing the critic’s personal preferences. It is precisely those situations in which a critic tries to impose his own tastes or interests over the general public that the French poet has in mind when he writes: “How many artists today owe to the critics alone their sad little fame!” (Baudelaire 1992, 79). On the other hand, this is natural since, throughout the time, the art critic has not managed to present himself as neutral, detached, uninvolved: “to be just, that is to say, to justify its existence, criticism should be partisan, passionate, and political, that is to say, written from an exclusive point of view, but a point of view that opens up the widest horizons” (Baudelaire 1992, 80). The critic has always been in the position to choose: either to

* PhD “Al.I.Cuza” University of Iași, Romania & University of Burgundy, Dijon, France

¹**Acknowledgements:** This paper is the result of a research activity financed by The Sectorial Operational Program for Human Resources Development under the project POSDRU/89/1.5/S/49944 (“Developing the Innovation Capacity and Improving the Impact of Research through Post-doctoral Programmes”).

defend the old values and hierarchies or to embrace what was new at the expense of the values sanctioned by tradition. However, the most difficult step to make for a critic has always been going beyond the clichés about art created by others or even by himself and allowing himself to experience new possibilities.

What was instrumental in the dissemination of art criticism in the 19th century was the development of the press, which facilitated the publication of numerous articles, both on the imitative arts and on music, as well as on theatre and literature. By means of these publications, the art critic becomes an increasingly important figure in moulding the public taste. He is the defender of an artistic trend, be it modern, innovating, or conservative, as mentioned above. For this reason, the critics and the artists permanently interacted and influenced each other. It should be mentioned that starting with the 19th century, the discourse about art comes mainly from the critic (especially in the imitative arts and in music); it is a discourse that artists can no longer master.

Viennese art was several steps behind European art and was confined to the academic manner of representation. As no international exhibitions were organized in Vienna, modern European art was not known well. Therefore, art critics produced their discourse in outmoded fashion and terms. The situation was similar even in the German world of the arts in the first half of the 19th century. ("Berlin's Salons are irregular; there is no special exhibition hall. For some years, in fact, there has been no Salon at all. Admission is 50 centimes. It would be out of keeping to speak here of German art. With the exception of that extraordinary genius, Adolph Menzel, this art is inferior to that of France, Belgium, Holland, Italy and Spain". Laforgue 1996, 199) The same can be said about the Viennese art and public of the time: "Regular art criticism was established in Vienna from the mid-1850s onwards as an important element in boosting the circulation of the expanding broadsheet press. In the earlier nineteenth century, only a narrow and mainly aristocratic section of the population had been interested in art. However, by the time the Künstlerhaus began organizing regular exhibitions of painting and sculpture in 1869, a growing, well-to-do middle class had become sensitive to the visual arts. This group needed information that would help them form their own taste and stimulate them to collect art". (Sarmany - Parsons 2008, 87)

In the European artistic circles, tradition had its say no later than 1850s; after this moment the new theories of art emerged and they influenced the artistic life, while the artists removed themselves from the influence of these traditional models which were ready to conform to the commissions of the state or church, which imposed the observance of certain ideological or stylistic requirements. However, this change happened in Vienna at a much later date than in Western Europe. It was the Viennese

Secession, founded in 1897, whose president was none other than Gustav Klimt, that achieved this artistic renewal.

The most efficient method the artists had in order to disseminate their ideas was to have their own publication, a magazine called *Ver Sacrum* and their own headquarters (Secession Building, designed by Joseph Maria Olbrich).

Here are some of the most important Viennese publications of the time, where the most heated debates regarding the new and older art and the relation between them were held: *Neue Freie Presse*, *Fremdenblatt*, *Salzburger Volksblatt*, *Montags Zeitung*, *Wiener Morgen Zeitung*, *Vossische Zeitung*.

Philosophy, the first Klimtian art piece that caused a scandal

In 1894, Gustav Klimt and Franz Matsch were commissioned to decorate the ceiling of the entrance hall of the new building of Vienna University. Klimt was to paint the ten lunettes and three out of the four panels of the faculties, with the themes *Philosophy*, *Medicine* and *Jurisprudence*. Franz Matsch was to paint *Theology* and the central panel, *The Victory of Light over Darkness*. These topics corresponded with the programme the university board had proposed, namely “the role of science and reason in society”.

Philosophy was initially presented in Paris, at the Universal Exhibition, where it was received quite enthusiastically. Its international success was also secured by the fact that on this occasion the painting was awarded the gold medal. On the contrary, in Vienna in 1900, when the panel representing *Philosophy* was displayed publicly, the university professors vigorously raised their voices against this painting, which they considered an attack on the academic art. Thus, 87 professors signed a protest against accepting the panel, as their expectations regarding it were entirely different. They would have wished a painting in the academic manner taking Rafael's *The School of Athens* as a model, where the thinkers should be represented as debating on philosophical topics or walking as the Athenian Peripatheticians. One of the professors even suggested a representation of the philosophers of all times, together with their disciples walking in a grove engrossed in conversation. (Schorske 1998, 219).

The Viennese artist considered such solutions anachronistic and unsuitable for the modern age and rejected them altogether. However, the representation of so complex a topic as “the human condition” which he finally chose and the manner he opted for – such a direct one – ended up in confusing and equally in aggrieving “the professors’ artistic ego; they did not interpret and rejected this humanity as a distortion and blasphemy of the role of science” (Hofmann 1970, 22).

As the artist himself believed, the representatives of the Faculty of Philosophy could not provide solid solutions to people, just as the progress of medicine does not alleviate people's pains and impotences, just as jurisprudence cannot protect them from the iniquities with which they are swallowed by "the goddess of revenge" (Hevesi 1984, 443).

Similar to Matsch's panel, the allegory of *Philosophy* should have represented "the victory of light over darkness", thus emphasizing the role of science; Klimt, however, produced a work that illustrates "the victory of darkness over everything else". In 1884, Hans Makart, the painter who had greatly influenced Klimt as a young artist, painted a piece with a similar topic (*Victory of Light over Darknes*) in the manner of the academistic art.

In his allegory of *Philosophy* and in the other two panels, Klimt's view of the universe appears related to that of Schopenhauer in *The World as Will and Representation*: a world in which the will is a blind energy incessantly repeated as breeding, love and death, to which the Nietzschean will can be added, in the form the philosopher proposed it in his early writings.

Contemporary critics saw Klimt's *Philosophy* as "a dull, submissive, dreamlike mass, drifting indefinitely, for better and worse, in the service of eternal procreation from the first stirrings of existence to their feeble demise as they sink into the grave. This is briefly interrupted by an intoxicating moment of loving union followed by a painful process of drifting apart. Love has been a disappointment, bringing neither happiness nor knowledge. Fate, however, remains unchallenged. Far away from cold, clear knowledge and also from the eternally veiled cosmic mystery, the human species is forever struggling for happiness and knowledge, while remaining a tool in the hands of nature, a tool used for the unchangeable purpose of procreation" (*Die Kunst für alle*, München, 1900, cited in Strobl 1963, 152).

Peter Vergo considers that the Viennese artist owes his knowledge of Schopenhauer's ideas in Wagner from the composer's essay *Beethoven*. This was because Klimt frequented artistic, social and intellectual circles in which Schopenhauer's, Nietzsche's and Wagner's ideas were admired and often represented a topic for heated debates. Therefore, starting from their ideas, the painter attempted at a synthesis of their world view (*Weltanschauung*) and at solving the problem of the human condition in his own manner and with his own resources.

He provides minimal information on his personal view in the exhibition catalogue (it is common knowledge that he did not like to talk about his paintings); the entry in the catalogue, however, contains the compressed essential ideas: "On the left a group of figures: the beginning of life, fruition, decay. On the right, the globe as mystery. Emerging below, a figure of light: knowledge". (*Offizieller Katalog der 9 Ausstellung der Secession*, Wien, 1900)

Unlike other previous paintings, where idealizing and sublimating reality were meant to make it more attractive and desirable, in the allegories for the university he chose to present topics such as disease, despair, selfishness and their ugliness. The characters are positioned so as to indicate resignation and sadness at the world's distress and suffering. Thus, they seem caught in a swirl they cannot fight, but which they face together.

Since the paintings were destroyed in the fire at the Immendorf Palace in 1945, the only information available regarding the chromaticity in Klimt's paintings can be found in the texts of the critics of the time. Ludwig Hevesi's commentary, for instance, is extremely helpful. "Let the gaze move to the two lateral pieces, *Philosophy* and *Medicine*: a mystic symphony in green, a rousing overture in red, a purely decorative play of colours in both. In *Jurisprudence*, black and gold, not actual colours, prevail instead of colour, the line gain significance, and form becomes a characteristic that one must regard as monumental". (Nebehay 1979, 170)

The groups of art critics pro and anti - Klimt

The allegorical paintings that Klimt produced for the University, namely *Philosophy*, *Medicine*, *Jurisprudence*, gave rise to scandal among the more conservative academics.

The first issue raised by the critics was the clarity of the artistic expression. They supported classical art as opposed to modern art, as they considered that the latter tended to distort the human shape and present it as ugly. About a decade earlier, the same was said about Wagner in the article *The Unhealthy Art*, published in the issue of *Neue Freie Presse* of February 15th 1885, where it was claimed that his music would endanger the singers' mental health because of the "expression of the most diametrically opposed extremes of the emotional life" of the characters impersonated on the stage. (McGrath 1974, 238)

Beside the artistic complaints, there was also a different objection: philosophy was supposed to be an exact, logical, coherent discipline. The artist's image did not quite match this prerequisite imposed by Vienna's academics. On the contrary, they considered the painting as "formless, incomprehensible, a dream-painting, the exact opposite of genuine philosophy". Others hurried to express their viewpoint without even having seen the painting: I don't know Klimt. I haven't seen the picture. But I hate modern art so passionately that I avoid it whenever I can".

Whether accepted or loathed, *Philosophy*, when exhibited, gathered a crowd around it and became the source of debates, some for, some against it, some acceptable, some utterly aggressive. However, the final blow was struck by the group of 87 university professors who signed the petition to reject the painting.

One from the group was **Friedrich Jödl** who, in order to account for his attitude, said: "It's not that I think the painting inappropriate for the university, it's that I simply think it a bad painting... it's not the nudity that offends, but the ugliness. Moreover, the dark, unclear symbolism, which no one can understand, contradicts the whole point of the work... We're not opposed to nudity or artistic freedom, we're against ugly art".

Hermann Bahr is one of the main leaders of the modernist movement in Vienna and one of Gustav Klimt's most important supporters. He is equally remembered for writing and publishing much to support the Secession movement. He was a person of great influence among the artistic élite. "He worked Vienna's cultural networks shrewdly, he was a close friend with theater managers and editors, his reviews could make or break actors, and his own novels, essays, plays, flowed constantly" (Whalen 2007, 141).

Indignant at the academic protesters' reaction, he sent a petition against them. He also strove to fight off the vehement attacks on Klimt and his paintings, which he published in a booklet entitled "Gegen Klimt/Against Klimt", where he collected a number of slurs directed at the painter that had been published in the press of the time and refuted them, exposing them as ridiculous and groundless.

Hermann Bahr would remark that the whole argument around Klimt's work was set against a more intricate contention between modern artists and the bunch of Philistines. This was a contention whose stake was "rather on the moral side than on the artistic" (Whitford 1991, 61). The idea that Bahr supported was that, generally speaking, at an initial stage, great artists are not understood by the throng and then their art becomes by necessity elitist. In other words, art has always set as its goal "to address the aesthetic sentiment of a minority of sensitive, elevated, noble and pure people; while the throng follows in at a slow pace, and slowly learn from them what the good and the beauty are".

What was, then, Bahr's main argument in Klimt's favour? Firstly, he appreciated the earnestness with which the painter worked. He also claimed that the painter's worldview may not be agreeable to everyone, but that does not preclude its grandeur. That is why the German critic would write: "That life is transitory is something every Austrian knows, (a profound truth within our misunderstood "gaiety"), and no one has brought his truth before our eyes with more grace than Klimt. To him the tiniest things are the portals of heaven. Every truth fades into appearance. Whatever he touches eludes him, whatever he holds is transformed" (cited by Whalen 2007, 142).

Franz Wickhoff was a supporter of the idea that modern art requires and must practice a certain form of ambiguity. Viennese academism and its need for clarity in terms of expression would be faced

with precisely this type of ambiguity in Klimt's works for the university. As an art critic and historian, as well as a supporter of what was new, Wickhoff could, at the most, display a certain amount of leniency regarding the clear, easily decipherable pieces (which can be deemed as banale for modern taste). Jödl's reaction to Klimt's work elicited Wickhoff's strong discontent; on asking the question "What is ugly in art?", he offered an appropriate answer: "The layman is too easily inclined to find a work ugly if he cannot immediately dissect it as understandable". (Bahr 2009, 60-64) After all, he claimed, *The Sistine Chapel* and Phidias' *Athena* could be thought of as just as undecipherable.

It should be noted, though, that Wickhoff's speech "*Was ist häßlich?*", delivered in front of Philosophical Society of Vienna, was never published, that is why information on it can only be obtained from Hermann Bahr's text, who accessed it by means of the press. Wickhoff insisted on the mistake some of the art critics of the time were making, who equalled beauty to the art of the past, ignoring at the same time the "visionary progressivism" of contemporary art. "With no frame of reference by which to judge the merits of this avant-garde painting, popular opinion had condemned Klimt for exceeding common understanding, thus betraying the public's own parochial view of the world." (Bahr 2009, 64) The scandal raised by the conservative critics and the endless arguments around the painting *Philosophy* finally made Wickhoff to label them as ignorants.

In search for the answer to the question "What is ugly in art?", one should consider the frequent confusion between the beautiful or ugly subject of an art object and the beautiful or ugly work of art itself. Aesthetically, beauty has been opposed to ugliness along the time, and was considered its reversed image. One should equally consider the complex nature of this relation, since the opposition between them has been associated to other such pairs as *matter and form*, *life and death*, *good and evil*, for "ugliness may lie attached to life, to a different form of beauty, to a renewal of form" (Aubry, *Le Nouvel Observateur*, 8 novembre 2007). For this reason, Raymond Polin considers that ugliness is the otherness (*alter*) of beauty.

E. Moutsopoulos even mentions a "lustful pleasure caused by ugliness, coming from the wish to break established idols and to institute an internal dialectic between the two categories" (Moutsopoulos 1976, 41-42). It is Klimt's very aim, who thus opposes the academics at the university and the type of art they promoted and encouraged. This would be explained by the fact that often artistic conscience opposes already established values; this opposition is associated with the pleasure derived from approaching what is forbidden and what is outside the realm of rules.

Umberto Eco remarked on the fact that tradition has set a considerable number of rules for beauty, and none for ugliness. This may be simply

because along the centuries ugliness has not been the choice topic for debate and there are few texts on it. On the other hand, it is a well known fact that ugliness has constantly raised the artists' interest: the satyr's masks in the ancient Greek comedies or tragedies, the monsters such as Medusa (representations through which ugliness is opposed to beauty). Through the very prerequisite condition of observing these rules, beauty is also bound to be confined to certain limitations, while for Eco ugliness is infinite, in other words, it is "more complex, more varied, more amusing." This remark supports Victor Hugo's statement that "the beautiful has but one type, the ugly has a thousand".

One of the most frequent confusing aspects is the association of ugliness of the represented object with the ugliness of the manner of representation, i.e. of the work of art. This association had been already remarked on and criticised when authors such as Aristotle claimed that "objects which in themselves we view with pain, we delight to contemplate when reproduced with minute fidelity: such as the forms of the most ignoble animals and of dead bodies" (Aristotle 2000, 7). We can, therefore, ask ourselves what precisely attracts us towards such works? What is usually emphasized is the perfection of the rendition or of the colouring, Aristotle poses as an answer.

The Romantics would say that distorted, horrible, even hideous things, when transferred in art, will become sublime, without, however, losing any of those aspects which define them as ugly. It is the virtue of the Romantics who ascertained that art cannot be reduced to the effect of beauty, that an attraction towards ugliness is parallel to an attraction towards beauty. In his volume *Aesthetik des Hässlichen*, Rosenkranz presents the way in which ugliness can be used purposefully, as ugliness and whatever causes horror can become objects for art. Thus, it can be said that ugliness and even repulsive objects receive an autonomous aesthetic status, as there is no further need for reference to beauty and its criteria. V. Hugo establishes the need to it as a modern man's feature to break constraining norms and rules and to lend ugliness and the horrible the quality of art.

Ludwig Hevesi is, in his turn, a supporter of Klimt and his art. He was equally a supporter of the Secession movement. A well-known art critic of his time, he wrote in the newspaper *Fremden-Blatt* between 1875 and 1910. Like Hermann Bahr, he played an important role in forming and educating the Viennese public's taste for art. He distinguished himself for his somewhat peculiar style and the critical method to approach topics. His greatest merit was that of happily combining the elements and features pertaining to historicism with those of modernism; his later studies indicate that "the evolutionary character of historicism and its changing interpretation during the period". (Sarmany-Parsons 2008, 87) This remark is important in that, as Ilona Sarmany-Parsons remarked, most of the books

published in the past three decades insist mainly on the opposition between the modernism of the 1890s and the conservative attitude and the antiquated element of the historicist art, while ignoring their continuity and complementarity. At any rate, his writings on art proved to be essential for certain authors who attempted at analysing the connection between the Viennese art of late 19th century and that of the beginning 20th century.

L. Hevesi considered *Philosophy* a masterful piece of art, a great vision that was misconceived. This is how the critic describes the painting: "We mediate at stardust, the swirl of atoms, the elemental forces in search for object that make all these tangible to us. Clouds of sparks fly around; each sparkle is a star, red, blue, green, yellow-orange or golden...The artist offers a colour harmony that sets the eye dreaming. At some point, from this chromatic display, a green cloud is gathering...An immovable stone face appears, as impenetrable as that of a Egyptian basalt sphynx ... It is the enigma, the image of the cosmic enigma, its approximation. Along this silent, covert face, a crowd brimming with life is moving. Charming children, youngsters with glowing bodies interlock, have the experience of desire and disaster, fight and struggle against human suffering, before rising again against the brevity of human life. Only the old man, head in hands, is sunk in these depths like a helpless clam [...] Klimt [...] commissioned to offer the allegory of the most mysterious branch of knowledge, found a genuinely pictorial solution to this problem.(author's translation)". (cited in Nebehay 1969, 212)

Klimt's answer to criticism: Goldfish

All these debates around the panels for the university, along with the repeated refusal to appoint him as Professor at the Academy of Fine Arts, where he was elected in 1893 and 1901, aroused Klimt's discontent. Tired at what was going on, he created a piece entitled *To my critics*, whose name he later changed to *Goldfish* (1901-1902) at his friends' persistent request.

This painting would raise even greater discontent and bitter criticism at the artist. What, however, made Klimt's work such a topic for debate? The answer is in the fore-ground of the piece, where the gibbous buttocks of a red-haired naiad are represented, her head turned, looking over her shoulder, smiling at the audience; further to the back, the partially represented, less enticing back of the black haired naiad is painted. The other two female figures seen from the front have the same enticing smile. We immediately recognize in the posture of the naiad in the fore-ground the male equivalent in the allegory *Medicine*, where the figure on Hygeea's right stands with his back towards the viewer.

This was the answer the artist deemed appropriate to all criticism, attacks and denigrations to himself and his work. A rather slighting answer for those whom it was addressed to, hence their prompt reaction.

The goldfish in the title, although comparatively large in the painting, goes virtually unnoticed as a simple element of the background, while the diminutive fishes with their gilded heads are almost lost against the small decorative area placed between the female figures in the upper part of the painting. The manner in which they are represented is somewhat reminiscent of another painting, *Silverfish (Nymphs)*, 1899), where the fishes are the last element one would notice, as the eye of the viewer is caught by the two nymphs. Klimt had approached aquatic motifs before, in his paintings *Moving Water* (1898) or *Fish Blood* (1898); such manner of expression will be revisited later in *Water Serpents I, II* (1904-1907).

However, in all these painting the surprising element is the naiads' hair, a symbolic "weapon" with genuine seductive power. Several of the artists of the period (Beardsley, Dante Gabriel Rossetti, Mucha, Toorop, Munch) had been fascinated by the female hair and placed much emphasis on the motif. It should be noted, though, that with Klimt, hair and the aquatic environment have strong sexual connotations: "At a time when respectable women kept their hair up and under careful control in public situation, the sight of such free-flowing hair held connotations of loss of inhibitions and unbridled sexuality" (Rogoyska, Bade 2011, 92). For this reason, the manner in which he presented sexuality and sensuousness in *Goldfish* (as well as in his other works) was seen as fascinating as well as threatening.

Finally, the artist decided to withdraw the paintings made for the university. In this context, he would explain to Bertha Zuckerkandl, a Viennese journalist: "The main reason for my deciding to ask for the paintings to be returned, do not lie in any annoyance that the various attacks might have aroused in me. All that had very little effect on me at the time, and would not have taken away the joy I felt in this work. I am in general very insensitive to attacks. But I am all the more sensitive if I come to feel that someone who has commissioned my work is not satisfied with it. And that is the case with the ceiling paintings".

At the same time, he makes the decision never to work on commission for a public institution again in order to spare himself any further ideological or stylistic restraints. "I've had enough of censorship. I'm going to help myself now. I want to break free. I want to get rid of all those unpleasant trivialities holding up my work and regain my freedom. I reject all state support, I don't want any of it... Above all, I want to take a stand against the way in which art is treated in the Austrian state and the Ministry of Education. Whenever there's an opportunity, genuine art and genuine artist are under attack. The only thing that's ever protected is feebleness and falsehood. [...] The state should not seek to exercise dictatorial control over

exhibitions and artistic statements; it should confine its role to that of mediator and commercial agent and should leave the artistic initiative entirely to the artist themselves...” (cited in Novotny/ Dobai 1967, 388).

References:

- Aristotle. 2000. *Poetics*, (translated by S. H. Butcher), Philadelphia: The Pennsylvania State University Press
- Aubry, Gwenaëlle. 2007. *Le (Dé)goût de la laideur*, Paris: Mercure de France
- Bahr, Hermann. 2009. *Rede über Klimt, Gegen Klimt*, Weimar: VDG
- Barasch, Moshe. 1998. *Modern Theories of Art 2: from Impressionism to Kandinsky*, New York/ London: New York University Press
- Baudelaire, Charles. 1992. *Pictorul vieții modern și alte curiozități (The Painter of Modern Life and Other Essays)*, București: Editura Meridiane
- Eco, Umberto. 2007. *Histoire de la laideur*, Paris: Flammarion
- Hofmann, Werner. 1970. *Gustav Klimt und die wiener Jahrhundertwende*, Salzburg: Verlag Galerie Welz
- Hugo, Victor, *Cromwell*, Preface (1827), http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Preface_to_Cromwell
- Laforgue, Jules. 1996. *Berlin: The City and the Court*, (Introduction and translation William Jay Smith), New York: Turtle Point Press
- McGrath J. W. 1974. *Dionysian Art and Populist Politic in Austria*, New Heaven: Yale University Press
- Moutsopoulos Evanghelos. 1976. *Categoriile estetice. Introducere la o axiologie a obiectului estetic*, București: Editura Univers
- Nebehay Christian. 1969. *Gustav Klimt: Dokumentation*, Wien: Galerie Christian M. Nebehay
- Nebehay Christian. 1979. *Gustav Klimt. Sein Leben nach zeitgenössischen Berichten und Quellen*, München: Deutscher Taschenbuch Verlag
- Novotny, Fritz/ Dobai Johannes. 1967. *Gustav Klimt*, Salzburg: Verlag der Galerie Welz
- Rogowska Jane, Bade Patrick. 2011. *Gustav Klimt*, New York: Parkstone Press International
- Sarmany-Parsons Ilona. 2008. *The Art Criticism of Ludwig Hevesi in the Age of Historicism*, JSTOR: Austrian Studies, vol. 16 (2008), pp. 87-104
- Strobl, Alice. 1964. „Zu den Fakultätsbildern von Gustav Klimt“, *Albertina Studien*, Issue 1, Wien
- Whalen, Robert Weldon. 2007. *Sacred Spring: God and the Birth of Modernism in Fin-de-Siècle Vienna*, Michigan: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Co
- Whitford, Frank. 1991. *Gustav Klimt*, Paris: Thames & Hudson



Klimt, *The Goldfish*, 1901-1902