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Gustav Klimt's work at Peleș Castle, which was unknown until now due to the cultural isolation of Communist Romania, is the focus of this study. Against the background of Carol of Hohenzollern's life and activities as King of Romania (1866-1914), the castle is viewed as playing an important role in forming the King's new identity in his new homeland. The eclectic decoration of the castle reflects Carol's life experience and character. The King represented the best match for Klimt's artistic aspirations at that time.

Klimt's early life and work during the early 1880s is examined in the light of his work at Peleș Castle. The artist was working for audiences in search of establishing their own social identity and his art may have been attractive to King Carol. On the other hand, Klimt was encouraged to innovate both by the special setting of his art and the social and cultural needs of his patron.

The Peleș paintings show that Klimt's original style was visible at a much earlier date in his career than scholars believed until now.
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INTRODUCTION

The second half of the nineteenth century in Europe was a period of unprecedented artistic diversity, which found its supreme expression in eclecticism. Against this background, the 1890s appear in historiographical perspective as a period of dramatic change, which ultimately led to the revolution known as Art Nouveau. Until recently, the period between Biedermeier and Art Nouveau was viewed as a veritable nineteenth-century "dark age." However, art historians have begun to understand the creative and cultural dynamics between this period of eclecticism and Art Nouveau.

A particularly interesting monument for the study of this transition is Peleș Castle in Romania, the summer residence of King Carol. A complex and controversial monarch, Carol of Hohenzollern became prince of Romania in 1866. He viewed himself as the leader of a small East European country with a nonetheless vital role to play in the European order. The new Romanian king began to employ art and architectural patronage in order to establish his own identity and legitimacy as Romania's head of the state.

Peleș Castle, built shortly after the proclamation
of Carol as King of Romania (1881), represented, from the very beginning, a major focus both in Carol's life and in that of Romanian society. Carol was involved in every aspect of its construction and decoration, for he proudly viewed Peleș as his principal residence. Carol's own search for identity explains some surprising artistic choices. One of these choices concerns Gustav Klimt's commission to decorate the castle. Klimt's work, almost unknown until now due to the cultural isolation of Communist Romania, is not only remarkable in its artistic value but extremely interesting from a historiographical point of view. The aim of this work is to draw serious attention to this important monument of art and to explain its artistic and social meaning. The underlying thrust of my argument is that royal patronage and the socio-cultural circumstances peculiar to Romania in that period substantially affected both the form and content of the artist's work.

I have been attracted by Klimt's work at Peleș since my early years of study and work at the Office of Patrimony at the History and Art Museum of the City of Bucharest. Objets d'art from the former royal collections often appeared in private hands, and I was always surprised by the particular veneration of which they were subject, even after many decades of Communist anti-dynastic policies. I also found it remarkable that the true
personality of the individuals who purchased and owned such objects was far less important than the value attached to them by this history. My interest thus shifted from 'pure' art history to history, though I found substantial encouragement and support from my professors and colleagues to continue my training in art history. In the process of researching and writing this thesis, I have benefitted immensely from the help and advice of many individuals. First and foremost were the expertise and generosity of Prof. Carmen Râchițeanu and Ruxandra Dreptu, with whom I worked in Bucharest. I owe a special debt of gratitude to my thesis advisors at Western Michigan University, in particular to my director, Dr. John Norman, and my readers, Dr. Barbara Brotherton (Art Department), and Dr. Michael Chiarappa (History). I am extremely grateful for their help and guidance.
The coup d'état that led to Prince Alexandru Ioan Cuza's abdication in 1866 created more problems than it presumably tried to solve. The political atmosphere at Cuza's abdication was extremely strained. Internal strife resulted in a wide variety of political options, from a monarchy under the former Prince Bibescu (favored by the old boyars) to a republic with Ioan Brătianu as president (the option of the more radical groups). A separatist movement emerged at Iași, the capital-city of Moldavia, one of the two principalities from which modern Romania was created in 1859. After Prince Alexander Ioan Cuza abdicated in February 1866, the two Chambers met and elected by acclamation Philip Count of Flanders, the younger brother of Leopold II of Belgium, as prince of Romania. This, however, was in blatant contradiction with the principles set by all Great Powers at the Paris conference in 1858. Although the idea of a prince from a non-native dynasty had been very popular in the years immediately before the Union of 1859, the conference had decided that only a native Romanian could have been elected as prince of the newly created state. Thus, by proposing Philip's candidacy, the Romanians ran counter
to the *status quo*. The Sublime Porte immediately protested against this decision, asking for a new conference of the Great Powers. Unlike 1859, due to a changing balance of power, France was in no position to offer any help. As tension mounted between Prussia and Austria, Napoleon III spared no effort to secure Venice for Italy. In February 1866, as the coup d'état in Romania forced Cuza to abdicate, the French Emperor favored a deal whereby the Austrians would be compensated with the Romanian principalities if they ceded Venice to the Italians. The 'nationality principle', it seems, was expendable in the case of the Romanians. Philip of Flanders declined the proffered throne, since as a grandson of the "Bourgeois King," Louis Philip, he would scarcely have been accepted by Napoleon. The Italian situation was still at the forefront of the French ruler's mind when the conference required by the Ottoman Empire convened in Paris on March 10, 1866. Facing an unexpected opposition by Russia and Austria, Napoleon reluctantly allowed the conference to settle the affairs of Moldavia and Wallachia. Young Brătianu and his friends, all of whom were the "men of 1848," the most important actors in the Revolution of 1848, wanted a "Lieutenant-Prince" and asked the advice of the French ruler, who discreetly directed them toward a new candidate, Karl (Carol) of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, then twenty-seven years old. It is not clear
who exactly advanced the name of this younger son of the former Prussian Prime Minister, Karl Anton of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen. In his memoirs, Carol claims that the first to suggest his name to Napoleon were Hortense Cornu and the baroness of Franque. Both were good friends of both the Hohenzollern family and of Mathilde, the French Foreign Minister's wife. Napoleon enthusiastically supported the idea, for the Hohenzollerns were related to both the French and the Prussian royal houses.  

Ion C. Brătianu, who was in Paris at the time, seems to have been well informed on these developments. On March, 30, 1866, he went to Düsseldorf, where Karl (Carol) was visiting his father, the military governor of the Rhineland and Westphalia. After a three-hour audience, Brătianu obtained a formal agreement from Carol's father, who, however, insisted that the final decision must rest with King Wilhelm, the head of the Hohenzollern family. The Prussian King, however, preferred a more cautious approach, arguing that as a Hohenzollern Carol was worthy of more than becoming ruler of a country, which, at that time, was still a vassal of the Ottoman Empire. Brătianu, however, did not wait for the king's answer and immediately announced to the government in Bucharest that Carol had accepted the Romanian crown. As a consequence, the referendum organized by the government
on April 2, 1866 was decided in favor of Carol. If we are to believe Carol's own testimony, it was precisely the Bucharest referendum that impressed the young prince so much, that he decided to accept the Romanian crown even without the approval of the Great Powers. King Wilhelm, impressed by his determination, declared his tacit support.

Carol's trip to Romania coincided with the beginning of the Austro-Prussian war. Disguised as Karl Hettingen (from the name of one of the Hohenzollern castles in Swabia), a Swiss citizen travelling to Odessa for business, Carol arrived safely in Romania via Vienna and Budapest. On May, 10, 1866, he was proclaimed prince of Romania and crowned by the metropolitan Nifon. The period following Carol's election to the Romanian throne represents one of the most important periods in the modern history of Southeastern Europe.

Carol was a member of one of the oldest and noblest families of Germany. Little is known of the family's history prior to the late 1000s. The Zollerns were close relatives to the Burcharding Dukes of Swabia. The first Zollerns attested by medieval annals under the year 1061 were the Counts Burchard and Wezel. According to the family tradition, Burchard built the family castle at Zollern, near Sigmaringen, and supposedly devised the Hohenzollern coat of arms with its motto "Allweg gut
"Zolre" (By all means, be a good Zollern). The Swabian line was founded by Friedrich II (who died in 1251), the son of the first Zollern burggrave of Nuremberg. Another burggrave of Nuremberg, Friedrich VI (1371-1440), a member of the Franconian line, fought in the Nicopolis crusade of 1396, which ended in a catastrophic defeat. He was responsible for saving King Sigismund of Hungary from being taken prisoner by the Turks. Count Karl I of Hohenzollern brought Sigmaringen into his family's possessions in 1535. The Swabian branch of the Hohenzollern family split into three lines in 1576. The Hohenzollern-Haigerloch line died out in 1634, and the Hohenzollern-Hechingen became extinct in 1869. The surviving line, the Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, became Princes of Hohenzollern in 1638.

In the early 1800s, the Hohenzollern-Sigmaringens allied themselves with Napoleon. Stéphanie of Beauharnais, who married the future Grand Duke of Baden, Karl Ludwig Friedrich, was Carol's grandmother. Stéphanie's daughter and Carol's mother, Joséphine, married Karl Anton of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, the last Prince of Hohenzollern. Carol was their second-born. Carol's elder brother, Leopold, would become the principal actor in the Franco-Prussian crisis leading to the war of 1870, as he was offered the vacant throne of Spain. Carol's younger sister, Stéphanie, became queen
of Portugal by marrying King Pedro V in 1859.\textsuperscript{17}

Carol (German: Karl) was born at Sigmaringen on April 20, 1839. Much of his later penchant for the Carpathian mountains and Sinaia can be explained by his early years in the Hohenzollern Alpine residences, either at Inzighofen and Krauchenwies castles, near Sigmaringen, at Umkirch, near Freiburg in Breisgau, his maternal grandmother's castle, or at Weinburg, his other grandmother's castle in Switzerland.\textsuperscript{18} Following the 1848 revolution, Carol's father was one of the first territorial German princes to recognize the Prussian King's suzerainty in 1849. In his speech, Karl Anton explicitly referred to the cause of German unity as one reason for his giving up of the title of Prince of Hohenzollern.\textsuperscript{19}

Carol grew in an atmosphere imbued with German nationalism, particularly after 1850, as his father was appointed commander of the 14th Division and the family moved from Sigmaringen to Düsseldorf. Following his studies at Dresden (1850-1856), Carol travelled to both Italy and Switzerland, but it is interesting to note that he was attracted as much by the Alpine regions of northern Italy as by the beautiful cities of Genoa, Milan, and Venice.\textsuperscript{20}

In 1857, Carol was appointed Second-Lieutenant in the Prussian army and came to Berlin to the School of Artillery and Engineering. He also participated to the life of the Prussian court, as his father became prime-minister
in 1858. Karl Anton, however, resigned in 1862, being followed at his own recommendation by the Prussian ambassador at St. Petersburg, Otto von Bismarck. Although already an officer, Carol did not participate to the Prussian campaign during the war in Italy in 1859. Following his visit to Lisbon in 1861 he travelled extensively in southern France and the next year in Algeria. He visited Constantine, where he was impressed by the last bey's residence, now occupied by French officers. Here the Bousaada oasis episode took place. Carol's arrival in Bousaada coincided with heavy and quite unusual rains, which made the local sheiks believe Carol had supernatural powers. They all prostrated themselves in front of his horse. The future king was very impressed by Algeria and the Bousaada episode may have inspired the "Moorish room" at the Peleș castle.

In 1862, Carol attended lectures at the University of Bonn and took private lectures in French literature. He was also appointed First-Lieutenant in the second Dragoon regiment, thus returning to Berlin. In December 1863, he visited France again, this time at the invitation of the Emperor's family. He spent the last weeks of the year at Compiègne, witnessing Napoleon III's hunting parties organized in full eighteenth-century attire, with the Empress and her suite dressed as Amazons.

As the Prussian-Danish War for Schleswig-Holstein
started, Carol was appointed the Crown Prince's ordnance officer and participated at the battle of Fridericia. In 1869, three years after becoming prince of Romania, Carol married Princess Elizabeth (Elisabeta) of Wied (born in 1843), the eldest daughter of the Duke of Nassau, and sister of the future Queen of Sweden. They had a daughter, Maria, born on October 12, 1870, who died four years later. Both Elisabeta and Maria influenced Carol's personality. I will later return to the role played by Maria's death in Carol's decision to build the Peleş castle at Sinaia. Queen Maria of Romania, the wife of Carol's successor to the Romanian throne, would later describe Carol as a rather stern personality, with a particular concern for precision and punctuality. There is however plenty of evidence that Carol favored, particularly after his daughter's death in 1874, a low key profile. Interviewed by Neue Freie Presse after his meeting with Emperor Franz Joseph in 1910, he emphasized that "kings are simple human beings, they could talk among themselves about simply human matters. They do not strike historical poses."

It is precisely this human dimension that strikes the reader of his memoirs. Carol was certainly very impressed by the referendum of 1866 and sincerely believed in what he viewed as his mission. His adventurous inclinations may have played a role in his acceptance of
the Romanian throne. As Paul Michelson put it, though "the fates of other European princes who had embarked on such romantic adventures, such as Othon of Greece and Maximilian of Mexico, were not exactly encouraging," Carol brought to Romania his determination and innate austerity. Carol saw as his long-range task to establish, by personal example and good administration, moral and financial rectitude in a country "utterly ruined by the past." He however was not ignorant of that past, especially of its glorious moments. He later compared his leading of the Romanian armies to victory in the 1877-1878 war against Turkey, by which Romania obtained its independence, to Friedrich VI's participation to the Nicopolis crusade of 1396, particularly because in both cases, Nicopolis witnessed confrontations between Romanian and Ottoman troops.

But Carol's adaptation to the new environment must have been very difficult. His role in the internal political life of the country was, at least initially, very limited, for he lacked personal popularity and was unacquainted with both people and political issues. He must also have experienced something of a cultural shock. At his arrival in 1866, Carol found the city of Turnu Severin, in western Romania, "rather unpleasant." He was horrified by his trip to Bucharest, especially by the little coach drawn by eight small horses, driven by two
very noisy postilions, driving across the fields of Oltenia, without following any established road or path. He crossed the country's major rivers (the Jiu and the Olt) by raft, since no bridges existed at that time. He also disliked the idea (suggested by one of his Romanian companions) of changing into a Romanian general's uniform before entering Bucharest. When asking about the royal palace, he was shown a single-floor house, formerly belonging to the Golescu family, which Carol viewed as "extremely primitive." But his first walk in Bucharest, despite the lack of any street lights, convinced him that the city had a certain charm. 31

Carol remained in the Golescu house until the radical transformation of the building in 1883, which gave the royal palace its present-day form. It was here that Carol brought his wife in 1869 and his daughter was born in 1870. It seems however that neither Carol, nor Elisabeta liked the city of Bucharest, at least not during the hot summer months. As early as 1866, soon after arriving in Romania, Carol visited the monastery of Sinaia, some 70 miles north of Bucharest, in the middle of the wilderness of the Carpathian mountains. In 1871, when Carol became ill and needed a change of air, he decided to spend the entire summer at the monastery in the mountains, together with Elisabeta and their newborn child. Carol's decision to move away from Bucharest
coincided with the anti-dynastic uprising of 1870 and the ensuing political struggle between Conservatives and Liberals. 32

At Sinaia, the royal family was given a small building near the monastery church by the monastic community. Carol and his wife preferred to stay here, though there was already a hotel "in Swiss style" built in the valley, in the middle of the Sinaia hamlet. 33 Though living a rather humble life, the royal couple indulged in a few luxuries, such as a piano for Elisabeta. 34 In 1871, Elisabeta's mother, Princess Maria of Wied, visited her daughter and son-in-law at Sinaia. The three of them decided to find a spot for a country house, which Carol and Elisabeta had long wished to build in the middle of the wilderness.

The following year (1872), Carol and Elisabeta spent again the hot summer months at Sinaia, this time bringing with them their respective retinues. At Sinaia, Carol was visited by his ministers, who found that the prince was an entirely different person, when away from Bucharest. Instead of a rather formal and dry attitude, they were surprised to find a relaxed and cheerful man. 35

In the summer of 1873, Carol and Elisabeta visited the World's Fair at Vienna, where Romania had a pavilion. At Ems, they met Alexander II, the Tsar of Russia, and Wilhelm, the German Emperor. On their way back, after
crossing the Romanian-Hungarian frontier, they first halted at Sinaia. They chose a different place for the country house, on the Peleș Creek valley. Carol had sketches and plans by Wilhelm Doderer, a professor of architecture at the Viennese Technical School (Technische Hochschule). This choice may have been motivated by the impression made on Carol by Vienna, in particular by its impressive Ringstraβe with buildings designed in the 1850s by Ludwig Förster. But the most remarkable architectural development of the 1860s and 1870s in Vienna was the romanticized country villa, a large, eclectic successor to the simple Biedermeier country house. Such villas proliferated in the suburbs, as the upper middle classes sought to escape the heat and clamor of the city. The interiors of these villas were modelled after the well-known, richly decorated atelier of Hans Makart, with its tiger skins, Turkish rugs, Venetian glass, elephant tusks, Moorish lamps, suits of armor, and miscellaneous chinoiserie. The Peleș castle, with its eclectic architecture, was inspired by the effect of the typical Makart-style interior, admirably described by the Viennese adjective aufgedonnert (loosely translated as "thundered-up").

Carol and Elisabeta returned to Sinaia only in 1875, after the traumatic experience of their daughter's death in 1874. The building of what had already begun to be
called "the castle" had made very little progress, both because of Carol's absence and a harsh winter. The construction teams also complained about the building site, located on top of underground springs, but Carol persisted in his decision. On August 22, 1875, he laid the foundation stone in a ceremony, which likened the construction of the edifice to the building of the Romanian state. Soon thereafter work restarted on a much larger scale. In her memoirs, Queen Elisabeta described the wide variety of languages spoken by workers hired at Sinaia: Italian, French, English, Serbian, German, and Romanian. According to Carol's wish, most of the construction material employed came from quarries situated nearby, at Piatra Arsă, Lunca Mare, and Slănic. But work at the Peleș castle stopped when the Russo-Turkish War started in 1877, followed by Romania's declaration of independence and Carol's involvement in the war that brought the Romanian army to victory. Equipped with Krupp canons and Peabody infantry guns, the Romanian army crossed the Danube, as Carol was appointed by Alexander II as supreme commander of the Russo-Romanian army besieging the Turks at Pleven. Carol was the first to break the Ottoman defence at Pleven, after four successive Russian attacks failed to take the fortress, and Osman Pasha, the famous commander of the Turkish troops, surrendered to the Romanians. Alexander II decorated Carol with the Cross of
Saint-Andrew, though in the following months Russia proved to be Romania's worst enemy, as both the treaty of San Stefano (1877) and the diplomatic struggle at Berlin (1878) demonstrated. But in the end, Romania's independence was recognized worldwide and Carol was proclaimed king in 1881. A period of rapid economic growth followed: the Romanian railway system was built, roads and bridges constructed, the National Bank founded. The King was deeply involved in many aspects of this growth, as he donated 300,000 franks yearly to cultural institutions, led and helped the Romanian Academy with money from the civil list and crown estates (to be established by law in 1884), and financed the Geographical Society, the restoration of cathedrals, and the publishing of the first etymological dictionary of the Romanian language.40

It was in this atmosphere of economic and cultural boom, that both royal residences, that of Bucharest and that of Peleş, took a new form. In 1883, the royal palace in Bucharest underwent substantial transformations. The building received two additional floors and the King's study room, the main living room, the library, and some other rooms received a decoration in German Renaissance style, according to Carol's taste. Queen Elisabeta's music room was also decorated with paintings, tapestries and bronzes in the same style. In addition, a winter garden was set at the first floor. All this, as well as
additional interior decoration was the work of Martin Stöhr, a German architect and interior decorator, who had come to Romania with Carol in 1867. Carol was a passionate furniture collector since his early years in Berlin. Stöhr brought to Romania a large number of artists from various German centers producing sculpted furniture (Augsburg, Lübeck, and Nuremberg), who worked on the interior decoration of the Cotroceni palace in Bucharest. In 1883 Carol also purchased a rich collection of paintings from the German consul at Bucharest, G. Bamberg. This became the basis for the royal collection, which Carol enlarged through subsequent purchases. It included especially works by late Renaissance or Baroque artists, such as Raphael, Botticelli, Vasari, Guido Reni, Titian, Lucas Cranach, Teniers, Van Dyck, Rembrandt, Ribera, Velázquez, Murillo, and Reynolds.41

At Peleș, work resumed in August 1878, as Carol hired a new architect, Johann Schultz from Vienna, to replace Doderer, whose initial design was too expensive.42 Stöhr became the chief architect.43 Major changes affected both the plan, the size and the building materials employed (more brick and wood than stone, as required by Doderer's initial blueprints). At the same time, work started on building the railway between Predeal (near the Hungarian-Romanian frontier) and Câmpina, north of Ploiești, thus connecting Bucharest to
Sinaia. Carol himself chose the building site for the railway station in Sinaia.\textsuperscript{44} In April 1880, Carol and Elisabeta made their first trip by train to Sinaia. Impatient, Carol again visited the building site in November.\textsuperscript{45} A royal dinner was first served in the future Knight's Room in April 1881, as King Carol and Queen Elisabeta went to Peleș immediately after the coronation.\textsuperscript{46} But the castle was only dedicated on October 7, 1883. A special medal was ordered for that occasion at Berlin.\textsuperscript{47}

The castle was built in the style of the sixteenth-century German Renaissance. Contemporaries compared it to the Bavarian king's castle at Hohenschwangau, but the use of late Renaissance as a source of inspiration for German architecture was very common in the 1860s and 1870s. In Germany, the sixteenth century was viewed as a century of national development, which is why the \textit{altdeutscher Wohnstil}, sometimes defined as late Gothic, sometimes as late Renaissance, became the basis for a German, 'national' architectural style of this period. It is no accident that Jakob Burckhardt's monumental work on the Italian Renaissance was published in 1860, as the German architect Lorenz Gedon organized the first exhibit, significantly entitled "The Works of Our Ancestors", which imposed the (German) Renaissance as an architectural model. The Neo-Renaissance house was also the backbone of
the contemporary Viennese architecture, well represented in the Ringstraβe building program of the 1860s. One of the most famous Viennese producers of sculpted furniture, Ludwig Bernhard, and his son, supplied many royal residences in the Balkans with sculpted furniture. The Peleș castle has many elements typical of a neo-Renaissance palace. First, the functional differentiation of the rooms (Herrenzimmer, Frauenzimmer, the nursing room, living room, library) is underlined by specific decorative elements. The large central hall at Peleș with its imposing main stairs is marked by portraits of ten members of the Hohenzollern family. One of them is the almost legendary Burkhard, depicted with the castle at Zollern in the background. The other is Eitel Friedrich VI, dressed in the full attire of the crusader, and near him stays the first member of the Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen branch, in his seventeenth-century dress. Martin Stöhr carved the lavish, interior decoration of the central hall in various species of precious wood.

Much more impressive and indeed, in the very tone of the neo-Renaissance house, is the Knights' Room, with King Carol's impressive collection of armors and weapons. Here, the fireplace is decorated with a large bronze relief depicting the battle at Nicopolis (1396) at the very moment in which Friedrich VI saved the Hungarian king's life. But the collection also includes the main
gate of the Vidin fort conquered by Romanian soldiers in 1877. Four cannons captured by the Romanian army from the Turks during the War of 1877/8 were displayed outside the room, at the main entrance into the inner courtyard.\textsuperscript{50} The association of medieval weaponry with late nineteenth-century paraphernalia is an evident attempt to connect the late fourteenth-century ancestor's deed to Carol's own military exploits. The Oriental Room is also filled with references to North Africa (including a small bronze statue of a dromedary, a clear allusion to Carol's trip to Algeria). Again, according to the standards of the neo-Renaissance house, the library's stained-glass windows show a collection of images of the Hohenzollern castles.\textsuperscript{51} Similarly, the stained-glass windows of Elisabeta's boudoir depict scenes from Romanian folk-tales and allegories of Poetry and Art.

The neo-Renaissance influence became even stronger with changes to the castle's facade that were carried out, between 1905 and 1914, by the Austrian architect Karl Liman.\textsuperscript{52} At that time, the Peles castle has become the principal royal residence for Carol, Elisabeta and Crown Prince Ferdinand and his wife, the future Queen Maria. Much of the political life of the country revolved around this place and some very important political figures of Europe also stayed there: Emperor Franz Joseph and Archduke Ferdinand with his wife, the Bulgarian
Prince, Ferdinand, and the King of Sweden, Oskar II. Elisabeta also invited numerous artists, both Romanian and foreign. George Enescu, the famous Romanian composer, and Pierre Loti, Elisabeta's favorite French writer, were among the most famous.

As early as 1883, Gustav Klimt, Ernest Klimt and Franz Matsch were commissioned to decorate the Florentine Room and the Theater. I will discuss this work in the last chapter. As the Peles castle was reshaped again in 1905-1914, and a new, smaller residence was built not far from it (the Pelișor castle), the second and third floor of the castle were decorated in a strikingly different style which paid tribute to the Secession. An even stronger Art Nouveau influence is visible in the interior decoration of the Pelișor Castle, the residence of prince Ferdinand and his wife, Maria. Royal patronage of Art Nouveau was unusual, but by no means unique. Hermann Hirschwald's art shop in Berlin, the Hohenzollern-Kaufhaus, opened in 1879. It was regularly visited and supported by the Prussian Crown Prince and his wife. It was here that the first fashion exhibit using Art Nouveau patterns was organized in 1902. The Hohenzollern-Kaufhaus supplied the imperial family with both René Lalique's jewels and the products of the Wiener Werkstätte. In Russia, the Grand Duke Boris Vladimirovich's mansion at Tsarskoe Selo near St. Petersburg was designed in the
half-timbered English style reminiscent of Baillie Scott and furnished by the London retailers Maples. In the 1890s, the Grand Duchess Elizaveta Feodorovna of Hesse-Darmstadt, Nicholas II's sister-in-law, was patron of the Moscow Kustar (Craft) Industries Museum. She was also the patron of the Moscow exhibition of 1902, which brought together leading European artists, such as Kotera, Olbrich, Mackintosh, Margaret Macdonald, and Korovin.  

What is remarkable at Peleș, however, is that historicist and Art Nouveau elements coexist side by side. Peleș both "looks like something" and "is something." It is no accident that the castle became the magnet of Romanian high-life. By 1900, Sinaia was already an important city. Members of the Romanian aristocracy came here every year, especially after May 10 (the Independence Day, but also King Carol's birthday), and remained until late November. Around 1900, a large number of villas (the word itself entered the Romanian language in the years immediately following World War I) were built, significantly bearing their owners' names: Prince Dimitrie Ghica, Nicolae Blaremberg, Prince Știrbey, V. A. Urechia, C. Argetoianu, Take Ionescu, Al. Lahovari, Dr. Urlățeanu, N. Filipescu, or Gh. Cantacuzino. An ever increasing number of hotels (Regence, Ungarth, Palace, Caraiman) offered shelter to foreign ambassadors coming to Peleș to talk to the King. At Ungarth were also organized the most
famous balls, where the ladies of Queen Elisabeta's retinue, all members of some noble families (such as the later famous Elena Văcărescu) introduced the latest fashions from Paris. Sinaia also offered a rich material for the study of social imitation, as brilliantly illustrated by the work of the Romanian writer I. L. Caragiale (1852-1912). In one of his famous Sketches, which were published regularly between 1899 and 1901 in the newspaper Universul, Caragiale describes a trip by train from Bucharest to Sinaia and satirizes the vain pretensions of those aspiring to a life similar to that of the royal family. In another, he uses as a stage the central park in Sinaia on the eve of the second Balkan war (1913), as a Bucharest reporter collects rumors circulating in Sinaia, which would later prove to be false. An even more interesting depiction of ongoing social changes is the short story La Peleş (At Peleş), in which Caragiale depicts a family of snobs invited to the Castle. Caragiale's picture may seem exaggerated to modern eyes, but the Peleş castle was truly the center not only of the small Carpathian city, but in an ever increasing way, of Romanian society and cultural life. It is against this background that Klimt's work at Peleş should be considered.
Gustav Klimt was born on July 14, 1862 in Baumgarten, in the southwestern suburbs of Vienna. On his father's side, Klimt's ancestors were Bohemian soldiers and peasants. His father, Ernst (1834-1892) came from Drabschitz, near Leitmoritz, in northern Bohemia. Klimt's grandfather was a lifeguard in the household troops of Emperor Ferdinand I (1835-1848). Ernst Klimt became an engraver by trade and married a Viennese girl, Anna Pfister (1836-1915). Klimt's mother was particularly gifted and her wish was to sing in the opera; instead she became the mother of seven children. Ernst Klimt was a jeweller, working in the eclectic style of the historicist period. The Klimts, however, lived a rather modest life, often sharing a single room with their children and frequently moving for non-payment of rent. Their story was also typical of thousands, who had come to Vienna from Bohemia in search of a better life and attracted by the economic boom of the 1850s. The catastrophic stock market crash of 1873, following the financial failure of the Vienna World's Fair, threw many of those families into a miserable life. It was difficult for Klimt's father to find a job, and his family moved five times.
between 1862 and 1884. Even in 1889, as life for the Klimts seems to have improved considerably, Ernst Klimt's annual income amounted to only 832 ducats, less than half that of the average worker.60

Despite considerable difficulties, the Klimts were extremely ambitious in regard to their children's education. Gustav, the second child, displayed obvious artistic gifts from an early age. His younger brother Ernst was also a great talent, but his premature death at 28 ended a promising career. The youngest brother, Georg, became a consummate craftsman in metalwork.61 Gustav was not able to attend the Gymnasium, the type of secondary school that provided a thorough grounding in the humanities and languages in preparation for a university career. Instead, he spent eight years in the local Volks- und Bürgerschule in the seventh administrative district of Vienna.62 The school offered a sound but basic education to children expected to become factory workers, craftsmen or petty clerks. At age 14 Gustav obtained his diploma. His teachers judged his talent for drawing as remarkable and advised his parents to let him go through the examination for the recently founded School of Arts and Crafts. As Emperor Franz Joseph created in 1864 the Austrian Museum of Art and Industry, the School was set up as an extension of the museum, at the suggestion of the art historian and archaeologist Rudolf
Eitelberger von Edelberg (1817-1885). The model for this joint institution was the South Kensington Museum (present-day Victoria and Albert Museum) and the School itself was organized on English lines. The Viennese school and museum were the first continental institutions of applied art. The Museum of Art and Industry was indeed designed to provide visual aids and teaching for craft and industry, as well as to raise interest for quality manufacturing, an idea well attuned to the Liberal policies of the 1860s. The School was expected to teach practical skills and knowledge with a view of combining forms of industrial craftsmanship and artistic work. Doubts about the school's teaching philosophy gradually increased during the first two decades of its existence. One important argument was that it only taught drawing, without actually preparing students for their next job. Some even claimed that the School was unable to produce aesthetically mature culture and to create competitive art on the national and international market. Despite such criticism, learning by copying—the basic principle of the School's teaching philosophy—played an important role in the formation of artists such as Klimt. At least this is the impression left by his early works, showing strict training, oriented toward historical patterns and examples, which were so typical for the historicist art of the Ringstraße era.
Klimt passed with distinction the entrance examination to the School of Arts and Crafts, which consisted of making a copy of a plaster cast of a classical female head. In October 1876, at the age of 14, he began his studies, with the purpose of eventually becoming a drawing master at a Bürgerschule (secondary school), a position offering a secure salary and a guaranteed pension.\textsuperscript{67} Franz Matsch (1861-1942) also began his studies at the School in that same year. Klimt's brother, Ernst, was also admitted there in 1877. Since both brothers were on scholarship, the financial situation of the Klimt family considerably improved. Moreover, soon after being admitted to the School, the Klimt brothers began working for their teacher.\textsuperscript{68}

Gustav, Ernst and Franz Matsch first registered for core courses taught by Michael Riesel, Ludwig Minnigerode, and Karl Hrachowina.\textsuperscript{69} They thus practiced ornamental drawing, copying three-dimensional and flat ornaments, as well as commercial \textit{objets d'art}. They also drew human figures from plaster casts and paintings. Practice was accompanied by lectures on projection techniques, perspective, and style. In 1879, all three friends registered for their qualifying examinations in order to be admitted for state examinations, which would have enabled them to become drawing teachers in secondary schools. Matsch's diary would later record what happened
Then it happened that [Rudolf] Eitelberger [von Edelberg, the art historian], a man of high rank in Vienna..., once more visited the school. Professor Riesel probably drew Eitelberger's attention to us. He had a thorough look at our work. 'Drawing teachers?' —and shook his head in disagreement... 'You must become painters!' Each of us received a scholarship of twenty ducats a month, and we studied under Professor Ferdinand Laufberger, in the Department of Painting and Decorative Art.

An etcher, lithographer, and painter, Ferdinand Julius Laufberger (1829-1881) became professor of figure drawing at the School in 1868. He also decorated a few public buildings on the Ring. His first task, the creation of the second curtain in the Viennese Opera House, was completed in 1869. He was also involved with the wall paintings for the stairway of the Austrian Museum of Art and Industry and was responsible for the medallions on the facade of the School of Arts and Crafts, when the new building was put up in 1873. Laufberger was a supporter of the idea that paintings were subservient to architecture, which made painting appear as a minor art. His extraordinary talent for decorative painting was remarkably appreciated in Vienna at that time. Laufberger was able not only to build a name for himself, but also to create a school, for his students followed both his principles and the idea of incorporating decorative paintings into architecture. In his diary, Matsch spoke highly of Laufberger as an artist and teacher:
Not only did Laufberger's own art benefit from his stay in Italy, and the Italian influence; he also brought back to Vienna old formulas and diverse techniques such as sgrafitto, the old art of fresco painting, the painting of terra cotta, and so on. He mastered these various techniques in practice as well as in theory. That made Laufberger the ideal teacher for the new School of Arts and Crafts that Eitelberger had just founded.\textsuperscript{12}

Matsch's judgement is particularly true in the light of Laufberger's attitude toward his three new students. He immediately noticed their remarkable potential and chose them as continuators of his principles and art. He thus began to employ them in public building programs. For the Klimt brothers, this was not only a quasi-official recognition of their talent, but also a substantial amelioration of their finances. Since joining the painting class, they had been augmenting their scholarship money by doing technical drawings for the then well-known ear specialist Adam Pollitzer. They also painted portraits from photographs for which they charged 6 ducats.\textsuperscript{13}

In 1879, Laufberger commissioned the Klimt brothers and Matsch to draw designs of the festoons with allegorical sgrafitto paintings in the courtyards of the Art History Museum in Vienna. He also introduced them to Hans Makart (1840-1884), the dominant figure of Viennese artistic life at that time. As a consequence, the three of them began working for the Fellner and Helmer company, which had built many theaters in various parts of Austria-Hungary, Germany, and the Balkans. Apart from
building a theater, the company was also responsible for the interior decoration. Through Ferdinand Fellner and Hermann Helmer, the Klimt brothers and Franz Matsch would be commissioned some important decorative works in the following years.

Ferdinand Laufberger died in 1881. His successor, Victor Julius Berger (1850-1902), was another of the Ring painters. He was an admirer of Makart, and he also recommended the three young artists to the prince of the Viennese painters. It is precisely at this time that the Klimt brothers and Matsch began to take issue in their works with Makart's principles of style. Ernst, Gustav and Franz graduated from the School in 1883. They soon set up their own studio, and beginning with 1883, they were always sure of public work.

As Klimt applied in 1893 for the job of professor at the Special School for Historical Painting in Vienna, he compiled a curriculum vitae containing his main activities as artist, a document which is crucial to the chronology of his work in the early period.

I set up a studio in 1883--Klimt wrote in this résumé--together with my fellow students, Prof. Matsch and my brother Ernst Klimt. In our last student years, Prof. Franz Matsch and my brother and I had already been entrusted with commissions which we duly carried out: in 1880 ceiling paintings for a palais on the Schottenring, further ceiling paintings for the pump-room at Karlsbad ["Music of the Nations," dated 1880], in 1881 ceiling paintings for the Palais Ziehrer [25-27 Argentinerstraße in the fourth district of Vienna], after studies by
Prof. Berger; in 1882, ceiling paintings and, to­
gether with Matsch and my brother, the curtain at
the Reichenberg Theater [State Theater in Liberec,
Czech Republic]. In 1883, I started to work indepen­
dently. Ancestral portraits, tapestry designs and
old master copies for the king of Romania for his
summer residence [the Peleș castle]; ceiling paint­
ings for the theater in Fiume, and for the Karlsbad
theater ceiling paintings and, together with Matsch
and my brother, the curtain ["Hommage to the Art of
Theater," curtain for the City Theater of Karlovy
Vary, Czech Republic, dating to 1886]. A year lat­
er, again with Matsch and my brother, a large ceil­
ing painting for the imperial hunting lodge in Lainz
[Hermes Villa at Lainz, in the eighth district of
Vienna]. In 1886, Baron Hasenauer commissioned me to
decorate the new Hofburg Theater. I executed four
large paintings; "Dionysos Cultus," "Strolling
Actors," [the actual titles are "Altar of Dionysos"
and "The Chariot of Thespis"] "The Theater in
Taormina," and "The Globe Theater in London." After
completion of this work, I was awarded, in 1888, the
Gold Award of Merit with Crown. In 1888, I was com­
missioned by the Vienna City Council to paint a view
of the auditorium in the old Burgtheater with about
150 watercolor portraits. This painting earned me the
Emperor's Prize of 400 ducats at the annual
Künstlerhaus exhibition in 1890. In between, I made
a few short journeys to Munich and Venice, and on
returning I painted, on the staircase of the
Kunsthistorisches Museum, 13 spandrel motifs repre­
senting the Florentine Quattrocento and Cinquecento
(David, Venus and Amor), Roman and Venetian
Cinquecento, Greck Antiquity and ancient Egyptian
and Italian art. On completion of this assignment,
I had the honor of being congratulated by the
Emperor. In the same year, I began painting for
Count Nicholas Esterhazy a view of the auditorium of
the Schloßtheater in Totis, with about 80 portraits
in oil. The unfinished painting was shown at the
Künstlerhaus annual exhibition of 1893 and I was
awarded the silver state medal. At present, I am
working on several portraits and on the decoration
of a music room [Dumba music room at 4 Parkring,
first district of Vienna]. Apart from these major
assignments, I have made a number of drawings for
paintings and several portraits for miniatures or in
watercolor or oil, also small decorative work and
easel paintings in various techniques.

The first thing catching the eye in this sweeping
survey of Klimt's early work is that his first ten or so years were marked by assignments outside Vienna, in the empire's neighboring provinces or even outside the empire. Klimt's beginning career was also characterized by joint enterprises with his brother Ernst and their friend Franz Matsch. It is indeed difficult to separate Gustav's individual work in assignments executed by all three members of the Künstlerkompanie. It is important to note that the idea of a team work has been suggested to them by their teacher, Ferdinand Laufberger, who also introduced the newly founded association to the art market, shortly before he died in 1881.

An important element of the remarkable success of the Künstlerkompanie was that the three young artists could obviously work much faster than only one painter, still preserving unity of style. The stylistic homogeneity of their work was undoubtedly a result of their common studies at the same school, under the same professors. It also derived from the idea, inspired by Laufberger, that they were decorative painters, without any wish to innovate or to shape their own individual styles. But this initial commonality of style did not last too long. In 1892, Klimt already shows tendencies of breaking the rules set by Laufberger in favor of his own, more original style. His brother's death in 1892 also contributed to the gradual separation of Klimt and
Matsch. The latter was the unofficial leader of the Künstlerkompanie, for he was in charge of all the paperwork and kept the accounts. Moreover, he had a special gift for ferreting out commissions.\textsuperscript{85}

The three artists worked according to clear plans. Only in two cases -- the Hermes Villa at Lainz and the City Theater at Karlovy-Vary -- did they work, as Franz Matsch would later put it, "all at once and higgledy-piggledy."\textsuperscript{86} As a rule, there was a clear division of work. As soon as they received a request for sketches to be submitted for a project, each one of them drew a complete set, thus providing customers with the possibility of choosing among three alternatives or even combining them. After sketches were returned to them, the three artists drew lots to decide which of them would paint which picture.\textsuperscript{87} This particular element makes it so difficult to separate Gustav Klimt's own contribution, for often he may have painted after designs made by Matsch.

In reality, things may have been quite different from the rosy picture Matsch gave in his diary. A closer examination of the works executed by the Künstlerkompanie shows that Ernst, the youngest of all three, played a rather subordinate role. He signed fewer works than the other two and only border or background painting. It is true however that, due to the fundamental idea on which
the *Künstlerkompanie* was based, all three members viewed themselves as interchangeable.

Even before the official foundation of the *Künstlerkompanie*, Ernst, Gustav, and Franz painted in oil four allegories framed in stucco on the ceiling of the meeting room of the Palais Sturany in Vienna. According to Matsch's diary, Gustav Klimt painted "Music", Ernst "Dance" and Matsch himself "Poetry" and "Drama." The paintings depict four female figures "swaying in the air" with their distinctive attributes: Drama carries a mask in her hand, Music blows two wind instruments, Poetry reads a poem, and Dance is shown in a dancing posture.

In 1880, the three artists also painted the ceiling of the *Kurhaus* in Karlovy-Vary (Karlsbad). The style of their paintings was strongly influenced by Laufberger and reminiscent of Renaissance models, particularly Michelangelo. All compositions are carefully balanced and rendered in an accurate three-dimensional setting. All subject-matters are allegories, which were well-suited to the academic taste of that period. The first signs of a rupture with this academic tradition are visible in the sketches executed for a publisher, who asked them to contribute to a collection significantly entitled "Allegories and Emblems." Klimt was asked to draw or paint various subjects, such as "The Fairytale", "The Times of the Day", "Youth", "Opera," "Fable," and
"Idyll". This extensive compendium was conceived in the purely historicist spirit, its aim being a revival of the allegory so frequently used by Renaissance, Baroque, and Rococo artists.

This project played a crucial role in the next development of Klimt's art. Some sketches, such as "The Four Seasons" (1887) and "Youth" (1882) are clearly under the influence of Laufberger. In addition, traces of Makart's influence could be found in "The Realms of Nature" (1882), "Opera," "Fable," and "Idyll" (1883). Makart is the source of inspiration for both Classical forms and the Baroque decorative exuberance and figural depiction. Makart's influence would prove to be a lasting one. It would become visible when Klimt tackled what Freud would call the complex of the *horror vacui*, filling the entire background of his pictures with an abundance of shapes.

In 1882, the *Künstlerkompanie* received a new assignment from Fellner and Helmer, that of decorating the ceiling of the theater in Reichenberg (present-day Liberec). The four ceiling panels were painted by Gustav Klimt and Franz Matsch, while Ernst executed the panel just above the curtain. During their work at Liberec, the three met a rich silver manufacturer from Vienna, who allowed them to use a large room in his factory for their studio. In exchange, the three artists designed silver
jewelry for the firm and painted small ivory items, later mounted in silver and sold as brooches. The presence of the artists of the *Künstlerkompanie* in the building on 8 Sandwirthgasse, in the fourth district of Vienna was also marked by a painting on the factory's main stairway's wall, a cherub blowing a trumpet.95

Immediately after completing their assignment in Liberec (1883), the *Künstlerkompanie* began working for the summer residence of King Carol and Queen Elisabeta at Peleș, in Romania. Klimt's contribution to this project was considerable, but because of its almost complete inaccessibility after 1947, his work at Peleș is known to only a few and, despite its significance for the artist's evolution in the following years, was never examined. No major monograph on Klimt mentions it, and, to my knowledge, no one has ever attempted to evaluate it in the light of Klimt's later work. The following chapter will fill this gap.
The Historiography of Klimt's Work at Peleș

There is scant literature dealing with Gustav Klimt's role in the interior decoration of the Peleș Castle, and what there is must be regarded critically, due to the presence of inaccurate information and even blatant errors.

The first to deal systematically with the interior decoration at Peleș was Jacob von Falke, the director of the Austrian Museum of Art and Industry. His _Das rumänische Königsschloß Pelesch_ (1893) is still viewed by many as the authority on Klimt's work at Peleș. It is not without interest that Falke spent several months at the Castle in 1890 and was provided by Carol himself with all the information needed. This is clear from Falke's detailed knowledge of the castle's design and construction. Falke refers to the family portraits of the (Hohen)zollern house: Wolfgang, the earliest count of Zollern (948), Friedrich I (980), Burkhard (1080). He argues that, in 1890, the family portraits continued, presumably in chronological order, on the main stairs with Eitel Friedrich III, Emperor Rudolph of Habsburg's brother-in-law, and Eitel Friedrich IV, who died at Pavia.
fighting for Charles V. According to Falke, the total number of portraits was 10, five of which were painted by Franz Matsch and five by both Gustav and Ernst Klimt. He claims that the Klimt brothers also decorated the ceiling of a room, in which he lists three important, original paintings: the portrait of a Venetian statesman by Tintoretto, a painting by Jacob Bassan, and Giorgio Vasari's *Holy Family*. At a later date, however, Tintoretto's painting was in the King's study. According to Mihai Haret, who saw it there, the ceiling of the King's study was never painted, for, as Falke himself describes it, it was carved in wood. In fact, the room decorated by the Klimt brothers is the Florentine Room.

Falke noted that the decoration of the Florentine Room was commissioned to the three painters of the *Künstlerkompanie*. He also mentioned the decoration of the Theater Hall: the ceiling painted by Matsch and the frieze (entitled, according to him, "Muses, Masks, Allegories, and Emblems") worked by Gustav Klimt. But besides this brief notice, Falke did not even bother describing the paintings.

Klimt's work is also absent from the most comprehensive monograph on the Peleș Castle, published by Mihai Haret in 1924. He had access to the original plans of the castle and to pictures taken at different stages as it was built. Haret's book relied heavily on interviews with
the last architect employed by Carol, Karl Liman, and with the King's secretary, Louis Basset. ¹⁰² He knew Carol, who encouraged and supported him in writing the book. ¹⁰³

Haret gave a comprehensive description of the castle, including a complete list of all paintings, ordered by rooms. Unfortunately, although he referred to some of the works commissioned to the Künstlerkompanie, there are no references to the artists themselves. Haret only mentioned Ernst Klimt in relation to a painting entitled "Old Man Kissing a Young Woman," which, according to him, dates to 1886, and was located on the first floor. ¹⁰⁴ According to Haret's list, Carol's collection consisted of 271 paintings (oil on canvas), of which 205 were genuine, fourteen were "modern" and 52 were copies of famous works. Haret's reckoning did not include paintings by anonymous artists. The works of the three Viennese painters are presumably to be found among these anonymous paintings, as well as among copies of famous paintings. To Haret, undoubtedly, Klimt or Matsch were names without any resonance, particularly when compared to Carol's rich collection of great masters.

Besides Falke's and Haret's monographs, Klimt's and Matsch's works at Peleș are briefly mentioned in two recent accounts of Klimt's work. ¹⁰⁵ Moreover, the Dobai and Coradeschi catalogues rely heavily on Falke's book,
for they had no first-hand information about the Peleş Castle. Coradeschi claims that the family portraits were painted after "bad engravings" (*mauvaises gravures*), but offers no evidence to substantiate this idea. Moreover, besides references to family portraits, neither Coradeschi, nor Dobai seem to be aware of the existence of original works in the Theater Room. They completely ignore both Matsch's painting of the ceiling and Gustav Klimt's frieze. But Dobai's interpretation still haunts modern accounts of Klimt's early life. The idea that the family portraits were made after some engravings goes back to a brief note in Franz Matsch's diary, which refers to a sixteenth-century book with portraits of members of the (Hohen)zollern family, which was sent by King Carol to the *Künstlerkompanie* in Vienna. Frank Whitford's recent monograph briefly mentions "a series of ancestral portraits, based on engravings, for a royal palace in Romania," but makes no reference to any other work at Peleş. Gottfried Fliedl's monograph ignores Klimt's Romanian work, despite extensive discussion of the artist's years of training and early career.

In the introduction to a Franz Matsch exhibition in Vienna in 1981, Herbert Giese discusses his work at Peleş, based on the painter's unpublished journal. Giese claims that the Romanian court commissioned to the three members of the *Künstlerkompanie* the execution of several
copies of famous works by Titian, Rembrandt, and Velázquez, and of sixteenth-century family portraits, the painting of the library's ceiling, as well as the execution of several sgrafitti, such as that of the tower clock.\textsuperscript{110} He argues that the entire commission was worked at Vienna and that neither Klimt, nor Matsch ever visited the Peleș Castle.\textsuperscript{111} According to Giese, the library's ceiling was painted by Matsch with an allegory entitled "The Poet and Poetry,"\textsuperscript{112} while Klimt painted an untitled, fifteen meter long frieze. But Giese's attribution is wrong. Matsch did not paint the ceiling of the castle's library, but rather the Theater Hall. That none of the three artists of the \textit{Künstlerkompanie} ever visited the castle, is also improbable. To be sure, the room on the second floor, known as the "Painter's Flat," was certainly decorated by Gustav Klimt, using the same themes and techniques he employed in the Theater Hall. It is believed that Klimt spent a few weeks in this room in 1917, shortly before his death, although at the time Romania was at war with Austria-Hungary and the major part of her territory, including Sinaia and the royal castle, were in the hands of her enemy.\textsuperscript{113}

Further support for Klimt's visit to Romania in 1917 exists in Christian Nebehay's recently published monograph.\textsuperscript{114} Nebehay knew Klimt personally and his study is based on an extensive archival research. He also pub-
lished Klimt's curriculum vitae written in 1893, a document which clearly attests Klimt's contribution to the decoration of the Peleș Castle. Nebehay suggests that Klimt's visit of 1917 was a continuation of earlier contacts established with the Romanian royal family, most probably as a consequence of his remarkable work at Peleș. But Klimt's life is poorly documented, largely because he did not leave any memoir or other personal documents. There are no references to Peleș or Romania in any one of the 399 letters and postcards to Emilie Flöge, which were recently discovered and published. In any case the earliest are dated 1897, fourteen years after the paintings at Peleș. Whether or not Klimt travelled to Romania in 1883 or 1884, whether or not he paid a new visit in 1917, remains a controversial issue. The evidence of Klimt's contribution to the decoration of the Peleș Castle, however, cannot be denied. His frieze in the Theater Hall is signed and dated, which leaves no doubt about authorship. Moreover, a stylistic analysis of Klimt's work at Peleș may be of a considerable significance for the current interpretation of his work, in particular for that of his earlier career.

Klimt's Work at Peleș

Jacob von Falke was probably the source for most of the modern accounts of Klimt's life and work, which
attribute to Gustav Klimt some of the family portraits in the central hall of the castle. The hall is surrounded by corridors leading to adjacent rooms, all richly decorated with wall and ceiling wooden carved panels and paintings. Two portraits facing each other are displayed in the corridor leading to the Florentine Room. Both represent Carol's ancestors in natural size: Duke Friedrich of Zollern (referred to in documents in 980), with the Zollern Castle in the background and slightly to the left, across the corridor, Duke Friedrich I of Zollern, the burggrave of Nuremberg (d. ca. 1200). Portraits of three sixteenth-century male members of the Zollern family decorate the walls of the central hall: Eitel Friedrich IV (d. 1525), the son of Joachim I Nestor, Kurfürst of Brandenburg (1484-1535); Eitel Friedrich V (d. 1562); and Eitel Friedrich VI (d. 1585). Eitel Friedrich IV is depicted in the cuirass (now displayed in the Kunsthistorisches Hofmuseum in Vienna), worn when he died on the battlefield at Pavia. Three sixteenth- and seventeenth-century members of the Zollern family are depicted on the opposite wall: Eitel Friedrich VII, the founder of the Hohenzollern-Hechingen line (1545-1605), Johann Georg, margrave of Brandenburg and duke of Jägerndorf (1577-1624), and Philipp Friedrich Christoph (d. 1671). The northern and the eastern corridors meet in front of the King's study, in the vesti-
bule of which appear two portraits of collateral relatives of Carol: Otto Heinrich, Kurfürst of Palatinate (1512-1559) and Wilhelm IV, Duke of Bavaria (1497-1550).

None of these portraits was either signed or dated, which makes it very difficult to identify Klimt's contribution. It is often claimed that the portraits were made after poor, presumably sixteenth-century engravings. The refined naturalistic portraits are, however, far from any known models. Despite claims to the contrary, the set of family portraits painted in oil on canvas, with highly saturated colors, is, stylistically speaking, remarkably homogeneous: all shapes are clear, all colors are bright, all brushstrokes are equally firm. I have been unable to detect any signs of Klimt's hand. The depiction of the Order of the Golden Fleece in Eitel Friedrich VI's portrait, which was granted post mortem to Carol's famous ancestor, may point to a certain inclination toward the use of allegory, but this is not necessarily indicative of Gustav Klimt's work, for both Ernst Klimt and Franz Matsch also used allegories. Moreover, if we are to believe Matsch's diary and Klimt's curriculum vitae, the family portraits were commissioned and probably executed by all three members of the Künstlerkompanie.

The same is true for the ceiling and the frieze panels in the Florentine Room. Falke claims that the ceiling was worked by the Klimt brothers. It is very
likely that Ernst and Gustav worked together in the Florentine Room, but neither the ceiling, nor the frieze were signed. The northern, western, and eastern walls of the Florentine Room display a 18-panel frieze, painted with oil on canvas. Two of the five panels on the eastern wall have Carol's monogram surrounded, in each case, by two putti. The panel in the middle depicts two denizens of the sea (trytons) battling a sea monster. Scenes depicted on six panels on the northern wall include a swan and a putto playing his flute, another putto with two billy-goats, two putti with a swan and a billy-goat, and Venus, born of the sea foam, sitting on her cockle shell. Finally, the western wall has five panels with sea-related scenes, such as Tryton blowing a shell horn, Neptune in his charriot pulled across the sea by two horses or two putti (one of which is sitting in a cockle shell) and a swan. It is unclear what is the underlying theme of this frieze, but from this brief description it appears that Dionysiac and maritime imagery was preferred, the latter probably in connection with the myth of the birth of Venus. At close examination, the frieze is in sharp stylistic contrast to the ceiling painting. The panels are clumsily painted, with no apparent concern for a detailed representation. Shapes are vaguely described, human bodies and animals only sketched. In contrast to the ceiling painting, no attention has been
paid to the features of the face or to such details as fingers. Colors, however, are very bright and brushstrokes are regular. The Dionysiac scenes have a rich grass background, with branches carrying pomegranates, but in general there is no depth in any of these panels.

The ceiling painting is a purely academic, naturalistic representation of a winged woman, sitting on a throne, only partially covered by drapery, with her left breast and foot left naked. She has a laurel wreath on her head and raises her right hand in a majestic pose. In her other hand, she holds a compass. At her feet, there is a globe and a trumpet. To her right are two putti playing on a ship's prow. The deep background is dominated by mountains, with a cabin in the bottom right corner, and the sea in the farthest plan. The brushstroke is clear and regular and the whole scene has precise contours. I have been unable to find any clear reference to the exact identity of the woman, but everything indicates an allegory, probably of the Great Discoveries at the dawn of the modern era. Could this painting be the work of Gustav Klimt? It is known that before working at Peleș, Klimt painted one of the allegories on the ceiling of the meeting room in the Palais Sturany in Vienna. Seven other allegories by him were included in the multivolume work edited by Martin Gerlach, Allegorien und Embleme (1882/1884), in which his brother, Ernst Klimt,
also published two allegories. None of these works resemble the paintings in the Florentine Room. In addition, the painting on the ceiling presents many features typical for Franz Matsch's early style, particularly its use of multiple perspectives and overlapping plans.126

If Falke is right in attributing the paintings in the Florentine Room to the Klimt brothers, presumably on the basis of his interviews with Carol, it is very difficult to discriminate Gustav Klimt's contribution to this work. Among all members of the Künstlerkompanie, Ernst seems to have been left with the less important work,127 which suggests that he might be viewed as the author of the frieze. But some distinct details of the panels, such as the grass background or the pomegranates, remind one of Gustav's work in the Theater Hall. It is true, however, that no stylistic parallel could be drawn between the putti in the frieze panels and those in the Theater Hall or in the contemporary Idyll (1884), inspired by Gustav Klimt's drawings for Allegorien und Embleme.128

In contrast to both the family portraits in the central hall and the Florentine Room, Falke's attribution of the paintings in the Theater Hall is fully confirmed. He claimed that the ceiling was worked by Franz Matsch and the frieze by Gustav Klimt. Matsch's signature could be seen on an oil-on-canvas draft for the ceiling at Peleş [entitled "Der Dichter und die Poesie" (The Poet
and the Poetry), now in the Austrian Gallery, Vienna. One of the eight frieze panels decorating three walls in the Theater Hall, which Falke called "Muses, Masks, Allegories, and Emblems," is signed "G. Klimt, 1884." Matsch's work covers almost the entire ceiling of the room. In a purely academic style, he depicted a winged woman (the Poetry), all dressed in light pink, in a peculiar state of suspension above ground, which could hardly be called flying. Such winged figures were common in contemporary Symbolist art, but many were treated as conventional symbols, such as those appearing quite frequently in the leading British art journal The Studio. But Matsch's winged allegory is not a common one. Herbert Giese argues that the model for the winged allegory of Poetry was Queen Elisabeta herself, known to her contemporaries, both in Romania and abroad, under her pen name of Carmen Sylva. The allegorical meaning of the scene is emphasized by the contrast between the Classical building on the right and the medieval garments of the man on the ground (the Poet), leaning against a stone vase with pink roses. Matsch, much more of a supporter of academic painting than Klimt, used light and dark hues to create the contrast between the two worlds, that of Poetry and that in which the Poet lives.

On both sides of the balcony of the Theater Hall, there are two panels, painted by Gustav Klimt. They
depict young girls picking flowers, kneeling against a rich background of leaves, pomegranates, and light-pink flowers. They have their hair bound in a knot on the back, and their brown-reddish and blue dresses reveal their arms, shoulders, and feet. Their faces are slightly indistinct and all shapes are barely sketched, a feature remarkably similar to Klimt's later drawing style, characterized by blurred contours.  

Klimt used an earth-tone palette (pink, green or blue, and brown), and light values. Loose brush work, colors and drawing technique create a tapestry-like effect lacking depth, in which background and foreground overlap. The flat background is a much later development of Klimt's style, first recognizable in the portrait of the pianist Josef Pembauer, which Klimt painted in 1890. In the case of Pembauer's portrait, however, there is a sharp contrast between the background and photographic naturalism of the portrait. However, at Peleș, for the first time, Klimt endorses the idea of dematerializing the reality depicted, while, at the same time, objectifying emotions. Faces and bodies are slightly distinct, a feature which reminds one of Klimt's Schubert at the Piano (1899), one of the first pictures in which he attempted an Impressionist style and one which is considered to be the starting point of his original style. The two panels at Peleș may also be viewed as the first sign of another tendency which will
become apparent later in Klimt's work, namely a new soft, languid style much influenced by Pre-Raphaelite painters, especially by Edward Burne-Jones. The composition is planar and still, the manner dreamy and decorative. According to Johannes Dobai, it is also from the Pre-Raphaelites (in particular from Rosetti's *Beata Beatrix*) that Klimt borrowed the topic of the Maiden (*unschuldiges Mädchen*). Dobai believes that the influence of the Pre-Raphaelites was not direct, but mediated by such German artists as Johan Heinrich Vogeler (1872-1942). It is possible, however, that the origin of this imagery is to be sought in the influence of Fernand Khnopff (1858-1921). Klimt may have been alerted to the Belgian painter's work in Munich, during his short visit of 1890 and 1891, when he saw the second annual exhibition in the Crystal Palace, where Khnopff's Symbolist paintings were first shown. The first clear example of this tendency is an oil-on-canvas entitled *Two Girls With Oleander*, now in a private collection in New York. Coradeschi dates the painting to the years 1890 to 1892, a period in which Klimt was also working on the much different decoration (spandrels and intercolumniation) of the staircase in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna, for which he was awarded the imperial Golden Cross. Lacking spatial depth and figural volume, the two panels at Peleș emphasize a decorative pictorial structure. In these panels,
Klimt departed from then naturalist rendering of space and light that characterizes his paintings in the Theater Hall and moved from representationalism toward a new pictorial vocabulary. The Symbolist association between women or girls and flowers is also remarkably close to later developments in the Art Nouveau style, in particular to jewels produced after 1900 by Luis Masriera.

The first long panel on the southern wall of the Theater Hall includes a female head in half-profile surrounded by a circular border, which is supported by two putti, one of them turned with his back to the viewer. The putto on the right has a drum in front of him and a percussionist's stick in his right hand. One of the most original elements of this panel, as well as of the corresponding ones on the opposite wall, is that a golden background frame with tendril ends protrudes into the picture, with the two putti literally sitting on it, as if on a fence. Surrounding, or going through, the frame itself are flower-laden branches, which gives one the impression that the purely decorative background is part of the foreground, the whole lacking any spatial depth. To my knowledge, this is the first case in which Klimt completely abandoned the conventions of traditional representation and tackled the issue of purely decorative painting, which would eventually secure his fame as
The closest, though paradoxical, analogy to be drawn for this panel is that of the Art Nouveau poster work, especially that of Alphonse Mucha of a much later date. Like Klimt at Peleș, Mucha produced images of maidens with abundant hair radiating out in serpentine coils, in which golden arches or frameworks protruded into the picture.

The next panel, considerably smaller, depicts a lyre, surrounded by pink and white flowers. Twigs and flowers are also to be found between the lyre's strings. The light comes from above, and Klimt uses gentle pale hues. As in the other panels, there is no spatial depth. Another remarkable feature is that the abundant floral decoration flows past the square border of the panel, a feature also pointing to Mucha's later style. It is, however, a quite innovative feature for Klimt, since the first works in which he clearly abandoned the conventional separation between frame and painting are traditionally dated to the 1890s: the portrait of the pianist Joseph Pembauer (1890), Love (1895) and Josef Lewinsky as Carlos in Clavigo (1895). In all these cases the border itself is decorated, but to my knowledge, there is no other pre-Secesssion example of a decoration flowing past the border of the painting. A strong connection, however, could be established between the lyre panel at Peleș and the portrait of the pianist Joseph Pembauer, which con-
trasts the photograph-like portrait with the background dominated by a lyre. Lyres of a similar shape would later appear in Sappho (1888-1890), Music I (1895) and Music II (1898), as well as in a litography published in 1901 in Ver Sacrum. Johannes Dobai views them as a typical Symbolist motive. But Klimt's 'lyre' was, in fact, inspired by kitharai depicted on Red-figured ancient Greek pottery of the late sixth century B.C. As Monique Halm-Tisserant has shown, Klimt familiarized himself with Greek vase painting not directly, through the collection of the Kunsthistorisches Museum, but via Eduard Gerhard's two works on Greek painted pottery, which were widely circulated at the Viennese School of Arts and Crafts. Klimt's 'lyres' were not mere copies of those depicted on Greek vases. The two lyres in Pembauer's portrait (one in the background, the other on the frame) are different from each other. That from Music II is richly decorated in a manner which could hardly be found on Greek vases. While 'quoting' from the rich repertoire of the ancient Greek imagery on painted vases, Klimt remodelled these borrowings and applied them according to his own principles, described by Johannes Dobai as the 'accumulative procedure' (additives Verfahren). Monique Halm-Tisserant believes that this technique only occurs in the early works of the artist, namely between 1886 and 1898, but the Peleș paintings show that her chronology needs
substantial revision.

The next, much longer panel depicts a reclining woman on a bed of leaves, with white flowers in her black hair, half-dressed in a transparent garment, covering her hips, and a twig in her right hand. Near her right knee, an amorous cupid with his back to the viewer, turns his head to the woman. In contrast to her delicate face, a grotesque, satyr mask appears at the opposite end of the panel. Klimt used light hues for the female body and the cupid and strong colors for the mask. The slightly indistinct features of the woman's head are in sharp contrast to the precise contours of the mask. The same geometric, tendril ornament we have seen in the case of the first composition on the southern wall is repeated here at both ends of the panel. Here, it even overlaps the right side of the mask, which leaves one with the odd impression that the naturalistic elements of the painting are in the background, while the foreground is purely ornamental. But the most important element in this panel is the mask. A Greco-Roman and Renaissance motive widely used as symbol of horror or, simply, as a grotesque element, the mask, along with the sphinx, was used by Romantics as symbol of perversity. According to Johannes Dobai, Klimt may have borrowed these symbols from James Ensor, Jan Toorop, or Odilon Redon.153 Both the sphinx and the grotesque head appear in Music II (1898), but the grotesque
head is also to be found in the poster for the first Secession exhibition in 1898 (on Pallas Athene's shield) and in the contemporary Pallas Athene (head of the Medusa on Pallas Athene's golden breastplate). Except Music II, the symbolism attached to grotesque heads is quite clear. They are meant to reinforce Pallas Athene's belligerance, as the protectress of art. In contrast, Music II shares with the Peleș painting the same symbolism, this time derived again from ancient Greek imagery. In the case of the Peleș compositions, the theatrical symbolism of the mask is reinforced by the presence of another mask on the opposite, northern wall of the Theater Hall.

On the northern wall, facing the panel with the reclining woman on the southern wall, there is a long panel with two distinct scenes. To the east, close to the stage, there is a female head in a circular border surrounded by two putti, each holding a violin. To the west, a reclining woman, half-dressed in a transparent garment, leafes through a musical score. Between two staffs, one can clearly read the signature "G. Klimt, 1884." At the western end of the panel, one can see the same geometric, tendril ornament as on the other two panels on the southern wall. As in the case of the lyre-panel, here too flowers from the rich floral background flow past the border of the panel.

The signature leaves no doubt about the authorship
of these paintings. Although only the eastern panel on the northern wall is signed, the stylistic unity of the entire set of paintings in the Theater Hall (with the only exception of the ceiling, worked by Matsch) identifies them clearly as the work of Gustav Klimt. The lettering of the signature, on the other hand, resembles that of Idyll dated to 1884 as well. In fact, very few of Klimt's early works were signed. With the exception of life-drawings alone as a student at the School of Arts and Crafts, no major work dated before 1886 was actually signed by Klimt. *Academy of Man*, an oil-on-canvas now at the Dorotheum in Vienna, which Klimt probably worked in preparation for his seven allegories published in *Allegorien und Embleme*, 156 is signed "G. Klimt, 1883." Another oil-on-canvas, *Fable*, prepared as illustration for the volume *Allegorien und Embleme*, is also signed "G. Klimt, 1883." By contrast, *Idyll* has only "G.K., 1884." Two other oil-on-canvas drafts for the paintings on the Burgtheater ceilings are also signed. 157

The next panel to the west is, like the corresponding one on the opposite wall, but much smaller. It depicts an actor with mask, a wreath of leaves and flowers on his head and two woodwind musical instruments (presumably flutes) in the background. Although the upper part of the instruments is cut off by the square border of the painting, the slender cone-shaped tube of one of them
goes past the lower part of the border. Flowers, leaves, and the actor's garment flow past the border as well. Klimt did not use actor masks very frequently. The only other works in which they appear are, to my knowledge, Tragedy, produced for a second series of the Allegorien und Embleme, published between 1896 and 1900, and a pen drawing for an allegory of the Theatre, Movement, and Costume made just two years before Tragedy (1895). The last panel on the northern wall depicts a woman's head in a circular border. She wears a diadem in her long, black hair. The circular border is supported by two putti sitting on the same geometric, tendril ornament we have seen in the other panels. Each one of these putti holds a trumpet. The head of one of them, as well as the rich, surrounding floral ornament extends beyond the border of the panel. The other putto seems to look down to the audience gathered in the Theater Hall. The portrait of the woman deserves special attention. Her stern-faced figure and her black hair remind one of Klimt's intercolumnar paintings at the Kunsthistorisches Museum, known as Ancient Greece (1890-1891). This painting is viewed by many as the debut in Klimt's art of a new kind of woman, posed and dressed in a way that anticipates Art Nouveau. Dobai believes that Klimt was influenced here by Whistler, and that Ancient Greece is the prototype from which Pallas Athene was later derived.
Ancient Greece, the woman in the Peleș painting wears a dress with a floral pattern, although her hair and her face looks more 'classical' than the painting in the Kunsthistorisches Museum.

A long panel painted by Klimt is located on the second floor of the Peleș Castle, in a flat entirely furnished in Art Nouveau style, known as the Painter's Flat, just above the entrance into the bay opening through two windows on the northern side of the building. This is the longest of all panels Klimt painted at Sinaia. In fact, it is a copy of the long panel in the Theater Hall which is signed and dated,\textsuperscript{16} to which he added a second female head in a circular border, on the opposite end of the reclining female nude. The woman's head is depicted in half-profile, with white flowers in her long, brown hair. The circular border is supported by two putti, one holding a tambourine, the other a flute. The same geometric, tendril ornament we have seen on the long panels in the Theater Hall decorates the panel in the Painter's Flat as well.

If surveying all the paintings in the Theater Hall and the Painter's Flat, it becomes apparent that Klimt's programme is based on four female heads in circular border, two reclining female nudes and two other, different panels (an actor with a mask and a lyre). It is not clear exactly who the two reclining women are, but the
association of musical instruments (drum, violins, flute, and tambourine) with three of the female heads, as well as the presence of an actor mask near one of the reclining women, suggest that we are dealing with allegories, most probably with four muses, that of lyric poetry (Erato), that of music (Euterpe), that of tragic poetry (Melpomene), and that of dance (Terpsichore). Erato, who was often represented in classical art as playing a lyre, is depicted on the southern wall of the Theater Hall, where the lyre-panel is located. On the northern wall appear Melpomene, who was represented holding a tragic mask (which also appears in the small panel in the middle of the northern wall), and Euterpe, known as the muse of music produced by wind instruments (in this case, the identification is also based on the presence of a musical score in the adjacent composition). Finally, the panel in the Painter's Flat associates Euterpe with Terpsichore.

Although Klimt was working on a topic he had already dealt with in his contribution to Allegorien und Embleme, his work at Peleș is fundamentally different. In many aspects, the Peleș paintings, in particular those from the Theater Hall, mark, for the first time, the shift from a purely academic style to one which anticipates the Secession.
CONCLUSION

When viewed against the background of his previous and most important subsequent works, Klimt's contribution to the decoration of Peleș Castle presents itself in a completely new light. By its stylistic coordinates, this contribution forces us to reconsider the chronology of Klimt's art. Dobai's analysis of Klimt's work, generally accepted by scholars, is based on three major periods, with further subdivisions. In a first period, he distinguishes (a) a late eclectic period up to 1890, followed by (b) a relatively quick abandonment of eclectic formulas and an increasing Symbolist influence, under the impact of both post-Impressionist and Pre-Raphaelite painters (1890 to 1897). The second period starts with (c) a transitional phase, in which Symbolist elements are rendered in a purely decorative manner (1897 to 1902). A fully decorative Symbolism (d) appears in Klimt's work beginning only with 1902 and lasting until 1908. Finally, the third period debuts with (e) a transition to Expressionism (1909-1910) and ends, in Klimt's last work, with (f) the rapid dissolution of both decorative and Symbolist elements (1910-1917).

This analysis of Klimt's work at Peleș shows that
Dobai's chronological divisions need substantial revision. From a stylistic point of view, this work should be classified in Dobai's phases (b) and (c), which are dated some five to fifteen years later. Klimt's signature and dating on one of the panels in the Theater Hall leave no doubt that his work at Peleș should be dated much earlier than Dobai's periodization suggests. As a consequence we can either treat Klimt's work at Peleș as an anomaly (and this is hardly likely) or conclude that the basic features of Klimt's original style were visible at a much earlier date in his career. The evidence presented in this thesis, particularly in the last chapter, demonstrates the pivotal role of Klimt's Peleș work. The soft, languid style, the lack of spatial depth and figural volume, a purely decorative style represented by the golden background frame with tendril ends protruding into the picture, as well as a number of specific motifs, such as lyres or masks, and, above all, the theme of Woman, all this is typical for the later, "modern" Klimt. Moreover, the interior decoration of the Theater Hall proved to be an important step in the artistic careers of both Klimt and Matsch, since each adopted for the first time an individual style, moving away from the designs of the Künstlerkompanie. This individualization has often been viewed as a gradual process that dates from shortly before or after Ernst Klimt's death in 1892. In reali-
ty, the Peleș paintings show that just one year after the Kunstlerkompanie was set up in 1883, Gustav Klimt and Franz Matsch were already rapidly maturing and highly original artists. Klimt's Peleș work suggests that his mature artistic personality was already in formation. In addition to his contribution to the decorative style of the Kunstlerkompanie, for the first time we glimpse at Peleș a highly original artist, able to produce independent works on a large scale. In his curriculum vitae, Klimt himself asserted that his independent work started in 1883, the same year in which he placed the debut of the Kunstlerkompanie. The work at Peleș is then used as an example of his independent work. I have sought to demonstrate that Klimt's assertion, largely ignored—somewhat inexplicably—by art historians, can indeed be substantiated by a close study of the artist's Peleș paintings.

Further, I would suggest the overall significance of the discrete circumstances in which this work was created. King Carol was Klimt's first major patron. Until then, Klimt had worked only for members of the Viennese bourgeoisie (e.g., Johan Sturany house, Palais Ziehrer). Even later, after the Kunstlerkompanie was commissioned to decorate the imperial hunting lodge at Lainz (1887), a work, which, in Matsch's words, was done "all at once and higgledy-piggledy," Klimt's work did not attract fur-
ther aristocratic patronage. He was not admired by Emperor Franz Joseph, despite receiving in 1890 the so-called "Emperor's Prize" (400 ducats from the Emperor's privy purse) for the "promotion of patriotic artistic works." Moreover, the Austrian heir apparent, Archduke Franz Ferdinand, was an opponent of modern art and may have influenced the Emperor in rejecting Klimt's nomination three times as professor of the Academy. Klimt, however, worked for members of a different social group. He decorated the room of the apartment of the Greek industrialist Nikolaus von Dumba (1830-1900) and was friends with Fritz Waerndorfer, a member of a wealthy Jewish family, who owned a large cotton-spinning mill in Nachod (Bohemia) and other mills at Günseldorf (Lower Austria). Klimt made portraits for the industrialist Otto Primavesi and for the Lederer family, who owned a large distillery in Györ (Hungary). Among his other patrons and collectors were the industrial magnate Karl Wittgenstein (father of the philosopher Ludwig), who took over the rolling mills in Teplitz in 1878 and dominated the Austrian iron industry; Berta Zuckerlandl, daughter of newspaper tycoon Moritz Szeps; Otto Böhrler, a chemist who became an important figure in the iron and steel industries; and the sugar magnate, Ferdinand Bloch-Bauer, who twice commissioned Klimt to portray his wife Adele (1882-1925).
The issue of patronage is also important for Klimt's work at Peleș. Carol was certainly not one of the major crowned heads of Europe, but he was related to the noblest families of the continent. His biography, as sketched in the first chapter, shows that Carol placed great value on such connections, which he also used for political purposes. He was therefore Klimt's first 'aristocratic' patron. Carol, however, was in a process of adaptation to the Romanian society, which was itself in rapid change. The King never managed to speak Romanian without a distinct German accent and the anti-dynastic uprising of 1870 seems to have upset and confused him. His search for "roots" in Romania is suggested by his obsession with comparing the exploits of his late fourteenth-century ancestor's participation to the tragic crusade at Nicopolis with his own military accomplishments during the Russo-Turkish war of 1877/8. Peleș Castle played an important role in forming the King's new identity in his new homeland. No other building in Romania was as important to Carol as this castle, though Carol's contribution to many other buildings of private or public use was substantial. He often referred to Peleș as "casa mea" (my house). In this neo-Renaissance house, Klimt's works were just as welcome as statues of the Romanian national heroes Stephen the Great or Michael the Brave or memorabilia of Carol's trip to Algeria. To call
this extremely diverse collection kitsch,\textsuperscript{173} is both misleading and anachronistic. Carol's tastes reflected his character and personality. In the absence of a recent account of his life and reign in the context of both the momentous changes over which he presided and his own experience in Romania, it is impossible to assess the importance of either the man or his times in shaping Peleș Castle. Eclecticism was hardly peculiar to the Hohenzollern king of late nineteenth-century Romania. On the other hand, the association between Peleș Castle and the Viennese country villas of the 1860s and 1870s, which I suggested in chapter I, should not be taken too far. Peleș is not a simple villa, but a mountain residence and the association Carol often made between some of the happiest moments of his life and the mountain landscape suggests that at Peleș, the King really felt "at home."

Most likely, Carol represented the best match for Klimt's own expectations. It should be remembered that at the time he worked at Peleș, the artist was still far away from any major scandal and enjoyed some imperial attention. In the early 1880s, together with Ernst Klimt and Franz Matsch, Gustav Klimt contributed to the collection of allegories published in 1882 as \textit{Allegorien und Embleme}. This contribution first drew the critics' attention to the until then obscure senior student at the Viennese School of Arts and Crafts.\textsuperscript{174} It is possible
that Carol saw the first series of *Allegorien und Embleme*, though no evidence exists of this book in the otherwise rich royal library. He may have been impressed by the contribution of all three members of the *Künstlerkompanie* to this volume and decided to commission to them some parts of the decoration of his castle. He may have been attracted by the combination of historicism and Makart style evident in some of Klimt's works for *Allegorien und Embleme*. More to the point and judging from what we know about Klimt's later works, his art was particularly welcomed by audiences in search of establishing their own social identity. The parallel to Carol and his castle at Sinaia is too strong to be dismissed as simple accident. Klimt was encouraged to innovate both by the special setting of his art (a royal residence) and the social and cultural needs of his patron.

Did Carol decide on iconography and program? We know that for the Kunsthistorisches Museum in 1890, the program for the *Künstlerkompanie* was set by Albert Ilg, who was director of the museum, after Hans Makart's death in 1884. The program for the Burgtheater, in 1888, had been set by Adolf von Wildbrandt, director of the theater between 1881 and 1887. In such cases, programs were set by senior officials and then lots were drawn among the members of the *Künstlerkompanie* as to who should paint what. Unfortunately, we are completely ignorant as to how
the program at Peleş was determined and who decided what was done by Klimt. Queen Elisabeta's reaction to Klimt's art is also a conundrum, but the decorative program matched both her romantic personality and artistic inclinations. That she posed for Matsch's ceiling painting in the Theater Hall suggests a considerable contribution and personal involvement in the realization of the project. As the personification of Poetry, Elisabeta looks down into the audience of the Hall to her favorite guests invited to the Castle, who enjoyed the artistic pleasures made possible by royal generosity. Klimt's reclining women and some of the putti also look down to the audience. The subtle association between Elisabeta-Poetry and Klimt's allegories cannot escape the attention of anyone sitting in the Theater Hall. The actual trompe-l'oeil effect is also remarkable: the abundant floral decoration flows past the panel borders, and the ornamentation becomes part and parcel of the dramatic effect. Despite claims to the contrary, this perfect match between decoration and architectural and social function strongly supports the idea that Matsch and Klimt viewed the Theater Hall with their own eyes.

On a more general level, the Peleş paintings show that Klimt's style matured not through an abrupt rupture with tradition, as suggested by his association with the Secession, but through artistic experiments within the
very framework of historicism and eclecticism. If we explain Klimt's artistic transformation against the background of the Secession, it remains a puzzle why and how Klimt, so long viewed exclusively as the academic history painter, became the artist now familiar to us only after the Secession.

The Peleș work shows, however, that by 1897, Klimt's distinctive style was already evident and rapidly maturing. More than ten years before the official proclamation of the Secession, Klimt first applied at Peleș, in the intimate atmosphere of Carol's castle, the celebrated motto emblazoned over the main entrance of the Secession building: "*Der Zeit ihre Kunst, der Kunst ihre Freiheit* (To the Age its art, to the art its freedom)."
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Appendix A

King Carol's Hohenzollern Genealogy
Friedrich I (d. before 1125)
Friedrich II (d. after 1145)
Friedrich III (d. ca. 1200)
Duke of Zollern
Burgrave of Nuremberg (1191/2)

(Swabian line)
Friedrich IV (d. ca. 1251)
Friedrich XI (d. 1401)
Eitel Friedrich III (1494-1576)
Karl I (1516-1576)
Count of Hohenzollern

(Sigmaringen) (Haigerloch) (Hechingen)
Karl II died out Eitel Friedrich VII
(1547-1606) in 1634 (1545-1605)
Maximilian Philip Friedrich
(1636-1689) Christoph (1616-1671)
Anton Aloys (1762-1831) died out in 1869
Karl Anton (1811-1885)
Prince of Hohenzollern

(Franconian line)
Konrad I (d. 1260)
Friedrich VI (1371-1440)
Burgrave and Prince of Brandenburg
Joachim I Westphal (1484-1535)
Kurfürst
Eitel Friedrich IV (d. 1525)

Johann Georg (1577-1624)
Duke of Jägerndorf
Friedrich II (1712-1786)
King of Prussia
Wilhelm I (1797-1888)
Emperor of Germany
Mihai I (b. 1921), King of Romania (1927-1930, 1940-1947)

Leopold Stéphanie Carol
(1835-1905) (1837-1859) (1839-1914)
(1859-1941) Emperor of Germany (1888-1918)
Ferdinand I (1865-1927)
King of Romania (1914-1927) (1866-1914)
Carol II (1893-1953)
King of Romania (1930-1940)
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