among young British tourists in Rome but, despite being promoted by engravers and approved by Winckelmann, it seems to have lost its appeal when transported to Britain, as is indicated by the surprising lack of numbers of pictures that have now disappeared. Foreigners appreciated Hamilton’s style more highly, and Cassidy traces its influence on artists such as David, whose Oath of the Horatii (Musée du Louvre, Paris) owes much to Hamilton’s Dinitis promising to avenge Lucretia (Yale Center for British Art, New Haven).

Since Hamilton could not make a living as an artist he turned to picture dealing. His letters throw a fascinating light on the methods employed in the art market at this period. He tried, for instance, to tempt the Oratorian fathers in Rome to sell their Barocci altarpiece by offering to provide a copy in mosaic. He was constantly on the alert for disposals from the collections of the Barberini and other Roman families and he employed agents to secure Italy from Venice to Messina for possible purchases. To the end of the 1790’s Hamilton was in regular correspondence with his Venetian contact Giovanni Maria Sasso, to whom many of these letters were addressed. As a dealer he was knowledgeable, successful and honest, securing on behalf of his British clients major paintings by Leonardo, Veronese, Tintoretto,Guerino, Poussin and Rosa. He avoided the work of contemporary artists, although he did arrange for the engraving of modern cameos from the Pichler family.

Hamilton made his reputation as a supplier of classical antiquities to most of the great British collections formed in the second half of the eighteenth century. The letters vividly illustrate how he and other dealers, such as Thomas Jenkins, operated. At first he bought from Roman families who were disposing of marbles from their palaces and villas, but demand could not be met from this source alone. He therefore had to expand his supply by undertaking speculative excavations in the surroundings of Rome. This costly venture involved renting or even buying a site and employing forty or more diggers to open up any promising mounds with no guarantee that anything would be found at the end of the day. In any case, all antiquities discovered had to be divided three ways between the Vatican, which had first choice, the landowner and the excavator. It was a risky business because, although Hamilton had an impressively good eye for a prospective site, he not infrequently had to abandon a case empty handed. The letter traces the course of these excavations from dig to dig because he gave constantly updated bulletins to his best customer, Charles Townley, sometimes accompanied by drawings of recent finds. All buyers wanted their marbles to be restored, since limewash statues were not welcome in British galleries. When Hamilton gave instructions to the Roman repairers he endeavoured to ensure that their restorations were accurate. As he told Lord Shelburne, ‘I never restore anything without antique authority’. Sometimes, however, he allowed himself to be carried away, as when he optically turned the torso of a Discobolus into Diomede stealing the Palladion.

What comes through very clearly in the letters is his genuine pleasure in creating important collections for his best clients. He told Shelburne that his collection was not to be ‘such as has been hitherto made by myself & others. I mean a collection that will make Shelburne House famous not only in England but all over Europe’. He worked hard to assemble for him the best statues on the market (dispersed, alas, on the destruction of Lansdowne House) and tried to persuade his client to adopt one of a series of plans for a worthy gallery in which to display them. His correspondence with Townley shows a similar enthusiasm for creating a major ensemble of Roman antiquities. He sometimes withheld marbles which he felt were not up to Townley’s standard in order to keep room for more important pieces, and he sent a series of suggestions (most of them ignored) as to the best method of displaying them. As the Bishop of Derry complained, Townley ‘got all the cream & he only the skim’d milk’.

The whole correspondence is full of lively detail about the formation of British collections, the creation of the papal museums at this period and the politics of the papal court, to say nothing of gossip about visiting tourists. Cassidy gives copious notes to provide background information and usefully documents the later history of the paintings and marbles to which Hamilton refers. These volumes are a marvellous store of information about an important episode in the history of collecting.


There has recently been a veritable flood of books devoted to Caspar David Friedrich. There were monographs by Werner Hofmann (2000), Werner Busch (2003), William Vaughan (2004) and Helmut Börisch-Supan (2008), while there was a hefty catalogue accompanying the exhibition Caspar David Friedrich: Die Entfaltung der Romantik held in Essen and Hamburg in 2006-07 and a monumental catalogue raisonné of Friedrich’s drawings by Christina Grummt (2011). The latest addition is the large volume under review, published in both a German and an English edition (translated by Fiona Elliott). At first glance, the book’s size and sumptuous illustrations create the impresion of a coffee table book, but it is certainly more than that: Grave’s study is an admirable attempt to analyse the specific nature of Friedrich’s art – no easy undertaking because, as the author observes, ‘few other artists seem to invite such conflicting interpretations as Friedrich. To this day, there is no general agreement as to whether his work is an expression of traditional Protestant faith, whether it arises from a fundamentally new approach to religious and aesthetic questions, or whether it should be read above all as political and social reflections’ (p.24).

Grave successfully interweaves a chronological overview with a discussion of the various interpretative approaches to Friedrich’s art. An inquiry into the religious aspects is centred on The cross in the mountains (Tetschen- oder Altar) of 1807-08. Another chapter deals with Friedrich’s connection with the intellectual cultural centre of Weimar and Goethe. The latent political meaning of Friedrich’s paintings is explored within the context of the Napoleonic Wars. Grave also makes reference to the often overlooked early patronage of both the ducal court in Weimar and the royal court in Berlin, where the young crown prince and future King Friedrich Wilhelm IV acquired such seminal works as the Monk by the sea and the Abbey in the oak wood, both of c.1808–10. They were first exhibited in the annual exhibition of the Berlin Academy of Art in the autumn of 1810. In his extensive analysis of these two paintings and other famous works such as The sea of ice (c.1823–24) or Wanderer above a sea of mist (c.1817–18), the author carefully examines the relationship between Friedrich’s work and theories of the sublime that became popular after their formulation by Edmund Burke in 1757. Indeed, the artist himself made a connection between the two. Yet, as Grave points out, this does not necessarily mean that Friedrich ‘wanted his paintings to be understood as an expression of an aesthetic of the sublime’ (p.189).

Immanuel Kant, for whom the sublime is a feeling caused by an overwhelming encounter with nature, had already described that such a sensation could be evoked by a work of art. In fact, it is here that Grave identifies a parallel to Friedrich’s art; he ultimately interprets it as an ongoing inquiry into the nature of representation. Instead of trying to give definitive answers about the validity of the often highly conflicting iconographic ‘explanations’ of Friedrich’s compositions, Grave refers to them only to step back and propose a substantially different, aesthetic interpretation. Werner Busch used a similar method in his 2003 study on Friedrich. Both Busch and Grave draw attention to the artist’s working methods. Yet where Busch primarily focused on the geometrical structures underlying Friedrich’s compositions, Grave’s approach is more holistic. He recognises in Friedrich’s art a constant reference to its own artificial nature, and his drawings and paintings always incorporate evidence of their popular and local status and avoid mere illusionism. Friedrich deploys ‘a complex repertoire of aesthetic strategies designed to destroy the conventions of perception’ (p.199). As a consequence, they have no ‘readily decipherable and immediately comprehensible “message”’. 
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AS TOBIAS NÄTTER acknowledges in his introduction to this substantial and seductive volume on the paintings of Gustav Klimt, some justification is required for the arrival of a new catalogue raisonné, accompanied by essays, only five years after the last such publication appeared. This earlier work, edited by Alfred Weidinger and issued in 2007 by Prestel Verlag, was itself an updating of the still useful 1967 catalogue raisonné compiled by Fritz Novotny and Johannes Dobai. Apart from the more obvious motives for rushing into print – an unsatisfactory international market for lavish books on this artist, professional rivalry within the Viennese museum world (where Weidinger is currently Deputy Director at the Belvedere and Natter the Director of the Leopold), or the chronological imperative of 2012 as the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of Klimt’s birth – there are a number of more strictly artistic reasons to be advanced in favour of the need for a new volume.

Chief among these are the inadequacies that Natter identifies in the 2007 catalogue raisonné entries (where Weidinger’s own texts alternate with those by Michaela Seiser and by Eva Winkler). Here, Natter finds a marked preference for description and formal analysis at the expense of cultural-political or art-historical contextualisation, and a related paucity of quotations from the commentary published by Klimt’s contemporaries. Two further failings are thrown into relief by Natter’s own concern to adopt a different approach. One is Weidinger’s surprising decision to dispense with a concordance, in as far as each entry in his catalogue ‘buries’ its reference to the corresponding Novotny and Dobai entry within its main bibliographical listing. The other is the frequent brevity of these bibliographies, as afoe of Weidinger’s lists of exhibitions, initially excused on the promise (still unfulfilled) that an online version would in due course greatly expand both.

In summarising what he believes to be the chief merits and innovations of his own catalogue raisonné, Natter places particular emphasis on his attention to the recorded responses and movements of those who made up the first audiences for Klimt’s work. Natter does indeed cite some admirably varied, apposite and eloquent observations: an enraptured Hermann Bahr on the ‘quintessentially Austrian’ status of the 1899 overdoor panel Schubert at the piano (cat. no.118); the generously evocative Ludwig Hevenst on the appearance of the storm cloud – ‘asphalt, sulphur, lava [. . .] more oozing than billowing’ – in the 1902/03 Lage poplar II (no.147); the humorist Theo Zasche’s scurrilous ditty on the divinely impregnated Danaë of 1907/08 (no.177); or the feisty journalist and well-connected salonnière Berta Zuckerkuhl’s embroiling on the drama of ‘blood and vengeance’ in Judith II (Salome) (no.182) of 1909. Yet such quotations are not altogether absent from Weidinger’s own catalogue and, on occasion, the very same ones recur (as here in the case of Hevenst), albeit usually given at greater length by Natter.

It is, then, all the more regrettable that this richly detailed log of Klimt’s critical fortune does not extend far beyond 1910, the year after which he altogether ceased exhibiting paintings in Vienna. Most of the entries covering works dated between 1911 and 1917/18 cite no contemporary critical responses at all. This curious indifference to the ‘late Klimt’ is reflected in the range of the essays that precede the catalogue. While the thematically conceived accounts – Susanna Parzych on the women in Klimt’s life and work, Evelyn Benesch on the landscapes, Marian Bisanz-Praeken on the drawings – do of course mention the output of the 1910s, there is no text entirely devoted to the period 1910–18 to balance those covering the ‘early Klimt’ (c.1882–97), by Rainald Franz and Angelina Pötschker, or Klimt’s ‘middle years’ (c.1897–1909), by Christoph Grunenberg.

A partially related, and rather more serious, absence throughout Natter’s catalogue entries are quotations from commentators abroad, with the occasional exception of those in Germany. Klimt remained a much-rearked figure at international exhibitions following his success in Paris in 1900. And in the last fifth of his thirty-five-year career he largely exhibited paintings only outside the Austro-Hungarian Empire – from Rome in 1911 to Copenhagen in 1917–18 – on each occasion eliciting atten-

