

Papers from the X,
AICA-Congress at Munch-museet,
Oslo, Norway, 29. August 1969.
Theme: "Edvard Munch et l'Europe."
Lecture 1.

The Affaire Munch, Berlin, 1892-1893.

by
Reinhold A. Heller

On November 5, 1892, the Verein Berliner Künstler sponsored an exhibition in the newly remodelled Architektenhaus, Wilhelmstrasse 92; arranged along the walls of the Ehrenhalle, a large glassdomed rotunda, were 55 paintings described in a communiqué as "Ibsen'sche Stimmungsbilder". The Verein Berliner Künstler, closely identified with the Berliner Hochschule für die bildenden Künste and its Art Academy, under the official patronage and protection of Kaiser Wilhelm II, had decided to show the citizens of the provincial German imperial city some examples of work by foreign artists. This was the second of such exhibitions; already water-colours by the Scottish painters Austin Brown and Robert Macaulay Stevenson, controversial but highly fashionable examples of European avant-garde artists, had aroused excitement for the radical "impressionist" style they displayed.² As a sequel to this, the newly elected exhibition committee decided to present a Norwegian painter who had refused to exhibit at Berlin's International Exhibition in 1891. The painter chosen for this first one-man exhibition held by the Verein was Edvard Munch. The exhibition has become legendary as "Die Affaire Munch."

In 1891 the Verein celebrated its fiftieth anniversary and for the occasion invited artists from all nations to take part in Berlin's first international exhibition. As had previously occurred solely in Paris and Munich, this Jahresausstellung would include artists from nations other than Germany and the organization of this exhibition of over 3,000 works would be handled by a special committee from the Verein headed by the highly influential battle painter and portraitist of the Berlin court, Professor Anton Alexander von Werner. Despite these innovations, the Jubiläumsausstellung turned out much like previous Berlin exhibitions. Roughly two-fifths of the artists were German. Despite personal visits to their Paris ateliers by the Kaiserin Friedrich, after much public chauvinistic debating France sent no exhibition because of the French defeat at Sedan in 1871. On May 1, 1891, the exhibition opened in the Ausstellungspalast am Lehrter Bahnhof. While military marches were being played by detachments of Prussian infantry and mounted calvary in the foyer of the Palast and while lottery tickets were being sold outside the entrance doors, the Kaiserin Friedrich and her son, Kaiser Wilhelm II, permitted Professor von Werner to explain the sculptures and paintings to them before the exhibition opened to Berlin's public. The tone of strict Prussian order was broken by only one incident: twenty-nine Norwegian painters with fifty-five paintings staged a protest, publically withdrew their entries and took them to Berlin's competitor, the International Exhibition in Munich's Glaspalast which opened on July 1.

The immediate cause of this protest action by the Norwegians was Anton von Werner. After having officially accepted Otto Sinding, who was in Berlin at the time, as the spokesman and representative of exhibiting Norwegian artists, von Werner refused all dealings with him in favor of Hans Dahl, a Norwegian landscape painter active in Düsseldorf. Dahl accused Sinding of leading a clique of "anarchist impressionists" who were suppressing Norway's artistic life; von Werner rescinded previous invitations to exhibit, and Dahl sent out twenty-two private invitations to various artists of Norwegian birth or descent active in Berlin or Düsseldorf. In response to these actions, the committee of Norwegian artists in Kristiania sent a telegram to the Verein and to Anton von Werner:

"Da das repräsentative Komité der norwegischen Künstler durch das Verfahren des Berliner Komité and durch die persönlichen Masseeinladungen ohne Wissen des repräsentativen Komité sowie durch die Verweigerung der Rechte des norwegischen Absandten, an der selbständigen Ausgestaltung der norwegischen Abteilung beschränkt worden ist, glaubt das Komité, der Verantwortung für die Representation Norwegens auf der Berliner Ausstellung nicht weiter übernehmen zu können und zieht sich in Folge dessen zurück."

Among the artists who withdrew was Edvard Munch. In Munich he exhibited four paintings: "Natt i St. Cloud" (1890), "Aften: Inger på stranden" (1889), "Dr. Christian Munch" (1881), and "Aften: Måneskinn" (Karen Bjølstad på veikanten, 1888). The paintings attracted no unusual attention.⁴

After these events of 1891, precisely why the Verein decided to invite Munch to Berlin in 1892 will probably never be fully known. The archives of the Verein have been destroyed, so they cannot be used in answering this question, but a rather extensive answer can still be obtained through newspaper accounts of the time.

Because Munch's work had not yet been seen in Berlin, the exhibition committee asked Fritz von Uhde, a respected Munich painter noted for his depictions of Christ entering the homes of German peasants, to recommend a painter from the Norwegian group. On the basis of *stemningsmalerier* Munch sent to Munich, Uhde supported the recommendation of Adelsteen Normann, the Norwegian landscape painter resident in Berlin who served on the Verein's exhibition committee.⁵ Normann informed the committee of the Norwegian state fellowships Munch had received, of his training in Bonnat's atelier in Paris, and of the fact that he had already had two one-man shows in Kristiania. On September 24, 1892, Normann wrote to Munch:

"Ærede Herr Munch,

Paa Gjennemreise ophold jeg mig en Dag i Christiania og fik der Anledning til Deres udmærkede Udstilling, som jeg likte saa særdeles godt, at jeg maa faa Lov til at ønske Dem til Lykke med samme.

Igaar havde vi her i Forsamling i Udstillingskommissionen for Verein Berliner Künstler, hvoraf jeg er Medlem, og faareslog jeg der at man skulde indbyde Dem til at udstille Deres samlede Billeder i Verein Berliner Künstler, hvilket enstemmigt blev antaget.

Jeg er derfor saa fri at spørge Dem, hvis De ikke allerede skulde have disponert over Deres Billeder om De ikke skulde være villig til at udstille dem her og under hvilke Betingelser.

Med Hilsen og Høiaktelse
A. Normann."

The intriguing question is why Normann, a conservative painter of Norwegian mountains and fjords, would invite the most radical of the young Norwegian painters to come to Berlin. Throughout his work, Munch reflected precisely that French art -- impressionism and the Post-impressionist movements -- which Berlin's artists and public rejected most violently. Yet Normann invited this painter to exhibit in Germany's most conservative art center and to be sponsored by its even more conservative artists' association whose protector was the Kaiser himself. Commenting

on this, Jens Thiis wrote, "Gud vet hvorledes Normann kunde finne på noe slikt," and then argued that Normann's motivations may have been that he "...holdt selv på med å arbeide sig ut av sin banale virtuosomanér."

Although Normann must have appreciated Munch's work, perhaps even because he himself was undergoing a stylistic change in his work, this does not seem to be a sufficient reason to take advantage of the trust placed in him by the Verein and to bring a painter to Berlin who could certainly find little acceptance there. A stronger motivation, which could have overcome numerous objections, is Normann's national pride. The new self-confidence which arose among the Norwegian people during the nineteenth century has often been described. A desire to emphasize things Norwegian and to demonstrate the uniqueness of Norway, her spiritual, if not political, independence from Sweden and Denmark were manifestations of this nationalism. It is perhaps a reflection of this spirit that Normann chose a Norwegian painter, a young man not yet thirty who manifested tendencies more radical than any other Scandinavian painter, who had been supported by the Norwegian state, and who had received the praise of such internationally known painters as Uhde, Thaulow and Krohg. If this motivation is correct, Munch became for Normann a symbol of Norway's independent and radical spirit.

Munch, of course, accepted the invitation, and Thiis again tells us why:

"For den unge Munch, som ikke hadde hatt for meget medgang her hjemme, var jo denne innbydelsen til der Reichshauptstadt arefull og opmuntrende. Især fristet det ham å skulle få utstille sitt kunstnerverk separat og i sammenheng. Han rustet seg følgelig så godt han kunde"

The invitation to Berlin certainly was an honor. Not only had the Verein Berliner Künstler held no previous one-man exhibitions, but Munch's was also to be the first one in the newly remodelled rotunda of the Archtektenhaus, a building in neo-baroque style constructed in 1875 to serve as a beer hall but later converted into the home of Berlin's Architectural Society.

It is also likely that Munch was seeking an opportunity to exhibit in Germany. Throughout the nineteenth century there had been a close interaction between Norwegian and German art.⁹ Artists whom Munch admired -- among them Christian Krohg, Erik Werenskiöld, Frits Thaulow, Kitty Kielland, Christian Skredsvig and Gerhard Munte -- had received their original training in Germany and maintained contacts with artists there.¹⁰ Normann and others had met with success, had found a large buying public in Germany and had decided to stay there. Some, such as Hans Gude, had even become respected teachers at the academies of Duesseldorf, Berlin and Karlsruhe.¹¹ The desire to come to Germany, to exhibit there, to find a public and financial success was shared by Munch with many other young Norwegian artists of his time.

Munch's exhibition in Christiania closed on October 4. The same day Normann wrote a letter requesting that the paintings be sent to Berlin as quickly as possible.¹² By October 20, Munch -- but not his paintings -- had arrived in Berlin; that day he sent a postcard to Karen Bjølstad:¹³

"Vær så snill. at sende hid min tegnemappe (samt alle mine tegninger -- de der findes i skufferne) samt alle kritikker af mine billeder (findes i

min komode i værelset mit) De sendes lettest og billigst pr. Stetiserdampskip. -- Udstillingen bliver ikke før om en fjorten dage -- da mine billeder er forsinket på veien -- Jeg har det meget godt hernede --

Min adresse er forløbige --

Café Bauer

Unter den Linden 26

EM"

During the days before his exhibition opened, Munch acquainted himself with Berlin, was together with Normann much of the time, and attended a meeting of artists, probably the Verein.¹⁴ He also personally hung his paintings in the Architektenhaus, arranging them so that the interrelationships existing between them would be clear.

Included in the exhibition when it opened on November 5 were fifty-five paintings; with the exception of a few earlier works, most of them were painted in Nizza and Åsgårdstrand in 1891 og 1892.¹⁵ Thus, the exhibition was a retrospective one which presented a clear view of Munch's development as a painter up to the time of those paintings Christian Krohg described as "beslektet med symbolismen, den siste retning i fransk kunst."¹⁶ But with the exception of the two or three last paintings -- primarily "Die Sorge" and the Monte Carlo paintings -- the most radical works Munch exhibited were variations on the manners of French Neo-Impressionism and James McNeill Whistler, paintings such as Rue Lafayette and Natt i St. Cloud. They predicted, but did not include, the expressionist style Munch developed in the years immediately following.

To most, if not all, the Berlin public -- the painters and critics as well as the viewers -- work done even in these techniques was, however, totally unknown or else known only by hearsay emanating from the Paris art scene. At this time, the new French art was so little known in Germany that three years after Munch's initial exhibition Courbet, Manet, Monet, Pissarro, Besnard and Renoir were still being described as "masters only a few of us have had the opportunity to know first-hand previously."¹⁷

In 1892, the dermier cri in Germany was still impressionism, but not the impressionism of Monet, Pissarro or Renoir, but rather the naturalistic style of Liebermann and Fritz von Uhde, artists who derived their technique from Manet and Israëls, from Courbet and Bastien-Lepage, and who concentrated on the depiction of peasant life. The intentions of their paintings were usually two-fold: to depict contemporary life, and to convey a social doctrine.¹⁸ Artists such as these founded the secessionist movements of Munich and Duesseldorf in 1892 and formed into groups such as the "24" in Munich or the "Elf" in Berlin who rented gallery space to exhibit together outside the official artists' associations. They fought for "naturalism" and "truth to nature" while anti-naturalistic symbolist doctrines were being proclaimed in France, Belgium, Holland, Italy and Scandinavia.

The official and majority view of the role of art in Germany can be summarized by a speech delivered by the major patron of the Verein Berliner Künstler, by Kaiser Wilhelm II:

"Die Kunst soll mithelfen, erzieherisch auf das Volk zu wirken, sie soll auch den unteren Ständen nach harter Mühe und Arbeit, die Möglichkeit geben, sich an den Idealen wieder aufzurichten... Wenn nun die Kunst, wie es jetzt vielfach geschieht,

weiter nichts tut, als das Elend noch scheusslicher hinzustellen, wie es schon ist, dann verständig sie sich damit am deutschen Volke."¹⁹

There was, then, an aesthetic atmosphere in which battles were still being fought that had been won in France some thirty years earlier, by Courbet and his followers, and in which the "modernists" were almost twenty years behind the remainder of Europe. Opinions and counteropinions were strongly voiced not only by critics and artists, but also by the aesthetically and politically highly conservative Prussian government which used its monetary support to implement its opinions and condemnations. Into this context, into an organization deeply entwined with the government, Munch brought his art in 1892. The reaction of both the public and the Verein Berliner Künstler could easily have been predicted.

Shortly after his exhibition opened on November 5, Munch wrote home:

"Ja nu er udstillingen åbnet - og den vækker en kolosal forargelse - her er nemlig en masse gamle elendig malere der er rasende over den nye retning - Bladene bruger sig forskrækkeligt - dog har jeg i et par fået svært ros - Alle de unge er derimod meget gla i mine billeder--"²⁰

While correct in speaking of "en kolosal forargelse", Munch's reports of strong support for his work from younger artists and the liberal press hid the truth from his family. Almost without exception, the critics of both leftist and rightist newspapers totally rejected everything which Munch represented. In the conservative National Zeitung, the critic G.V. reported about the paintings being shown by the young Norwegian, "der Maler E. Blunch (sic) aus Christiania."

"Wie die ganze jüngere Künstlerschaar aus den Skandinavischen Ländern, so hat auch er sich mit Leih und Seele den Gesetzen des französischen Impressionismus verschrieben und wie alle seiner Landsleute sucht er in dem Abschütteln aller älteren Kunstgesetze seine Pariser Vorbilder womöglich noch zu überbieten. Von irgend welcher künstlerischen Tradition, von irgend welchem Anknüpfen an ältere hergebrachte künstlerische Ideale ist bei Blunch wie bei allen seinen übrigen Genossen nicht die Rede."²¹

Similarly, the popular weekly Illustrierte Zeitung speaks of Munch as

"...einer der verwegenen modernen Impressionisten dessen Kunst jeder Tradition der älteren Richtungen Hohn spricht."²²

As could be expected, the archly conservative critic and art historian Adolf Rosenberg raised the choruses of criticism to new heights. Munch's paintings, he said, are

"Exzesse des Naturalismus, wie sie in Berlin noch niemals zur Ausstellung gelangen sind. Was der Norweger in Bezug auf Formlosigkeit, Brutalität der Malerei, Roheit und Gemeinheit der Empfindungen geleistet hat, stellt alle Sünden der französischen und schottischen Impressionisten wie der Münchener Naturalisten tief in den Schatten. Es sind Bildnisse, Interieurs mit Figuren, Strassenansichten, Strandlandschaften und grøteske Phantasiestücke, die in der liederlichen Art hingeschmiert

sind, so dass es bisweilen schwer hält, eine menschliche Figure daraus zu erkennen oder überhaupt die Natur eines Gegenstandes zu bestimmen... Über die Munch'schen Bilder (...) ist kein Wort weiter zu verlieren, weil sie mit Kunst nichts zu tun haben."²³

For over ten years after this, Rosenberg's Kunstchronik refused to discuss Munch's work again.

In a unique example of agreement with Rosenberg, one of the most liberal Berlin critics, Richard Straubinger likewise condemned Munch for his non-traditional, "anarchistic" paintings:

"Fast alles ist in jüher Hast auf Leinwand oder Puppe hingebürstet, oft bis zur Unkenntlichkeit in den Anfängen gelassen, in der Angst, die hohe Intuition des Malergenies könne bei weiterer Durchführung verdunsten... Wie mit Besen hat unser norwegischer Zauberlehrling mit dem Pinsel herumgefuchelt und sich gewiss dabei gedacht: 'Seht, ich brauche nur in meine Farbentöpfe hineinzutauchen, und Raphael und Tizian müssen sich vor mir verkriechen!' Das ist die Impression norwegischer Observanz!"²⁴

Amidst all the condemnation, only one voice appeared in favor of Munch; Theodor Wolff, editor of the Berliner Tageblatt, criticized his columnist Straubinger for having joined the camp of academicians. Jens Thiis praised Wolff as "den første (kritiker), nest Christian Krohg, som har begrebet noe av Munch;"²⁵ If this praise is perhaps somewhat too high, Wolff was certainly more understanding than Berlin's professional art critics:

"Ich ging - warum sollte ich es leugen und mich besser machen, als ich nun einmal bin? - in die Rotunde, um zu lachen... Aber bei allen Heiligen sei's bekundet, ich habe nicht gelacht... Denn zwischen manchen Schrullen und wahren Scheusslichkeiten glaubte ich feine, überzahrte Stimmungen zu sehen - in dunklen, monddurchflutheten Zimmern, auf einsamen Feldwegen, in verschwiegenen norwegischen Sommernächten - Ich glaubte das Atmen stiller, melancholischer, sonderbarer Menschen zu hören, die nachtwandlerisch und wortlos, den schweren Kampf in der Brust verbergend, über ödes Strandgeröll dahinschreiten. Und ich lachte nicht --"²⁶

But while the critics were still writing, Berlin's artists were already acting to express their displeasure. Amid reports of anarchist activities in Paris and rising beer taxes in Bavaria, the front pages of Germany's newspapers described the strange events taking place in the sacrosanct and hallowed Verein Berliner Künstler. On November 10, the Frankfurter Zeitung published this telegram from Berlin:

"Die Kunst ist in Gefahr! Alle Rechtgläubigen erheben ein grosses Wehgeschrei! Rettungsbataillon vor! Die Kunst ist in Gefahr!"²⁷

Two days later, Munch wrote home:

"Ja sligt røre havde jeg jo aldrig trod der skulde bli - ... Iaften skal det store slag

stå - dere har vel læst i bladene om at de gamle malere vil styrte comiten og lukke udstillingen - der har været holdt store møder i forveien - man ruster sig formeli som til slag - Igår var der et møde på 100 malere der vil støtte komiteen - dog tror man at de vil blive i minoritet - og altså blir udstillingen lukket --"

The dispute reported by Munch and the newspapers began as soon as the exhibition opened. Under the leadership of Prof. Hermann Eschke, sculptor from the Academy, twenty-three Verein members demanded the immediate closing of the show "aus Hochachtung vor Kunst und Ehrlichem Künstlerischem Streben, sowie in dem gewiss berechtigten Wunsche, den Verein Berliner Künstler vor dem Verdachte seiner nicht würdiger Unternehmung zu bewahren."

The leadership of the Verein rejected this proposal because it lacked a sufficient number of signatures. Prof. Eschke then filed another petition, this one with thirty-one signatures, demanding that an immediate extraordinary meeting of all Verein members be held; this petition was granted.

On November 11, the meeting was held. Once again Prof. Eschke demanded that the exhibition be immediately closed and that the exhibition committee resign. In opposition to this proposal, the painters August von Heyden and Ludwig Knaus cited Theodor Wolff's reviews and argued that all artists must be guaranteed the right to exhibit. In addition, it was argued, Munch was the invited guest of the Verein and must have his rights as a guest, as well as an artist, protected. The Kraus and Heyden speeches were strongly cheered, but the Verein voted to support the Eschke proposal, 120-105. Speaking for the exhibition committee, the painter Wentscher announced the resignation of all its members, but was immediately contradicted by four of his colleagues -- surprisingly including Normann -- who intended to retain their positions. Eight of the twelve committee members were then replaced by supporters of Eschke's proposal. At this time, according to plans developed at the meeting held the previous evening, the Academy's Professor of Graphic Arts, Franz Köpping, protested that the affair was not an artistic question at all, but simply whether or not the Verein had the right to throw an invited guest out the door. With the words, "Keine dezente Person kann nun noch dem Künstlerverein zugehören!", Köpping and some 80 other artists walked out of the meeting. Early Sunday morning, November 12, Munch's "anarchistic smears" were removed from the Architektenhaus.

After leaving the Verein, Prof. Köpping walked down the Potsdamerstrasse to a small palais built by Schinkel which housed the gallery of Eduard Schulte, Berlin's most liberal exhibition locale. There, shortly after midnight, the Freie Vereinigung Berliner Künstler was founded. With Köpping as their leader, the artists decided to remain in the Verein Berliner Künstler, but to fight within it for the rights of invited guests and for the exhibition of non-German art in Berlin. On November 18, a circular letter signed by 45 of the minority artists was issued to explain their motives and aim:

"Die Unterzeichneten gehörten der Minorität von 105 Vereinmitgliedern an, welche am 12. November 1892 in der ausserordentlichen Hauptversammlung des Vereins Berliner Künstler gegen den Antrag gestimmt haben, welcher sofortige Schliessung der Munch'schen Ausstellung verlangte. Wir

wurden bei unserer Stimmabgabe von dem Gedanken geleitet, dass Herr Munch, von einer durch den Verein Berliner Künstler frei gewählten Kommission zur Ausstellung eingeladen, als vom Verein selbst eingeladen betrachtet werden muss, und deshalb verurteilen wir, ohne zu der in den Munch'schen Bildern ausgesprochene Kunstrichtung irgendwie Stellung zu nehmen zu wollen, die Schliessung der Ausstellung als eine dem üblichen Anstand zuwiderfahrende Massnahme."³⁰

With this statement, The Affair Munch closed -- almost. Two other lesser events followed as a result of it. On January 8, 1893, three professors -- Franz Skarbins, Hugo Vogel and August von Heyden -- resigned from their positions at the Berlin Academy because of the extremely antagonistic attitudes and actions towards them of Academy Director Anton von Werner and other faculty members.³¹ The reason for this antagonism was the support the three professors had given Munch. The second event occurred on March 21, 1893. Munch applied for membership to the Verein Berliner Künstler! To fulfill the Verein's entrance requirement, Munch presented a painting "eines auf einem Sofa liegenden Mannes" which the members could examine. On April 11, by a vote of 77-39, they rejected Munch's membership application.³²

Jens Thiis summarized the Affaire Munch masterfully and briefly as follows:

"Altså: Munch kom som inbuddt gjest til Berlin med sine 55 billeder en av de første dage i November, og som udstillingslokale fikk han sig overlatt den store overlys-rotunde i Architektenhaus, Wilhelmstrasse. Billedene blev hengt opp og udstillingen åpnet og umiddelbart derefter lukket; billedene sendt på dør. Men forargelsen var enorm og til å begynne med næsten enstemmig, senere eftersom begivenhetene utviklet sig, delvis isprengt med enkelte irrasjonelle forsvar for den "norske anarkistmaler"."³³

In this summary, Thiis is essentially correct, but in his details he often errs, as this account has indicated. These faults Thiis shares with almost all other descriptions of the Affaire Munch; all of them repeat half-truths and unfounded legends.. Among these legends, two deserve additional comment: that Munch caused the founding of the Berlin Secession, and that his art was supported by Berlin's younger artists.

The actual Berlin Secession was not founded until May 2, 1898;³⁴ Munch became member of it in 1904. It would be rather difficult to argue that the events of 1892 were the direct cause of events of 1898 or 1904! Likewise, it is incorrect to say that the artists seceded from the Verein in 1892. The Freie Vereinigung Berliner Künstler never formed into a secession, rather they remained in the Verein Berliner Künstler as an internal opposition to official policies. Its sole act after the Affair Munch was to organize a jury-free exhibition in June, 1893. To this, Munch sent two pastels: a version of Natt i St. Cloud (now Sigval Bergesen d.y. Coll.) and another work depicting an "interior by lamplight."³⁵ After this exhibition, the Freie Künstlervereinigung disappeared.

The artists of this organization all supported Munch in opposition to the Eschke proposals, however there was never a question of supporting Munch's art. There was extremely little disagreement about the con-

denunciation of Munch's work; it was the brusque denial of a guest's rights which appeared as the major issue of the "Affaire Munch", the breaking of the laws of courtesy, not the support of new artistic tendencies. Most of the minority artists, including Köpping and Max Liebermann, were a generation older than Munch and represented artistic movements at least to some degree acceptable or even taught at the Academy. Only Walter Leistikow, two years younger than Munch and a painter of highly stylized *Stimmungslandschaften*, ever defended Munch's work.³⁶ What united Berlin's few liberal artists with academy professors was not Munch's art, but the single issue of *Gastfreundschaft*.

This is a telling commentary on the Berlin where Munch chose to remain for several years. Not aesthetics, but a question of honor and etiquette could bring a split, a sharp exchange of vituperative opinion among Berlin's artists. They remained united in opposition to the new, and Munch remained alone. The *Affaire* takes on significance in the history of modern art only because it brought Munch international notoriety and fame. After this, he ceased being solely a Norwegian artist and became a European artist having a pivotal role to play in the evolution of twentieth century art.

Footnotes

1. Adolf Rosenberg, "Eine Ausstellung von Oelgemälden," Kunstchronik, NF IV (1892/93), p. 74.
2. "Kunst und Kunstgewerbe," Illustrierte Zeitung, IC, No. 2578 (Nov. 28, 1892).
3. For further information concerning this exhibition, see "Ein Epilog zur Berliner Kunstausstellung," Freie Bühne für modernes Leben, II (1891), pp. 963-966.
4. So far has not been possible to locate a catalogue of this exhibition. The paintings are identified by Munch in a letter to Karen Bjørstad: Edvard Munchs brev, familien (Oslo, 1949), p. 105, No. 101.
5. See "Der Bruch innerhalb der Künstlerschaft Berlins," Freisinnige Zeitung, VIII, No. 270 (Nov. 13, 1892). Fritz von Uhde exhibited at Kristiania's Høstutstilling in 1888 and came to Norway on that occasion. Frits Thaulow also reports that Uhde told him in Munich -- the reference is most likely to 1891 -- that Munch was the most interesting painter active in Scandinavia. C.f. Frits Thaulow, "Vore Kunstnerstipendier på Afveie: Svar til B.B.," Dagbladet, Dec. 17, 1891, as reprinted in I Kamp og i Fest (Kristiania, 1908), p. 120.
6. Letter in Munch-museet.
7. Jens Thiis, Edvard Munch og hans samtid (Oslo, 1933), p. 198.
8. Thiis, p. 198.
9. See Alfred Kamphausen, Deutsche und skandinavische Kunst, Begegnung und Wandlung (Schleswig, 1956), pp. 57 ff.
10. Ibid. p. 63, and Leif Østby, Norges Kunsthistorie (Fakkelbøker) (Oslo, 1962), p. 147.
11. Østby, p. 133.
12. Letter in Munch-museet.
13. Postcard, cancelled Berlin, Oct. 4, 1892, in Munch-museet.
14. Brev, p. 120, No. 135. Dated Berlin, Oct. 25, 1892.
15. C.f. catalogue of the exhibition. Reproduced in Christian Gierløff, Edvard Munch selv (Oslo, 1953), p. 86.
The paintings are identified in my Ph.D. dissertation, "edvard Munch's 'Life Frieze': Its Beginnings and Origins," pp. 26-29.
16. Christian Krohg, Kampen for tilværelsen (Oslo, 1954), p. 174.
17. H.A. Lier, review of the Internationale Kunstausstellung des Hamburger Kunstvereins, Kunstchronik, NF V (1895), p. 407.
18. For an extensive, if opinionated, discussion of German art and literature of the 1880's and early 1890's, see Jost Hermand and Richard Hamann, Deutsche Kunst von der Gründerzeit bis zum Expressionismus, Vol. II, "Natura-

Footnotes

- lismus" (Berlin, 1959). An excellent contemporary discussion is Rich. Muther, Geschichte der Malerei im XIX. Jahrhundert, Vol. III (Munich, 1894).
19. Wilhelm II, speech delivered at the dedication of the Siegesallee in Berlin, Dec. 18, 1901. In Das persönliche Regiment: Reden und sonstige öffentliche Aeusserungen Wilhelms II. (Wilhelm Schröder, ed.), (Munich, 1907) p.164.
 20. Brev, p. 120, No. 126.
 21. G.V., "Kunst, Wissenschaft und Literatur," National-Zeitung, Nov. 6, 1892; second Beiblatt.
 22. "Kunst und Kunstgewerbe," Illustrierte Zeitung, IC, No. 2578, (Nov.28, 1892).
 23. Rosenberg, 74-75.
 24. Richard Straubinger, "Aus unseren Kunstsälen," Berliner Tageblatt, XC No. 568 (Nov. 8, 1892).
 25. This, p. 203-204.
 26. Theodor Wolff, "Bitte ums Wort: Die Affaire Munch," Berliner Tageblatt, XXI, No. 576 (Nov. 12, 1892), and "Bruder Straubinger," Berliner Tageblatt, XXI, No. 583 (Nov. 16, 1892).
 27. "Der Impressionismus in Berlin," Frankfurter Zeitung, XXXVII, No. 31. (Nov. 10, 1892).
 28. Brev, p. 122, No. 128, The letter must have been written Novill and incorrectly dated by Munch.
 29. As cited by L.B., "Kunst, Wissenschaft und Literatur," National-Zeitung, Nov. 9, 1892; second Beiblatt.
 30. As cited in "Kunstchronik," Münchener Neueste Nachrichten, XLV, No. 534 (Nov. 22, 1892). In addition to the reports already indicated, our account of the Affaire Munch is also based on the following: "Der Bruch innerhalb der Künstlerschaft Berlins," Freisinnige Zeitung, VII, No. 276 (Nov. 13, 1892). "Kunstchronik," Münchener Neueste Nachrichten, XLV, No. 522 (Nov. 15, 1892).
 31. Letter from Prof. Hugo Vogel, Berliner Tageblatt, XII, No. 21 (Jan. 12, 1893).
 32. Kunstchronik, NF IV (1892/93), p. 363.
 33. This, p. 199. This, p. 204, states that Adolf von Menzel was one of the minority artists supporting Munch. This is incorrect; the artist in question must be Ludwig Manzel, a sculptor working in a Neo-Baroque Style, whose name This remembered or read incorrectly.
 34. Sigfried Wichmann, "Berliner Secession," in (catalogue) Secession: Europäische Kunst um die Jahrhundertwende, Munich: Haus der Kunst, 1964, pp. 9-13. Munch's first exhibition with the Secession took place in 1902.
 35. Jaro Springer, "Die Freie Berliner Kunstausstellung, 'Kunst für alle,'" VIII, No 20 (July 20, 1893) p.314. This exhibition has not previously been recorded.
 36. Walter Selber (i.e. Lestikow), "Die Affaire Munch," Freie Bühne für modernes Leben III (Dec. 1892), p. 1296-1300.