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Introduction

This thesis is part of the project organised by Professor David Jackson entitled *Nordic Art. The Modern Breakthrough*. The project sought to examine the interaction between Nordic and non-Nordic art at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. It culminated in two major exhibitions of Nordic art at Groningen in the Netherlands and at Munich in Germany.\(^1\) Although a significant majority of artworks at both exhibitions was the same, Groningen subtitled their show ’1880-1920’ and Munich ’1860-1920’. This period was one in which Nordic art embraced external artistic influences, and in turn was exhibited more widely and taken more seriously outside the Nordic region. It became apparent that to cover such a broad temporal range of artworks and artists in the detail required for a PhD thesis was impractical, and after initial research two dates presented themselves as highly significant boundaries, namely the *Expositions Universelles* (World’s Fairs) in Paris that took place in 1878 and 1889. It was also necessary to concentrate on oil painting, though success in pastels and watercolours has not been overlooked.

These dates were significant for a number of reasons, not least because they provided a substantial and prestigious showcase for Nordic art in Paris, which at that time was the acknowledged art capital of the world. 1878 was also a significant date, because at this time many Nordic artists were beginning to leave Germany – particularly Munich – for Paris. They were drawn there by both the *Exposition* and the subsequent exposure to French art at the International Art Exhibition in Munich in 1879. This exposure, albeit much of it from the Barbizon school from earlier decades, and also exposure to teaching by French artists in the Paris *ateliers*, led to a profound alteration in the type of art produced by young Nordic artists from the late 1870s onwards, with the 1880s a particularly fertile period for significant paintings in a more modern style. These paintings, to a greater or lesser extent, rejected the dark tonalities of German-influenced art and also the Romantic Nationalist Nordic art of the mid nineteenth century. These new pictures were often painted in France by artists who trained at French schools (particularly that of Léon Bonnat) and adopted French techniques. In the early part of the period under consideration, from 1878 to the mid-1880s, the subject matter painted was very often French also.

This was due to two major factors, the first being that during the long summer break away from the Paris art schools, artists would venture to the French coast and countryside in order to sketch and find subject matter for their paintings. Sometimes these excursions would become less transitory as important artists’ colonies sprang up at Concarneau, Cernay-la-Ville and particularly Grez-sur-Loing, where artists would often paint alongside those of their own nation, or those who spoke a language they could comprehend. In Scandinavia, the colony at Skagen at the very northern tip of Denmark was also highly significant. The second factor that pushed artists towards French subject matter was that being successful in France necessitated producing work that would please French judges and critics. At the beginning, an artist’s chances of success were improved substantially by painting a French scene in a French style; success in France led in turn to much greater prestige at home. Additionally, artists were immersed in French art in Paris, both at the art schools and at the Louvre where they found works to study and copy. Pictures by the Spanish masters were also popular, and frequently promulgated by French tutors like Bonnat. In the 1880s Nordic artists increasingly combined French techniques and themes with subject matter from their own homelands, a synthesis that produced the finest works of the period in terms of both contemporary critical acclaim and their subsequent positioning in the artistic canon.

Much of the successful Nordic art of the period involved the representation of rural people – agricultural labourers, fishermen, artisans – working at their allotted occupations. These representations were unromanticised, and were not consciously imbued with socio-political aspects; any such readings cannot be taken as indications of the artists’ intent. Their roots lay in the work of Jean-François Millet, Gustave Courbet, and Jules Breton, who had depicted sowers, stonebreakers and gleaners in a style now called Realism. These French works often did contain an implicit social, moral or political message and were seen as being in opposition to the smoothly-finished pictures of the official Salon. However, the Nordic artists seemed more intent on capturing the dignity and decency of rural work rather than conveying a message of the undoubted hardships involved in nineteenth-century rural life. They placed the workers’ efforts of honest and unchanging toil in forthright opposition to the industrialisation and urbanisation that increasingly pervaded European life. The Nordic artists often painted in a Naturalist style, one that took Realism as its basis and added an imaginative or aesthetic note to their work. They were clearly interested in portraying the dignity and even nobility of working people as a fitting subject, but also
had aesthetic considerations at the forefront of their concerns. The artist who was the prime instigator and role-model for Naturalist painting at this time was Jules Bastien-Lepage (1848-84), whose breakthrough occurred at the Salon of 1878 with *The Haymakers* (1877; fig. 49a). His qualities of rural subjects, high horizon lines, tilted perspectives, clarity and a lyricism that bordered on the unworldly, made him the chief inspiration for the many foreign artists who followed the *juste-milieu*, or middle way, between Salon academicism and the avant-garde of Impressionism.

The *Exposition Universelle* of 1889 proved to be a watershed for Nordic artists in Paris with over five hundred oil paintings exhibited by over two hundred artists. Four *Grand Prix* were awarded, five *Légion d'honneur* and innumerable gold, silver and bronze medals (see Appendix 1). By this date, many Nordic artists had returned to their home countries, secure in their status, and carrying their accumulated knowledge with them. After 1889, many Nordic artists who had exhibited regularly at the Paris Salon stopped doing so, perhaps feeling a sense of anti-climax after the exhilaration of the *Exposition*. They also knew by this time that the young artists’ opposition to the conservatism of the official art bodies in Scandinavia had borne fruit, with the founding in the 1880s of artists’ own schools and exhibiting societies where they were free from autocratic state control.

The aim of this thesis is therefore to add to our knowledge of Nordic art in Europe in the period 1878-1889. To this end two artists were selected as case studies, using a different approach to each. Erik Werenskiold was the only Norwegian painter at the 1889 *Exposition Universelle* to be awarded a *Grand Prix*. It soon became apparent that little research had been conducted into the origins of his most famous painting *Peasant Burial* (1883-85; fig. 48), and that many scholars repeated previous assumptions. Additionally, not only is the picture still to this day an iconic representation of nineteenth-century Norway, but it differs from many other representations of the period. Instead of showing the rural classes engaged in toil, it was intended by Werenskiold to portray rural Norwegians as strong and noble citizens, inside the orbit of European culture, at exactly the time that rural landowning farmers were gaining political power in Norway. The discussion of Werenskiold is therefore based around this key picture.

The other artist whose oeuvre appeared ripe for analysis was the Norwegian-born Dane, P. S. Krøyer. Not only did Krøyer exhibit at both the 1878 and 1889 *Expositions,*
winning a *Grand Prix* at the latter, but he exhibited with great success at the *Salon* between 1879 and 1889, winning third and second-class medals and being made a *Chevalier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur* in 1888. Additionally, it is difficult to name a Nordic artist whose technical virtuosity was equal to Krøyer in the period under consideration. My research was aided significantly by the exceptional amount of factual information contained in the catalogue for the exhibition *Krøyer: An International Perspective,* ² which was held at the Hirschsprung Collection and Skagens Museum in 2011-12. The meticulously-compiled exhibition information, the result of several decades of research by Marianne Saabye (Hirschsprung Collection), provided a firm basis from which to conduct an analysis of Krøyer’s international career. In this respect the Krøyer catalogue differs significantly from the much smaller essay-based catalogue that was produced for the major Erik Werenskiold exhibition that took place in 2011 at the Nasjonalmuseti in Oslo (hereafter referred to as the Norwegian National Gallery), in that it facilitated a detailed consideration of Krøyer’s art.³

After these substantial case studies, two other areas presented themselves as important areas for research. Firstly, an investigation into the careers of successful Nordic women artists in the period under consideration. Three artists met with success at the *Salon* during this period, Harriet Backer, Bertha Wegmann and Emma Löwstädt-Chadwick. Backer and Wegmann followed broadly similar career paths via Munich and Paris, and both had painting partners who exhibited at the *Salon*, Kitty Kielland and Jeanna Bauck respectively. Additionally, Backer, Kielland and Wegmann were three of the four Nordic women artists who were awarded silver medals at the 1889 *Exposition.*⁴ I decided therefore that these two pairs of painters would make a representative case study to investigate the problems encountered by Nordic women painters, not least their lack of access to art schools and life classes and the antipathy they encountered from the art establishment.

Secondly, I was aware that I could not ignore Nordic artists who exhibited during the period, but whose success and reputations were achieved after 1889. Edvard Munch presented a particular problem, in that this thesis is concerned with the provision of new information and ideas, whereas Munch’s oeuvre has been investigated quite thoroughly, with the result that more books have been produced about him than any

---

⁴ The other was Anna Ancher.
other nineteenth-century Nordic artist. This problem was solved by the time limitations of the thesis, addressing only the two pictures that Munch exhibited outside Scandinavia during this period, in 1885 and 1889 respectively. Similarly, the internationally-recognised Danish artist Vilhelm Hammershøi exhibited just four pictures – at the 1889 Exposition Universelle – and these likewise form the basis for my research into his international exhibition oeuvre.

My final chapter concentrates on all other Nordic artists who met success at the Salon from 1878 to 1889. While of necessity not as rich in analysis as the previous chapters, it provides the first comprehensive account in any language of the Nordic art and artists officially recognised in Paris during this period. It is based on the official records as published in the Salon catalogues, and has involved – where possible – the matching up of French titles, often vague or generic, with extant Nordic artworks.

It should be noted that in this thesis I have used the correct contemporary name for Oslo: Christiania up to 1876, Kristiania from 1877 to 1925, Oslo thereafter. Additionally the term ‘Scandinavia’ covers Norway, Denmark and Sweden, and ‘Nordic’ covers Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Finland. Icelandic art was included in the project-related exhibitions, but was produced after the end of my relevant time period.

This thesis will demonstrate the origins of the Nordic art that was internationally recognised in the period 1878-1889, discuss its critical reception, and additionally will make original connections between Nordic and non-Nordic artworks, in order to provide a better understanding of the place of Nordic art in the artistic canon.
Chapter One – Erik Werenskiold: Peasant Burial

Introduction

Erik Werenskiold’s *En Bondebegravelse* (fig. 48, *Peasant Burial*, 1883-85) is a popular and much-considered work of Norwegian art from the second half of the nineteenth century. Cited frequently in English-language assessments of art of the period, its importance is stressed by both art historians and contemporary artists as a seminal and inspirational work. It was highly praised at exhibitions in Oslo (1885), Berlin (1886), Paris (1889) and Munich (1891), and its current recognisability in Norway is demonstrated by the use of the picture to advertise the exhibition *Erik Werenskiold (1855-1938)* at the Norwegian National Gallery (June-Sept. 2011): the Gallery describes the work as ‘an integral part of Norway’s visual identity’.

In addition to a number of survey works of Scandinavian art, Clarence Sheffield Jr. devoted a chapter of his 1999 Ph.D. to the picture. However, I propose that previous considerations have only scratched at the surface of our understanding of the painting, and that a systematic investigation of a number of areas and approaches will give a much fuller and richer comprehension of its meanings and significance. These areas can be summarised as follows:

Firstly, the art that Werenskiold encountered in Munich in the period from 1875 to 1881, and in Paris from 1881 to 1883, and a concomitant discussion of his early works. The impact of Werenskiold’s visit to Gudbrandsdalen in 1878 and his commission to illustrate the 1879 edition of Peter Christen Asbjørnsen and Jørgen Moe’s ‘Norwegian Folk Tales’ (*Norske Folkeeventyr*), coupled with a close examination and analysis of the preparatory drawings made by Werenskiold in 1878 that provide a purely compositional basis for the later painting.

Secondly, the tradition of Romantic Norwegian Painting in the nineteenth-century, from which emerge depictions of the ‘peasantry’ (*bønder*) and the Norwegian stave churches that are integral elements of Werenskiold’s preliminary drawings. Also, a discussion of the social, cultural, economic and political circumstances in the period leading up to the exhibition of *Peasant Burial* in Oslo in 1885.

---

Thirdly, a challenge to the traditional view that Courbet’s *Burial at Ornans* (1849-50; Musée d’Orsay) provides a close representational basis for *Peasant Burial*, and that a comparison with James Guthrie’s *A Funeral Service in the Highlands* (1881-82; Kelvingrove Art Gallery, Glasgow) is a far more productive exercise.

Finally, an examination of the whole genre of funeral and burial pictures in the period prior to *Peasant Burial*, and a brief discussion of the previously unconsidered parallels between ‘The Glasgow Boys’ and Nordic artists of the relevant period. Additionally, a consideration of two Nordic works by Christian Skredsvig and Albert Edelfelt that were of a particularly high profile due to their success in France immediately prior to the production of *Peasant Burial*.

**Erik Werenskiold from 1875 to 1885: Munich, Paris and Telemark**

Erik Werenskiold was born in 1855, the year that the great Norwegian Romantic painter Adolph Tidemand attended the atelier of the French history painter Thomas Couture in Paris. Werenskiold was born into a relatively prosperous family and was gifted both academically and artistically. He attended the Royal Drawing School in Christiania (now Oslo) and lodged with the family of the eminent conservative philosopher Professor Marcus Monrad. The Monrad family were highly impressed with Werenskiold’s artistic abilities and decided to send his sketchbook to Tidemand, who had been resident in Düsseldorf for many years.

Tidemand was equally impressed and advised Werenskiold to head for Munich to continue his studies. Tidemand recommended Munich for two reasons at this time (1874). Firstly, Tidemand himself was in poor health both physically and mentally: his only son, also Adolph, died in this year, as did Tidemand himself two years later. More pertinently, Tidemand would have been aware of Munich’s growing importance, both as a cultural centre and as the main centre of artistic education for foreign students in Germany in the 1870s. Munich attracted a gamut of Norwegians, beginning with Eilif Peterssen, who had entered the Munich Academy in October 1873, and had in turn become tutor to Harriet Backer (in 1874) and Asta Nørregaard (1875) who, as women, were not permitted to attend the actual Academy. The precocious Hans Heyerdahl had

---

also entered the Academy aged seventeen in November 1874, and in 1875 Henrik Ibsen arrived in the city from Dresden. Christian Skredsvig also arrived in 1875, although he did not enrol at the Academy, quite possibly for financial reasons. Werenskiold himself arrived in December 1875 in the company of an older painter, Oscar Wergeland, who was presumably there to show Erik ‘the ropes’, as Wergeland had been registered at the Academy since April 1874.

However, Erik was unable to begin for a few months as the Academy classes were full; his date of admission is recorded as 4 May 1876. Theodor Kittelsen, later to be Werenskiold’s co-illustrator of the folk tales of Asbjørnsen and Moe, registered in October 1876, Gerhard Munthe arrived in 1877 and Eyolf Soot registered in January 1881, just before Werenskiold left Munich. Like Backer, Kielland and Nørregaard, Werenskiold’s future wife Sophie Thomesen was also drawn to the artistic community of fellow Norwegians in Munich, despite the Academy ban on female members. Thus the majority of a whole generation of significant Norwegian artists were concentrated for a few brief years in the capital of Bavaria, in contrast to earlier generations who had favoured Düsseldorf, Karlsruhe, Dresden and Berlin.

Werenskiold was successful immediately as a pupil in Munich, and was awarded a silver medal for drawing at the Academy’s annual exhibition in 1876. Unlike Düsseldorf (Tidemand) and Karlsruhe/Berlin (Hans Gude), the tutors at Munich were German, and for Werenskiold the most influential was the history painter Wilhelm von Lindenschmit, who began to tutor him in October 1876. Lindenschmit was an admirer of the French Barbizon school, and of Gustave Courbet who had been much-fêted when he spent six weeks in Munich on the occasion of the first International Art Exhibition held there in 1869. It is instructive to look at the art that was seen by Lindenschmit and the other Münchner at that exhibition.

---

9 Marit Werenskiold, ‘Erik Werenskiold in Munich 1875-1881’, Konsthistorisk tidskrift/Journal of Art History, 68, 2, 1999, p. 83. Oscar Wergeland’s father was a cousin of the major figure in Norwegian literature in the first half of the nineteenth century, Henrik Wergeland, who in turn knew Erik’s father. Oscar’s great-uncle, Nicolai Wergeland, was closely involved in the drafting of the Norwegian constitution of 1814, a subject that provided Oscar with his most famous work National Constituent Assembly Eidsvoll 1814 (1885; Riksforsamlingen på Eidsvoll 1814).
10 Ibid.
11 Matrikel AdBK München.
12 Marit Werenskiold, 1999, p. 83
13 Ibid., p. 84.
French works included an early Manet, *Spanish Singer* and a version of Delacroix’s *Chiron and Achilles*. More pointedly, the Barbizon School was represented by the recently-deceased Theodore Rousseau, and by two landscapes and a loosely-painted small study of *St. Sebastian* by Corot. Lindenschmit would also have noticed Charles Daubigny’s solitary picture *Gypsy Camp*, his great enthusiasm for the Frenchman’s work was to be inherited by Werenskiold. Courbet was the chief attraction at the show and made a great impression on Lindenschmit. Courbet exhibited at least five works including the psychological picture *The Sleepwalker*; a bucolic idyll *The Rest during the Haymaking Season; Landscape at Mézières*; and the provocative nude *Woman with a Parrot*. However, it seems likely that it was Courbet’s earlier large composition *The Stonebreakers* (1849; fig. 1) that drew the most attention, with its simple and dignified rendition of two men, one young one old, working hard in the blazing sun, trousers covered in mud and surrounded by the various tools of their trade. Clarence Sheffield sees affinities between *The Stonebreakers* and the ‘simple, dirty shoes, soiled trousers and randomly placed wooden spades [of Werenskiold’s figures], adding ‘The combination of young and old figures [...] also resembles Courbet’s combination of young and old stonebreakers’. To these observations I can add the intense heat of the day in both pictures. However, the backbreaking toil of Courbet’s peasants, with their badly-torn dirty clothing, is far removed from the sturdy, upright and smartly-attired (albeit dusty) farmers in Werenskiold’s final painting (fig. 48).

Finally, two historical works were on display by noted Professors from the Academy, Karl von Piloty and Lindenschmit himself. Piloty, who was to become director of the Munich Academy in 1874, submitted *Mary Stuart*. He was particularly fond of great historical death scenes, and his oeuvre included *Seni before the Body of Wallenstein* (1855), *The Death of Caesar* (1865) and *The Death of Alexander the Great* (1884 – unfinished).

---

14 No. 1384 (1860, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York); No. 1328
15 No. 207, *Landscape after the Rain*.
16 No. 1327, No. 1329; No. 1165 (c.1850-55, Louvre, Paris).
17 No. 1165 (c.1850-55, Louvre, Paris).
18 No. 253 (c.1855, Musée des Beaux-Arts, Besançon; No. 1392 (1867); No. 1299; No. 1304, (1866, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York); No. 1305 (1849, formerly Staatliche Gemäldegalerie, Dresden – destroyed).
19 Sheffield, 1999, p. 68.
20 No. 972.
Fig. 1. Gustave Courbet, *The Stonebreakers*, 1849 (destroyed), ex-coll. Staatliche Gemäldegalerie, Dresden, 165 x 238cm.

Fig. 2. Wilhelm von Lindenschmit *Ulrich von Hutten, 1516*, 1869. Medium, size, location, unknown.
Piloty had been the tutor of Hans Makart, who Werenskiold described as ‘the greatest colourist in Germany’, and who later became a major influence on Gustav Klimt. Lindenschmit was obviously a man who paid thorough attention to detail (just like Werenskiold) as his submission had by far the longest title in the exhibition (thirty-four words) best abbreviated as *Ulrich von Hutten, 1516.* In addition to painting episodes from British history, such as *John Knox and the Scottish Iconoclasts* and *Sir Walter Raleigh in the Tower visited by his Family* (1873), Lindenschmit’s other paintings possess a similarly strong Protestant emphasis. A number of pictures depict the struggles of Martin Luther, and the aforementioned *Ulrich von Hutten* portrays a man of anti-Catholic, Lutheran opinions. Lindenschmit’s ‘Lutheran streak’, in a predominantly Catholic area of Germany, would have resonated well with the religious upbringing of the Norwegian artists.

Werenskiold initially accepted Lindenschmit’s ‘French’ method of priming the canvas ‘with a thick “sauce” of black and brown’, as evidenced by his early work *Study of a Woman, Semi-Nude* (fig. 3). The ambitious and impatient Hans Heyerdahl, nearly thirty years younger than Lindenschmit, disliked this method thoroughly and was soon at loggerheads with the professor, leading to Heyerdahl’s departure from Munich. Marit Werenskiold suggests that it may have been Heyerdahl who eventually dissuaded Erik from continuing to prime his canvas with a dark undercoat. This removal of the inherent dark colouration of academic painting, which sought to add the gravitas of the ‘old masters’ to contemporary pictures, is a recurrent theme during this period. In 1884 the French writer Joseph Péladan described Manet’s *The Absinthe Drinker* (1858-9; Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen) as ‘painted throughout in the brown gravy and motiveless reds and yellows which will soon be eliminated from [his] palette when his brush makes a hole in this dark cellar’. By 1882 in Norway, Edvard Munch was rebelling against ‘the controlled image washed in brown sauce and glassily varnished’. For young artists, highly-finished works on a dark background were giving way in favour of a looser, less-finished style, reflecting a flight from the *re tardataire*

---

22 No. 733: *Ulrich von Hutten, in einer Herberge von adeligen Franzosen im Streit über Kaiser und Reich angefallen, sticht den Nächsten nider und jagt, selbst nur and der Wange verwundet, die Übrigen in die Flucht, 1516.*
23 Marit Werenskiold, 1999, p. 84.
24 Ibid., pp. 90-91.
history painting of the German tutors and the old precepts of the traditional French Salon.

It is somewhat ironic therefore that Heyerdahl’s *Adam and Eve expelled from Paradise* (fig. 4), which received a third-class medal at the 1878 *Exposition Universelle* in Paris – a fantastic achievement for a twenty-one-year-old Scandinavian – was painted before he left the Munich Academy. A French critic wrote of Heyerdahl’s painting: ‘The model [...] has a general appearance of something wild, combined with a sense of stark reality, which contrasts with the mystery of its sinister essence, menacing and uncertain, as the two exiles are sent away. There is strength in there’. Heyerdahl painted a decidedly modern-looking long-haired couple, whose realistic flesh colour contrasts with the paler and more classical tones of Werenskiold’s semi-nude.

![Fig. 3. Erik Werenskiold, Study of a Woman, Semi-Nude, 1877, Bergen Kunstmuseum, oil on canvas, 88 x 64.5cm.](image)


Another important artist in Munich at this time was Wilhelm Leibl. A close friend of Eilif Peterssen, Leibl had also been inspired by Courbet’s visit to Munich in 1869, and his unsentimental depictions of peasants in the Bavarian countryside possess a naturalism that is indebted to the Frenchman. Leibl’s objective approach to peasant life has strong parallels with that of Werenskiold’s *Peasant Burial*, and Leibl’s portraiture also shares the naturalistic and affectionate feel of Werenskiold. Werenskiold would have seen Leibl’s *The Politicising Farmers* (fig. 5; *Die Dorfpolitiker*), which portrays German men of a similar class to the Norwegian bønder of *Peasant Burial*. In Leibl’s depiction, the group of men can be seen discussing a land document, and it was this ownership of land that made the Norwegian bønder an important political class in relation to their actual numbers. Werenskiold would also have noticed that Leibl’s picture appears to be derived from Adolph Tidemand’s *Politicising Farmers* (fig. 6, *Politisereende bønder*):  

30 Sold by Grev Wedels Plass, Oslo, 27 November 2007, Lot No. 23, NKR 3,300,000.
the titles are identical and in both cases a group of five seated men is discussing a document, with the leftmost figure sitting on a bench under a window. It is interesting to note the French-influenced Naturalism of Leibl’s picture compared to Tidemand’s ‘Romantic-Realism’.

Fig. 5. Wilhelm Leibl, *Politising Farmers (Die Dorfpolitiker)*, 1877, Museum Oskar Reinhart am Stadtgarten, Winterthur, Switzerland, oil on wood, 76 x 97cm.

Fig. 6. Adolph Tidemand, *Politising Farmers (Politiserende bønder)*, 1849, sold by Grev Wedels Plass, Oslo, 27 November 2007, lot no.23, material unknown, 67 x 85cm.
Werenskiold was given the prestigious task of providing illustrations for Asbjørnsen and Moe’s *Norwegian Folk Tales* (*Norske Folkeeventyr* – published 1879), and spent the summer of 1878 away from Munich sketching in the northern reaches of the Gudbrandsdalen, a 150-mile-long valley in north central Norway. This visit provided the original concept for *Peasant Burial* and there is therefore a discussion of the art from this trip in the next section. Werenskiold drew sketches of many individual figures on his Norwegian odyssey, as he had done on a Bavarian trip with Skredsvig the previous year, and was now able to compose a picture, *Berrypickers* (fig. 7), based on combining individual portraits from the Bavarian trip into a unified composition. This picture is the first painted example of the compositional method that Werenskiold utilised to create *Peasant Burial*. By the end of 1878, Heyerdahl was not the only Norwegian to have left Munich. Backer, Kielland, Skredsvig and Peterssen had all departed, amongst other reasons attracted by the *Exhibition Universelle* in Paris, where Heyerdahl was to find success. However, Werenskiold was doing well in Munich and continued to study there.

Fig. 7. Erik Werenskiold, *Berrypickers* (*Kinderscherze*), 1878, private collection, oil on canvas, 81 x 97cm.
*Berrypickers* has a feel of the influence of Wilhelm Leibl in its depiction of Bavarian peasantry, but also a slightly syrupy, engagingly sentimental mood in its portrayal of the peasant children as lively and carefree. It proved a hit when exhibited in Munich in the summer of 1878 and in Kristiania in October, where it brought Werenskiold to the attention of the Norwegian critics. The following year there was a further major international art exhibition in Munich, and Werenskiold was now able to observe at first hand a huge variety of European artworks, with over 2,200 exhibits catalogued. This art exhibition was crucial to Werenskiold’s future artistic development and made him feel ‘a joy that almost hurt’; it is therefore discussed in some detail.

The Munich tutors were represented by Lindenschmit’s five pictures of historical, religious and mythical scenes. Piloty did not exhibit this time, but a former student of his, Wilhelm von Diez – who had taught Eilif Peterssen – showed three works, and Werenskiold’s first tutor in Munich, Ludwig von Löfftz, entered four. Wilhelm Leibl had but one work, and this only in the addendum alongside the late-arriving French pictures, entitled *Portrait of a Young Bavarian*. Its title suggests an affinity with Werenskiold’s *Berrypickers* of the previous year.

The Norwegians themselves were well represented. Hans Gude, in the year before he finally left Karlsruhe for Berlin, showed three landscapes. No-one was more convinced than Gude that living in Germany left one’s deeply-felt Norwegian character unaffected, but on this occasion he showed two views of Scotland and one of Austria. Gude’s former student, Hans Dahl, used the ancient Norse myth of the goddess Rán and her daughters as a subject for *A Game in the Waves*, in which bare-breasted maidens frolicked in the choppy surf. Gerhard Munthe showed three pictures of Norway; *Dawn breaking in the Suburbs – Winter* and two works both entitled *Autumn Evening in Norway*. Frits Thaulow, also a former pupil of Gude and brother-in-law of Paul Gauguin, sent two Norwegian depictions from his studio in Paris, *Against the*
Coast and Norwegian Coast, and a view of the Basin de la Villette in the French capital.\textsuperscript{40} The Swedish history painter Carl Gustav Hellqvist was also represented.\textsuperscript{41} Mention must be made of the Finn Albert Edelfelt’s magnificent history painting *Duke Karl Insulting the Corpse of Klaus Fleming* (1878; Ateneum, Helsinki), as the picture had an underlying agenda that supported the cause of Finnish Nationalism.\textsuperscript{42} Its dramatic nature, large scale and fine technique would surely have aroused the envy and admiration of Lindenschmit. The cosmopolitan nature of the exhibition was further illustrated by the inclusion of three British works, Millais’s *The Tribe of Benjamin Seizing the Daughter of Shiloh* (1847) and a pair of unspecified portraits by George Frederick Watts.\textsuperscript{43}

The French contingent was late in arriving at Munich, and their pictures had to be included in the substantial addendum to the first edition of the catalogue. However, it was the French works in this section that really excited Werenskiold and had a profound effect on him, particularly the landscapes by Corot and Daubigny and the work of the Paris-based Hungarian Mihály Munkácsy.\textsuperscript{44} Corot had died in 1875 and two works by him were submitted, *The Row of Willows* and *Riverbank*.\textsuperscript{45} These pictures have proved hard to identify,\textsuperscript{46} but are exemplified by *Saint-Nicholas-les Arras: Willows on the Bank of the Scarpe* (1871-72; fig. 8).

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item No. 1038 and No. 1039; No. 2187.
\item No. 402 and No. 403.
\item No. 2118; No. 2198 and No. 2199.
\item Marit Werenskiold, 1999, pp. 89-90.
\item No. 1977 and No. 1978.
\item Alfred Robaut’s *Catalogue Raisonné* seems not to have noted the 1879 Munich exhibition: *L’œuvre de Corot: catalogue raisonné et illustré par Alfred Robaut* (Paris: H. Floury, 1905).
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Werenskiold would have related to Corot’s fresh, unsentimental depiction of peasants inhabiting their natural landscape. The background is in complete contrast to the dark Munich style, and the brushwork is loose and fine. Corot’s composition has affinities with the seventeenth-century Dutch landscape tradition, typified by Jacob van Ruisdael and Aelbert Cuyp, which Werenskiold would have known and enjoyed. Corot, however, came a close second in Werenskiold’s ‘French affections’ to another painter of the Barbizon School, Charles-François Daubigny, who had died in February 1878. Daubigny was represented by three works, *On the Banks of the Oise*, *The Herd* and *Moonrise*. *On the Banks of the Oise* (fig. 9) typifies the Barbizon approach in its portrayal of the gentle effects of light and shadow based on direct observation from nature, and this proved inspirational to Werenskiold.

---

47 A fact clearly unknown to the compilers of the Munich catalogue who omitted the usual †.
Moonrise (fig. 10) is a nocturne that depicts two small figures resting under a tree watching the bright full moon rise. Its subject is highly-reminiscent of Samuel Palmer during his Shoreham period, but with a finer brushwork technique. Both of these works by Daubigny contain a stillness of atmosphere – one of day and one of night – that would have reminded Werenskiold, based in urban Munich, of the peace and tranquillity of the Norwegian countryside. It is noticeable that in the cities of Munich, Paris and Christiania, Werenskiold always made excursions to the surrounding countryside and clearly preferred rural to urban life.
Fig. 11. Mihály Munkácsy, *The blind Milton dictating ‘Paradise Lost’ to his Daughters*, 1878, New York Public Library, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown.

Fig. 12. Jules Breton, *The Gleaner*, 1877, Musée des Beaux-arts, Arras, ex Musée d'Orsay, Paris, oil on canvas, 230 x 125cm.
For Werenskiold, the most magnificent painting he had ever seen was Mihály Munkácsy’s *The blind Milton dictating ‘Paradise Lost’ to his Daughters* (fig. 11). The balance of the figures in the composition – so important to Werenskiold in *Peasant Burial* – the quiet stoicism of Milton and the emotional undertones clearly struck a chord with the young Norwegian artist. Werenskiold would also have seen *Portrait of Victor Hugo* by his future tutor Léon Bonnat, but would assuredly have paid more attention to the towering figure of Jules Breton’s *The Gleaner* (fig. 12), which, like Daubigny’s *Moonrise*, had been shown at the Paris Salon of 1877 and *Exhibition Universelle* of 1878. This would have been Werenskiold’s first exposure to a monumental larger-than-life figure at the forefront of the picture plane in a style that was being popularised by Jules Bastien-Lepage (unrepresented at Munich). Bastien-Lepage was soon to become a great favourite with painters and critics across Europe, praised by influential people such as the art historian and curator Jens Thiis and Werenskiold’s close friend, the critic Andreas Aubert, who accompanied him to the Munich exhibition. Werenskiold’s picture from the same year, *A Confession* (fig. 13), gives an indication of figures filling the picture plane, without possessing the monumentality or psychological ‘otherworldliness’ of Breton and Bastien-Lepage. As exemplified by *Peasant Burial*, Werenskiold’s preferred method for treating figures in a landscape was to frame them in a traditional manner using natural vegetation.

As Nils Messel has noted, despite the claims of Werenskiold and Jens Thiis, there were no French Impressionists at Munich in 1879, no Monet, Pissarro or Caillebotte. It seems that memories of the exhibition were later informed by subsequent events and repute, and that later viewings became conflated with earlier ones. The Barbizon School was the most significant and influential proponents of French art at the exhibition, and can be considered as the forebear of *Peasant Burial*. Siulolovao Challons-Lipton says that Werenskiold’s exposure to this art prompted his decision ‘to go to Paris to learn this innovative French mode’.

---

50 Marit Werenskiold, 1999, p. 90; No. 2129.
51 No. 1944.
52 No. 1949.
With many of his Norwegian friends already in the French capital, it is inferred that he headed swiftly in that direction. However, there was actually a gap of eighteen months before Werenskiold finally arrived in Paris in February 1881 and I propose a number of reasons for this. Unlike the impetuous Heyerdahl, Werenskiold was a patient man, as evidenced by the painstaking care that he put into his artworks, both drawing and painting: *Peasant Burial*, not overlarge in size, took three summers to complete. Indeed, it was this attention to detail that endeared him to the Munich professors, with whom he had a good working relationship. Werenskiold’s art was proving popular in Munich and he was getting a name for himself: two of his works, *Sunshine, Pipping* (1879; private collection) and *The Meeting in the Fields* were well received at the Munich Art Society exhibition in the spring of 1880.55

Additionally, Werenskiold had his relationship with Sophie Thomesen to consider and they became engaged near the end of his Munich sojourn in November 1880. What is definitely known is that Werenskiold, a hard-working and sensitive man, fell ill with ‘a rheumatic disease’ in April 1880. His symptoms, a numb tongue and right arm, were symptomatic of a calcium deficiency, but, whatever the cause, he spent the summer recovering in various mountain resorts in the Alps and the Tirol. Marit Werenskiold discusses the importance of the two paintings mentioned above: Sunshine, Pipping was considered by Erik Werenskiold to be ‘the first green picture painted in Norway’. and a later en plein-air version of The Meeting in the Fields (1880-81), with many of the background trees removed, was sold to the top Bavarian art-dealer Wimmer & Co., which enhanced Werenskiold’s growing reputation in Norway. In these two pictures, we witness the origins of the green grass that occupies much of the centre ground in Peasant Burial, and provides a natural foil to the darkly-clad figures.

In February 1881, just as Werenskiold was achieving his greatest success in Munich, he left for Paris, arriving in time to see the sixth Impressionist exhibition which began on 2 April. Here, Werenskiold would have seen paintings by Degas, Raffaëlli, Gauguin and Morisot, and he had a particular liking for the work of the first two named. Monet, Renoir and Sisley did not exhibit, but he could have seen them instead at that year’s Salon. Werenskiold also made contact with the art dealer Theo van Gogh around this time.

My theory that Werenskiold studied Pissarro’s work is evidenced by the former’s ‘first major work from France’, The Potato Harvesters (1881; private collection), as Pissarro exhibited The Potato Harvest (1880; location unknown) at that same Impressionist exhibition. Pissarro was also known to be the most generous of the Impressionists in his willingness to discuss his methods. However, although there is a
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56 Ibid., pp. 92-93.
57 Marit Werenskiold informed the author that this is quite possible, as Erik Werenskiold’s doctor advised him to drink plenty of milk at this time. Interview with Marit Werenskiold, September 2011.
58 Marit Werenskiold, 1999, pp. 91-93.
59 Ibid.
61 Marit Werenskiold, email to the author, 26 April 2011.
mild similarity with the brushwork technique of another of Pissarro’s sixth Impressionist exhibition works, *La Sente du Choux en Mars* (fig. 14), the Impressionist technique that Werenskiold displays around the graveside of *Peasant Burial* (fig. 15) – loosely-applied translucent colour using a broad brush – seems closer to me to James Guthrie (fig. 16) than the more painterly dabs of the French painter.

Werenskiold made his debut at the Paris *Salon* that year with some drawings, and at the *Salon* he was much taken with P. S. Krøyer’s *Italian Village Hatters* (fig. 17). The honesty of the picture and the balance of the composition, with a little humanity added by the boy looking directly at the viewer, appealed to Werenskiold in a similar manner to Munkácsy’s *Milton*, this time with two very young boys working with their father. It is interesting that Krøyer’s ‘extreme verism was misinterpreted as being revolutionary
in both style and content’. Krøyer had shown a similar work at the Salon in The Smithy at Hørnbaek (1878; fig. 64) three years previously, but in the Hatters the extreme heat emphasised by the lack of any clothing above the waist, the scrawny appearance of the hatter himself, and the extreme youth of his child assistants, upset bourgeois sensibilities. The heat, the very hard physical labour, and the contrast between age and youth provide strong parallels with Courbet’s The Stonebreakers. The bourgeoisie saw Italian Village Hatters as a statement on the conditions of working people, and by inference an attack on themselves. However, the picture won a medal at the Salon, and Werenskiold, who saw the picture a number of times, believed that Krøyer had tried to be truthful rather than political and that the painting provided an object lesson in bringing figures together to form a cohesive whole. Every time he saw Krøyer’s work he realised that he had not learnt in Munich ‘to draw the totality steadily and definitely’. This would prove to be a lesson well-learnt when Werenskiold came to compose Peasant Burial.

---

64 Challons-Lipton, 2001, p. 107.
65 Ibid.
66 Marit Werenskiold, 2009, p. 94.
Although Werenskiold resided for two-and-a-half years in Paris, he did not remain in the city for long periods. He returned to Christiania, visited Krohg and Skredsvig at Grez-sur-Loing, and spent the summer of 1882 north of Paris at Villiers-le-Bel, where Thomas Couture – tutor to both Tidemand and Olaf Isaachsen – had died three years previously. Werenskiold confessed that he found the Paris Salon ‘clever, but awfully

---

68 Isaachsen had studied under Johannes Flintoe (see fig. 31), a Danish-born Romantic painter who had also taught Hans Gude before he studied under Couture. After Couture, Isaachsen spent time in Courbet’s atelier.
The primacy which the Salon gave to French art is reflected in the Gazette des Beaux-arts, which at that time devoted large sections to its native painters, and then added later les écoles étrangères in smaller geographical sections. It made brief comments about individual pictures and often amalgamated foreign artists together in a single reference. It may be that Werenskiold reacted against this chauvinistic and Franco-centric milieu, particularly as, while his German was excellent, he struggled with the French language. In general, it is fair to say that Werenskiold felt a closer affinity to the Germans than the French as a people, despite his love of the Barbizon artworks.

It was during a return to Kristiania that Werenskiold was instrumental in organising the Norwegian artists’ strike of 1881/2. He and other young artists had long disliked the control exerted by the Kristiania Art Association (Kunstforeningen), and the Association’s refusal to accept Gustav Wentzel’s A Carpenter’s Workshop (fig. 42) at their annual exhibition was the final straw. A group led by Werenskiold, Frits Thaulow and Christian Krohg organised the year-long strike, which led to the artists’ own annual Autumn Exhibition in 1882, where there was ‘room for all dissenting artistic voices’. Werenskiold had been inspired by the example of the French Salon of 1881, where government control had been relinquished and the artists themselves took over the Salon organisation. Subsequently in 1885 he set up an Academy of Drawing and Painting in Christiania with Krohg and Heyerdahl.

---

69 Marit Werenskiold, 1999, p. 94.
70 Marit Werenskiold, email to the author, 26 April 2012.
72 Thaulow and Krohg were the two major Norwegian artists of the period who did NOT study in Munich. They had both studied under Hans Gude in Karlsruhe and then spent time together in the Danish artists’ colony at Skagen. Thaulow was often based in Paris, and Krohg was in Paris from 1881-82 at the same time as Werenskiold.
73 Sue Prideaux suggests that the strike was actually ‘more of a publicity stunt than a strike’, and infers that the artists’ main concern was publicity for their cause. See Prideaux, 2005, p. 44.
74 Challons-Lipton, 2001, p. 162. In 1884 the new government gave financial support to this annual exhibition.
75 Léon Bonnat’s popularity with his fellow artists is indicated by the fact that he came top of the election for the painting committee of the Salon in both 1881 (1,670 votes) and 1882 (1,121 votes). See Art Journal, 1881, pp. 237 and 371. Bonnat taught Werenskiold in 1888-89.
76 Challons-Lipton, 2001, p. 163.
In March 1882, prior to his wedding to Sophie Thomesen, Werenskiold saw the seventh Impressionist Exhibition. Gauguin, Morisot and Pissarro exhibited again, but this time there was no Degas or Raffaëlli. However, Renoir, Monet, Sisley and Caillebotte had all returned and it was the latter artist who made a substantial impact on Werenskiold, and also on Christian Krohg, who painted a portrait at Grez of the Swedish artist Karl Nordström on a balcony based on Caillebotte’s work.\(^77\)

Werenskiold’s immediate response to Caillebotte was literary: he published an article entitled *Impressionisterne* in *Nyt Tidsskrift* in the autumn of 1882, in which he discussed the ‘absurdity’ of Caillebotte’s viewpoint from the fourth or fifth storey of a Parisian building. The viewpoint in *Peasant Burial* is a comparatively conventional one, but Werenskiold extracted from Caillebotte the knowledge that Impressionism was a broad church, and that in its broader context it could also include the Realism of Caillebotte and the loosely-painted Naturalistic works of Manet. Werenskiold would have been aware of Caillebotte’s best-known work *The Floorscrapers* (*Les Raboteurs de Parquet*, 1875; Musée d’Orsay, Paris) and noted its truthful portrayal of working people, albeit from an unusual viewpoint. Additionally, he would have noticed parallels with Krøyer’s *Hatters*; three males, naked from the waist up, engaged in hard manual work.

Werenskiold wrote *Impressionisterne* on the island of Tåtøy, near Kragerø, and at this same juncture he painted the impressionistic work *Herders at Tåtøy I* (fig. 18). Challons-Lipton points out that there were three important characteristics of Impressionism that Werenskiold categorised in his article: the creation of luminosity by the colour blue, a rendering of the transitory nature of things, and a boldness of composition.\(^78\)

---

\(^77\) Christian Krohg, *The Swedish Painter Karl Nordström* (1882), Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo. Edvard Munch was also inspired by Caillebotte’s balcony viewpoints. See Challons-Lipton, 2001, p. 132.

\(^78\) Challons-Lipton, 2001, p. 132.
This gentle and reflective portrait of three young children lost in their own thoughts possesses a luminous quality, and it could be argued that there is a mood of ephemerality to the work, in the capture of a fleeting moment of reflection. Theboldness of composition is nearly as far as Werenskiold goes in his use of anImpressionist technique for rock and vegetation. However, one could argue that the
actual subject of the composition is anything but bold in its depiction of a rural idyll. In
a re-working of the same theme the following year (fig. 19), Werenskiold adopted a
more distant viewpoint, with a greater emphasis on the orthogonal created by the rock
formation. There is a greater emphasis on the clarity of the blue sky, and he uses
touches of red to represent small flowers reminiscent, in a less-concentrated manner,
of Monet’s *Path in the Île Saint-Martin, Vétheuil* (1880; Metropolitan Museum, New
York), which he would have seen at the 1882 Impressionist Exhibition.

Although hard to tell from a black and white reproduction, Werenskiold’s *Sawmill Tåtøy* from this same period (1882; *Sagbruk Tåtøy*) appears particularly redolent of
Monet’s large, painterly, swirling brushstrokes, in both foreground and in the subtler
misty, smoky background. It seems highly likely that Werenskiold would also have
seen the work of Monet at the exhibition at the Durand-Ruel Gallery in Paris in March
1883, as we know his first child, Werner, was born in Paris in April. Erik’s friend
Andreas Aubert certainly saw the exhibition and it was particularly influential also for
Harriet Backer, who had been at Munich with Werenskiold and was later one of the
select ‘Fleskum Summer’ group of 1886.

Aubert, an influential critic, published a major article on Monet in Norway in December
1883, in which he spoke of ‘an illusion that one would have thought impossible from
such a tangled heap, from such a web of colours’, observing that colours that were
normally mixed on the palette were now mixed in the viewer’s eye. Aubert would
assuredly have discussed the subject of colour theory with Werenskiold, although
Werenskiold was not prepared to use unrealistic or unnatural colours. The following
year Aubert reviewed the Parisian art of 1883 and singled out Jules Breton, Bastien-
Lepage and the deceased Millet as ‘the most significant artists’. There are distinct
indications of the influence of Bastien-Lepage in Werenskiold’s *Herders* (fig. 18), such
as the placement of figures at the forefront of the picture plane, the dreamy, red-
cheeked appearance of the girl on the left, a feeling of stillness and transience, the

80 Werner Werenskiold (1883-1961). Geographer and geologist, father of art historian Professor
Marit Werenskiold (q.v.).
81 Challons-Lipton, 1998, p. 158.
82 Andreas Aubert, ‘Kunstnæstillinge i Paris. III. En impressionist’, *Aftenposten* 21 December
1883, quoted in Nils Messel, ‘Norwegian Impressions’, in Torsten Gunnarsson (ed.),
*Impressionism and the North: Late 19th Century French Avant-Garde Art in the Nordic Countries
1870-1920* (Stockholm, Nationalmuseum, 2002), pp. 212-213 (Messel’s footnote reference ‘8’
83 Andreas Aubert, ‘Fra det Franske Nutidsmaleri’, *Nordisk Tidsskrift*, 7, 1884, p. 378, quoted in
Sheffield, 1999, p. 58.
low-angle perspective and high horizon line, and the loose Impressionism of the non-
figurative elements.

By the summer of 1883, Werenskiold was staying at Gvarv in Telemark, on a farm
called Lindheim. Sophie Werenskiold’s uncle, Ole Thomesen, was the magistrate there,
and also the local representative in the Norwegian parliament in the 1870s and 1880s.
Here Werenskiold began to work on *Peasant Burial*, which took him three summers to
complete. In 1883, however, Werenskiold completed his other major work of this
period, *Girls From Telemark* (fig. 20). It is interesting to compare this picture with
*Peasant Burial*, painted in the same immediate area.

Fig. 20. Erik Werenskiold, *Girls from Telemark/Telemarksjenter*
(Also known as *From Telemark (Fra Telemark)*, 1883,
Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 80 x 98cm.)

---

84 Another version of this picture is in Göteborgs Konstmuseum. See Varnedoe, 1988, pp. 252-
254.
Lief Østby recounts how Werenskiold wrote in August 1883 that the parents of these girls were *fine Telebønder* (upper-class Telemark farmers) and that they wore plenty of silver. In other words, these were from the same class, the *bønder*, as the unknown person being buried in *Peasant Burial (En Bondebegravelse)*. Compositionally, there is the same grassy mid-ground and mountainous background as *Peasant Burial*, but not the muddy foreground or snow-capped peaks. In *Peasant Burial*, the houses are specks on the horizon, but here they are more prominent and smoke gives a sign of human habitation. In *Girls From Telemark*, the *skigard* (rail fence) gives a structural basis to the picture, and in *Peasant Burial*, the wicker fence and stone wall perform a similar function. Werenskiold utilises the *skigard* later as a framing device in *Evening on Lindem* (1884, *Aften på Lindem*, Private Collection). *Girls From Telemark* does not possess the blazing sunshine of *Peasant Burial*, but instead portrays a more temperate and equitable climate. It is also of interest that the girls’ clogs are very similar to those worn by the main character in Courbet’s *Stonebreakers*.

Patricia Gray Berman sees the muted tones of Grez-sur-Loing in the sister painting to this one (*On the Plain (På Sletten)*, 1883; Göteborgs Konstmuseum), and that the girl depicted is ‘the Norwegian cousin of Jules Bastien-Lepage’s French peasants’. But *Girls From Telemark* does not have its substantial figures at the very front of the pictorial plane, and there is no hint of the indefinable ‘otherworldliness’ of Bastien-Lepage. This is a much more Realist than Naturalist work, with no emphasis on the importance of the eyes as communicators of human emotion. The figures pictured from the side and rear looking into the distance have parallels with the two girls in William Stott of Oldham’s *The Ferry* (1882; fig. 103), painted at Grez and exhibited at the 1882 Paris *Salon*, and also with the figures who look wistfully towards the horizon in works by Caspar David Friedrich, a painter whose popularity Andreas Aubert was instrumental in reviving. Friedrich’s pupil, the Norwegian artist J. C. Dahl, also employed this *Rückenfigur* approach in his *Mother and Child by the Sea* (1840; Barber Institute, Birmingham).

---

85 Østby, 1977, p. 89.
Fig. 21. Erik Werenskiold, *Rustic Funeral (En Bondebegravelse)*, 1878, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo. Title as per Østby (1977).

Fig. 22. Erik Werenskiold, *A Poor Burial in a Norwegian Mountain Hamlet*, 1878, *(En fattig Begravelse i en Norsk Fjældbygd)* as published in *Ude og Hjemme* (Copenhagen) 22 June 1879.
Werenskiold was based in Munich in 1878, but on a visit home to Christiania he received the prestigious commission to illustrate a new edition of the *Norwegian Folk Tales* (*Norskfolkeeventyr*) collected by Peter Christen Asbjørnsen (1812-85) and Jørgen Moe (1813-82). These fairy tales, in the same tradition as the Brothers Grimm in Germany, are highly important in Norway’s cultural and literary history, and to her sense of national identity. Werenskiold decided to visit Gudbrandsdalen, a long and fertile valley in the county of Oppland, and more specifically Vågå, a small community in the north of the valley, in the vicinity of which were three ancient stave churches, at Vågå, Lom and Garmo. Werenskiold was following in a long tradition by visiting this area for sketching purposes. Tidemand went there in 1843, just prior to meeting Hans Gude. The Norwegian Romantic painter Johan Frederick Eckersberg – later a tutor to both Christian Skredsvig and Gerhard Munthe – followed Gude and August Cappelen on a study trip to Gudbrandsdalen in the summer of 1846, where they visited Vågå and Lom. Asbjørnsen himself had visited the area in 1874.

Werenskiold visited the old farms in the area: Bjølstad, Sve, Håkenstad, Blossom, Sandbu. He reminisced later: ‘...and in the valley bottom [was] the ancient velvety brown stave church with its carved portals and lovely proportions [...] Here petty kinglets lived on their manor farms, and the crofters were their serfs’. Werenskiold felt he had entered a timeless world where he could capture the essence of Norwegian culture. Unlike the many coastal settlements in Norway, both Gudbrandsdalen and Telemark were inland and thus less susceptible to outside cultural influences. It was felt therefore that these areas were where the true heritage of Norwegian culture resided, and Werenskiold himself said ‘I have never come across anything that seemed more Norwegian to me than Vågå’. Werenskiold always had an eye for people who looked or acted a little peculiarly, so that he could incorporate these traits into his folktale drawings. In his mind he had made the connection between the kings in the old fairy tales and the wealthier farmers in the valley, the bønder, perhaps the very class represented in *Peasant Burial*: ‘When I was at Bjølstad, and saw the owner, that rich old buffer, [...] I was reminded of the king in the fairytale’, he said.

---

87 The best-known tale in the English-speaking world is the story of the Three Billy Goats Gruff.
90 Ibid.
91 Ibid., p. 268.
92 Ibid., p. 267.
As can be seen from the comparisons that follow, Werenskiold has used some of the fairy-tale characters to inhabit his final preparatory drawing for *Peasant Burial*. The sexton (*klokker* – fig. 24) is not so much an officer of the church as an odd-job man who rings the church bell, digs graves, officiates in the absence of the priest, and has other sidelines, such as a spot of fishing envisaged by Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson. He is a more sober version of the charcoal burner pictured talking to the king, who is, of course, a fat jovial *bonde* (fig. 23). The young man on the right of the preparatory drawing is the typical *askeladden* (ash lad – fig. 25), the good-natured, open-faced young fellow who, despite suffering at the hands of his two older brothers, comes good in the end through a combination of cleverness and kindness. *Askeladden* comes from the same source as *Cinderella*; both are the put-upon youngest of three children. Though their menial job is to tend the cinders or ashes of the family hearth, they triumph where their siblings fail. Norwegians are happy to claim this as a metaphor in respect of its older brothers, Sweden and Denmark.

---

**Fig. 23.** Erik Werenskiold, *The Charcoal Burner and The King*, 1879, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, See Marit Werenskiold (1999), p. 89.

**Fig. 24.** Erik Werenskiold, Detail of fig. 22, *The Klokker*
Firstly, what can we discern from the transition from Werenskiold’s initial rough sketch (fig. 21) to his final published version (fig. 22)? All the figures are now fully-developed characters, with the exception of the woman on the left whose face is still shrouded. The tidily-clad original sexton has evolved into a baggy-clothed and rougher-looking character, while a gravestone has appeared, bottom left, to carry the sexton’s hat. The stick that is used to mark the grave prior to the *jordpåkastelse* – the final sprinkling of earth by an ordained priest – has grown in height and thickness, and the two wheel-shaped gravemarkers at the right have migrated to the centre, front and rear. Of particular significance to the final painting of *Peasant Burial* is the background. In the first drawing (fig. 21), there is what is generally agreed to be the stave church at Vågå; as Marit Werenskiold says of the later painting: ‘Instead of Vågå church, his first thought was to use Heddal Stave Church [in Telemark] as background, but he
abandoned this in favour of the magnificent scenery of Gvarv. As can be seen when comparing figures 27 and 28, the first drawing is indeed based on the church at Vågå. However, in the final drawing he has replaced the square-topped doorway with an arched one, and a lattice window has appeared to the right of the door. I propose that the final drawing is based on the nearby stave church at Lom, where just such a circular doorway exists (figures 29 and 30). Although restoration to the church has occurred since 1878, the surround of the doorway is identical, including the protruding sections at the base of the arched area. There is also a lock in a similar position, halfway down on the left-hand side, and a casement window identical in style to the ones at Lom, where one would hope that the restorers have remained faithful to the original style. In the following section, I will explain why the stave church is so significant in these early drawings, and therefore the great importance of Werenskiold’s rejection of such a church as a background for Peasant Burial.

Secondly, what can a detailed examination of the final published drawing (fig. 22) tell us? The published drawing has in very small capitals at its base F. HENDRIKSEN X. I. V. BØHME. This shows that the woodcut was created by V. Bøhme at the Frederik Hendriksen Xylographiske Institut in Copenhagen. Hendriksen, as well as being the publisher of Ude og Hjemme, was a great friend to Norwegian painters. He was at the dinner in Copenhagen a decade later when Werenskiold was made to feel ‘extremely stupid’ by his friends for going to Paris to study at Bonnat’s atelier in 1888. On the reverse of the drawing held by Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, it says ‘Drawing by Erik Werenskiold, painter, sent from Munich to me in 1878. Printed in ude og hjemme No. 90, F.H. 1879’. In the copy of Ude og Hjemme, there is an accompanying poem written by Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson, who was responding to ‘Werenskiold’s bold realism’. I print a translation of the full version below, as the first written indication that this is nothing like a bonde burial, a fact already indicated visually by the motley assemblage at the graveside.

---

94 Nobel-prize winning author Knut Hamsun was born near Lom in 1859.
95 Marit Werenskiold agrees with this – conversation with the author September 2011.
96 Challons-Lipton, 2001, p. 86.
98 Østby, 1977, p. 15. Bjørnson’s interpretation of the event is his own and is not based on Werenskiold’s ideas.
99 Translation by Birgitte Røeggen, edited by Jan Cox.
ON THE CHURCH YARD (To Werenskiold’s picture)

(Paa Kirkegaard – til Werenskiolds Billede)

They buried her down, they poured on the earth
Her father, her husband, her sons,
And her brother as well – he stood by himself;
They thought: Now God will reward her

She worked until she sank, the loyal slave,
For them, and tending the cow at home.
The worst that she had, was the calving every spring
And also them, when they drank and got rowdy.
Now she could escape, and even towards the end
she thought: It’s still a bit too early.
But the body was shattered, and the head was tired,
And the ache in the chest was unbearable.

They took some liquor for enjoyment
The day she was due in the ground
And the sister-in-law did some baking, they bought a little food
And the brother bought wood for the coffin.
The sexton was called; he came, but he was tired,
He’d been fishing all night:
He sang, while thinking: I got six pounds eighteen for those mackerel yesterday.

And the song still fell upon them, and they shut their eyes tightly.
Here we stand alone, while she is with God
And looks after us and prays. Amen.

B. B.

So we can see how Bjørnson interpreted the picture. A group of men had driven their
daughter, wife, mother, sister, to an early grave, and the sexton was taking the service
mechanically while thinking about his fishing. The idea that a bonde wife would be
described like this is highly unlikely. For example, the English traveller Augustus J. C.
Hare observed that the wives of the bønder ‘never walk, have a sledge for winter, and
a carriole and horse to take them to church in summer’. 100 Instead, the clue to the
class of people concerned is in the title of the picture as published (fig. 21): A Poor
Burial in a Norwegian Mountain Hamlet. The crucial point to make here is that these
preparatory sketches are NOT ‘En Bondebegravelse’ but ‘En fattig gravelse’ - a poor
burial, not the burial of a land-owning farmer. The people in the final painting are of a
different class from those in the final drawing.

100 Augustus J. C. Hare, Sketches in Holland and Scandinavia (London: Smith, Elder, 1885), p. 131.
Fig. 27. Vågå Stave Church, (c.1150 & 1625-30).

Fig. 28. Erik Werenskiold, detail of fig. 21.

Fig. 29. Lom Stave Church (12th/17th Century)

Fig. 30. Erik Werenskiold, detail of fig. 22.
The Stave Church

Werenskiold’s use of the stave church in his drawings of 1878 is significant because of the role that the image of the stave church signified in Norway. It was the tangible sign of Norway’s medieval past, its culture and its long history. Interest in the stave churches had been reawakened thanks in large part to the efforts of the prestigious Norwegian painter Johan Christian Dahl, who was sympathetic to the mood of growing Norwegian nationalism that followed the creation in 1814 of the Norwegian parliament and that led eventually to full independence in 1905. This nationalist sentiment saw the stave churches as immutable symbols of Norwegian-ness, and as early as 1828 the Romantic artist Johannes Flintoe painted a markedly old-fashioned depiction of people in traditional costume at the stave church at Heddal in Telemark (formerly known as Hitterdal), which has proved highly popular with writers and artists.

Fig. 31. Johannes Flintoe, *Stave Church at Hitterdal*, 1828. size, medium, location, unknown.

---

In 1833 Andreas Faye provided a basis for the fairy tales of Asbjørnsen and Moe with an academic collection of folk tales. In the second edition (1844), there is the story of the hunter who rediscovered Heddal church, centuries after the population had died out following the Black Death. Briefly, in this tale, the hunter fires an arrow and hears a clang. Upon investigation it turns out to be a bell in the church now inhabited by a huge bear, which the brave hunter swiftly dispatches. This allegory suggested that Norway's medieval history had only been sleeping undiscovered and had not disappeared, and also alludes to the inherent courage of the Norwegian race. In 1836 Andreas Faye, The Church in the Woods (Heddals Kirke I Valders); 1844, in Jan Faye Braadland, 'Echoes of the Brothers Grimm from Thule: A Short introduction to Andreas Faye (1802-69) and his Norske Sagn (1833)' in Jahrbuch der Brüder Grimm-Gesellschaft, Band V,1, 1995, pp. 20-21. See also Thomas B. Willson, History of the Church and State in Norway: from the tenth to the sixteenth century (London: Archibald Constable, 1903), p. 246. Theodor Kittelsen made a memorable drawing of a large bear curled up in front of the altar (Den Gamle Kirke in Svartedauen (Christiania: 1900)).
Faye had written about the Gaara stave church at Bø in Telemark, lost before the time of J. C. Dahl, and in 1837 Dahl himself published a book of plates of stave churches.\textsuperscript{104} Dahl also made later pictures of the stave churches at Borgund (1841), Vang (1842-43) and Kaupanger (1847). The case of the church at Vang is the most interesting in that Maia Maria Langley states that ‘Dahl never saw the church at Vang in its original pristine state’ and that Dahl was influenced by drawings he received from the German-born artist Franz Wilhelm Schiertz.\textsuperscript{105} Langley cites Bang (p. 292), but fails to mention that on that same page Bang quotes Wexelen’s assertion that ‘the church was being demolished when Dahl passed it in 1839’.\textsuperscript{106} Jan Faye Braadland states correctly that Dahl, far from never seeing the church, actually negotiated its purchase and then persuaded the King of Prussia to resurrect it, supervised by Schiertz, in an area of Silesia that is now in Poland.\textsuperscript{107}

Finally, the church at Heddal was the subject of a painting by Tidemand in 1847 and a drawing of the main portal by George Andreas Bull in 1853, while the British travel writers Alfred Smith (1847)\textsuperscript{108} and Augustus J. C. Hare (1885) discussed it favourably in their travelogues. Its fame was such that Hare declared it ‘our principal object in coming to Norway’.\textsuperscript{109} The stave church stood for the rediscovery of Norway’s past, and was of great importance as a symbol of Norway’s nationalist aspirations, particularly to J. C. Dahl, the father of Norwegian landscape art. I see Werenskiold’s decision to excise it from Peasant Burial as a means of removing all references to Norway’s past in the picture, and instead present a contemporary group of rural people in a contemporary setting. This is Norway NOW, he is saying.

The Romantic tradition, the \textit{Bønder} and Norwegian society

Werenskiold and his generation of artists such as Heyerdahl, Skredsvig and Krohg arrived in the aftermath of the domination of Norwegian art in the first half of the nineteenth century by ‘National Romanticism’, an artistic movement that began after Norway’s secession from Denmark in 1814. Johan Christian Dahl (1788-1857) was as

\textsuperscript{105} Langley, 2000, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{107} Braadland, 1995, p. 5.
\textsuperscript{109} Hare, 1885, pp. 113-14.
instrumental in this as in his efforts to save the stave churches and, after training with Caspar David Friedrich in Dresden, he created an influential oeuvre of images of the Norwegian sublime. Adolph Tidemand (1814-76) added to Dahl’s landscape tradition by depicting the lives of rural Norwegians within the landscape, particularly at times of ceremony or significant events, sometimes within a domestic setting. Hans Gude (1825-1903), a tutor to many Norwegian artists, completed this triumvirate, producing dramatic landscapes of ‘Romantic Realism’. Thomas Fearnley (1802-42), trained by Dahl, and August Cappelen (1827-52), trained by Gude, were also significant portrayers of landscape in this era, but both died at an early age.

In 1848, Tidemand and Gude worked together to produce *Bridal Journey in Hardanger* (fig. 33), a picture which not only combines many of the themes under discussion, but is also the iconic image from this National Romantic era. Tidemand (figures) and Gude (landscape) created a highly-artificial construct of a bridal party leaving an ancient stave church on the headland, the main boat populated by urban people dressed up in traditional peasant costumes. The scenery is imagined and the stave church does not exist, but Tidemand and Gude were highly successful in capturing the national mood at that time (and again, far more recently, as an idealised representation of Norway in the mid-nineteenth century). The careful placing of models to represent real figures in a landscape, and the tapping into the prevalent zeitgeist, suggest that Werenskiold was aware – perhaps subconsciously when he painted *Peasant Burial* – of Tidemand and Gude’s strategies.

---

The constitutional changes of 1814 were particularly significant for the bönder. This is therefore a good moment to clarify what is signified by the words bonde (singular) in En Bondebegravelse, and the bönder (plural). Peasant Burial is the accepted translation of En Bondebegravelse, though Kent (1987) translates it as ‘Peasant Funeral’ and Østby (1977) as ‘Rustic Funeral’. Just to confuse the issue, the word bonde is also used in Norwegian to mean a farmer. Sheffield quotes Øyvind Østerud’s broad definition of bonde as ‘farmer, tenant farmer, and virtually anybody who owns a farm or tills the soil for a living’.  

The historian T. J. Derry directs enquirers of bonde to ‘Peasant landholder class’ in his index. Ruth Symes states correctly that ‘these bönder [are] often confusingly translated as “peasants”or “peasant farmers”’ and that [for the British nineteenth-century observer] ’the bonde possessed one unexpected characteristic for one who

---

worked so close to the earth: he was independent and free of any overlord'. The crucial point here is that the bönder owned their own land, and that this gave them substantial political rights. As we will see, the bönder were at the very top of the rural social scale, so to use the pejorative word ‘peasant’ may mislead an Anglophone audience. Additionally, the word begravelse can refer to both a funeral and a burial, and I observe that what is taking place in the picture is a burial service: there is no open grave about to receive the coffin, as in Courbet’s Burial at Ornans. My translation of En Bondebegravelse is therefore ‘Burial Service of a Smallholder Farmer’.

In the 1814 constitutional negotiations, the landholding peasantry were given thirty-seven of the 112 delegate places (33%). In the 1833 Storting (Parliament), they had forty-five out of the ninety-six seats (47%), and by 1859 they were allocated two-thirds of the 111 parliamentary seats. Johan Sverdrup, the Prime Minister when Peasant Burial was completed, spent many years attempting to cement an alliance between these bonde representatives and the urban political left. The bönder were thus an ever-increasing political force in nineteenth-century Norway, where the entitlement to vote depended on land ownership; conversely there was a large majority of the rural population who had no political power. These can be identified as tenants, husmenn (who rented land in exchange for work: “cottars”), landless labourers, and farm servants (often the sons or daughters of other farmers). There follows the rural breakdown as at 1845:

---

114 Derry, p. 7.
115 Ibid., pp. 33, 46.
117 Ibid. Grigg sources his information from T. C. Blegen, Norwegian Migration to America, 1825-1860 (Minneapolis, 1931), p. 5. However, Blegen’s figures can only be a partial summary, as his total of the rural population is only 353,876, at a time when the total population, predominantly rural, was 1.33m.
Fig. 34. Rural Social Structure in Norway c.1845

Fig. 35. Births and Deaths in Norway 1801-1899 ('000s)
So, according to the 1845 statistics (fig. 34), the bønder, who were the only rural class to wield any political power, made up a mere 22% of the rural population. The vast majority had no political power, hence the success of Marcus Thrane in attracting over 20,000 members into his worker’s unions by 1850. However, Thrane was arrested the following year and spent seven years in prison, during which time his movement faded. The other significant factors that affected the bønder in the nineteenth century were the inter-related ones of changes in agricultural practice and unprecedented population growth. Although the population had generally been increasing prior to the nineteenth century, there were often ‘corrective’ years, such as 1742, when deaths substantially exceeded births, because of crop failures, outbreak of disease etc. However, in 1815, following Norway’s constitutional link with Sweden at the end of the Napoleonic Wars, the birth rate began to rise sharply, while the death rate increased much more slowly (see fig. 35). On average, between 1815 and 1885, births were 74% higher than deaths. A variety of reasons are put forward for this, including the replacement of cereal crops by potatoes, the improvement in agricultural yields, and the decline in deaths from disease in part related to vaccination. The importance of the potato as a food source and its ability to withstand variable climatic conditions is emphasised in Knut Hamsun’s Nobel-prize winning novel Growth of the Soil (Markens

---

118 Derry, 1973, p. 41.
120 See Grigg, 1980, pp. 210-220.
Grøde, which was written in 1917, but harks back to the colonisation of rural Norway in the nineteenth century:

What was that about potatoes? Were they just a thing from foreign parts, like coffee; a luxury, an extra? Oh, the potato is a lordly fruit; drought or downpour, it grows and grows all the same. It laughs at the weather, and will stand anything; only deal kindly with it, and it yields fifteen-fold again. Not the blood of a grape, but the flesh of a chestnut, to be boiled or roasted, used in every way. A man may lack grain to make bread, but give him potatoes and he will not starve.\(^\text{121}\)

The dominance of, and reliance on, potatoes in Telemark – only introduced to Norway at the start of the nineteenth century – is illustrated clearly by figures of crops sown in Seljord from 1835 to 1875 provided by Ann Norderhaug.\(^\text{122}\) I have simplified her original structure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crops sown in Seljord, Telemark 1835-1875</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Barrels: 1 Barrel = 145 litres)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Grain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Just at the time when population numbers were rocketing, the number of people required to work on the land was decreasing, due to improvements in agricultural techniques and productivity. These conflicting pressures led to an enormous migration from Norway. As the American historian Roger Daniels says: 'nowhere else on the European Continent was the pressure of population on arable land as strong as in Norway.'

There were many factors that affected this migration, but figure 36 shows a strong link between years of large population growth and subsequent large-scale emigration (and vice versa). Thus the year of exceptional population growth in 1879 was followed by the peak year of emigration in 1882, when nearly 29,000 people left Norway in one year, one-and-a-half per cent of the total population of 1.9 million. Three quarters of a million people left between 1840 and 1914, principally for America, yet the population still doubled during this period. Not only was there no requirement on the land for the politically-impotent husmenn, labourers and farm servants, but many of the children of the bønder also had to leave for the towns or emigrate.

In 1852, Adolph Tidemand painted ten scenes of the Bondeliv (Life of a Norwegian farmer family) at the summer palace 'Oscarshall', commissioned by King Oscar I. These pictures by Tidemand embodied the ‘National Romantic’ ethos, and utilised the bonde as an idealised representation of the Norwegian way of life. The ten scenes are Gutter og piken på seteren (Boy and girl in the pasture), Frieriet (The Proposal), Brudefølget (The Bridal Procession), Familielykke (Family Happiness), Ved det syke barns leie (At the sick child’s bedside), Mor erer for barna (The mother reading to her children), Faren lærer sønnen å knytte garn (The father teaching his son to tie a fishing net), Lystring (Spearfishing), Den yngste sønnens avskjed (The youngest son’s farewell) and De ensomme gamle (The aged alone). Note that Tidemand’s contemporary depiction of The Youngest Son’s Farewell (fig. 38) is a clear but romanticised representation of the overpopulation problem faced by the bonde family.

---

125 See Daniels, 2002, pp. 172-75. The Norwegians tended to live in enclaves, ‘a nation within a nation’ and before 1890 were overwhelmingly rural settlers, with over 50% in just three states that ran parallel to the Canadian border: Wisconsin, Minnesota and North Dakota. After 1890 urban migration began to hold sway.
127 Sold for NKR 4,000,000 at Grey Wedels Plass, Oslo, No. 19, on 25 May 2000.
As I have stated, the *bonder* were comparatively lucky in relation to those lower down the rural social scale, but their relative affluence in their self-contained local community and political ‘clout’ could not disguise the fact that their offspring faced uncertainty. Although I have previously shown that Werenskiold’s rejection of the stave church background is a break with traditional genre, the burial of a *bonde* is surely a subject that would make a fitting eleventh panel in Tidemand’s *bondeliv* series.

The Sauherad History Group and Sauherad Local History Archive have published the identities of Werenskiold’s eight Telemark models for *Peasant Burial* (fig. 48). They are from left to right, with ages in 1883 when the painting commenced:

- Ragnhild Moen (35) – (1848-1920)
- Christoffer Gunheim (29) – (1854-1915) [his mother was Gunhild Kise?]
- Hans Ibsen Moen (57) – (1826-1906)
- Hans Gunheim (14) - (1869-1963)
- Anund Lindheim (63) – (1820-1906)

Fig. 38. Adolph Tidemand, *The Youngest Son’s Farewell (Den Yngste Sønns Avskjed)*, 1867, Sold Grev Wedels Plass, Oslo, 25 May 2000, Lot No. 19, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown.

The Sauherad History Group and Sauherad Local History Archive have published the identities of Werenskiold’s eight Telemark models for *Peasant Burial* (fig. 48). They are from left to right, with ages in 1883 when the painting commenced:

- Ragnhild Moen (35) – (1848-1920)
- Christoffer Gunheim (29) – (1854-1915) [his mother was Gunhild Kise?]
- Hans Ibsen Moen (57) – (1826-1906)
- Hans Gunheim (14) - (1869-1963)
- Anund Lindheim (63) – (1820-1906)

---

Knut Lindheimsmaoen (69) – (1814-1900) [Also known as Knut Larsson Kise?]
Kristoffer Notevarp (26) – (1857-1918) [Son of Tollev Lindheim 1824-88]
Gunleik Kaasa (62) – (b. 1821)

You will note that the farm name Lindheim is in two of the surnames. *Moen* means meadow and there is an extant drawing by Werenskiold of *Gvarvmoen*. In the present day there are many people in the Sauherad area with these surnames, and the nursery at Gvarv has departments called Gvarvmoen and Gunheim. There are clearly family connections between the models. The most interesting figure is ‘the masterly characterisation’ of Christoffer Gunheim as the schoolmaster in his long grey coat reading the oration. The nephew of Anne Steinhaug (1896-1994) reports that his aunt was taught by Gunheim, who in addition to being a schoolteacher was also *klokker* (sexton) and chorister at Nes church.

In 1883 Arne Garborg published a semi-autobiographical novel *Bondestudentar*, which dealt with the difficulties of someone from the *bonde* class going to university, and the way in which the hero has to overcome many disadvantages in comparison with his urban ‘cousins’. The book also shows the *bonde* student as possessing different qualities from the city student, qualities which enable him to triumph in his unfamiliar urban environment. Despite its contemporary context, this is another portrayal of the *bonde* as an exemplar, on this occasion confronting and overcoming the challenges of modern life. In July 1884 Werenskiold wrote to Jonas Lie ‘I think [Garborg’s book] is magnificent […] What he says regarding the *bonde* student can be applied to almost all our people in comparison with other nationalities’. It is highly significant that Werenskiold was reading *Bondestudentar* at the same time as he was painting *Peasant Burial*, in which he had his very own former *bondestudentar*, Christoffer Gunheim, as the model for the schoolteacher officiating at the service. Gunheim was a *klokker* as well as a schoolteacher, but Werenskiold wanted his orator to speak for a smart,
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129 Østby, 1977, p. 93.
130 Family names did not always pass from father to offspring in rural nineteenth-century Norway. Often people would use the name of the farm where they lived or use their father’s Christian name plus suffix for their ‘surname’. These names could change if the person moved or changed status, hence Knut Lindheimsmaoen could also be Knut Larsson Kise. It was not until 1923 that fixed hereditary surnames were enshrined in Norwegian law.
modern Norway, not the parochial, crumpled, old-fashioned *klokker* of the 1878 drawings. I believe this to be the reason why Werenskiold changed the *klokker* into a more formal schoolteacher in the final picture.

In July 1885, just as he was finishing *Peasant Burial*, Werenskiold wrote to Bjørnstjerne Bjørnson apologising for his lack of communication, which he excused by his preoccupation with the ‘Kielland affair’. Werenskiold then explained that he had been upset the day before by a *bonde* from Siljord (Seljord) called Telnæs ‘who writes poetry’. Werenskiold continued, ‘He possessed the worst type of *bonde*-boasting’ and went on to discuss the way that Telnæs’s type ‘want Romanticism back, the fools’. Werenskiold added ‘the *bønder* are flattered, when one says “Norwegian” or “national” [...] If “Norwegianess” is going to leave the people because they participate in European culture, then let them go to hell’.

It is interesting to compare these two letters. In the first, Werenskiold held up the *bonde* student as an excellent example of how he wanted the Norwegian to be seen in an international context. In the second, he decried the old-fashioned, ‘local’ ideals of a man who wants to protect Norwegian culture from exposure to outside influences, at the cost – as the cosmopolitan Werenskiold saw it – of Norway’s role in the international arts community. Werenskiold’s jibe at Romanticism is a reminder of his refutation of the ‘National Romanticism’ represented by Tidemand, yet he was still happy to continue to illustrate the highly ‘Norwegian’ romantic tales of Asbjørnsen and Moe. Werenskiold’s simultaneous rejection and embracement of the past is a key point.
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134 Bjørnson and Jonas Lie had submitted a proposal to parliament that Alexander Kielland, author of *Gift* (1883; published in the UK as *Poison*) and younger brother of the artist Kitty Kielland, should receive a stipend. Kielland, a strong critic of the ‘hypocrisy’ of the church, had his request turned down, perhaps because of the opposition of the Prime Minister’s influential nephew, Jacob Sverdrup. Bjørnson declared that he would not take his own stipend in protest.

135 Jorund Telnes (1845-92) was a local politician, writer and poet, whose best known work was based on the legend of the 14th-century heroine Guro Heddelid, who reputedly came from Seljord. The artist Harald Kihle (1905-97), who found *Peasant Burial* a great source of inspiration (Sheffield, 1999, p. 104), later illustrated Telnes’s book *Guro Heddelid* (Oslo: Samlaget, 4th edn. 1972 [1886]).

The Burial Picture: ‘A Funeral Service in the Highlands’

It has been asserted frequently that Werenskiold’s inspiration for Peasant Burial was Courbet’s Burial at Ornans (fig. 49), for example:

‘It is fitting [...] to view Peasant Burial as an homage to Courbet’s Burial in Ornans’.137

‘[Peasant Burial]...is generally reminiscent of Courbet’s Burial at Ornans’.138

‘Werenskiold has perhaps paid tribute to Courbet’s Burial at Ornans’.139

‘[Peasant Burial]...often has been said to derive from Courbet’s Burial at Ornans [...] which is very likely’.140

‘Peasant Burial also makes explicit reference to Gustave Courbet’s famous painting Burial at Ornans’.141

‘Courbet’s Burial at Ornans [...] directly inspired Peasant Burial’.142

These scholars give no explanation as to where Werenskiold saw the work of Courbet, but as he was based in Munich in 1878 when he created his compositional basis for the picture, this case may rest on the enthusiasm for Courbet that Werenskiold inherited from his tutor Lindenschmit and his fellow-artist Wilhelm Leibl. Of course, the non-Scandinavian-based writers may have been unaware of the 1878 drawings, and therefore wrongly relate Werenskiold’s inspiration to his contact with Courbet’s art in Paris during his residency there from 1881-83. There is, however, another picture that is far closer to Peasant Burial in mood, in religion, in composition, in extraordinarily close detail, when compared with Courbet’s work. I refer to James Guthrie’s A Funeral Service in the Highlands of 1881-82 (fig. 40). Because of this close correspondence, I will discuss the sequence of events in some detail.

James Guthrie (1859-1930) was a Scottish artist and a mainstay of the group known as ‘The Glasgow Boys’. Late in 1881, it is said that he witnessed the funeral of a young boy who had drowned near the village of Brig O’Turk in Perthshire.143 In 1985, Roger Billcliffe, the best-known writer on the Glasgow Boys, referenced James Caw’s statement that Guthrie ‘painted the head of the minister before he left the village’, and that he completed the work in the studio of John G. Whyte in Helensburgh in the winter of 1881-82, using porters and fishermen for models and Whyte’s son as the
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138 Challons-Lipton, 2001, p. 113.
139 Valmestad, 1990, p. 79.
140 Marit Warenskiold, 1999, p. 87.
141 Sheffield, 1999, p. 68.
143 Millais had painted the background to his Portrait of John Ruskin there in 1853.
young boy.\textsuperscript{144} A quarter of a century later, Billcliffe is vaguer in his assertions that Guthrie 'had little time to complete more than a few drawings and sketches on the spot (primarily of the minister)', and that in his later painting Guthrie used 'local characters in place of the Highland farmers and labourers'.\textsuperscript{145} Werenskiold also used local models to replace those from his original drawings, so there are initial strong parallels with the production methods of \textit{Peasant Burial}. 


Fig. 39. Erik Werenskiold, *A Poor Burial in a Norwegian Mountain Hamlet, 1878, (En fattig Begravelse i en Norsk Fjældbygd)* as published in *Ude og Hjemme* (Copenhagen), 22 June 1879.

Fig. 40. James Guthrie, *A Funeral Service in the Highlands, 1881-82*, Kelvingrove Art Gallery, Glasgow, oil on canvas, 129.5 x 193cm.
Fig. 47. James Guthrie, *A Highland Funeral* as published in *Magazine of Art*, May 1883, frontispiece, p. 309, engraving.

Fig. 48. Erik Werenskiold, *Peasant Burial (En Bondebegravelse)*, 1883-85. Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 102.5 x 150.5cm.
Similarly, writers have asked a couple of key questions of Guthrie’s work that also apply to *Peasant Burial*. Had Guthrie seen Courbet’s *Burial at Ornans*, and — in trying to explain Guthrie’s new-found ‘French’ impressionistic style — had he seen the work of Jules Bastien-Lepage? To this I must add, had Guthrie seen Werenskiold’s *A Poor Burial in a Norwegian Mountain Hamlet*? In his earlier article, Roger Billcliffe states his argument — but perhaps has doubt in his mind — when he says rather ungrammatically that ‘it seems almost totally impossible for Guthrie to have seen *Burial at Ornans* before finishing his own painting’. He relies on Kenneth McConkey’s evidence (itself based on Robert Fernier, *Gustave Courbet et Sa Vie* (Paris, 1978)) that the only possibility was for Guthrie to have seen it in Paris in the winter of 1881, and that this ‘seems too improbable’. However, William Hardie was pleased to ‘correct’ Billcliffe when saying ‘Guthrie seems (according to the Stevenson notes) to have visited Paris for a few days in 1880, and to have made another short visit in 1882. It is therefore entirely possible (*pace* Billcliffe) that he would have been aware of the *Burial at Ornans* [...] and perhaps also works by Jules Bastien-Lepage’. However, Hardie’s counterargument does not hold water, as 1882 would have been too late for *A Funeral Service in the Highlands*, and, according to McConkey, *Ornans* was not on exhibition in 1880.
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146 Billcliffe, 1985, pp. 52-53.


149 McConkey, 1982, p. 33. n. 17.
Similar arguments apply to a meeting between Guthrie and Erik Werenskiold: 1880 was before Werenskiold arrived in Paris and 1882 was too late for Guthrie’s picture, so it adds one large unlikelihood to another to suggest that they might have met in Paris in the winter of 1881, particularly as this was when Guthrie was busy painting his picture ‘done rapidly and under strong impulse’. Additionally, Werenskiold could not speak English and, despite a ‘melting-pot’ of nationalities, Gunnarsson notes August Strindberg’s comment that the ‘Scandinavians and English-speaking paid little attention to each other at Grez’.
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150 Caw, 1932, p. 14. The painting must have been completed very rapidly, because it was ready to go off to that year’s Royal Academy exhibition in London (No. 146) by the end of March 1882. Also exhibited at the Royal Glasgow Institute of Fine Arts 1883 (No. 455), where purchased by John Forbes White of Aberdeen for £210.

151 Marit Werenskiold, email to the author, 26 April 2011.

To add one final ingredient to this mixture, no one has been able to identify the source of Guthrie’s French-influenced painting technique in *A Funeral Service in the Highlands*. A great deal has been written about whether he was exposed to Bastien-Lepage’s work, and if so, where and when? Guthrie probably saw *Les Foins* (1877; fig. 49a) when it was exhibited at the Grosvenor Gallery in London in 1880\(^{153}\) as he studied in London in the studio of John Pettie from 1879 to 1881,\(^{154}\) but I feel that this is surely not relevant, as *A Funeral Service in the Highlands* has very little of the characteristics one associates with Bastien-Lepage. Guthrie’s subsequent work, *A Hind’s Daughter* (1883; National Gallery of Scotland, Edinburgh) is far more redolent of Lepage’s manner, with a solitary girl staring directly at the viewer, while *Schoolmates* (1884-85; Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Ghent) – despite a smoother brush technique – contains figures that both look like Bastien-Lepage’s work and possess an otherworldly atmosphere characteristic of the French artist. Instead, I believe that Guthrie was probably influenced by Arthur Melville’s work from Grez-sur-Loing, e.g. *Paysanne à Grez* (1880; Bourne Fine Art, Edinburgh) exhibited at the Royal Scottish Academy in 1880.\(^{155}\) Laura Newton, for example, notes how Guthrie’s *The Cottar’s Garden* (1881; private collection) shares subject matter and ‘that sense of enclosure’ with Melville’s *A Cabbage Garden* (1877),\(^{156}\) and *A Funeral Service in the Highlands* very much possesses that similar sense of confinement.

What is extraordinary is the compositional similarity between Guthrie’s painting *A Funeral Service in the Highlands* (fig. 40, 1881-82) and Werenskiold’s illustration *A Poor Burial in a Norwegian Mountain Hamlet* (fig. 39, 1878). The two pictures are of similar proportions and both have a Calvinist frugality and lack of ornamentation. Each has a preacher with right arm raised in front of a door (figs. 43 and 44) – if you place one figure upon another, those arms are at identical angles. Each has a square-framed window and each has a young boy standing to the side of a tall bearded father-figure, with the child showing a little more emotion than the surrounding adults (figs. 45 and 46). The Norwegian spades are replaced by a Scottish sickle. Most remarkable of all is the old man towards the front of the picture plane in each composition (figs. 41 and

---


\(^{154}\) Billcliffe, 1985, p. 16.

\(^{155}\) Newton, 2005, p. 56.

\(^{156}\) Ibid.
42). They stand in an identical pose, with head slightly bowed, arms and hands crossed, Guthrie’s figure turned parallel to the picture plane in order to emphasise his dignity. I draw particular attention to the visible part of the old man’s right hand, covered by the left in each case. In Guthrie’s version, there is a clear thumb and forefinger clutching a hat and stick, in Werenskiold’s a thumb and probably two fingers grasping the shovel in an identical manner. These similarities are even more marked when compared to Werenskiold’s subsequent painting. Of course there are differences, most notably the absence of the female figure on the left, but as women were not permitted at a Scottish funeral, but instead remained inside the house, the lit window is surely indicative of the female presence within. I think that the possibility of Guthrie having seen Werenskiold’s drawing in *Ude og Hjemme* as unlikely as a Parisian encounter with the Norwegian, so it is hard to account for the close similarity, yet the visual evidence of a link is so strong.

Guthrie was known at this time for his pictures of people of the cottar class, equivalents of the Norwegian *Husmenn* who lived from a small piece of land rented in exchange for working for the *bonde* landlord. The Highland mourners share an affinity with the poor Norwegian mountain mourners. There are many other correspondences between the Norwegian artists of this period and the Glasgow Boys. Many of them travelled to Paris and Grez, and were influenced by French Naturalist techniques and subjects in exhibitions and galleries at home and abroad. Laura Newton quotes Billcliffe’s words on ‘The Boys’ that can apply equally to Werenskiold’s drawing, in that it ‘records the tedious and hard work of the rural poor without making political comment on it and without invoking undue sympathy on the part of the viewer’. It is interesting to compare contemporary works by the Norwegian Gustav Wentzel and the Scotsman W. Y. Macgregor (figs. 50 and 51). Both works are from 1881, both have the same title, and both feature a carpenter leaning from the left over their workbench surrounded by wood shavings. They provide a clear visual example of the closeness between Scotland and Norway, and in both cases the aim is an honest but unsentimental depiction of manual labour that neither glorifies nor romanticises working people.
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158 *Snekker* can mean carpenter or joiner – Macgregor’s work may first have been exhibited as *A Carpenter’s Shop* in 1882 - see Stevenson and Walsh, 2010, p. 130.
159 The age old connection between Scotland and Norway is well known. Particularly pertinent is that a Scottish army of some three hundred men invaded Norway in 1612 and marched through Romsdal and Gudbrandsdalen (site of Werenskiold’s drawings), where they were massacred by a force of Norwegian bønder and peasants (note the differentiation), including men from Vågå,
at the Battle of Kringen (Kringom). This ‘romantic’ event was well-known in Norway in the nineteenth century. Edvard Storm had written a folk song called *Sinklars Visa* (*Sinclair’s Song or Ballad*) in 1781 (lyrics: ‘The bønder of Vågå, Lesja and Lom, shouldering sharp axes...’). Andreas Faye referred to the battle in *Norske Sagn* (1833), and Hans Krags in a book of 1838 (Krags was the parish priest in Våga 1830-42: See Jan Faye Braadland, ‘Andreas Faye og det Nasjonale Gjennombrudd’, *Ast-Agder-Arv* 2003: *Årbok for Aust-Agder kulturhistoriske senter.* (Arendal, 2003), pp. 70-1). Henrik Wergeland then wrote the tragedy *Sinklars Død* (*Sinclair’s Death*) c.1840, and Adolph Tidemand painted *Sinclairs landing i Romsdal* (with Morten Müller) in 1876, just prior to Werenskiold’s trip to Gudbrandsdalen. The eponymous Captain Sinclair was in fact subordinate to expedition leader Lieutenant-Colonel Alexander Ramsay (see Thomas Mitchell, *History of the Scottish Expedition to Norway in 1612* (Edinburgh: T. Nelson, 1886)).
The Burial Picture 1849-1885

As demonstrated earlier, Courbet’s Burial at Ornans is often seen as being inspirational for Peasant Burial. But in contrast to A Funeral Service in the Highlands, Burial at Ornans has many differences when compared with Werenskiold’s work. Initially there is one of scale. Burial at Ornans is over thirteen times the size of Peasant Burial and over eight times the size of A Funeral Service. It is also over twice as long as it is high, whereas the other two pictures are both only one-and-a-half times. We then consider the number of people: Courbet’s work has over fifty characters, Guthrie’s fourteen and Werenskiold’s eight. Additionally, as Michael Fried says, ‘Ornans is ‘processional’’, there is a sense of slow movement in contrast to the fixed stillness of Werenskiold and Guthrie. Courbet’s picture depicts the bourgeoisie of Ornans in contrast to the purely rural inhabitants of the other two. Courbet’s picture appears more open than that of Werenskiold, enclosed by picket fence and stone wall, and that of Guthrie where the cottage is a substantial feature. Courbet’s Burial really is a burial; in the Guthrie it is still to happen, in the Werenskiold it already has. To this one must add the subject of religion: Gabriel Weisberg notes Charles Bigot’s description of Werenskiold’s work as ‘a Protestant burial and more than likely represents one of a nonconformist sect’, while Guthrie’s picture is described by his biographer James Caw as ‘marked by power and pathos, pregnant with the grave and austere spirit of Calvinism’. One might describe these works as ‘ultra-protestant’. They have none of the pageantry or ceremonial embellishment of Courbet’s Catholic service. Marit Werenskiold sees this as a virtue and declares that ‘[Erik] Werenskiold [...] creates a genuinely Norwegian, soberly Lutheran rural scene, in contrast to Courbet’s pompous picture of a crowd at a Catholic burial’. She implies that the conceit of the French picture contrasts with the purity and clarity of Werenskiold’s depiction.

Politically, Werenskiold’s work can be seen as portraying the emergent bonde class as dignified representatives of rural Norway, enduring hardships stoically, both in life and in death. Werenskiold’s work was painted between 1883 and 1885, just at the time that there was a constitutional crisis in Norway following the great success of the Left
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162 James L. Caw, Scottish Painting 1620-1908 (Bath: Kingsmead Reprints, 1975 [1908]).
163 Marit Werenskiold, 1999, p. 87.
in the 1882 election. The Left consisted of all the rural representatives – i.e. the bonde class – and a third of the urban ones.\textsuperscript{164} King Oscar’s opposition to the Left led to the prospect of a takeover by the army in support of the conservative Right, but a crisis was averted when, in 1884, the King finally accepted a government led by Johan Sverdrup.\textsuperscript{165} Werenskiold’s picture is therefore highly representative of the new ruling class in the Storting (parliament). T. J. Clark devotes much energy to a discussion of whether Courbet’s sympathies are ‘Bohemian or Peasant’ at the time of Burial at Ornans, and says that the picture represents the equivocal situation of the bourgeoisie; on the one hand the target of peasant distrust, on the other providing leadership for rural radicalism.\textsuperscript{166} Michael Fried believes that Clark’s political claims for Courbet’s work are ‘modest’ and that a more specific interpretation of context to pictorial content is required.\textsuperscript{167} In comparison to Werenskiold’s picture, I see similarities in that both represent a comparatively prosperous section of rural/small-town society, although we know the Norwegian bønder were already grasping the reigns of political power.

It is particularly rewarding to compare the two gravediggers in the works of Werenskiold and Courbet. T. J. Clark discusses the ‘dedicated revolutionary’ Max Buchon – himself depicted in Burial at Ornans – and concludes that Buchon regards the gravedigger in the picture as ‘the one proletarian’.\textsuperscript{168} Buchon writes: ‘the eye is drawn to the gravedigger who sits there on the edge of the grave, [...]he] shows no meanness in his robust posture. He is even the only one in that immense reunion who kneels, and yet, look! he alone carries his head high, he alone commands’.\textsuperscript{169} It is certainly true that the gravedigger is centre stage in this work, and that his white sleeves stand out against the dark attire surrounding him. He possesses a clear and alert countenance that contrasts with the two beadles, red-robed and red-faced, who stand immediately behind him. There are parallels here with Shakespeare’s gravediggers in Hamlet who, despite their lowly social status, possess a wit and wisdom superior to that of their supposed betters. Interestingly, Courbet’s gravedigger wears a black waistcoat and white shirt that corresponds with the majority of the mourners in Peasant Burial.

\textsuperscript{164} See Derry, 1973, pp. 56-59.
\textsuperscript{165} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{167} Fried, 1990, p. 118.
\textsuperscript{168} Clark, 1973, pp. 18, pp. 115-16.
Clarence Sheffield says that in *Peasant Burial* ‘the six male figures who stand at the right are dressed in a similar manner and form a coherent group [...] The two figures on the left side of the grave wear lighter coloured garments than the six figures at right’.\(^{170}\) However, I question that the six form a coherent group, despite Sheffield’s assertion that the elbow of the man on the extreme right (touching the head of the young fellow second-right) connects them.\(^{171}\) The picket fence is there specifically to exclude the man on the far right, who is not as closely related to the deceased, and is perhaps a *bonde* from a neighbouring farm.

In *Peasant Burial*, the gravedigger has his head bowed in a deeper, more deferential gesture than the proud but respectful three men and boy who stand near him. Although he is placed towards the front of the picture plane, he is far less prominent than Guthrie’s counterpart, and far more peripheral than Courbet’s gravedigger. All this information, including his grave-digging duties, suggests that he is of lower class than the surrounding men, but his inclusive position indicates that he was perhaps a long-standing loyal employee of the deceased or the deceased’s family. Perhaps he is the last remnant of the true peasants of *A Poor Burial in a Norwegian Mount Hamlet* (fig. 22)? It is the uncertainty that surrounds the specific class of person being buried that adds to the mystery and appeal of *Peasant Burial*.

Despite the assertion by Ingvild Pharo and Egil Sagstad that ‘The funeral motif is rare in European art’,\(^{172}\) I find this not to be the case. Guthrie’s work follows a long line of Highland funerals, such as George Harvey’s *A Highland Funeral* (fig. 52, 1844),\(^{173}\) Robert Ranald McIan’s *A Highland Funeral in the Braes of Lochaber* (1849),\(^{174}\) Kenneth Macleay’s *A Highland Funeral* (1859)\(^ {175}\) and David Murray’s *A Highland Funeral* (1876), which was exhibited at the Royal Scottish Academy in 1880,\(^ {176}\) just prior to Guthrie’s work. Also included in this category is Hugh Cameron’s *The Funeral of a Little Girl on the Riviera* (fig. 53, or *A Child’s Funeral in the Riviera*), depicting a sunny Catholic
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170 Sheffield, 1999, p. 75.
171 Ibid., p. 78.
173 Exhibited RSA 1844, No. 161.
174 Exhibited RSA 1849, No. 239.
175 Exhibited RSA 1859, No. 237.
176 Exhibited RSA 1880, No. 113.
funeral in stark contrast to Guthrie’s dour Protestant work. George Harvey’s old-fashioned and sentimental style of Scottish art shares much of the stoic Romanticism of his Norwegian contemporary Tidemand. Just like Werenskiold, Guthrie was in opposition to this ‘old-fashioned’ genre, though both Guthrie and Harvey’s pictures feature a similar faithful collie dog that adds pathos to the scenario.

Fig. 52. George Harvey, *A Highland Funeral*, 1844, engraved version.

Fig. 53. Hugh Cameron. *The Funeral of a Little Girl on the Riviera* or *A Child’s Funeral on the Riviera*, 1881, McManus Art Gallery, Dundee, oil on canvas, 123.8 x 210.2 cm.

Guthrie and Werenskiold would also have been aware of the work of Frank Holl, who had depicted funerals in a sentimental, Victorian manner in *I am the Resurrection and the Life (The Village Funeral)* (1872; Leeds City Art Gallery) and *Her Firstborn: Horsham Churchyard* (1876; McManus Art Gallery, Dundee). On the continent, Albert Anker had painted *A Child’s Funeral (Kinderbegräbnis)* in 1863, and the seventeen-year-old Isaac Israëls made a successful debut at the Paris Salon with *Military Funeral* in 1882. Jules Bastien-Lepage had plans for a similarly-themed picture, *The Burial of a Young Girl*, in a series to be entitled *Les Mois Rustiques*. He also made sketches and planned to exhibit his final picture at the 1885 Salon (as *L’Enterrement d’une Jeune Fille*), but his own death intervened.

In 1853 Tidemand and Gude had produced another joint portrayal in a Romantic style, this time of a *Funeral on Sognefjord (Likferd på Sognefjorden)*, in which a coffin in a rowing boat is draped in a Norwegian flag. Additionally, Sheffield identifies ‘an important Scandinavian precedent for *Peasant Burial*, based on work by Bo Lindwall that notes similarities with Gustav Cederström’s *Burial in Alsike* (1883, *Begravning i Alsike*). However, as this work was painted after Werenskiold’s 1878 drawings, it cannot be a precedent. The Nordic funeral-themed work that I think most influential is Albert Edelfelt’s *Conveying the Child’s Coffin* (fig. 54), which would have been well-known after it received a third-class medal at the Paris Salon of 1880, the first to be awarded to a Finnish artist. Edelfelt painted this in a Natural, *en plein-air* style, much influenced by his friend Jules Bastien-Lepage. The French critic Philippe de Chennevières thought that ‘Perhaps it was worth more than the third-class medal it
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178 See Billcliffe, 1985, p. 50 and McConkey, 1982, p. 17 and p. 33 n. 13. Also, Østby, 1977, p. 23, for Werenskiold’s knowledge of *The Graphic*. Werenskiold may also have known of Vincent Van Gogh’s enthusiasm for Holl via Theo Van Gogh.


180 No. 1387 Enterrement militaire en Hollande.


183 An identically-titled work by Gude alone, dated 1866, is in the Göteborgs Konstmuseum, Sweden.

184 Sheffield, p. 69.


was awarded. The emotion is so simple and effortless, and the poignant sadness its simple good-heartedness'. I find this work relevant to both Werenskiold and Guthrie. The air of stoical acceptance and mood is very similar in both Werenskiold and Edelfelt’s works, while the Guthrie and the Edelfelt share the feature of a red-faced, downward-looking small child, brave but inwardly grieving, positioned right next to the coffin.

---

Fig. 54. Albert Edelfelt, *Conveying the Child's Coffin (Convoi d'un enfant (Golfe de Finlande)),* 1879, Ateneum Art Museum, Helsinki, oil on canvas, 120 x 204cm.

Fig. 55. Albert Edelfelt, *Divine Service in Uusimaa Archipelago (Service divin au bord de la mer),* 1881, Préfecture du Haut-Rhin, Colmar ex Musée d'Orsay, Paris, oil on canvas, 122 x 178cm.
Fig. 56. Christian Skredsvig, *A Farm at Venoix (Une Ferme à Venoix)*, 1881, Musée de Normandie, Caen, oil on canvas, 200 x 300cm.

Fig. 57. Christian Skredsvig's *Une Ferme à Venoix* (top centre) *in situ* at the Paris Salon of 1881. Salon de 1881. Photographié par G. Michelez.
Nordic Success at the Paris Salon

There are two pictures that were highly successful at the Salon during Werenskiold’s first Parisian period that also merit close consideration. The first of these is Christian Skredsvig’s A Farm at Venoix (fig. 56, Une Ferme à Venoix), winner of a gold medal at the 1881 Salon (fig. 57). 188 Werenskiold would have been delighted at this Norwegian success and would have paid close attention to the work. Physical similarities are many. Skredsvig’s picture, although less bright than Werenskiold’s, contains a mixture of bright sunshine and shadows. It is painted in a Naturalist en plein-air style that contains significant Realist elements. There is plenty of green grass, a concept that Skredsvig would have known from both Werenskiold and the Barbizon artists. There are similarities between Werenskiold’s white picket fence and Skredsvig’s grey picket gate, both features surmounted in the top right-hand corner by similar extending tree branches. There also appears to be an enclosing stone wall on the central left-hand side of Skredsvig’s work. Both pictures have an air of quiet contemplation about them. Sheffield notes how Norwegian artists felt a kinship with Normandy, due to the possibility that Rollo (c.846–c.931), the first Viking ruler of Normandy, was Norwegian, and that the Normans were thus descended from Norwegian stock. 189

The second picture I wish to consider is another by Albert Edelfelt, Divine Service in Uusimaa Archipelago (1881; fig. 55). We know that this was a success because it was acquired by the French state after its appearance at the 1882 Paris Salon. 190 Like Peasant Burial, there is an upright male figure holding a bible or hymnbook, in a similar position just away from the left-hand edge of the canvas. Common features are an expanse of grass, and again some vegetation in the top right-hand corner. This picture also shares an air of quiet contemplation, as the congregation ponder the speaker’s words.

---

189 See Sheffield, 1999, pp. 59-60. Rollo (aka Ganger Rolf or Hrolf), great-great-great grandfather of William I of England (the Conqueror), may have been Norwegian or Danish. Fjågesund and Symes, 2003, note how nineteenth-century Britons saw a link between the Normans and the Norwegians, and that Gudbrandsdalen farmers were happy to exploit the legend of Rollo, and their own ‘blue-blooded descent’, in pursuit of the British tourist trade – See Fjågesund and Symes, 2003, pp. 124-26, particularly the extract from Williams (1877, p. 222) on p. 125.
Peasant Burial
The composition of *Peasant Burial* has already received considerable analysis from Clarence Sheffield,\(^{191}\) so I propose at this stage not to repeat his observations, but to add my own findings. Firstly, I must conclude my Guthrie connection. I have seen no published explanation as to why Werenskiold suddenly reconnected with the burial theme after an absence of five years. Perhaps he saw something at Gvarv – one of the people or one of the churches at Sauherad or Nes – that struck a chord in his memory.\(^{192}\) More likely however is that in May 1883, in the month or so before Werenskiold arrived at the farm at Gvarv, an engraving of Guthrie’s *A Funeral Service in the Highlands*, now entitled *A Highland Funeral* (fig. 47), appeared as the frontispiece for that month’s *Magazine of Art*.\(^{193}\) It seems perfectly feasible to me that a Scandinavian artist, even Werenskiold himself, or the anglophone Sophie Werenskiold, would have observed its similarities to *A Poor Burial in a Norwegian Mountain Hamlet* and remarked upon it. I suggest this because of the similarities already noted between the two pictures, and because of some specific features. In other words, having raised the possibility of Werenskiold’s drawing informing Guthrie’s picture, I now raise the possibility of an engraving of Guthrie’s picture informing Werenskiold’s painting. Let us examine several key pieces of evidence.

Firstly, the tall man in all three compositions, his head above and to the left of the older man with bowed head, begins with a full head of hair in Werenskiold’s original drawing (fig. 58), but in Werenskiold’s final painting (fig. 60) this man is far more like Guthrie’s figure, balding significantly on top (fig. 59), than his own earlier drawing. Similarly, the old man has a full head of hair in the drawing (fig. 58), but has lost most of it by the time of the painting, moving closer to Guthrie’s (fig. 59) and has also gained Guthrie’s side-whiskers. Most interesting of all is that the old man (fig. 61) began with a thumb and at least two fingers around his shovel. Now in the painting (fig. 63) his grip has metamorphosed into a thumb and single finger on either side of the gripped object in an identical fashion to Guthrie’s figure (fig. 62).

---

\(^{191}\) Sheffield, 1999, pp. 75-86.

\(^{192}\) Norway’s most famous folk musician, the Hardanger fiddle player Torgeir Augundsson (1799-1872), known as “Myllargutten” (Millerboy), was born in Sauherad. Halfdan Egedius illustrates the painter Thorleiv Stadskleiv playing the Hardanger fiddle in *Play and Dance* (1896; Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo).

\(^{193}\) *Magazine of Art*, May 1883, p. 309.
It is of interest that *Peasant Burial* is a wholly rural representation, with no indication of mechanisation or modernity. Completed in the same year – 1885 – as the first hydro-electric power supply in Norway was delivered to nearby Skein,¹⁹⁴ the picture shows a small farm, including sundry outbuildings, positioned far into the background.

¹⁹⁴ The railway through the area was not complete until 1924. The Norsk Hydro plant at Vermork outside Rjukan opened in 1911, and became world famous for its production of ‘heavy water’ during World War Two, with Axel Aubert (1873-1943) in the role of director-general (1926-41) and chairman (1941-43) at this time. Axel’s mother Hilda Thaulow was the artist Frits Thaulow’s first cousin, and Axel’s father Otto Benjamin Andreas Aubert (b. 1841) was first cousin of the critic Andreas Aubert (1851-1913).
and located above the schoolteacher’s head. If not the actual living place of the *bonde* who was being buried, it alludes to the typical farm setup of the *bonde* family who are depicted around the grave. Werenskiold confessed that ‘I was gripped by the motif […] It is indeed foolish to think that one should be obsessed by a motif for three summers in succession’.  

I believe Werenskiold’s ‘obsession’ can be divided into three constituent parts. Firstly, he spent many weeks assessing each of the eight people, thinking about their posture and direction, capturing their individual character, then emphasising this without resorting to caricature. Secondly, he assembled these figures into a coherent compositional whole, as he had observed in the work of other European artists. Finally, he considered what mood, message and public impact he wanted this assemblage to convey. Only after the labour of three summers did Werenskiold consider that he had succeeded in unifying these diverse elements into a picture ready for exhibition.

*Peasant Burial* made a considerable impact when exhibited in Christiania in 1885. Its amazing clarity and lack of sentimentality led people to see it as almost ‘raw’ and ‘brutal’.  

When it was exhibited at the *Exposition Universelle* in Paris in 1889, ‘the faces of [Werenskiold’s] subjects, all portraits, contrasted sharply with, and therefore appeared more authentic than, the idealized ones by other artists at the exhibition’. Finally, as stated previously, the Norwegian National Gallery describe it over a century later as an integral part of Norway’s visual identity.

**Conclusion**

Erik Werenskiold’s *Peasant Burial* is an important and fascinating work of art. The attention which the artist lavished upon it is evident in the clear and convincing depictions of the people of rural Telemark. I believe that my analysis has brought to the fore a number of previously unconsidered areas. I have shown that the earlier preparatory drawings provide a purely compositional basis for the final picture, and that it is not, as Sheffield states, ‘a synthesis of the two most cherished rural regions – Telemark and Gudbrandsdal’, but a painting of Telemark people in a Telemark landscape, different in class from those Werenskiold saw at Vågå. I have shown also
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that these drawings contained recognisable figures of characters from Werenskiold’s folk tale drawings.

I have rejected Courbet’s *Burial at Ornans* as a pictorial basis for *Peasant Burial* for many reasons: the scale and shape of Courbet’s picture, the number of figures, its openness, its sinuous movement, its opulence and its overt Catholicism. I do, however, acknowledge that Werenskiold would have known Courbet’s picture, and perhaps even been aware that Bastien-Lepage thought it ‘the ultimate source’. Instead, I suggest a clear affinity with Scottish Calvinism and the work of James Guthrie. In connection with this, I note the centuries-old historical link between Scotland and Norway, much romanticised in the nineteenth century, and demonstrate the exceptional closeness of pictures of *A Carpenter’s Workshop* by Wentzel and Macgregor respectively.

Significantly, I demonstrate how Werenskiold’s *Peasant Burial* is a synthesis of the art that he saw in Munich and Paris from 1875 to 1883, including French Naturalism in the work of Corot and Daubigny, with its play on light and shadow, tranquillity, gentle tones, and scenes of honest peasantry in their rural environment. Wilhelm Leibl was also a conduit for this French-based influence, in that Werenskiold would have seen his works on a regular basis. We must also consider the creation of the compositional whole achieved by Munkácsy and Krøyer in the individual works that Werenskiold praised, and the stoic acceptance of life and death in Edelfelt’s great compositions. Skredsvig’s green and sunlit view of Normandy seems very close in spirit to *Peasant Burial*, and perhaps Guthrie is there also. Certainly, the latter’s theme, composition and Protestant mood and frugality comes far closer than any other work.

Finally, I show how Werenskiold rejects the old Norway, in the form of the ancient stave church background and the ‘eccentric’ characters of Vågå, in order to create a portrait of modern European Norwegians. He succeeds pictorially in his negation of the Romantic rituals of Tidemand, but conversely his very subject matter, the burial of a bonde, is rooted firmly in that self-same Norwegian Romantic tradition.

---

CHAPTER TWO – PEDER SEVERIN (P. S.) KRØYER

Peder Severin Krøyer was born in the Norwegian town of Stavanger in 1851, but was brought up by his aunt in Copenhagen and is universally considered as a Danish artist. He was some three-and-a-half years older than Erik Werenskiold, and there was a similar gap between Krøyer arriving in Paris in June 1877 and Werenskiold in February 1881. Krøyer was also three years ahead of Werenskiold in first exhibiting at the Paris Salon, making his debut in 1878. Like Werenskiold, Krøyer did visit Munich, but only briefly – in June 1875 – and did not remain to study there, although he and the Norwegian Eilif Peterssen found time to paint each other’s portraits. Interestingly, one of the three German history painters who impressed Krøyer was the director of the Munich Academy, Karl von Piloty.

Krøyer was undoubtedly the most successful Danish artist from an international perspective in the period under review (1878-1889) and this chapter concentrates on his works from this time. These years also coincide with Krøyer’s first international exhibition in Paris at the 1878 Exposition Universelle to the last time he exhibited at the Paris Salon in 1889, though his paintings continued to be exhibited internationally right up to his death in 1909. At this point I will summarise Krøyer’s international exhibition record from 1878 to 1889, which serves to emphasise the over-riding importance of Paris to Krøyer’s prominent international position.

1878 Paris (Exposition Universelle).
1879 Paris (Salon).
1880 Paris (Salon).
1881 Paris (Salon), Gothenburg.
1882 Paris (Salon), Vienna.
1883 Did not exhibit abroad.
1884 Paris (Salon), London, New Orleans.
1885 Paris (Salon), Paris (Georges Petit), Antwerp, Brussels, Bergen, Stockholm.
1886 Paris (Salon), Clermont-Ferrand, Berlin, Gothenburg, London.
1887 Paris (Salon), Paris (Georges Petit).
1888 Gothenburg, Berlin.
1889 Paris (Salon), Paris (Exposition Universelle).

---

200 Jan Gorm Madsen in Saabye, Krøyer, p.17.
201 Saabye, Krøyer, pp. 335-37.
Krøyer began his apprenticeship somewhat younger than Werenskiold, studying for six years from the age of thirteen at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts in Copenhagen (1864-70). In 1872 he won a ‘minor gold medal’ in an Academy competition, and from 1873 to 1877 he spent much time in Hornbæk, a fishing village in Zealand which was gradually becoming Denmark’s first artists’ colony. In the three years prior to exhibiting at the 1878 *Exposition Universelle* in Paris, Krøyer travelled extensively in Germany, the Netherlands, Belgium, Spain and Brittany, always looking at the art in the major galleries and museums during the course of his travels. He also spent time as a pupil in Léon Bonnat’s studio in the summer of 1877. Bonnat had studied in Madrid early in his career, and his enthusiasm for Velázquez and Ribera influenced the pictures that Krøyer concentrated on in the Prado the following year.

The 1878 *Exposition Universelle* was held from May to November 1878; Krøyer arrived in Paris in September following seven months in Spain. There were five different classes of competition at the exhibition, and in the oil painting class the Nordic countries were well represented with around 230 exhibits (Sweden eighty-two, Denmark seventy-six, Norway fifty-eight, Finland twelve). It is notable that many of Denmark’s representatives were members of the Royal Danish Academy of Art, including four who had died in the 1870s. Most prestigious among the deceased was the former director of the Academy, the painter of the ‘Danish Golden Age’, Wilhelm Marstrand.

However, Denmark’s reliance on its ‘old guard’ – it is suggested that some works were ‘re-dated’ in order to make them appear more contemporary\(^\text{202}\) – was not a successful move as far as the critics were concerned, and this led to an outcry against the Danish art establishment.\(^\text{203}\) Two pictures by Krøyer were chosen for exhibition, the first being *The Smithy at Hornbæk* (1875; fig. 64),\(^\text{204}\) which had been exhibited at Charlottenborg three years earlier, and had been purchased by the major collector Heinrich Hirschsprung prior to that exhibition – this was the first major purchase by the Danish tobacco baron, whose support was to prove highly significant to Krøyer throughout his


\(^{\text{204}}\) No. 35 *Forge* – (1875; Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen)
As was to be the case in future years, French art criticism privileged Krøyer above his fellow Danish artists. In the *Gazette des beaux-arts*, Edmond Duranty described Danish painting as ‘conscientious, painstaking, cold and dry’, adding ‘the light is always harsh, the tone without finesse, without delicacy or liveliness. I will cite as the best those works of Messrs. Exner, Dalsgaard, Helsteld, Jerndorf, then the Forge of M. Kroeyer where there are good areas of design, and a fairly good hearth effect’. Krøyer’s second entry was a portrait of a much older Danish artist, the flower painter Otto Diderich Ottesen (1816-92), who himself had three compositions in the *Exposition*. It also worthy of note at this point that Krøyer would have also seen his fellow Dane Carl Neumann’s picture of fishermen hauling a Seine net at Skagen beach (fig. 92).

Katrine Halkier raises the possibility that Krøyer may have had at the back of his mind Constantin Hansen’s *Interior of the Old Hammer Mill at Hellebæk* (fig. 63a) when he painted *The Smithy at Hornbæk*, because Krøyer almost certainly saw that picture at Hansen’s home. It appears to me that whereas Hansen’s work is very much about the depiction of the room, Krøyer’s work is about the process of working with hot iron, and also about showing his skills in depicting a source of light at the centre of his work. To an English eye, this work is highly reminiscent of Joseph Wright of Derby (1734-97), who painted five pictures on the theme of blacksmiths and iron forges from 1771 to 1773. Particularly pertinent are the two similar versions of *A Blacksmith’s Shop*, now in New Haven and Derby respectively and painted in the period 1770-71 (figs. 67 and 68). Research into the Yale (New Haven) version has shown that Wright placed a small piece of gold leaf onto a lead-white underlay, which he then covered with a layer of Naples yellow in order to achieve the effect.
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207 No. 36 *Portait d’un peintre (O.-D. Ottesen)* – (1873; Charlottenborg Udstilling kom.)
208 Nos. 50-52.
210 *A Blacksmith’s Shop* (1771; Yale Center for British Art), *A Farrier’s Shop* (1771; lost: Mezzotint by William Pether in Derby Museums and Art Gallery), *A Blacksmith’s Shop* (1771; Derby Museums and Art Gallery), *An Iron Forge* (1772; Tate, London), *An Iron Forge viewed from without* (1773; Hermitage, St. Petersburg).
Fig. 63a. Constantin Hansen, *Interior of the Old Hammer Mill at Heelebæk*, 1859, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 60 x 68cm.

Fig. 64. P. S. Krøyer, *The Smithy at Hornbæk*, 1875, Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 91 x 118.7cm.
Fig. 65. P. S. Krøyer, *Three Smiths at Hornbæk*, 1876, Grohmann Collection, Milwaukee, oil on canvas, 94 x 117 cm.
Fig. 67, Joseph Wright of Derby, *A Blacksmith’s Shop*, 1771, Yale Center for British Art, oil on canvas, 128.2 x 104.1 cm.

Fig. 68, Joseph Wright of Derby, *A Blacksmith’s Shop*, 1771, Derby Museums, oil on canvas, 128.2 x 104.1 cm.
Wright had read Thomas Bardwell's *The Practice of Painting and Perspective made easy* (1756) and in this treatise Bardwell advised that 'white is a friendly working colour and comes forward with yellows and reds'. It is just this type of practice that Krøyer has made use of in *The Smithy at Hornbæk*, utilising yellow, orange and red to bring out the brilliance of the white-hot metal. I am not suggesting that Krøyer was directly aware of Wright’s work at this stage of his career, more that there was a commonality of source material. However, we know that eighteenth-century Swedish artists were certainly aware of Wright’s work. Thomas Bardwell promoted Rembrandt as a 'master of all the parts of colouring', and in 1875 Krøyer (and his travelling partner Frans Schwartz) would have seen relevant works by Rembrandt in their tour of Germany, particularly *The Adoration of the Shepherds* (fig. 69) in the Alte Pinakothek in Munich and *The Parable of the Rich Fool* in Berlin. From Krøyer's travel diary we learn that 'it was...great masters from the history of art, such as Correggio, Titian and Rembrandt that aroused [Krøyer’s] attention', in Dresden 'it was again names like...Rubens, Rembrandt and Van Dyck', and in Munich 'they spent many hours in both the Alte and Neue Pinakothek', *The Adoration of the Shepherds* being located in the former. In this picture, Rembrandt has used yellow tints to produce the effect of a dazzling white light emanating from the Christ Child.

In parallel, Benedict Nicolson suggests that Wright’s use of a central light source recalls the religious scenes of the Dutch artist Gerrit van Honthorst, who in turn had been heavily influenced by the chiaroscuro effects he had observed in the work of Caravaggio. We know Krøyer must have been impressed by the Dutch and Flemish works he witnessed in Germany, because in 1877 he went on an artistic pilgrimage to the Low Countries. Krøyer would have been aware of van Honthorst as a master of the Dutch Golden Age, and would have seen that artist’s *The Dentist* (fig. 70) as we know that he visited the Gemäldegalerie in Dresden. In van Honthorst’s work the chiaroscuro effect of a strong central light force and darkened surroundings is clearly
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213 Thomas Bardwell, 1756, p. 2.
214 Gemäldegalerie Berlin (1627).
216 Ibid., p. 16.
217 Ibid., p. 17.
apparent, and this significant interplay of sources of light and dark shadows is something that we see in a number of Krøyer’s works. Although Krøyer’s main figure is not as idealised as that of Wright, both artists have a common goal in that they portray the manual labourer as dignified and industrious, and avoid a coarse or sentimental depiction. Wright’s placement of women and children in his scenes of industrial production has been criticised for providing a foil in order to emphasise the masculinity of the role of the iron-workers, but in this picture by Krøyer the young apprentice appears completely natural in his positioning and representation. The role of children in this type of picture was to prove much more controversial in Krøyer’s *Italian Village Hatters* of 1880 (fig. 17).

It is interesting that there are compositional similarities between Krøyer’s work and that of another piece of art from the Dutch Golden Age. *A Smith’s Forge*, then believed to be by Adriaen Brouwer, was in the collection of Bouchier Cleeve of Kent during the eighteenth century. Although known only by the Mezzotint reproduction engraved by James Macardell (fig. 66), and containing two figures rather than three, both feature a figure with their arm pulling on a bellows chain on the left of the picture and a blacksmith with his right arm holding a hammer raised ready to strike on the right of the composition. A final point is that in the 2012 Krøyer Catalogue, Katrine Halkier discusses another later version: ‘The copy of *The Smithy at Hornbæk* has not been seen since [around 1889]. It would in fact have been interesting to compare the two paintings and see the alterations Krøyer had made.’

I have discovered that the other version resides in the Grohmann Museum in Milwaukee, and can indeed be compared with the original artwork. The later picture, virtually identical in size, appears lighter in colour and has perhaps not suffered so extensively from the darkening process, caused by the use of bitumen, that appears to have affected a number of Krøyer’s early works, such as the original *The Smithy at Hornbæk, A Sardine curing and packing factory in Concarneau* and possibly *Italian Village Hatters*. The picture also represents a different moment in the blacksmith’s process; in the original, the blacksmith’s hammer is up and that of his assistant is down, but the reverse is true in the later work. Additionally, the youthful apprentice’s face is now fully exposed to the viewer, and appears more active, now pulling the chain that drives the bellows with both hands. This picture resulted in Krøyer being awarded the *Diplôme d’honneur* at an exhibition in New Orleans in 1885.
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220 Katrine Halkier in Saabye, *Krøyer*, p. 156
Fig. 69. Rembrandt van Rijn, *The Adoration of the Shepherds*, 1646, Alte Pinakothek, Munich, oil on canvas, 97 x 71cm.

Fig. 70. Gerrit van Honthorst, *The Dentist*, 1622, Gemäldegalerie, Dresden, oil on canvas, 147 x 219cm.
Krøyer resumed his studies in Bonnat’s atelier in the winter of 1878-79, and was persuaded by his teacher to produce a classical piece for the Salon of 1879. It seems a little unusual, following Krøyer’s exposure to the Spanish art of Velázquez and Ribera, and his reaction to the work of Jules Bastien-Lepage at the 1878 Exposition – ‘what young power [...] what originality, what openness towards nature, and what energy...’ – that Krøyer should produce such a conventional piece of work. Presumably, Bonnat persuaded him that this represented his best chance of recognition, and Krøyer then took the advice of Karl Madsen as to a specific subject, that of Daphnis and Chloë. He was influenced pictorially by his good friend Laurits Tuxen, whose second version of Susanna at her Bath (1878) featured a nude female with one foot tucked behind her calf, itself based on a similar figure in Jean-Léon Gérôme’s Moorish Bath (1870).

Although Daphnis and Chloë was well received in Denmark, its lack of success in Paris doubtless persuaded Krøyer in 1880 to submit a Salon picture that was much closer to his own pictorial concerns at that time. These were the depiction of working-class people in their natural environment and, in a progression from his earlier ‘smithy’ pictures, the way that a painter could illustrate the effect of light, both as overall tone and as a consequence of a light source, internal or external, illuminating the picture plane. From April to July 1879, Krøyer visited a number of favourite painting haunts of artists in France, including Cernay-la-Ville, Pont-Aven and Douarnenez. In Cernay, Krøyer painted French forest workers on a sunken road (1879; Ribe Kunstmuseum) and at Pont-Aven a small study of a Breton girl shelling peas (1879; Skagens Museum), but it was in that summer’s final destination, Concarneau, that he painted his Salon entry.

On his 1878 trip to Spain, Krøyer had copied a number of pictures by Velázquez in the Prado, including his travelling companion Julius Lange’s favourite Las Hilanderos (1657; fig. 71; The Tapestry Weavers). This picture exhibits a number of concerns that manifest themselves in Krøyer’s Salon entrant A Sardine curing and packing factory in Concarneau (1879; fig. 72), namely the depiction of women at their labours, the overall hue of an indoor environment, the intrusion of an external beam of light, and
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222 P. S. Krøyer to Heinrich Hirschsprung, 14 October 1878, in Saabye, Krøyer, p. 3.
223 Saabye, Krøyer, p. 169.
224 Ibid., pp. 20-22.
225 Ibid., p. 169.
226 Paris Salon No. 2028 Dans une sardinière à Concarneau (Finistère).
the effect of the illumination of the rear of the picture (backlighting). Krøyer’s emphasis in the picture is on the faces of the women – some very clear, some in shadow – and the play of light on the scales of the fish. He uses slivers of grey, black and white to bring forward the fish from their darker surroundings, using white impasto to provide additional highlights, particularly where three bands of light cut across the long table. Here also is the first significant use by Krøyer of the long diagonal that draws the eye from the foreground to background, and is highly effective at providing pictorial recession. Other notable works by Krøyer that include this device include Italian Field Labourers. Abruzzo (1880), At the Victualler’s when there is no fishing (1882; fig. 79), and Summer’s day at the South Beach of Skagen (1884; fig. 98).
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Fig. 71. Diego Velázquez, *Las Hilanderas*, c.1657, Prado, Madrid, oil on canvas, 167 x 252cm.

Fig. 72. P S Krøyer, *A Sardine curing and packing Factory in Concarneau*, 1879, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 101 x 140cm.
Fig. 73. Mihály Munkácsy, *The Lint Makers*, 1871, Hungarian National Gallery, oil on canvas, 141 x 196cm.

Fig. 74. Max Liebermann, *Women Plucking Geese*, 1872, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, oil on canvas, 118 x 172cm.
A chapter of the 2012 Krøyer exhibition catalogue is devoted to the interaction between Krøyer and the German painter Max Liebermann. This illustrates two pictures of women in a working environment painted before Krøyer’s work: *Workers in the turnip field* (1876) and *Sewing class, work hall in the Amsterdam Orphanage* (1876-77). Mentioned but not illustrated is Liebermann’s picture that comes closest in mood and composition to Krøyer’s picture, namely *Women Plucking Geese* (fig. 74; 1872), which was exhibited at the 1874 *Salon.*

In both pictures women are working industriously, the majority seated, while one upright man is present in each, centre right of the picture plane. Both pictures show a darkish interior, though in each case there is a strong light source in the form of a bright square window. There is also a correspondence of white feathers and white fish-scales. It is also of interest, as Marianne Saabye has noted, that Liebermann sent his picture entitled *The Cannery Workers* (1879-80) to the *Salon* at exactly the same time as Krøyer sent his Concarneau sardine packers. This is a much more crowded and brightly-lit picture in which the viewer is much closer to the large-scale figures; the Dutch women are preparing vegetables for canning and there is no male presence. Saabye discounts the likelihood that Krøyer was influenced by Liebermann’s two preparatory sketches for his work originally produced in 1872 and 1873, or by Liebermann’s later picture, and I concur with this, in that the two contemporary *Salon* works are very different in mood and tone – even the common theme of a cannery is hardly relevant, given the absence of the canning process from both works.

However, I think it far more likely that Krøyer was aware of Liebermann’s *Girls Plucking Geese* for the compositional reasons mentioned earlier. Additionally, Christian Krohg was well aware of Liebermann’s picture when he composed his own *Plucking the Seagull* (1879), while Nils Ohlsen adds that: ‘Liebermann was an important influence on Krohg [...] because of the natural sobriety of his compositions...’. Krohg lived in Berlin from 1875 to 1879 and Liebermann was in Paris for much of this period, but Krohg had clearly found access to the Liebermann composition – then housed in a
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private collection in Hamburg – in either original or reproduced form. It is argued by Hendrik Zeigler that Liebermann’s composition was itself inspired by Mihály Munkácsy’s *Lint Makers* (fig. 73; 1871). Zeigler could equally be talking about a comparison between Krøyer and Liebermann’s works, rather than Liebermann and Munkácsy’s, when he says ‘the figures are richly contrasted against the darker background [but] the most glaring similarity [...] is found in the strong row-like arrangement of the figures’, and that Liebermann had acquired from Munkácsy ‘the courage to portray simple social milieus in richly contrasted light-and-dark painting’. Finally:

Both artists employed a pronounced light-dark contrast in the two paintings in question. However, bringing out figures from a dark background achieved by an undercoat of asphalt-black was a phenomenon typical of the time and one that can be observed in numerous other artists of the same generation [...]. The application of this painting technique offered the possibility of dramatizing what was in the picture, especially when it came to acts that were inherently banal; most of all, however, it suggested a skill resembling that of the old masters, which could elevate the painting to the rank of a venerable history painting already sanctioned by the past.

We know that Krøyer’s work began to ‘benefit’ almost immediately from its bitumen base (asphalt and bitumen are interchangeable terms). His representative at the 1880 Paris *Salon*, the painter Adrien Jourdeuil, wrote to Krøyer that ‘you are well-placed on the picture rail in the large entrance hall [...] Your picture appears well but it seems to me to have darkened’.

What is interesting about the three pictures by Munkácsy, Liebermann and Krøyer is their intent. Munkácsy’s work is inherently political at a time when Hungary had just achieved greater autonomy as part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire (1867); in his own words Munkácsy describes how this picture harks back to the unsuccessful Hungarian revolution of 1848: ‘women, children, the injured and so on, who are making bandages for the injured, and a wounded soldier who is recounted (sic) his experiences during the campaign’. There is a strong emotional and sentimental feel to this picture, with the central placement of a demure young girl, a brave wounded soldier recounting his
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tale, and a small child giving her modest assistance. Liebermann’s work, painted just after the end of the Franco-Prussian war, is not nationalistic and avoids the sentimentality of his Hungarian mentor. However, this picture does exemplify the hard, monotonous toil of the peasant class and their gloomy working conditions in a sober and realistic manner.

Ziegler also notes how Liebermann deliberately removed a central focal point to his picture; this encourages the eye to roam horizontally across the band of labouring women and their attendant geese. The exact opposite is true in Krøyer’s case. The eye alights on the central figure and is drawn deep into the picture by the long diagonal row of women filleting. I see this as less political in intent than Liebermann’s work, in that the women have smooth faces, and appear more relaxed and less stressed in their actions. Krøyer provides only a little indication of the laborious nature of the women’s ill-paid jobs, and the smelly, grubby, conditions in which they worked – if a fishing fleet returned to port, then the women would be required to work very long hours until the catch had been dealt with; it was not steady employment. The critics agreed, in that there was no mention of the possible political nature of Krøyer’s work – that was to be directed at him after the following year’s Salon. Albert Wolff in Le Figaro described the Concarneau painting as ‘One of the finest genre pictures in the foreign section’ and Ernest Chesneau said that the only painting in room eleven that would last was ‘the Sardine Packing Factory by M. Krøyer with a highly-picturesque lighting effect conveyed in an absolutely remarkable way…’. The picture won no awards, but Krøyer reported that Léon Bonnat was adamant that ‘Next year you are sure to win a medal, I will then remind the jury of the injustice done to you’.

To return to the evidence for Liebermann’s influence, Saabye relates how Krøyer and Liebermann lived and worked very close to each other on the edge of Montmartre in Paris in late 1877 and early 1878, where Bonnat had his studio, and mentions the repetition of motifs in Liebermann’s work that also occur in Krøyer’s, not just in the Concarneau picture, but more overtly in Krøyer’s Italian Field Labourers, Abruzzo, of the following year. Later in this chapter I also mention Liebermann as an early portrayer of boys swimming, a motif that Krøyer began to explore at Skagen in 1884.

Saabye in fact says that Liebermann was working, albeit unhappily, on Ins
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Schwimmbad (At the Swimming Baths) at the same time that both he and Krøyer were working near each other on the Boulevard de Clichy in Paris.\textsuperscript{243} Finally, I must add that Liebermann had achieved a certain notoriety with his Geese picture in Germany, and his anti-establishment stance would have endeared him to Krøyer, who faced a similar ‘old-guard’ in Denmark, typified by the Danish selection at the 1878 Exposition.

Krøyer spent much of 1880 in Italy, particularly in Sora, a picturesque area about 100kms south-east of Rome, where he painted the afore-mentioned Field Labourers: ‘Sora in particular [is] the best I have yet seen of Italian folk life; big beautiful people and a completely well-preserved costume’.\textsuperscript{244} In a complete contrast to the Concarneau picture, Krøyer here attempted to master a portrayal in bright sunlight, admitting that he struggled to get some cohesion from ‘all these sunlit white shirts and red waistcoats’.\textsuperscript{245} In this picture, Krøyer restricted his impasto to touches on the workers’ sleeves and the tops of their socks. The repetition of figures diminishing along a diagonal line recalls Goya’s The Third of May 1808 (1814), which Krøyer would have seen in the Prado, and was itself the source for Manet’s The Execution of Emperor Maximilian (1868-69), a study for which resides in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen. The long-handled spades also resemble an inverted version of the repetitive lances in Uccello’s The Battle of San Romano (c.1435-55), versions of which Krøyer would have seen in the Uffizi and the Louvre, and similarly Velázquez’ Las Lanzas (1635) in the Prado.

In a similar manner to A Sardine curing and packing factory in Concarneau, I feel that Krøyer has failed to capture the inherent toil and drudgery of the labouring process. Despite the appearance of the workers that they have been digging for quite some time, there is little sign of strain, no perspiration and no mud about the clean white shirts. The tanned and muscled digger nearest to the viewer, sporting two feathers in his hat and with smooth foreleg thrust forward, affects an unconcerned air as he concentrates on his job. The inclusion of three women also leads the viewer to believe

\textsuperscript{243} Saabye, Krøyer, p. 63.
\textsuperscript{244} P. S. Krøyer to Heinrich Hirschsprung from Sora (Italy), 3 May 1880, in Saabye, Krøyer, p. 195.
\textsuperscript{245} P. S. Krøyer to Frants Henningsen from Sora (Italy), 15 August 1880, in Saabye, Krøyer, p. 196.
that the task is far from physically onerous. Krøyer himself, in a letter to his mother, admitted that 'it is a very picturesque subject'.

The picture was not shown in Paris, but instead was exhibited first in Denmark, and then went to the 1881 Nordic Art Exhibition in Gothenburg and the 1882 'First International Art Exhibition in the Künstlerhaus' in Vienna, at the latter being exhibited alongside the Concarneau picture. Despite being available for sale, it failed to find a buyer at all these venues.

The picture that Krøyer opted to send to the 1881 Paris Salon was his *Italian Village Hatters* (1880; fig. 17), the picture that had both captivated and informed Erik Werenskiold. This must be considered one of Krøyer’s most significant artworks, not least because it gained him the Salon medal (third-class) that Bonnat had foretold the previous year. Additionally, the picture received considerable critical attention in both France and Denmark and was exhibited again at the *Exposition Universelle* in 1889, by which time it had been purchased by the British-born Jenny Adler, widow of the Danish banker and politician David Baruch Adler.

As Peter Michael Hornung has noted, Krøyer often liked to work simultaneously on an indoor picture and an outdoor picture. While engaged on the *Italian Field Labourers* Krøyer said that he then

began to make some sketches in a hatter’s workshop [...] an extraordinarily painterly subject [...] which I believe unreservedly will be the best of my pictures this year. The lighting, the contrasts between the characters of the various naked bodies, the father’s lean, characteristic body and the children’s – one skinny, the other round and plump. It is a pure treat to paint.

Compared with the *Concarneau* and *Italian Labourers* pictures, on this occasion Krøyer has managed to convey the essential reality of hard manual work in hot, dirty and dismal surroundings, not least in the drop of sweat that falls from the nose of the
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grimy hatter. Although Krøyer claims that one of the children is plump (presumably the boy on the far left), neither appears particularly well fed; in fact the boy in the middle looks underfed, accentuated by his trousers which appear slightly too baggy for him. The boys’ vulnerable air is heightened as they have to stand on a chair to contribute to the work process, and their humble efforts have resonances with the small child with her back to us in Munkácsy’s Lint Makers. The boy who looks directly out appealingly at the viewer is reminiscent of the dark-clothed urchin in Manet’s The Old Musicians (1862; National Gallery of Art, Washington), although in that picture it is the old man who confronts the viewer. There are many examples of the direct gaze extending between subject and viewer in other works by Manet such as Olympia (1863), Le Déjeuner sur l’herbe (1863) and The Railway (1873), and also the young boy who stares at us in The Fifer (1866).

Similarly, Velázquez famously made use of this device in Las Meninas (1656), the aforementioned Las Lanzas, and also the two cheerful drinkers from The Triumph of Bacchus (1629) which Krøyer had copied when in the Prado (fig. 76). Hornung points out that other Spanish painters like Ribera and Murillo also made much use of this device, illustrated by a downcast urchin from Murillo’s The Dice Players (1680) in the collection of the Alte Pinakothek in Munich. Krøyer made further use of this spectatorial device the following year, when Heinrich Hirschsprung’s young daughter engages directly with the viewer, while her parents and four brothers are preoccupied (1881; Hirschsprung Family Portrait). While I agree with Saabye that Krøyer’s use of dark colours and realistic painting style bear a relationship to Velázquez and other Spanish artists, I am less convinced by her assertion that the hatter’s ‘stature and posture bear similarities to the figures in Velázquez’s picture of The Forge of Vulcan’. I observe no great similarity and posture; instead the dark and muscled torso of the hatter seems much closer to the figures in Luca Giordano’s Vulcan’s Forge (fig. 75; c.1660), Giordano interestingly being a pupil of Ribera and much influenced in early works by his Spanish master. Krøyer could only have seen Giordano’s image in reproduction. There are also resonances in this work with the hammers and red-hot ingot of Krøyer’s Smithy at Hornbæk pictures.

Saabye, 1992, p. 23.
Fig. 75, Luca Giordano, *Vulcan’s Forge*, c.1660, Hermitage, St. Petersburg, oil on canvas, 192.5 x 151.5cm.
Fig. 76. P. S. Krøyer in his studio, 1883.
On the easel is his work *At the Victuallers when there is no fishing* (1882)
On the wall are copies by Krøyer of sections of two works by Velázquez
from the Prado:
(left) *El bufón don Diego de Acedo, El Primo* (*The Cousin*) (c.1645)
(right) *Los borrachos* (*The Drunks* from *The Triumph of Bacchus*) (1629)
What is particularly interesting is the different reaction of European and Danish critics to the *Hatters*. Albert Woolf in *Le Figaro* described the picture as ‘a little jewel’ and Krøyer as ‘a man of extraordinarily great talent’, and Krøyer himself reported that Bastien-Lepage – ‘hero’ to so many European artists – had ‘complimented me beyond all measure’. It is surely significant that, in the *Hatters*, in addition to the torsos, Krøyer concentrated his attention to detail on the hands and face, just as Bastien-Lepage was wont to do. An example of this is Bastien-Lepage’s *Joan of Arc* (1879), exhibited at the 1880 *Salon*, which Krøyer had thought ‘by far the most beautiful modern art I have seen’. Bastien-Lepage’s 1881 *Salon* offering, *The Beggar* (1880; Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek), likewise has a ‘hands and face’ emphasis of detail, and I suggest that Bastien-Lepage, consciously or sub-consciously, appreciated this in Krøyer’s picture. There was further praise to be found in the collection of Krøyer’s clippings from the international press. *La France Nouvelle* thought it deserved ‘special distinction’, *The Illustrated London News* deemed it ‘as noticeable a picture as any in the exhibition’ (there were nearly 2,500 of them), and *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* declared that ‘the picture is very excellently made’.

In the spring of 1882, the Dane Karl Madsen, who had painted at Skagen in the 1870s and had since become an art critic, took great delight in asserting that the ‘skimply-educated’ Danish public would ‘only see that Krøyer’s figures are hideous, gorilla-like creatures and [...] find the picture "Horrid". Several authors have commented on the contradictory reception of the picture in Denmark in 1882. However, the primary source material in English for this assertion is lacking and the evidence rather circumlocutory. In 1992 Marianne Saabye said that ‘The picture of the hatters [...] caused considerable consternation when it was exhibited in Denmark’, and in 1998, Bente Scavenius noted that ‘The worthy citizens of Copenhagen were appalled at being confronted by the poor hatter’ and that ‘many reviewers were shocked that it should have been shown at all’.
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In the same year, Challons-Lipton in her PhD thesis also referred to Scavenius’s book and from it extracts that the painting ‘was particularly criticised for its large format for such a modest subject’. She continued: ‘The Danish public interpreted the Hatters as a brutal attack on the bourgeoisie, which was not Krøyer’s intention’. Although Challons-Lipton does use primary sources (Krøyer’s letters) for further discussion of the Hatters, she does not do so for the issue of the Danish reception of his work. Finally, in 2012, Saabye says that ‘the public and most of the critics […] considered the painting offensive in its realism. In particular the hatter’s sweat-dripping nose prompted indignation’. However, if the single example I have located of primary criticism (clearly the source of Saabye’s last comment) is anything to go by, the claims of a vehement reaction are indeed justified. The Danish periodical Højskolebladet doubted whether ‘such figments of the imagination’ existed at all and whether ‘yon human baboon with his dripping nose and the filthy kids were a picture of reality’.

While not doubting the veracity of the criticism by Danish public and press, I propose that this lack of primary references to Danish criticism is perhaps the result of Krøyer’s desire to preserve the positive pan-European press cuttings than the negative Danish ones. I think it likely that Krøyer was surprised by the Danish reaction and, after gradually ‘pushing the boundaries’ with the Smithies and the Sardine Workers, it had not occurred to him that the more conservative Danish audience would be upset by his latest offering. I have already mentioned Krøyer’s letter of 15 August 1880 in which he states that his main preoccupations in the Hatters are the light and the contrast between the bodies. The following month he described to Pauline Hirschsprung ‘A very dark picture, an almost black, smoke-laden interior of a hatter’s shop, a real village hatter, with two small sons, all naked to the waist. A few rays of sunlight seep through the window and illuminate the smoke’. The evidence of these letters suggests strongly that Krøyer’s concerns were not with the working conditions, but with light and form, and the opportunity to demonstrate his painterly skills. Hornung perceptively points out that Krøyer’s impoverished Hatters are emphasised to the viewer by three factors, namely the scale of the canvas, the small number of figures (doubtless
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thinking of the two dozen or so Farm Labourers and Sardine Workers) and the vertical format. This latter attribute narrows the viewer’s field of vision and concentrates it on the central area of the picture; it also means that the figures are comparatively taller than in a similar-sized landscape work and therefore the impact is intensified. In 1884, Emil Hannover made the grand claim that the Hatters represented ‘a turning point in the history of Danish art’.

Krøyer sent a very different type of picture to the 1882 Salon. In 1881, prior to the furore over the Hatters at Charlottenborg, he accepted a commission to paint a portrait of the conservative figure Ferdinand Meldahl; architect, director of the Royal Academy of Fine Arts and proponent of just the type of old-fashioned art that had caused Denmark to be heavily-criticised at the 1878 Exposition Universelle. This unlikely combination of ‘radical’ painter and traditionalist model led to two portraits, a rather conventional square-shaped official work, and an elongated, more provocative picture. The second portrait, Portrait of the architect F. Meldahl (fig. 77; 1882), shows the architect in a sombre black suit contrasting against a white-tiled chimney-breast. The third colour in Krøyer’s limited palette is gold; the coal scuttle and fireside tools are highly-detailed and have small white highlights that glisten very effectively in a hyper-realist manner. The picture possesses a similar atmosphere to Whistler’s The Painter’s Mother (fig. 125; 1871), and one could easily describe the Meldahl portrait as an arrangement in white, black and gold. Earlier in 1881, Krøyer had produced a picture where gold is the dominant colour, Messalina (1881; Göteborgs Kunstmuseum), which was then placed in an elaborate gold frame in order to emphasise further its auric intensity. It is of interest that this portrait also features a face that looks slightly downwards and turned to one side. Messalina accompanied the Italian Field Workers to Gothenburg in 1881 where it ‘became the centre of attention at the exhibition’ and was sold to Pontus Fürstenberg. It is of note that many of the significant picture collectors such as Fürstenberg, Heinrich Hirschsprung, Jenny Adler, and the Melchior family, were descendants of Jewish families who had settled in Scandinavia.
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Fig. 77. P. S. Krøyer, *Portrait of the Architect F. Meldahl*, 1882, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 195 x 113cm.

Fig. 78. Léon Bonnat, *Portrait of Jules Grévy*, 1880, Musée d'Orsay, Paris, oil on canvas, 152 x 116cm
The picture clearly has its origins in the type of *Salon* portraiture favoured by Bonnat. Challons-Lipton rightly identifies similarities of style with Bonnat’s own *Salon* entry that year, *Portrait de M. Puvis de Chavannes*,

267 in which Bonnat presents a sober, full-length portrait of his fellow artist and tutor. Bonnat would obviously have noted the similarity of subject, although it is unlikely he felt threatened when he declared Krøyer’s painting ‘less good than your last *Salon* picture [...] which was a true jewel’. 268

Conversely, as Krøyer had not been in Paris since the *Salon* twelve months previously, it is unlikely that he had seen his tutor’s portrait. Bonnat had previously submitted two portraits for the 1881 *Salon* and both Manet and John Singer Sargent had been awarded second-class medals (in a year in which there were no first class) for their portraiture that same year: all this may have influenced Krøyer’s thought processes regarding his own submission in 1882.

There are however a number of other portraits by Bonnat that have stylistic similarities to Meldahl. Even if Krøyer had not seen Bonnat’s *Portrait of a Man* (1868; Cleveland Museum of Art) with its similarities of moustache, beard, right hand inserted into clothing, and touch of colour on the left lapel, he would certainly have known *Portrait of Jules Grévy* (1880; Musée d’Orsay). This portrayal shows the then president of the French Republic in a long black coat facing directly towards the viewer. It shares the sobriety and psychological intensity of Krøyer’s portrait, and there are no adornments on Grévy’s jacket, and nothing to hint at his position, except for two books and some loose papers. Similarly, although in the official portrait Meldahl was shown with a pair of compass dividers and a drawing of the Marble Church in Copenhagen, 269 the *Salon* portrait gives no indication of his profession. Both Bonnat and Krøyer’s pictures convey status by means of a concentration of gaze and an upright, dignified posture; they share a common gravitas. Bonnat’s picture was one of his two entrants in the 1880 *Salon* alongside his dramatic depiction of *Job* (1880; Musée Bonnat, Bayonne) and Kroyer’s *Sardine Factory*.

However, Krøyer’s portrait does not share the heavily-muted palette and significant lack of accoutrements in the pared-down Bonnat, who is confident enough to let the solid monochrome bulk of Grévy’s body reinforce the authority of his expression. Krøyer is keen to show off his painterly skills, hence the gleaming gold fireside

267 No. 305 – Coincidentally, Puvis de Chavannes himself won the main award, the *Médaille d’honneur* for painting, at the 1882 Salon.


269 *The Architect, Professor F. Meldahl, seated*, 1882; Museum of Natural History, Frederiksborg.
implements and the beautiful white tiling. He also adds touches of detail like the spectacles hanging from the coat, a cravat pin, and a small red, green and yellow pin in the left lapel which corresponds with the touch of red on the same lapel in Bonnat’s *Portrait of a Man*. Krøyer certainly gives Meldahl a certain *froideur* in his portrayal, and the dark figure against the cool white tiles possesses an air of solemnity and introspection, with little indication of warmth. Just as with the *Hatters*, the French reaction was much better than the Danish. Frédéric Henriet in the *Journal de l’Aisne* said that ‘M. Krøyer [...] furnishes proof of qualities of the first rank in the portrayal of M. Meldahl, [...] the features arouse attention with the authority that genuine talent is able to give them’. Further proof of its success in France occurred when it was sent to the 1889 *Exposition Universelle*, in such august company as Krøyer’s *Hatters* (1880), *Skagen man going out fishing at night, late summer evening* (1884) and *Hip, hip, hurrah! Artists’ party* (1885-88). However, according to Karen Christensen, it was for the Meldahl portrait that Krøyer was awarded the *Grand Prix* at the *Exposition*. Conversely, the picture was poorly received in Denmark and Meldahl’s wife, who had commissioned the work, refused to hang it.

In May 1882, after leaving Paris and the *Salon*, Krøyer headed for Vienna, where he exhibited three pictures including the *Sardine Factory* and the *Italian Field Labourers*. In Vienna, the *Erste Internationale Kunst-Ausstellung im Künstlerhause* was the first major exhibition of international art to be held in the city and it attracted large crowds. Notable pictures included Bonnat’s *Job*, Wilhelm Leibl’s *Three Women in Church*, Karl von Piloty’s history painting *Seni at the Dead Body of Wallenstein* (1855; Neue Pinakothek, Munich), and Munkácsy’s huge *Christ before Pilate* (1881; Art Gallery of Hamilton, Ontario). Scandinavian pictures included Carl-Gustaf Hellqvist’s *Valdemar Atterdag holding Visby to ransom, 1361* (fig.182; 1882) and works by the Düsseldorf-based Norwegians Vincent Stoltenberg-Lerche, Morten Müller and Adelsteen Normann. At the Vienna exhibition, Krøyer met Fürstenberg (the purchaser of *Messalina*) and the influential brewer Carl Jacobsen, who later hosted the 1888 French art exhibition in Copenhagen and founded the *Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek*.
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Also exhibiting in Vienna were the Danes Viggo Johansen and Michael and Anna Ancher, who are closely associated with the artists’ colony at Skagen on the very northernmost tip of Denmark. Laurits Tuxen – also represented in Vienna – visited Skagen in 1870, the poet and painter Holger Drachmann and the young art student Karl Madsen went there in 1871, followed at intervals by, among others, several Norwegian artists: Frits Thaulow in 1871 or ’72, Christian Skredsvig in 1873 and Christian Krohg in 1879. In 1874 and 1875 respectively Michael Ancher and Viggo Johansen visited the area, and in the ‘year of weddings’ of 1880 Michael Ancher married the Skagen innkeeper’s daughter Anne Brøndum, Viggo Johansen married her cousin Martha Møller, and Karl Madsen married another cousin, Martha’s sister Henriette Møller. Unfortunately, Henriette died in childbirth in March 1881 and her son Henry was taken into Martha and Viggo’s family. Martha and four of her children were later featured in Viggo Johansen’s Washing the Children (1888; Ordrupgaard). The bereavement had some bearing on Karl Madsen’s decision to become a critic for Dagsavisen later that year.

It is therefore somewhat surprising that with all this artistic activity, Krøyer had not visited Skagen before, but in July 1881 he had expressed to Laurits Tuxen his private thoughts in respect of ‘old-guard’ painters like Exner and Vermehren and concluded that ‘The countryside here in Denmark is beautiful […] I do not think it is the fault of the landscape that there is no life and power in the Danish painters’. Thus when he met Michael and Anna Ancher and Viggo and Martha Johansen in Vienna in 1882, this may have encouraged him to make it his next port of call, despite assertions that Michael Ancher tried to dissuade him because of his fear of a ‘big fish’ like Krøyer arriving in his own ‘small pond’.

276 Claus Olsen, ‘The artists’ colony at Skagen’, Krøyer and the artists’ colony at Skagen, Exh. Cat., National Gallery of Ireland, 1999, p. 15. Also exhibiting were Vilhelm Kyhn, Julius Exner, and Thorvald Niss (Svanholm, 2004, p. 60).
277 Olsen, 1999, p. 12, claims that Drachmann visited Skagen with Madsen in 1871 and that Thaulow first visited in 1872, but Svanholm says that Drachmann visited Skagen with his ‘studio-mate’ Thaulow in 1871, and that Madsen had visited independently in 1871, where he was well received by Ane Brøndum, mother of Anne (Svanholm, 2004, pp. 52-54).
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Three weeks after leaving Vienna, Krøyer arrived in Skagen in June 1882. That summer the weather was poor in Skagen, which meant a prompt beginning for Krøyer’s ‘indoor’ picture *At the Victualler’s when there is no fishing* (1882; Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen). Krøyer also began painting two significant ‘outdoor’ works during his four months in Skagen, *Fishermen hauling a net at Skagen’s Southern Beach* (1882; Skagens Museum) and *Fishermen hauling a net at Skagen’s Northern Beach, late afternoon* (fig. 85; 1882-83), but for various reasons none of these three works went to Paris the following year; 1883 was the only blank year in International exhibitions for Krøyer in the period 1878 to 1889.

Krøyer made a swift oil sketch for *At the Victualler’s when there is no fishing* before proceeding to the production of the major work, which can be seen above (fig. 79) and on Krøyer’s easel in the black-and-white photograph of the artist’s studio taken in 1883 (fig. 76). The picture features the victualler’s shop owned by the Brøndums in Skagen – at the far end is (Christian) Degn Brøndum, Anne Ancher’s brother, formally dressed and clearly recognisable from his 1883 portrait by Christian Krohg (Skagens Museum).

The picture shows a group of fishermen loitering, presumably waiting for the bad weather to clear. Although there is an overall air of boredom, a little business is being conducted at each end of the counter. Although unintentional on Krøyer’s part, his painting of Michael Ancher’s brother-in-law in his first week in Skagen would certainly
not have allayed Ancher’s fears that Krøyer was 'muscling in’ on his territory. In fact, Ancher wrote to Krøyer in early November 1882 complaining that 'You paint my parents-in-law’s shop, you could scarcely come much closer...it was an attack on a place that was mine, it reminds one of the rich man who had many sheep, but slaughtered the poor man’s only lamb.'

The picture reprises a number of effective tropes that Krøyer had employed previously. Firstly, the backlighting that Krøyer had employed in his *Sardine Factory* picture, with the main light source emanating from a squared window towards the rear of the shop. This in turn is highly-reminiscent of the square-paned window in the *Hatters*, with diagonal shadows cast downwards by the wooden window frame – Krøyer is, as ever, concerned with the appearance of light, and his ability to portray its three-dimensional effect on a two-dimensional canvas. Then, just as in the *Hatters*, he shows two small appealing children, although their sentimental effect is in this case mitigated by the lack of direct eye contact. The viewer is very close to the picture plane, and our eyes are drawn to the three large metal containers in the foreground, and then the large, centrally-placed fisherman – missing from the initial sketch – who looks directly at us with a slightly mournful expression, his age precluding the emotional reaction that the *Hatters*’ young child engenders. The smoke from the fisherman’s pipe drifting in front of the window evokes the smoky atmosphere in front of the *Hatters* window. Additionally, the long, diagonal shop counter, leant on by resting fishermen, has a very close correspondence to the long table in the *Sardine Factory*, with its line of figures on its right-hand side, on this occasion leading us down into the picture and the discrete figure of Degn Brøndum at the far end. Finally, there are subtle touches of gold on the weighing scales and lamp fittings that remind one of the more substantial fireside fittings in *Portrait of F. Meldhal*.

As Annette Johansen says, the 1880s in Paris were a very good time for Nordic painters. In addition to the annual *Salon*, there was ‘an enormous growth in the number of independent group and special exhibitions, most of them arranged by galleries and art dealers.’ Pertinent to Krøyer is that in 1882 the Georges Petit Gallery held their first *Exposition International de Peinture*. In April 1885, Krøyer had just returned from visiting Albert Edelfelt in Paris when an urgent letter arrived from
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the Finn, saying that if Krøyer wanted to take part in the fourth *Exposition* at Georges Petit, he would have to act with all haste.\(^{285}\) The fact that Krøyer responded so rapidly to this last-minute request from the *Exposition* committee (including Albert Besnard) is a clear indication of the prestige of the exhibition. Krøyer sent four pictures, including *At the Victualler’s when there is no fishing*, which was by then the property of Bernhard Hirschsprung, older brother of Heinrich. The other three pictures have generic titles in the catalogue such that it appears no firm identification of them has been made.\(^{286}\) Painters who also showed works at the *Exposition* give an idea of its prestige: Bonnat, Cazin, Edelfelt, Liebermann, Monet, Raffaëlli, Ribera (d. 1652!) and Sargent.\(^{287}\)

At the exhibition, *At the Victuallers* had caught the attention of the American artist Alexander Harrison, who was acting as agent for the wealthy American collector John G. Johnson. In July 1885, Harrison wrote to Krøyer from Concarneau asking if the picture was for sale and, on being informed not, Krøyer sent *Sardine Factory* and *Skagen Men going out fishing at night, Late Summer evening* (fig. 86) to Paris for his consideration.\(^{288}\) Harrison then asked if Krøyer ‘would not mind doing some male types in the same genre as the fishermen hauling nets’,\(^{289}\) almost certainly *Fishermen hauling a net at Skagen’s North Beach* (fig. 85) which Harrison would have seen at the 1884 *Salon*. Krøyer eventually produced a picture similar in size and content to *At the Victuallers* entitled *Interior from Winther’s shop in Skagen* (1886; Philadelphia Museum of Art), which was exhibited at Georges Petit in 1887\(^{290}\) before going to John G. Johnson. Johnson was overjoyed with his picture, in which Krøyer had depicted some local ‘characters’ in a low-roofed tavern amalgamated with the effects of light on both highly-polished wood and assorted glassware: ‘I am delighted with the work which reveals new beauties at every turn. The light is handled in a way which rivals the old masters. If Krøyer paints often thus, he is one of the foremost artists of his day’.\(^{291}\)


\(^{286}\) No. 59 *Intérieur de Cabaret en Danemark (At the victuallers)*, No. 60 *Marine*, No. 61 *Marine (coup de soleil sur la mer)*, No. 62 *Sur la plage*.


\(^{290}\) No. 50 *Dans le Cabaret des pêcheurs*.

Presumably, Krøyer may have thought *At the Victuallers* too small to ask Bernhard Hirschsprung to release it for the 1883 *Salon*, as he had previously feared that the *Sardine Factory* would get lost amid the great throng,\(^{292}\) and that picture was over one-and-a-half times bigger than *At the Victuallers*. There were also problems attached to Krøyer’s two ‘outdoor’ pictures from his four-month Skagen stay in 1882. *Fishermen hauling a net at Skagen’s Southern Beach* (1882; Skagens Museum) was smaller still and was probably painted for Krøyer’s commission to provide a prize for the Christiania Art Society – certainly Krøyer contracted to ship it to Norway before the end of September 1882.\(^ {293}\) *Fishermen hauling a net at Skagen’s Northern Beach. Late Afternoon* however, was very much of a size to be sent to the *Salon* (135 x 190.5cm), but Krøyer was in no hurry to finish this picture, as he was determined to capture the effects of extraordinary light as the sun sank low on the horizon and bathed the toiling fishermen. The weather in the summer of 1882 was poor and Krøyer simply did not have enough fine days on which to complete this project.\(^ {294}\) However, Mette Bøgh Jensen adds that Krøyer wrote to his mother in September 1882 complaining that the fishermen were too busy fishing to act as models for his pictures, and he was thus wasting valuable time.\(^ {295}\) The picture was eventually completed in the summer of 1883, and was one of three works — two oils and a pastel — that Krøyer submitted to the 1884 Paris *Salon*.\(^ {296}\)

---

\(^{292}\) Ibid., p. 189.

\(^{293}\) Saabye in Ibid., p. 216

\(^{294}\) Ibid.


\(^{296}\) No. 1340 *Pêcheurs de Skagen* (Danemarck); - *coucher de soleil*. 
Fig. 80. Carl Bloch, *Fishermen’s families awaiting their return in an approaching storm. From the west coast of Jutland, 1858*, Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 116 x 186cm.

Fig. 81. P. S. Krøyer, *Morning at Hornbæk. The fishermen come ashore, 1875*, Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 102.7 x 161.5cm.
Fig. 82. P. S. Krøyer, *Hornbæk Fishermen catching Herring*, 1877, private collection, oil on canvas, 100 x 132cm.

Fig. 83. Michael Ancher, *Will he clear the point?*, 1879, Amalienborg Palace, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 101 x 142cm.
Fig. 84. Oscar Björck, *The Boat is Launched. Skagen*, 1884, Skagens Museum, oil on canvas, 192 x 222cm.
Fig. 85. P. S. Krøyer, *Fishermen hauling in their Nets, Skagen North Beach*, 1882-83, Skagens Museum, oil on canvas, 135 x 190cm.

Fig. 86. P S Krøyer, *Skagen men going out fishing at night. Late Summer Evening*, 1884, Musée d'Orsay, Paris, oil on canvas, 160 x 245cm.
The painterly skills, light, texture, subject and mood of the two fishing pictures (fig. 85 and fig. 86) are perhaps the finest examples in Krøyer’s oeuvre, so it is important at this point to record a chronology of the development of the depiction of Danish fishermen as subject matter. As early as 1858, the young Danish history painter Carl Bloch painted *Fishermen’s families awaiting their return in an approaching storm. From the west coast of Jutland* (fig. 80). Bloch uses a variety of devices in the Romantic tradition to create both emotional tension and pathos, such as a faithful dog looking expectantly out to sea, and a variety of men, women and children expressing different emotions: worry, stoicism, anguish, indifference and despair. Although Michael Ancher painted a more modern version of this theme at Skagen in *Will he clear the point?* (1879; fig. 83), it is interesting that there is scarcely a trace of emotion in Krøyer’s two great works – they are concerned with depicting the fishermen honestly and soberly, while allowing Krøyer to demonstrate his virtuoso artistic skills. Following Bloch’s later success, in 1869 his picture was bought by Heinrich Hirschsprung and installed in the Hirschsprung family home;²⁹⁷ Krøyer would certainly have seen the picture on his visits to the Hirschsprungs, such as when painting the *Hirschsprung Family Portrait* in 1881.²⁹⁸

As we know, Krøyer himself had spent his summers in the fishing port of Hornbæk in the far east of Denmark from 1873 to 1876. It is interesting to see the development in Krøyer’s work when comparing his *Morning at Hornbæk. The fishermen come ashore* (1875; fig. 81) with *Hornbæk fishermen catching herring* (1877; fig. 82), completed after he had left Hornbæk. In the former work, Krøyer harks back to an earlier age. There is a broad panorama of figures depicted from a conventional angle, in a style that appears to combine influences from Krøyer’s Copenhagen tutor Frederik Vermehren with the social realism of Millet. The man on the left-hand side of the picture (fig. 87) strikes the viewer because of his old-fashioned garb and harks back to the figure in Vermehren’s *A Jutland Shepherd on the Heath* (1855; fig. 88) from twenty years earlier. On the right-hand side, the group of women gutting the fish are very much in the tradition of the labouring women in Millet’s *The Gleaners* (1857; Musée d’Orsay). By contrast, Krøyer’s work painted in 1877 has a much more modern feel to it – the viewer is placed among the fish towards the front of the boat, whose prow cuts through the vibrant, choppy sea. The fishermen are more active, the sky more red and

²⁹⁸ The picture can be seen in two photographs of the Hirschsprung home dated 1889 and ‘after 1897’ reproduced top left and bottom right respectively on p. 20 of *100 years of Danish Art.*
threatening, and the picture is severely cropped, facilitating our concentration on the three figures. The more modern feeling engendered by the use of cropping during this period may be attributed possibly to either the *Japonisme* influence exemplified by Hokusai and Hiroshige or, as Trond Aslaksby opines in respect of Christian Krohg’s similarly-themed *Port your helm!* (1879; Nasjonalmuseet, Oslo) ‘contemporary journalistic photography’.  

Fig. 87. P. S. Krøyer, *Morning at Hornbæk. The fishermen come ashore*, 1875. Detail of fig. 81.

Fig. 88. Frederik Vermehren, *A Jutland Shepherd on the Heath*, 1855, detail. Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen.

---

There are strong parallels between Michael Ancher and Krøyer. Both were trained at the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Krøyer from 1864-70 and Ancher from 1871-75. As Lise Svanholm points out, during 1876 Ancher was working on *A Lay Preacher holding a Service at Skagen Sønderstrand* (1877; Skagens Museum) and ‘must have known Krøyer’s [*Morning at Hornbæk*]...The composition is almost identical’.\(^{300}\)

Certainly the shape and positioning of two of the sails in their respective compositions are very similar, and Ancher would have seen Krøyer’s work at the annual exhibition at Charlottenborg in 1876. Like Krøyer’s 1875 work, Ancher’s *Lay Preacher* harks back to the generation of Vermehren, Julius Exner and Bloch in the 1850s and 1860s; indeed, Ancher’s picture contains a seated stoic-looking old man, with white whiskers and a tall brown hat facing to the left of the canvas, just as in Bloch’s afore-mentioned *Fishermen’s families awaiting their return* (fig. 89 and fig. 90).

---

\(^{300}\) Svanholm, 2004, p. 49.
Just as a comparison of Krøyer’s two works from 1875 and 1877 show a move away from the Danish academic tradition and towards an embrace of European Naturalism, so Ancher moves in a similar direction between his 1877 composition and his far-better-known 1879 depiction of fishermen entitled *Will he clear the point?* (1879; fig. 91). In his earlier work, Ancher adopted a panoramic view as some three dozen members of the Skagen fishing community listen devoutly to a preacher who addresses them on the beach. However, when he composed *Will he clear the point?*, Ancher ‘modernised’ just as Krøyer did; Ancher’s later picture is close to the subject and cropped to the left and below. The viewer is much nearer to the fishermen, who look both more modern in terms of attitude and more active than in the earlier composition. Again the sky is made more threatening, and again the waves are churned up to provide a more dynamic feeling. Both Krøyer and Ancher added seagulls to their later works to enliven and animate the sky. Finally, both the later works are less ‘parochial’ in appearance; they strike the viewer as highly-typical early examples of a pan-European Naturalism that was prevalent in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, in which working people were depicted without sentiment using artistic skills in a manner that rivalled the photographic snapshot, but without the distracting presence of the photographer.

*Will he clear the point?* proved a great success at the Spring exhibition at Charlottenborg in 1880, and it was eventually purchased by King Christian IX.301 Ancher, rather than portraying a generic group of fishermen in the picture, succeeds in producing a diverse range of characters of varying age and expression – just as with Werenskiold’s later *Peasant Burial* – by utilising real models to produce characterful individuality. Likewise, there is an air of mystery as to what is actually being portrayed that adds weight to the picture; we do not see the boat that is trying to survive the perils of the stormy meeting of the Baltic and North seas. This device of placing the onus on the viewer’s imagination, rather than illustrating a narrative, is a highly-effective stratagem in art production. Just as in Bloch’s picture, Ancher again uses a seated, white-whiskered figure to illustrate contemplation and a pointing figure to guide the viewer in the direction of the unfolding drama. Ancher’s work was much reproduced and he painted several further versions of the picture, and a number of

---

other works in a ‘suite of heroic fisherman paintings that concluded in 1896.\textsuperscript{302} It must also be noted that Ancher’s picture is a clear development from his earlier work \textit{Fishermen in stormy weather watching ships sailing by} (1876; private collection), which he exhibited at Charlottenborg in 1876. In that work he also shows a similar-sized group of fishermen looking out to sea, although depicted from slightly further away and without the tension of the later work. Close inspection reveals that several of the fishermen models are common to both works.

Mention must also be made of the picture produced by Krøyer’s friend Laurits Tuxen, \textit{The lifeboat is launched} (1877; private collection). Tuxen’s scene of heroic lifeboatmen is well constructed, with the lifeboat depicted at an acute angle as it takes its first battering from the waves, and thus displays to us the seven brave men aboard. There are strong similarities between the features of these men and those of Ancher’s work, and it seems possible that they share some of the same models. However, the actual depiction of the foundering ship in Tuxen’s picture removes the ambiguity and tension inherent in Ancher’s work. It is also worth mentioning that only a small percentage of Skagen fishermen modelled for pictures; a further complaint from Ancher to Krøyer was that ‘there are...probably some 500 fishermen in Skagen, and of these I have perhaps painted 20. You come and you paint the very same 20, or at least 10 of the 20’.\textsuperscript{303}

It is now an appropriate occasion to analyse how Krøyer’s \textit{Fishermen hauling a net at Skagen’s Northern Beach} possesses a greater number of indications of Krøyer’s skills than any of his other pictures. Firstly, we know that Krøyer was very patient in constructing this work, and that his main concern was the recording of the light. This has resulted in a subtle but highly effective ‘bathing’ of the picture in the gentle, pale, fading golden rays of the setting sun. Krøyer utilises this mellow light to produce a highly-realistic gleam on the damp black boots of the fishermen. Krøyer is also exceptionally effective in his depiction of the reflection of the straw-coloured jacket of the fishermen on the far left – and of the three fishing boots closest to us – in the receding water nearest to the shoreline. Another skilful artistic device is the manner in which Krøyer depicts part of the scene through the semi-transparency of a large fishing


\textsuperscript{303} Michael Ancher to P. S. Krøyer, 21 November 1882, in Svanholm, 2004, p. 66.
net. This brings to mind a picture by an artist that Krøyer rated very highly, namely Titian’s *Portrait of Cardinal Filippo Archinto* (1558; Philadelphia Museum of Art), in which the elderly Archbishop of Milan is seen through a veiled curtain. Coincidentally, this Titian was purchased by Krøyer’s future patron, the aforementioned John G. Johnson. Krøyer’s picture also displays a number of more physical attributes such as the subtle earrings that adorn each of the men, the thick brown and ochre impasto in the bottom right-hand corner that add substance to the sand ridges and tidemarks, and the taut sinews in the beautifully-modelled foot and ankle of the largest fisherman. Finally, it is of interest that Krøyer’s picture shares subject matter, identical title and the same geographical location with Carl Neumann’s 1870 composition *Fishermen hauling a net at Skagen North Beach* (fig. 92). This picture was exhibited at the 1878 *Exposition Universelle* where Krøyer could have seen it or, if not there, then at the Statens Museum for Kunst (purchased 1870).

![Fig. 92. Carl Neumann, Fishermen hauling a net at Skagen North Beach, 1870, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 130 x 198.5cm.](image)

To return to Krøyer’s *Fishermen hauling a net*, French critics such as Louis de Fourcaud were most impressed with this offering by the ‘Danish painter who looks like becoming a true master’. Fourcaud described Krøyer’s picture as being ‘executed with such clarity and power...Everything is rendered to this end with matchless decisiveness and

---

304 No. 47 *Pêcheurs près de Skagen, le point le plus septentrional du Danemark.*
delicacy: the seascape, the ambivalence of the hour, the last rays of the setting sun, the physiognomies and postures of the fishermen. The Salon jury concurred, awarding Krøyer one of only twelve second-class medals in a year when no first-class were awarded. Additionally, Krøyer was the only non-French recipient, a clear indication of the difficulties faced by Nordic and other non-French artists in Paris. The picture received a final seal of approval in that it was sold through the dealer Adolphe Goupil to a buyer from Newcastle in the United Kingdom. Marianne Saabye is quite right to suggest that it was probably purchased by the philanthropic shipyard owner Charles Mitchell or his painter son, Charles William Mitchell. The picture was still listed as being in Newcastle in 1923 in the highly-authoritative publication by Hans Christian Christensen P. S. Krøyer. Fortegnelse over hans Oliemalerier (Copenhagen), but reappeared at Denmark’s most prestigious art auctioneers Bruun Rasmussen in August 1991, where Skagens Museum purchased it for DKR 2.5 million.

One artist who was clearly influenced by Krøyer’s picture was his close friend and fellow Skagen painter, the Swede Oscar Björck. In 1884, Björck painted Launching the boat. Skagen (fig. 84), in which three men are pushing a boat towards the sea with their backs, while a fourth is using a long oar for the same purpose. Björck uses a heavy impasto on the foreshore, just as Krøyer did, and utilises it additionally for the foaming surf into which the oar plunges. There are also similarities in appearance of the top half of the largest figure in Björck’s picture and that in Krøyer’s – clothing, countenance, beard and hat – although Krøyer’s major figure is barefoot. This latter point provides a clue as to why Krøyer’s work is comparatively more successful than that of Björck. In Krøyer’s work you get a real sense of stress, strain and tension exemplified by the taut left foot of the protagonist. Björck produces a large, striking and finely-coloured picture, but he fails to capture the tension of Krøyer’s painting. The three front figures give little indication of the energy they are expounding to get the boat launched; only with the rearmost figure do we get a sense of exertion as he plunges his oar into the surf.

This picture was not the only depiction of Skagen fishermen by Krøyer to appear at the 1884 Salon. In 1883, he had produced a very different type of oil painting, showing a group of five fishermen on the beach, four resting and one standing.
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307 Saabye, Krøyer, p. 217.
Entitled *Fishermen at Skagen Beach. Late Summer Evening* (fig. 158; 1883), this picture is in marked contrast to the other large work, much more loosely painted and with an air of resignation and torpor, as opposed to dynamism and vigour. We can only see one of the five faces clearly and this character has his eyelids fully closed. It is clearly late on a summer evening and the fishermen have had a long day. This picture is all about mood and feeling, in a style that became popular in the latter half of the 1880s; this is a very early work of this type in Scandinavia. The picture was exhibited at Charlottenborg in 1884 and then was taken into the Royal Collection. Krøyer was obviously pleased with the work because he immediately began a pastel version of it that in size, 1.37m x 1.91m, was nearly as large as the original oil. Krøyer was clearly delighted with his new version, writing to Michael Ancher that it was ‘much more deeply toned down, much more night and much better than the oil picture’.  

It was the pastel version that was exhibited in Paris in 1884 under the title *On the beach at Skagen, Denmark, twilight* and is now known as *Summer Evening* (1884). The critic Fourcaud pronounced it ‘a totally admirable pastel’, and described the work in considerable detail, concluding that ‘It is life caught in the act – the life of men and the life of things – and nothing entices me more’. Clearly, the picture had not suffered during transportation as Krøyer had feared it might – he wrote to Eilif Petersen on 6 March 1884: ‘The fact is that a pastel is a delicate powder [...] should much have fallen off [...] then work it together again [...] by rubbing it together with your fingers’. Despite the excellent reviews and the efforts of Theo Van Gogh at the dealer Goupil & Cie, the picture remained unsold. The earlier oil version was later exhibited by Krøyer at Georges Petit in Paris in 1887, and again as one of Krøyer’s portfolio of seven oils at the *Exposition Universelle* in 1889, at both of which it was exhibited under the title *Sur la plage*.  
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309 No. 2904 *Sur la plage de Skagen (Danemark), crepuscule*.  
311 Ibid.  
312 P. S. Krøyer to Eilif Petersen, from an exhibition label at ‘Masterpieces from Skagen Museum’, exhibition at the Hirschsprung Collection (4 May-3 September 2012). This letter is referred to by Saabye in *Krøyer*, p. 222, and in p. 326 n. 9.  
314 1887 Georges Petit No. 51 and 1889 *Exposition Universelle* No. 84.
Krøyer returned to this subject for a final time at the Paris Salon, when in 1886 he exhibited *Skagen men going out fishing at night. Late summer evening* (fig. 86), which he had painted at Skagen during the fair-weather summer of 1884. Just as in *Fishermen hauling a net*, Krøyer bathes the picture in a particular light, this time with the setting sun behind him and the moon shining across the water on the right-hand side. Although one of the fishermen is hauling up a net, the other four are passive, and the overall mood is one of stillness and tranquillity.

It is interesting that the delicate yet deep blue of sun and sky has not reproduced successfully in either the 2008 catalogue *Échappées nordiques* or the 2011 catalogue *Krøyer an international perspective*. Marianne Saabye, curator of the latter exhibition, believes that the red-tinted underpainting used by Krøyer in the sky and the distant sea is not consciously observed by the human eye, but has an effect on the colour when a digitised photograph of the picture is taken. White impasto is employed to portray the effect of moonlight on water, in a manner that recalls the Impressionism of Monet’s *Impression: Sunrise* (1872; Musée Marmottan Monet, Paris). Krøyer begins with just a dot of light on the sea, then a small single stripe, then a larger one, and eventually the largest area of reflected moonlight is closest to land. He achieves considerable depth in his picture by placing two large boats near to land, then repeats the motif by placing a further vessel on the horizon line in the distance, in a manner reminiscent of the technique used by Caspar David Friedrich in his *Stages of Life* (c.1834; Museum der bildenden Künste, Leipzig); in this picture Friedrich has three tall sailing ships, each a smaller near-mirror of the previous one, retreating into the distance on a left-to-right diagonal. The French critic Charles Ponsonailhe became quite poetic when he described Krøyer’s picture:

> The sky and the sea recall the milky tone of dying turquoise; they are made blue by the light which regretfully abandons, for a few hours only, the earth. In the foreground, in a fishing smack, the mariners make sail. The other boats, already distant, sail off between the caresses of the blue summer night, between the two abysses which, under the light of the moon, harmonise and confound their depths. On the horizon, well beyond the line that seems to enclose the circle of our vision, appears a white veil. One believes that the aerial skiff is sailing towards some distant astral home […] A strange unspeakable charm leads us to the land of dreams, face to face with this Northern nature, this scented scene of poetry in humble reality.
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315 *Échappées Nordiques*, pp. 54-55 and *Krøyer*, p. 226.
316 Interview with Marianne Saabye, Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen, 5 March 2012.
317 Charles Ponsonailhe quoted in Scotteez-de Wambrechies, *Échappées Nordiques*, p. 54.
The foreground of Krøyer’s work is dominated by some discarded skate on the shoreline. The larger skate is damp and shiny, while his smaller compatriot possesses vertical chalky stripes of red, white and blue that remind the modern viewer of extruded toothpaste. Dorthe Rosenfeldt Sieben of Skagens Museum explains that although we regard skate wings as a delicacy today, at the time of this picture in Denmark it was thought to be a ‘devil-fish’ and was thrown away rather than eaten. In Concarneau in 1880, the year after Krøyer visited the town, the French artist Achille Granchi-Taylor painted a large portrait of a fisherman carrying two skates or rays (they are very similar) with red-tinged wings, but it seems doubtful if Krøyer would have seen this work. However, it certainly suggests that Krøyer would have been well-acquainted with the species in question, hence his specific study for the major work entitled *Dead Skates* (1884; Skagens Museum). Coincidentally, the British painter Stanhope Forbes also spent the summer of 1884 (at Newlyn) painting a picture in which a large skate appears placed at an identical angle in the foreground: *Fish Sale on a Cornish Beach* (1885; Plymouth Art Museum).

There are other international aspects and influences in Krøyer’s picture. As Marianne Saabye points out, just before Krøyer painted his picture, he had been to London in the company of three companions, including Albert Edelfelt and Werenskiold’s friend, the Danish xylographer Hendriksen. In London, Krøyer was yet again exhibiting his *Sardine Factory*, but took the opportunity to see a large number of works by James Whistler, including his famous Nocturnes. Certainly, Krøyer’s work with its stillness and calmness, deep blue colouration, and touches of gold in the water have a great affinity with Whistler’s *Nocturne: The Solent* (1866; Gilcrease Museum, Tulsa), *Nocturne: Blue and Silver – Cremorne Lights* (1872; Tate Britain), and *Nocturne: Blue and Gold – Southampton Water* (1872; Art Institute of Chicago). The apparent flimsiness of the translucent golden sails also provide resonances with those of Japanese sampans, and it is likely that Krøyer would have seen Japanese prints, which were also highly influential upon Whistler. Louis Gonse, editor of the *Gazette des Beaux-arts*, had published *L’Art Japonais* in 1883, and the critic Karl Madsen added to this genre in Denmark with *Japansk Malerkunst* in 1885, indicating both a European,
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318 Interview with Dorthe Rosenfelt Sieben at Skagens Museum, 22 August 2012.
320 Saabye, *Krøyer*, p. 86.
321 Ibid. pp. 86 and 228.
and specifically Danish, interest in Japanese art within the circles that Krøyer was inhabiting around the time of his painting.\textsuperscript{323}

However, there is another picture that Krøyer would have seen prior to his summer in Skagen in 1884, namely \textit{Crépuscule} (or \textit{Twilight}) (fig. 93; c.1884) by the well-known American artist Alexander Harrison, exhibited at that year’s \textit{Salon}.\textsuperscript{324} In 1913 Charles Louis Borgmeyer asserted that ‘It was at Grez that [Harrison] knew the famous Swede, Carl Larsson, and the famous Dane, Kroyer’.\textsuperscript{325} Whether or not Harrison first met Krøyer in the latter’s brief visit to the artists’ colony in May 1884, there certainly appeared to be a group of artists of different nationalities who were all under the spell of Jules Bastien-Lepage and, to a lesser extent, James Whistler, and who all spent time in Concarneau and Grez: Krøyer, Harrison and William Stott of Oldham. Stott and Krøyer had both been in Concarneau in the summer of 1879, before it became much ‘busier’ with artists in the 1880s, and Stott and Harrison had met when students at the \textit{Atelier Gérôme} in Paris later in 1879.\textsuperscript{326} At the 1880 \textit{Salon} all three artists exhibited just one picture, displaying a common theme: Kroyer’s \textit{Concarneau Sardinery}, Stott’s pastel \textit{Concarneau, Finistère} and Harrison’s \textit{Côte de Bretagne}. This was the same \textit{Salon} where Bastien-Lepage’s \textit{Joan of Arc} made such an impression on Krøyer.

Roger Brown classifies these followers of Bastien-Lepage as \textit{juste milieu} artists who adopted ‘some of the informal techniques of the Impressionists’\textsuperscript{327} but also, according to art historian Albert Boime, ‘gratified the public taste for modernism combined with traditionalism by modifying the disquieting techniques of Impressionism’ by use of ‘solid draughtsmanship’.\textsuperscript{328} It would also be correct to describe all these artists as Naturalists, who painted what might be described as a form of artistic realism as opposed to photographic realism. Bastien-Lepage was the \textit{beau ideal} for this kind of

\begin{footnotes}
\footnotetext[323]{Gonse had published etchings of two of Krøyer’s 1884 Paris Salon exhibits in the \textit{Gazette des Beaux-arts. Pêcheurs de Skagen au soleil couchant} in June 1884 and \textit{Un déjeuner d’artistes}. See also Saabye, Krøyer, p. 91.}
\footnotetext[324]{No. 1177 \textit{Crépuscule}. The image above in fig. 93 corresponds with the picture \textit{La Crepuscule (Twilight)} in Charles Louis Borgmeyer ‘Alexander Harrison’, \textit{Fine Arts Journal}, Vol. 29, No. 3, September 1913, p. 523. The lantern slide above was produced by ‘Henry Blattner, optician, St. Louis’ and was from the Caulfield McKnight Collection, now digitised in the University of Michigan M-library. The picture no longer appears to be in the St. Louis Arts Museum, successor to the Museum of Fine Arts, St. Louis.}
\footnotetext[325]{Borgmeyer, September 1913, p. 531.}
\footnotetext[328]{Albert Boime, \textit{The Academy and French Painting in the Nineteenth Century} (London, 1971, p. 17), in Ibid., p.15.}
\end{footnotes}
artist 'and to many English, Irish, Scottish and American artists he became something of an idol'. In 2004, William H. Gerdts wrote 'Bastien’s influence can be seen in Harrison’s artistic strategies, though there is also the possibility of interaction with other members of the Grez colony, especially the English painter William Stott'.

Nearly a century earlier, John Lavery’s biographer had said that those who remembered Stott best were ‘mainly old-time students at Grès, who discussed among themselves the all-important question, “Does Stott influence Alexander Harrison, or is Alexander Harrison influenced by Stott?”’ Stott, Krøyer and Harrison seem to have so many commonalities of role model, geography, time, subject matter, painting style, the Salon, and the fact that they were non-French nationals in a Franco-centric environment that it is more than reasonable to assume that they encountered and took note of each other’s work. Borgmeyer explains the evolution of Harrison’s twilight picture:

During the summer of 1884 (sic.1883), Alexander Harrison was one evening walking on the digue at Concarneau with Bastien Lepage. A beautiful twilight moon soared in front of them across the small bay, and he then boasted to his friend that he would paint a masterpiece of it. The following day he made a small memory sketch of it that was fairly successful, and then a series of experiments to improve tone, composition etc., and finally during the winter developed [...] the Crepuscule of the St. Louis Museum.

Harrison’s picture shares a number of factors with Krøyer’s that suggest a commonality of purpose: the same time of day, allied to the hazy moonlight that reflects across the water, painted in Krøyer’s case with lines of horizontal jagged impasto, and the muted palette, concern for atmosphere and distant horizon line. Harrison said many years later that there was ‘no other region where one could get the same effects of light and color as on the shores of beautiful, though at times hardy, Finistère’, and this surely echoes with Krøyer’s priority to capture the effect of light at Skagen.

---

329 Brown, p. 15.
333 Ibid., p. 532.
Again, the critical success of a work by Krøyer was not matched by the sale of the picture, and we know from its planned exhibition in Berlin in 1888 that Krøyer had by this time presented it to the French artist Albert Besnard, who had been on the committee for the Georges Petit exhibitions in Paris, and also the committee for the exhibition of French art in Copenhagen in 1888. A large-scale portrait of this latter committee, including Besnard, was produced by Krøyer at the behest of the owner of the Carlsberg brewery, Carl Jacobsen (fig. 109). Besnard loaned Skagen men going out fishing at night to the Danish section of the 1889 Exposition Universelle, where the critic H. Marcel said ‘Krøyer […] is a true master when it comes to acuity of vision and sureness of hand […] each of [his paintings] is remarkable’. He continued by describing ‘the Skagen men going out fishing at night […] under the blue night sky extending over a phosphorescent sea which seems to have cast up haddocks and skates on the sand in soft, rainbow-coloured flesh tones, as if they were flowers’. Besnard decided to donate his picture collection – this one included – to the Musée du Luxembourg in 1899 and it is now owned by the Musée d’Orsay.

334 It was also probably exhibited at the Continental Gallery in London in 1886 – See Saabye, Krøyer, p. 336.
335 Saabye, Krøyer, p. 229, and p. 337.
337 Ibid.
338 See Scottez-de Wambrechies, Échappées Nordiques, p. 54, and Saabye, Krøyer, p. 229
Fig. 94. P. S. Krøyer, *Artists’ luncheon at Brøndum’s Hotel*, 1883, Skagens Museum, oil on canvas, 82 x 61cm.

Fig. 95. Pierre-Auguste Renoir, *The Luncheon of the Boating Party*, 1880-81. Phillips Collection, Washington D. C., oil on canvas, 129.9 x 142.7cm.
Fig. 96. P. S. Krøyer, *Artists at the Breakfast Table in Grez*, 1884, Prins Eugens Waldemarsudde, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown.

Fig. 97. Photograph: Dining Room at Brøndum’s Hotel, early 1890s. Clockwise from left: Degn Brøndum, Hulda Brøndum, Anna Ancher, Marie Krøyer, P. S. Krøyer (at end), Michael Ancher. P. S. Krøyer’s *Artists’ Luncheon in Skagen* (1883) can be seen above and to the left of Anna Ancher’s head.
A separate theme that Krøyer addressed at the Salons of 1884 and 1885 was one that had occupied him since his days in France in the late 1870s, namely portrayals of convivial groups of artists seated around a table enjoying the opportunity to eat, drink and talk. This theme was one that had often been used by artists in the past, in that it provided subject matter that was lively, colourful and above all immediately accessible, without the need to arrange and hire models. Krøyer would certainly have been aware of such antecedents as Wilhelm Bendz’s Artists gathering at Finck’s Coffee House (1832; Thorvaldsens Museum), which was purchased by the Norwegian artist Thomas Fearnley, who in turn sold it to the renowned Danish sculptor Bertel Thorvaldsen. It would then have been displayed at the Thorvaldsen Museum in Copenhagen which opened – four years after the death of Thorvaldsen – in 1848. Bendz’s aims seem to provide a blueprint for Krøyer’s works: ‘In the foreground I had a number of painters with whom I consorted daily, and I attempted to reproduce the life ruling there, and to portray each as typically as possible’.\textsuperscript{339}

At the 1884 Salon, in addition to his two large fishing paintings, Krøyer exhibited a smaller oil, now entitled Artists’ Luncheon at Brøndum’s Hotel (fig. 94),\textsuperscript{340} which he had painted at Skagen the previous summer. The seven artists depicted in the painting are the Dane Michael Ancher; Norwegians Eilif Peterssen, Wilhelm Peters, Charles Lundh and Christian Krohg; and Swedes Oscar Björck and Johan Krouthén. The grouping is completed by the hotel-owner Degn Brøndum. We have a first-hand account of life among the group in the summer of 1883 by writer and critic Georg Brandes, who wrote in his autobiography (1908):

A group of artists lived or congregated daily at Brøndums Hotel, a group in which one felt extremely at ease [...] The entire company sat from morning to evening around the table at Brøndum’s; constantly eating, drinking, debating, discussing, contradicting, damning. A couple of times a day they got up from the table and went for a swim [...] One day, Eilif Petersen, Björck, Krøyer and Ancher sat around me and painted me. However, the first two rejected their portraits. Krøyer, who did a pastel, was finished in no more than two hours.\textsuperscript{341}

Krøyer’s picture is painted in a loose, Impressionistic style, with white brush strokes particularly visible at the near-end of the table, where bottles, glass, bowls and

\textsuperscript{340} No. 1341 Le Dîjeuner des artistes, à Skagen.
\textsuperscript{341} Georg Brandes in Svanholm, 2004, pp. 75-76.
tablecloth are all highlighted with painterly effects. The far window is reminiscent of the similarly-shaped one towards the rear of his picture of the previous year *At the Victuallers when there is no fishing*, but the pale blues and yellows, offset by a bright white, provide a much greater impression of light flooding into the room. Patricia Berman proposes that it was ‘painted with a rapid, ribbon-like touch [suggesting] a freshness and spontaneity that is allied with Parisian Impressionism’,\(^{342}\) and detects the influence of Anna Ancher because of the ‘vibrant colors and emphasis on the enlivening effect of sunlight on an interior space’.\(^{343}\) Lise Svanholm draws comparisons with Kröyer’s *Artist’s Luncheon. Cernay-la-Ville* (1879), which was ‘influenced by his recent visit to Spain’, whereas the 1883 picture ‘is influenced by the painting of light with which all the artists were so preoccupied a few years later’.\(^{344}\)

In 1882 Kröyer arrived in Paris just too late for the seventh Impressionist exhibition, but would surely have been aware of the critical acclaim given to Renoir’s *The Luncheon of the Boating Party* (fig. 95; 1880-81). This picture too shows a group of friends enjoying a lunch, with bottles and glasses on a white tablecloth. It is painted in a loose, relaxed, Impressionist style from which, by the time of the exhibition, Renoir had already turned away following his visit to the Raphael frescoes at the Villa Farnesina in Rome during the winter of 1881-82. Both Kröyer and Renoir’s pictures have compositional similarities: they both feature a standing man in the top left-hand corner of the composition, and a seated figure looking ahead and just to the left in the lower left-hand corner (Christian Krohg and Gustave Caillebotte respectively). It is tempting to think that Kröyer was inspired by Renoir’s picture, but all we can say for sure is that they share an atmosphere of conviviality based on wine, food and conversation; a similarity of subject and painting technique; and a strong sense of enclosure of the figures within the picture frame.

Kröyer’s pictures of artists lunching from 1879 (Cernay) and 1883 (Skagen) share a use of swift and sketchy brushstrokes in certain parts of the picture; however, the faces are clearly recognisable, particularly in the later work. As Marianne Saabye points out, compared with the Cernay picture in which everyone is in dark clothing, here ‘Kröyer has created a fine balance between the brown- and grey-clad men seated and standing on one side of the table and those dressed in black and dark blue on the other side of

---


\(^{343}\) Ibid.

\(^{344}\) Svanholm, 2004, p. 74.
Krøyer is now using light to give clarity to even the darkest tones, as opposed to leaving the dark jackets in shadow. One factor that is surely significant is that the Cernay picture is of thirteen people in landscape format, whereas the Skagen work is of eight people in a portrait format, from a more oblique angle, and with more severe cropping. This has the effect of drastically reducing the amount of the table we see in the picture and increasing the focus on the group of artists. In both pictures, although there are a large number of bottles, the artists are shown much more (to use Brandes’ terminology) ‘debating, discussing, contradicting’ as opposed to ‘eating, drinking’. There is a solemn and thoughtful air in the Skagen picture that suggests weighty matters are under consideration: Karl Madsen wrote that he thought Johan Krouthén appeared in the picture ‘bowed in thought, as is suited to a philosopher’.346 Krøyer’s Skagen picture was soon installed in the dining room at Brøndums Hotel, where it remained until the whole room was removed – lock, stock and barrel – in 1946 to the nearby Skagens Museum.

In its second article on the Salon of 1884, the Gazette des Beaux-arts published a drawing of the three figures (Krouthen, Björck, Krohg) on the left of the composition, accompanied by a review by Louis de Fourcaud:

> There they are eight or ten good companions, (blonds), guys, happy to be in the world, responsible around the table for the still-charged vessels of a ‘repas de Gamache’. Each head is drawn according to grand plans, modelled in the light, presented according to its physiognomy. A fresh harmony of cheerful tones unifies the composition. Is there amassed in Mr. Kroyer some Menzel and some Manet? 347

Krøyer’s pleasure at the pastel he had exhibited at the 1884 Salon (Summer Evening, aka On the beach at Skagen, Denmark, twilight) may well have encouraged him to show another pastel at the 1885 Salon, and he entered it for exhibition along with two plaster busts, one of Michael Ancher and one of a Skagen fisherman.348 Krøyer’s pastel was of a small group of artists at the breakfast table in the artists’ colony of Grez-sur-Loing. In May 1884, Krøyer had been in Paris prior to a delayed expedition to London, the final delay caused by the celebrations for Krøyer’s second class medal at

345 Saabye in Krøyer, p. 73.
347 Louis de Fourcaud, Gazette des beaux-arts, June 1884, p. 476. A repas de Gamache is a large meal as eaten in Cervantes’ Don Quixote.
348 No. 3867 Portrait de M. Ancher and No. 3868 Un pêcheur de Skagen.
the Salon – in future he could exhibit without reference to the Salon Jury.\(^{349}\) He took advantage of the delay to make a short trip to Grez where he met up with a group of successful Swedish artists. His picture *Le Déjeuner des artistes à Grez* (fig. 96) depicts seven recognisable characters: Oscar Björck (the only figure common to both ‘artists’ pictures), Carl Larsson (medal winner at the 1883 Salon) and his wife Karin, Karl Nordström, Bruno Liljefors (who had an entry at that year’s Salon), the sculptor Karin Aroseniusvägen and the little-known C. W. Jænsonet.\(^{350}\)

This picture has been little discussed. Although difficult to be definitive from a reproduction, it appears to have more in common with earlier works such as the *Concarneau sardinery*, than the light and airy *Artists’ Luncheon at Skagen*. This is because Krøyer was demonstrating again his ability to illustrate the impact of areas of light in a darkened environment, for example the window in the top centre of the picture and the lighting of his cigarette by the standing man. However, the main effect of light is the illumination of the face, and particularly the forehead, of Carl Larsson, the acknowledged leader of the Scandinavians at Grez. He has a great sense of animation as he looks across the table to Karl Nordström, perhaps talking or listening to his wife Karin Larsson,\(^{351}\) whose black clothing and black hair dominate the centre of the picture. This area of black colouration contrasts effectively with the brilliant white of the tablecloth. Finally, the Danish contingent as a whole appear to have made little impact at the 1885 Salon, the debut year of Michael Ancher and Viggo Johansen. The Salon judges only award to a Scandinavian was an honourable mention to the Norwegian Otto Sinding (see pages 295-97).

\(^{349}\) Saabye, *Krøyer*, p. 86.


\(^{351}\) The Larssons’ first child Suzanne was born in 1884, the year of Krøyer’s picture.
1886 Paris Salon

I have already discussed extensively Krøyer’s *Skagen men going out fishing at night*, which was so well received at the 1886 *Salon*. His two other works there appear to have received little or no attention in comparison. A pastel entitled *Head of a Woman*\(^{352}\) remains unidentified, while a smaller oil painting *The iron foundry, Burmeister and Wain*\(^{353}\) (1885; Statens Museum for Kunst) was an attempt to reprise Krøyer’s earlier ‘forge’ pictures on a larger scale. It shows a foundry at an engineering and shipbuilding company in Copenhagen, and employs a number of Krøyer’s techniques, notably the lighting effect of the bright molten metal inside a large, gloomy industrial shed. Although technically well-constructed, its broad view of a large number of figures deprives it of individuality and intensity. The picture stayed in the ownership of the Burmeister family (who commissioned it) until it was donated to the Statens Museum for Kunst in 1922. In a commentary under the heading *The Social Realist Revolution that Never Was*, Kasper Monrad and Peter Michael Hornung argue convincingly that

P. S. Krøyer may well have had a brief flirtation with the most unrelenting realism about 1880, but he soon moderated the tone in his pictures. When he painted *From Burmeister and Wain’s Foundry* in 1885 […] for the shipyard management, he produced a tribute to industry with which those commissioning the work could be satisfied. There are no worn out workers to be seen in the painting, only champions of industrial progress. This is just about the only painting from the 1880s with a factory as its motif.\(^{354}\)

Krøyer’s representations of working people had clearly changed following the outcry over the *Hatters*, so that the pitiful semi-naked family of toilers seen in 1880 has been replaced by 1885 with industrious and prosperous factory workers and strong and heroic fishermen. Social Realism has been sanitised so that a – perhaps unintended – critique of working conditions has become a celebration of the nobility and vitality of labour.

---

\(^{352}\) No. 2993 *Tête de femme – pastel.*

\(^{353}\) No. 1299 *Dans une fonderie.* The company co-founder William Wain was from Bolton.

1887 Paris Salon

In 1887 Krøyer entered a further two pictures at the Paris Salon, one of which had also been painted at Skagen in the highly-productive summer of 1884. This was *Summer day at the South Beach of Skagen* (fig. 98; 1884), and depicted a group of naked boys bathing, while a female contemporary is left fully-clothed on the shoreline. As this is one of Krøyer’s most considered and popular pictures, I intend to analyse it in detail.

The subject combination of the shoreline and bathing boys has an involved history, but the first thing to say is that, as so often is the case, there appears to be a shared communality of topic at the same time among painters in different locations. Two of Krøyer’s friends also spent the summer of 1884 painting the subject of boys on the shoreline, Albert Edelfelt in Finland, and Alexander Harrison in Brittany. Additionally, William Stott of Oldham spent the same summer working on a series of pastels of a similar sandy shoreline/ blue sea/ blue sky combination, such as *A Seascape* (fig. 100; 1884).

In *Summer day at the South Beach of Skagen*, there are actually tiny grains of sand that attest to its *plein-air* method of composition. Krøyer employs a very loose Impressionist technique in the bottom left-hand corner of the work, and a thick white impasto for the line of the surf, the inlet at the rear of the picture, and the clouds top left. In reproduction, the picture has a quality of prettiness to it, but the use of different textures makes it a much more robust work when viewed in actuality. Significantly, Krøyer uses one of his favourite ploys by beginning a long diagonal at the bottom left-hand corner that leads us along the shoreline and into the detail at the back of the picture.\(^{355}\) Discussing the composition of the work, Marianne Saabye recalled Krøyer’s recent (1884) visit to London where he had seen ‘a very important exhibition of works by James McNeill Whistler [...] including a small water-colour, *Opal Beach* [...] which may have inspired Krøyer’.\(^{356}\) Although there certainly are similarities, Whistler’s diagonal is much shallower and starts higher up the picture, so does not accomplish the same function.

Another of Whistler’s works that could be regarded as significant is *Harmony in Blue and Silver: Trouville* (fig. 99; 1865), which has a brighter and airier feel than *Opal Beach*, light playing upon sky, sea and shore, and is thus more in character with

---

\(^{355}\) See also Monrad and Hornung, 2002, p. 11.

Krøyer’s work, although its composition is in horizontal bands. Whistler’s picture was probably exhibited at the Georges Petit Gallery in Paris in 1883 and, like Krøyer’s picture, has a lone figure standing on the beach (Gustave Courbet), whose gaze is ambiguous rather than directed. Like Krøyer, William Stott also saw Whistler’s seascapes at the Dowdeswell Gallery in London in 1884, and was clearly affected additionally by Degas’s pastel coastal landscapes of Normandy; Krøyer may also have been aware of these works in which what mattered to Degas ‘was not topographical exactitude or anecdote, but the effects of light and atmosphere with colour’. 357 This resonates with Marianne Saabye’s view of Krøyer’s picture: ‘The true subject of the painting…is…the light and its special effect on the shining sea and the large expanse of sand’. 358

---

Fig. 99. James Whistler, *Harmony in Blue and Silver: Trouville*, 1865, Isabella Stewart Gardner Museum, Boston, oil on canvas, 49.5 x 75.5cm.

Fig. 100. William Stott of Oldham, *A Seascape*, 1884, Gallery Oldham, pastel, 24.1 x 31.7cm.
Stott’s use of pastel began just a year after Krøyer had begun to use it, and immediately after Krøyer had exhibited a pastel at the 1884 Salon. While not suggesting that Krøyer had a direct impact on Stott, it is clear that the use of pastel was much discussed among Naturalist artists around the years 1883-84.

Marianne Saabye suggests that Krøyer’s picture has great resemblances in its colour scheme to [John Singer] Sargent’s earlier picture of the oyster-catchers from Cancale.\(^{359}\) This is a reference to a picture which Sargent entered successfully for the 1878 Salon, when Krøyer was in Spain. However, there is another picture by Sargent that also deserves consideration, although the same caveat applies in that ‘Krøyer can only have known this picture from reproductions’.\(^{360}\) In Neapolitan Children Bathing (1879; Sterling and Francine Clark Institute, Williamstown, MA) Sargent produced a work that illustrated four naked boys on a beach. Aside from the obvious components of sand, sea and sky, it included, like Krøyer’s picture, a head bobbing in the water and a surf line of visible white impasto. The critic of the (New York) Daily Graphic described Sargent’s painting as possessing ‘the feeling of atmospheric glow […] a transparency and sparkle that is very remarkable, even among the dazzling productions of this young American exponent of the French school of light’.\(^{361}\) This description could equally apply to Krøyer’s painting, and is indicative of a commonality of intent.

Two other artists who may have had an impact on Krøyer’s picture are Max Liebermann and Francesco Paolo Michetti. Earlier in this chapter, it was noted that Liebermann’s Girls Plucking Geese shared a number of facets with Krøyer’s Sardine Factory, and that Krøyer and Liebermann were very close neighbours in Paris at a time when Liebermann was working on a picture entitled Ins Schwimmbad (Boys Bathing 1875-78; Dallas Museum of Art). It seems more likely than not that Krøyer saw Liebermann’s picture in the period leading up to 1884, but the only thing that might have registered with Krøyer was the actual subject of boys bathing; Liebermann’s picture has an internal not external setting and is painted with a muted palette of beige, brown and fleshtones.

\(^{359}\) Saabye, Krøyer, p. 225.
\(^{360}\) Ibid.
Michetti was another important artist for Krøyer, because in Turin in 1880 he said of the Italian’s work ‘I fell totally in love. He is an excellent artist’. A key picture in Turin was the highly-luminous work *An impression from the Adriatic* (fig. 101; 1880), in that it features naked children bathing in an azure-blue sea. However, it seems fair to say that whereas Krøyer’s Northern European colours are subtle, gentle and worldly, Michetti’s animated figures bathe in water so blue that it gives his work an air of unreality, heightened further by the beasts adorning the sails of two of the boats in the composition. Krøyer’s work is far more understated, its long diagonal leading the viewer deep into the back of the picture, and provides much more long-term interest for the viewer in comparison with the horizontal immediacy of the Michetti, which provides little for the viewer after the initial impact.

In respect of subject matter for Krøyer’s *Summer’s day at South Beach*, one painter’s work seems particularly relevant, the afore-mentioned William Stott. At the 1882 Salon, Stott exhibited two pictures, both painted at Grez-sur-Loing. The first picture, *The Bathing Place* (fig. 102; 1881) features a languid study of three naked boys enjoying the pleasures of bathing from a boat in the Loing; the attitude of the boy lying down with his arm across his face gives a clear indication of the heat of the day. Stott’s other picture, *The Ferry* (fig. 103; 1881), also has subject-matter resonances with Krøyer’s work in that, on the bank of the river, a girl in a blue dress has her hands clasped behind her back while she looks out across the expanse of water. Stott’s girl is older, does not wear a hat, and her gaze is horizontal rather than slightly downward. However, the two similarly-dressed girls adopt comparable poses, and both appear motionless and deep in thought. Additionally *The Ferry* is also redolent of Bastien-Lepage; the *en-plein-air* Naturalism, vegetation, cropped tree and ‘dreamy’ quality are shared with Bastien-Lepage’s composition from the previous year *Poor Fauvette* (1881; Glasgow Museums) – Bastien-Lepage was the iconic artist for the painters who were based at Grez at that time.

---

363 The first owner of *The Ferry* was John Forbes White of Aberdeen, who also bought James Guthrie’s *A Highland Funeral*. See also Jacobs, 1985, p. 63.
Fig. 101. Francesco Paulo Michetti, *An Impression from the Adriatic*, 1880, Galleria d’Arte, Moderna, Milan, oil on canvas, 74 x 150 cm.

Fig. 102. William Stott of Oldham, *The Bathing Place (La Baignade)*, 1881, Neue Pinakothek, Munich, oil on canvas, 137.5 x 200.5 cm.
Fig. 103. William Stott of Oldham, *The Ferry (Le Passeur)*, 1881, private collection, oil on canvas, 109 x 213.9cm.

Fig. 104. William Stott of Oldham, *The Two Sisters (Les Deux Soeurs)*, 1882, Rochdale Art Gallery, oil on canvas, 142.2 x 215.9cm.
Finally, a major factor that would have drawn Krøyer to Stott’s work was that Stott was awarded a third-class medal in a year in which there were no first-class. With nearly 3,000 works at the *Salon*, the achievement of any class of medal brought with it publicity, recognition and kudos for the artist concerned, particularly if they were in the small minority of non-French painters. The importance of *Salon* success was emphasised by the American author Blanche Willis Howard in her wildly successful novel *Guenn – A Wave on the Breton Coast*, published in 1883 and based around the artistic community in Concarneau, featuring the painter Edward Emerson Simmons. Simmons, loosely disguised as Everett Hamor in the book, has the single-minded ambition to gain success at the *Salon*: ‘He had been heard to make the savage assertion that to reach his goal he would not hesitate to walk over the bodies of babes and virgins’. In 1884, Stott exhibited at the *Salon* another pertinent picture entitled *Two Sisters* (fig. 104) which he had painted back in 1882. Although there is only a partial similarity of subject, that of children on the seashore with a large expanse of sand occupying much of the picture plane, Stott’s aim of ‘creating atmospheric and tonal harmony’ is completely in tune with Krøyer’s intentions. Stott painted his picture only a few months after he would have seen Alexander Harrison’s *Castles in Spain* (1882; Metropolitan Museum of Art; *Châteaux en Espagne*) at the 1882 *Salon*. Harrison’s picture of a clothed boy sprawled out on a sandy shore was created at the artist’s studio in Pont-Aven. The picture is highly reminiscent of Bastien-Lepage, with its muted palette, high horizon line, and otherworldly quality. This picture is said to have led to Harrison’s friendship with Bastien-Lepage, though claims that the two artists ‘painted many a day side by side in Old Brittany’ seem somewhat exaggerated as Bastien-Lepage died at the end of 1884. Additionally, Harrison had exhibited *Shipwrecked* (*Un Naufragé*; whereabouts unknown) and *At the Seaside* (*Au Bord de la Mer*, whereabouts unknown) at the 1881 *Salon*, the former described in the *Chicago Tribune* as ‘A foreground of sandy shore and the lonely figure of a man waving his handkerchief to attract a distant sail – the sentiment of the picture is one of desolation,
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364 The book went into at least forty editions; Simmons achieved an Honourable Mention at the 1882 Salon with *Etude à Concarneau*.
367 Borgmeyer, 1913, p. 530.
only relieved by the motion of the waves and the blue of the far off sky. Harrison added to this theme at the 1884 Salon when, alongside Crépuscule (discussed earlier in this chapter) he exhibited The Castaways (or Shipwrecks) of Glenans (Les Naufragés des Glenans; whereabouts unknown), quite possibly inspired by the shipwreck off the Lannions (Glenans) in Blanche Willis Howard’s book.

The purpose of discussing these numerous works by Stott and Harrison, and the debt of Krøyer and these artists to acknowledged ‘masters’ such as Bastien-Lepage and Whistler, is not to try and suggest that Krøyer borrowed directly from any specific work or feature. Rather, it is to suggest that in the circle of these artists there were a number of themes that were in common circulation: children bathing, seashore and sand, waves and the sea, figures in contemplation across stretches of water. These themes can be allied to the techniques and stratagems that one associates with this Naturalist circle: muted palettes, high horizon lines, en-plein-air painting, lack of smooth finish, and a depiction that contains elements of both realism and otherworldliness.

To conclude this theme, Harrison exhibited a vast canvas entitled Bords de Mer (fig. 105; destroyed) at the 1885 Salon, which showed several naked boys getting ready to bathe on a Brittany shoreline, with one lad dashing towards the sea with a hand raised aloft. Stott riposted with A Summer’s Day (1886; Manchester Art Gallery) at the 1886 Salon, featuring three naked boys playing on a beach. Gauguin then painted a similarly-themed work in the summer/autumn of 1886 entitled Breton Boys Bathing (1886; Hiroshima Museum of Art), showing seven boys in a mixture of states of undress on the banks of the River Aven in Pont-Aven. Yet again, the two girls in this picture are shown fully clothed, and as passive rather than active participants.

Krøyer himself reprised the subject in a number of works painted at Skagen in 1892, which showed boys bathing or running towards the sea. The now-lost Boys Bathing

---


369 Alexander Harrison’s brother Birge Harrison said that ‘in 1883 all Americans knew Concarneau, not because of the astonishing tableaux of William Picknell, but the novel Guenn that everyone read’.


371 No. 2239 (Un jour d’été).
and a study for it entitled *Wait for Us!* (1892; Skagens Museum) show a boy running to the sea holding his right arm aloft as he shouts to the boys already in the water. The figure is very similar to that in Harrison’s *Bords de Mer*, and Marianne Saabye also mentions how another figure in Krøyer’s *Boys Bathing*, that of a boy running with arms by his sides, is mirrored in J. F. Willumsen’s *Sun and Youth* (1910; Göteborgs Kunstmuseum). As a final example, the Spanish artist Joaquín Sorolla painted a picture of ill and crippled naked boys attempting to bathe in the sea. Entitled *Sad Inheritance* (1899; Fundación Bancaja, Valencia; *Triste Herencia*), this piece of social realism was commended at the 1900 *Exposition Universelle*. Sorolla returned often to the theme of bathing children in the decades that followed, though his work lost its social conscience and instead concentrated on leisure activities and pictorial qualities of tone, light and vibrancy.

In addition to *Summer day at the South Beach*, Krøyer exhibited a second work at the 1887 *Salon*. Entitled *Music in the Studio* (fig. 106; 1886) it features a quartet of
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372 Photographic copies are in Krøyer, p. 127 ill. 147, p. 293 fig. 65.
373 There is a preparatory version of the work dated 1909 in the J. F. Willumsen Museum, Frederikssund, Denmark, entitled *Children playing on Skagen Beach*; Saabye, Krøyer, p. 296.
374 A typical example, and indicative of Sorolla’s current prestige, is *Children on the Beach, Valencia* (1916) which sold at Sotheby’s in London (No. 221) in May 2013 for £2.77 million.
musicians surrounded by a contemplative audience. Krøyer himself admits to having '28 portraits in the picture', which include the Neruda Quartet led by the Czech cellist and composer Franz Neruda. Again, Krøyer is clearly attempting to demonstrate his skill in showing the effects of light sources in a darkened environment. In fact, the picture, like a number of his early works, has darkened considerably, and is thus difficult to appreciate fully. What can be said is that Krøyer has used white impasto to heighten the effect of the candlelight, and shows his skill with a very fine rendition of the musical notes on the sheet music that faces the viewer. As in other paintings by Krøyer (Artists’ Luncheon, Cernay-La-Ville and Artists’ Luncheon at Brøndum’s Hotel), the centrally-placed lighting at the top of the picture provides an excellent device that both ‘anchors’ the work and directs the viewer’s eye downwards to the scene below. The theme of an evening picture was in vogue at this time, again illustrating how different painters would suddenly seize upon the same idea or subject matter at precisely the same moment. Krøyer wrote to Michael Ancher ‘Everyone is painting evening pictures; this terrible, impossible, pitch-black winter has forced everyone into it’.

Katrine Halkier introduces the keen rivalry between Krøyer’s picture and Viggo Johansen’s Evening Conversation (fig. 107, aka Evening Chat, aka Chez Moi). The two paintings were exhibited at Charlottenborg in 1886, and critic Karl Madsen said ‘The two pictures mentioned deal with widely different themes and in fact have little else in common than that there is evening light and a couple of the same people in both. But no one mentions one without immediately citing the other and weighing their merits against one another’. Halkier explains further that Madsen ‘prefers Johansen’s more intimate picture’, ‘far more modest and comprehensible’, in opposition to the ‘distanced and foreign’ mood of Krøyer’s work.
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375 No. 1331 Une Soirée Musicale dans mon Atelier. There is a smaller copy of the picture in the Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen.
377 P. S. Krøyer to Michael Ancher 5 February 1886 quoted in Ibid.
378 Karl Madsen quoted by Katrine Halkier in Ibid., p. 243.
379 Halkier in Ibid., p. 243.
380 Karl Madsen quoted by Katrine Halkier in Ibid., p. 243.
381 Halkier in Ibid., p. 243.
Madsen, of course, knew Krøyer well, but was even closer to Johansen as his deceased wife and Johansen’s wife were sisters; Madsen himself is depicted in both pictures, as is Krøyer and the architect Thorvald Bindesbøll. Halkier suggests that Johansen’s picture is closer to a prevalent Danish feeling of both ‘small is beautiful’ and a preference for the local ‘Danish’ over the ‘foreign’ or ‘international’. Bente Scavenius encapsulates the views of Madsen and the Danish public stating that ‘Where Krøyer was lionized by the reviewers and the public at large for his peerless virtuosity, Viggo Johansen was admired more for his ability to immerse himself, with exquisite artistry, in the intimacies of everyday life’.
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382 Bindesbøll was the designer in 1904 of the label for Carlsberg Pilsner, still used to this day.
384 Bente Scavenius, 1999, p. 35.
Fig. 106. P. S. Krøyer, *Music in the Studio*, 1886, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 179 x 206cm.

Fig. 107. Viggo Johansen, *Evening Conversation*, 1886, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 105 x 142cm.
Krøyer’s work is certainly broader in scope in many ways, not least physically. His picture is two-and-a-half times the area of Johansen’s. It contains approximately the twenty-eight portraits that Krøyer mentions (some are indistinct), compared with six in Johansen’s picture. The all-male figures in Krøyer’s picture sweep across the width of the whole canvas and the room is large with a very high ceiling. In Johansen’s composition the six figures, four male and two female, are gathered around the focal point of a table in a small circle, on one side of a compact room.

A difference in colour and tone is also significant. In Krøyer’s picture, the bright, local white light from the candles, the blackness of clothing and far wall, and the gold fittings and frames, make this a Whistlerian symphony in white, black and gold, recalling the colour scheme of Krøyer’s Portrait of the Architect F. Meldahl. In subject matter, Krøyer’s work recalls Degas’s close depictions of the orchestra in the 1870s, such as The Orchestra at the Opera (c.1870; Musée d’Orsay). In contrast, the dark red wall covering depicted by Johansen adds warmth and intimacy, and there is a lovely balance between the bright lamp on the table and the two subtle candles at either side of the piano against the opposite wall. The concept of people in a darkened room gathered around a strong source of light recalls Rembrandt’s Adoration of the Shepherds discussed earlier.385 The two Danes’ pictures share a sense of introspection and contemplation, but ironically it is the figure of Krøyer, with slightly open mouth and raised hand, who animates the discussion in Johansen’s work. As has been noted, Johansen’s picture not only harks back to earlier pictures by Krøyer of dark rooms with distinct sources of light, such as the Artists’ Breakfast at Grez, it also recalls Michael and Anna Ancher’s Appraising the Day’s Work (1883; fig. 108),386 sharing an easy intimacy, a warmth of colouration, and effects of light and dark shadow.

Just as Krøyer had reprised his picture *At the Victuallers* for John G. Johnson when painting *Interior from Winther’s shop in Skagen*, so Johansen did exactly the same, producing a similar sized work for Johnson entitled *My Friends* (1887; Philadelphia Museum of Art). It features a group of people around a table that again includes Krøyer, Madsen, Bindesbøll and Martha Johansen. This picture also has a strong source of light from a table lamp, but feels cooler due to the pale blue wall covering. Bindesbøll is again well to the fore in a later picture by Johansen entitled *An Artists’ Gathering* (1903; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm), which depicts a much larger group drinking round a table, illuminated by a substantial hanging lamp in the top-centre of the canvas. It appears that Krøyer was not depicted on this occasion as he and the Johansens, particularly Martha, had had a severe falling-out in 1891 over Krøyer’s wife. Krøyer wrote that ‘It seems to have become quite a sport in your circle to cast aspersions on my wife under the aegis of Martha, seconded by Bindesbøll and people of like mind’.  

A final important comparison between *Music in the Studio* and *Evening Conversation* is not mentioned by Halkier, in that both pictures were sent to the 1887 Paris *Salon*. A French critic, presumably seeing it before it had darkened significantly, thought that Krøyer’s picture was ‘very laudable and very original; the painter demonstrates an
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incredible eye for the distinctive characteristics of his figures.\textsuperscript{388} *Evening Conversation* was exhibited in Paris under the title *Chez Moi*, a fact confirmed by Kasper Monrad who says that ‘the original brass plate that Viggo used when he exhibited the painting at the Paris *Salon* in 1887 is kept in the [Statens] museum, and here the title reads: "Chez moi"’.\textsuperscript{389} In the final outcome, the *Salon* jury preferred Johansen’s picture to Krøyer’s, as the former garnered an Honourable Mention. Unlike Krøyer’s picture, Johansen’s work became part of the Danish exhibition at the 1889 *Exposition Universelle*, where it was again exhibited as *Chez Moi*:\textsuperscript{390}

1888

Krøyer’s name is unexpectedly absent from the Paris *Salon* catalogue of 1888, after exhibiting there for nine of the previous ten years. The main reason appears to be that he spent the summer of 1887 working on his major composition *Hip, Hip, Hurrah!* (fig. 112) and it was not finished in time for the following year’s *Salon*.\textsuperscript{391} Indeed Krøyer did not even attend the *Salon* in 1888, unlike his previous ‘fallow’ year of 1883. Instead, Krøyer was in Paris in February 1888 before the *Salon* opened to gather committee members for a substantial exhibition of French art that was to take place in Copenhagen that year; entitled *Franske Kunstvaerker*, it ran for five months from May to October 1888, under the aegis of a much broader exhibition, namely The Nordic Exhibition of Industry, Agriculture and Art. The French Art exhibition was financed by the brewer Carl Jacobsen, who engaged Krøyer, aided by Laurits Tuxen, to use his contacts in Paris to create a selection committee. Krøyer’s prestige in Paris is surely indicated by the names he persuaded to join his committee, particularly as the art was going to be seen in a country that the French regarded as an artistic backwater. Louis Pasteur was persuaded to become president, the major art dealer Georges Petit was involved in picture selection and the former arts minister Antonin Proust\textsuperscript{392} was to be the representative of France.\textsuperscript{393} Artist-members included Albert Besnard, (the recipient at around this time of Krøyer’s *Skagen men going out fishing at night*), Jean Charles Cazin and Alfred Roll. It is surely significant that the three highly-prestigious artist-

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
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tutors, who had taught numerous Scandinavian artists, were also involved: Léon Bonnat, Jean-Leon Gérôme and Pierre Puvis de Chavannes.

Jacobsen also commissioned Krøyer to paint a picture of the committee – including himself – which he intended would add further prestige by exhibiting at the *Exposition Universelle* in Paris the following year. This led to the creation of two very similar artworks by Krøyer: firstly, a more loosely-painted initial study *The Committee for the exhibition of French art in Copenhagen 1888*, measuring 73 x 100cm and now housed in the Hirschsprung Collection. Secondly, an identically-titled much-larger work (fig. 109; 144 x 221 cm) that is currently in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.394

Krøyer was aided in his study by a black and white photograph of the committee taken at the Anchers’ house in Skagen in the summer/autumn of 1888.395 Over the winter of 1888-89 in Paris, Krøyer then ‘managed with toil and trouble to gather the total of 30 people who were to be in the picture’, 396 adding each committee member to his allotted place in the composition. It is interesting to see how Krøyer uses so many of his tried and trusted stratagems to produce a unified composition that appears more effective than the broad horizontal format that he employed for *Music in the Studio*.

Firstly, he places a corner of the table directly in the middle of the picture at the bottom of the canvas, a device that recalls *At the Victualler’s when there is no fishing* (1882), *Artists’ Luncheon at Brøndum’s Hotel* (1883), and *Hip, Hip, Hurrah!* (1885-88). This enabled Krøyer to employ his favoured long diagonal on the far side of the table to give the picture cohesion and depth. He also reduced the three lamps to two, in a straight line down the middle of the table that runs parallel to the committee members. These lamps, particularly the nearest one, illuminate and enliven the faces of the committee members at the centre of the composition; Louis Pasteur, easily recognisable from his earlier portrait by Albert Edelfelt (1885; fig. 206), is shown with a large document in front of him, discussing a point thoughtfully with the architect Vilhelm Klein397 standing next to him. The green shades of the lamps mirror the colour of the table surface, and the whole effect provides a luminescence that contrasts with
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394 At the major 2011-12 exhibitions of Krøyer’s work at two venues, the Hirschsprung Collection exhibited their own picture, while Skagens Museum exhibited the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek version. See Halkier in Saabye, *Krøyer*, pp. 246-48.
397 Klein worked for both Thorvald Bindesbøll’s father Gottlieb Bindesbøll and Ferdinand Meldahl (fig. 77).
the darker figures at the edge of the composition. Indeed the glowing green colour gives the picture a sense that something scientific in nature is taking place.

Krøyer also introduced a window to provide some Velázquez-style backlighting that adds not only additional light to the right-hand side of the canvas, but reflects into and animates the large glass cabinet at the back of the picture. Each individual portrait is carefully positioned to avoid masking and give a clear view of the subject’s face, yet it retains the impression of a naturally-occurring event rather than a staged montage. The picture was finished in time to be exhibited at the 1889 Exposition Universelle, where Carl Jacobsen appears to have used his influence and determination to overrule the hanging of the Danish pictures that had been organised by Krøyer and Michael Ancher.398

398 Sabye, Krøyer, p. 100.
Fig. 109. P. S. Krøyer, *The Committee for the Exhibition of French Art in Copenhagen 1888, 1889*, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 144 x 221cm.

Fig. 110. Unknown photographer, *The Committee for the Exhibition of French Art in Copenhagen 1888, Skagen, Summer/Autumn 1888.*
After the *Exposition Universelle* of 1889, the following year the *Gazette des Beaux-arts* devoted five whole pages to Krøyer’s picture; three pages of text, an engraved copy of the picture and a diagram indicating the names of the substantial majority of the portraits. This was a great honour for a non-Frenchman, and there could be no clearer indication of Krøyer’s prestige in France. It just remains to add that Krøyer’s busiest ever year on the domestic front was 1888. He contributed nine works to an exhibition of Danish art as part of the same overall Industry, Agriculture and Art exhibition that included the French artwork display. Running at virtually the same time was a Heinrich Hirschsprung-sponsored exhibition of Danish art to which Krøyer sent twenty-six works, many of them drawings and watercolours.

**1889 Salon**

Krøyer sent one picture to the Paris *Salon* of 1889, another assemblage of portraits gathered together in a work entitled *Evening Gathering in the Banqueting Hall of the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek.* This work had also been commissioned by Carl Jacobsen and showed in excess of twenty people dressed in their finery and surrounded by Jacobsen’s sculpture collection. However, the *Salon* was overshadowed in 1889 by the massive display of art at the *Exposition Universelle*, where Danish artists exhibited 190 oil paintings, in addition to watercolours and pastels. Krøyer exhibited seven oils and two watercolours, and his oil pictures seem to have been chosen with deliberate care so that the selection covered some of his most praised and discussed works from the previous decade. Five of the seven pictures have already been discussed in this chapter: *Italian Village Hatters* (1880), *Portrait of the Architect F. Meldahl* (1882), *Fishermen at Skagen Beach. Late summer evening* (1883), *Skagen Men going out fishing at Night. Late summer evening* (1884) and *The Committee for the Exhibition of French Art in Copenhagen 1888* (1889). Therefore I will now discuss the final two works in question, *La Frescita. Granada.* (fig. 111; 1878) and *Hip, hip, hurrah!* (fig. 112; 1885-88).
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399 André Michel, ‘Le Comité Français de L’Exposition de Copenhague’, *Gazette des Beaux-arts*, 32\(^{\text{ne}}\) Année, 3\(^{\text{ne}}\) Période, 3\(^{\text{ne}}\) Tome, February 1890, pp. 148-51.
400 For full details of Krøyer’s 1888 exhibition record, see Saabye, *Krøyer*, p. 337.
401 No. 1467 *Une Soirée, à Ny Carlsberg.*
402 No. 82, No. 83, No. 84, No. 85, No. 88 in exhibition catalogue respectively.
La Frescita was the most surprising inclusion in Krøyer’s works for the Exposition. Not only did it date back to 1878, but it is a small picture, measuring 51 x 43 cm. Painted during Krøyer’s long stay in Granada from April to September 1878, the picture shows a young, smiling Spanish gypsy girl, with part of her face in light and part in shadow. The white, red and yellow flowers contrast well with her jet black hair, and the coral-red necklace emphasises her honey-coloured skin. The title appears to be Krøyer’s homophonic attempt to spell La Fresquita, which best translates into English as ‘the cheeky one’, in that the girl is fresh in the sense of being playful and impudent. The art historian Julius Lange had set out with Krøyer to Spain in February 1878 and, after they had parted, wrote to Krøyer in May: ‘Of your other work, naturally La Frescita is the one I hold most dear, even if I don’t agree that it’s better than the large one. I think it is fair to say that there is something slightly distemper-ish about your large painting, it occurred to me the first time I saw it, and others think so too’.

This is almost certainly a reference to Two Gypsy Women outside their cottage (1878; Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen), measuring 182 x 156 cm; and the first
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picture Krøyer began work on in Granada. No other painting appears as a likely candidate. We know that Laurits Tuxen said of it that it ‘was a little harsh and black in the shadows’ and that because of this, Krøyer ‘insisted...that it had to be repainted, which he in fact did, but thereby took the bloom off it’. Krøyer confessed to Tuxen in July 1878 that ‘I am so tired and sick of looking at it that I am no longer able to judge it’. So, in order to allay Lange’s concerns, Krøyer’s repainted it, but in doing so he diminished the overall quality of the picture in Tuxen’s eyes. This is a further demonstration of the problems associated with the use of bitumen-like pigments in Krøyer’s early works.

La Frescita was first exhibited at the Christmas exhibition at Charlottenborg at the end of 1878 at a time when Krøyer was in Paris. He received news of it from Laurits Tuxen in Denmark: ‘The laughing Spanish girl has produced great happiness at home. It is a really enjoyable and fresh work’. The picture was also exhibited at the annual Academy exhibition at Charlottenborg in the spring of 1879, and in 1882 in Vienna where it was exhibited as being in the ownership of Bernhard Hirschsprung and with the ‘correct’ Spanish spelling of La Fresquita. The picture reverted to its original spelling for the Exposition Universelle, and was later shown in Berlin in 1902 where it received attention from German art critic Hans Rosenhagen: ‘From the study trip that he undertook that year [1880] to Spain comes the portrait of a young gypsy <La Frescita>, which has the dark, bold colouring of the Bonnat school.

In the space of twenty-one months, from November 1908 to August 1910, first Heinrich Hirschsprung, then his brother Bernhard, Krøyer himself, and finally Bernhard’s wife Emma Mathilde Hirschsprung all died. Thus at the huge memorial exhibition to Krøyer in Copenhagen in October 1910, La Frescita was listed as ‘belonging to the communal property of deceased factory owner Bernhard Hirschsprung and his later deceased wife Emma Mathilde Hirschsprung’. It then appeared in a huge auction catalogue in January 1911 of many hundreds of artworks
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and paintings that had belonged to Bernhard Hirschsprung and his wife. Thus it passed out of the Hirschsprung family and is now in a private collection.

Fig. 112. P. S. Krøyer, *Hip, Hip, Hurrah!*, 1885-88, Göteborgs Konstmuseum, oil on canvas, 134 x 165cm. Clockwise from left: Martha Johansen, Viggo Johansen, Christian Krohg, P. S. Krøyer, Dgn Brøndum, Michael Ancher, Oscar Björck, Thorvald Niss, Helene Christensen, Anna Ancher, Helga Ancher.

Fig. 113. Fritz Stoltenberg, *Artists’ lunch in front of the Ancher House, Skagen 1884*. P. S. Krøyer is visible in the centre of the composition, as is Anna Ancher seated on the bench. Photograph.

412 No. 715.
Finally, I wish to consider one of Krøyer’s most famous and popular works *Hip, hip, hurrah!* (fig. 112; 1885-88). The title is said to have originated from a cheer that was introduced to Skagen by Norwegian artist Christian Krohg.\(^{413}\) Obviously English in origin, the earliest reference to the cheer that I have been able to discover is in Edmond Temple’s *The Life of Pill Garlick* (1813), accompanying the drinking of rum on board a ship during the Napoleonic Wars:

> The first toast “success to Pill Garlick and his saucy crew,” was drank with nine times nine, hip! hip! hip! and a hoorra! the tumult was excessive.\(^{414}\)

According to Michael Ancher, the painting was inspired by five photographs taken in the summer of 1884 by the German painter Fritz Stoltenberg (fig. 113).\(^{415}\) It took Krøyer some four years to complete as he struggled to obtain likenesses of all his models, forcing him to change his initial ideas as the picture progressed. Even as late as 1888, Thorvald Niss was missing from a detailed preliminary study, perhaps finally occupying the place Krøyer had intended for Eilif Peterssen, who could not be persuaded to reprise his 1883 visit.\(^{416}\) It seems particularly ironic that the picture which represents the most spontaneous scene depicted by Krøyer also took the longest to paint. The composition of the picture reminds one of a mirrored version of *At the Victuallers when there is no fishing*, because again a long diagonal emanates from a sharp corner towards the centre front of the picture. In *Hip, hip, hurrah!* there are bottles and glasses that provide an initial point of focus and guide the viewer along the table towards the figures and champagne flutes that form the toast. In *At the Victuallers*, old tins perform exactly the same function at the forefront of the composition; a line of dishes, bottles and glasses guide us down to Degn Brøndum at the end of the counter. Finally, Krøyer again has an area of light at the rear of the composition, a strong indication of the sunshine from which the revellers are shaded by the foliage. As ever, Krøyer is demonstrating his ability to depict the impact of light, with little dapples of gold in people’s hair, on the tablecloth and on the tips of the leaves on the left. The golden yellow of the champagne provides additional liquid sunshine for the revellers.

\(^{413}\) Mette Bøgh Jensen in Saabye, *Krøyer*, p. 234.
\(^{415}\) Mette Bøgh Jensen, 2011, p. 113. See also Saabye, *Krøyer*, pp. 112 and p. 234; Elisabeth Fabritius, ‘Krøyer, Skagen and Photography’ in *Krøyer and the Artists’ Colony at Skagen*, pp. 75-76.
There is a clear division in the picture between the sexes, both physically and behaviourally. The seven men are all standing up and actively cheering, but the women are much more passive. Helene Christensen is also toasting, but in a more subdued manner from a sitting position. Martha Johansen is looking thoughtful at the end of the table gently clasping her glass with both hands, while Anna Ancher is having to cope with her wriggling daughter Helga, who aged from a two-year-old to a six-year-old during the genesis of the picture. Krøyer utilises his favoured white impasto on the dresses of the female Anchers, on the lace on Martha Johansen’s neck, on Viggo Johansen’s bald spot, and on the creases of the tablecloth. These all add a touch of texture to an otherwise smooth picture. The Anchers’ dresses recall the influential American *Salon* painter John Singer Sargent, with Helga Ancher a reminder of the four-year-old Julia Boit in Sargent’s *The Daughters of Edward Darley Boit* (1882; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston). Sargent’s picture was exhibited at the 1883 *Salon*. It has a much stiller and more brooding feel to it, reminiscent of Velázquez’s *Las Meninas*, but it ‘gave Sargent an opportunity to demonstrate his mastery at painting white in different conditions of light’, surely one of Krøyer’s aims in his own picture. Although the picture is one of bonhomie, there have been critics such as Michael Jacobs, who said of it that

> The completed picture, for all its would-be spontaneity and warmth, is strangely cold and contrived. There is certainly something deeply ironic about it, not only in the immense problems that arose in its making, but also in its evocation of the Skagen colony as a group of people existing in perfect happiness and friendship.

Jacobs believed that Krøyer had impregnated Helene Christensen, who then fled briefly to America. Although the evidence for the pregnancy is poor, notwithstanding a journey to America in the 1890s, it appears that Krøyer had earlier rejected Christensen, who was a close friend of both the Johansens and the Brøndums. Christensen had helped to look after Helga Ancher, later becoming the Skagen schoolmistress. This knowledge of underlying tensions and the compositional method have clearly informed Jacobs’ view of the picture. This negative view is not shared today by the Danish public, and because of its exceptional popularity, Skagens
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Museum – publicly regretting *Hip, hip hurrah!*'s home in a Gothenburg Museum – have arranged an interactive digital version of the picture housed in the studio in the garden where Krøyer originally painted it.

*Hip, hip, hurrah!* was purchased in 1888 by Pontus Fürstenberg, who had earlier purchased Krøyer's figure of *Messalina*, and was eventually bequeathed to the Gothenburg Museum of Art. Fürstenberg was happy to lend the picture to the *Exposition Universelle*, where it appeared as « *Hip, hip, hurra, hurra, hurra!* »^422^ and it formed part of the portfolio that earned Krøyer the *Grand Prix* at the exhibition.^423^ The Nordic pictures were awarded four pages in the *Gazette des Beaux-arts*, one of which was taken up almost entirely by an engraving from the Spanish artist Araujo!^424^ Of the remaining three pages of text, around half a page was devoted to a discussion of Krøyer, far more than any other artist. Maurice Hamel said of Krøyer:

> One must name Krøyer separately, this curious mind, active, free, who has absorbed from French art the ease of design, the elegance of appearance, something of both the nerves and of the head which is not of his country. He is more cosmopolitan than the Danes, a little delicate in colouration, but a clever and rapid illustrator. He gives new proof of his talent immediately, grouping around a meeting table – under the contrasting lighting of lamps and of the closing of the day – the French committee in Denmark. One notes particularly the figures of Bonnat, Cazin, Falguière, Puvis de Chavannes, so lively and so well-designed. His eloquence is natural, as amusing and as witty as can be, surprising in the tone of an appearance, or the meaning of a look in the semi-tones where the light identifies a feature of argumentative profiles, energetic or meditative, and creates profound immediate likenesses from nothing. ^425^

It is ironic then, that at the very height of his popularity and acclaim in Paris, Krøyer withdrew from the Paris *Salon*, instead exhibiting at Georges Petit in 1890 and 1891. In later years he was happy to concentrate on exhibiting closer to home in Denmark, Sweden and Germany, though he did return to Paris with fourteen artworks for the 1900 *Exposition Universelle.*^426^ Krøyer's outlook on life had changed after he met Marie Triepcke (fig. 151) in Paris in December 1888 and subsequently married her in July
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^422^ No. 86
^425^ Ibid., p. 378.
1889. This latter year also marked a sea-change in Krøyer’s art, in that his later work was much softer and atmospheric, with the artist becoming known to the Danish public for his depiction of women in long, flowing dresses strolling along the beach in the Skagen twilight. The Social Realism and honest representations of fishermen of the 1880s had, as in much of Scandinavia, given way to a type of painting that was based on mood, feeling and atmosphere, albeit that the depiction of light was still central and crucial to Krøyer’s creative œuvre.
Edvard Munch: Works exhibited outside Scandinavia up to 1889

In recognition, saleroom prices and sheer volume of publications, one Nordic painter of the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century stands heads and shoulders above the others. Edvard Munch, complete with ubiquitous *The Scream*, is for the public at large perhaps the only recognisable name of this period. Unlike other scholars, I concentrate solely on the narrow but important subject of Munch exhibiting outside Scandinavia in the 1880s, particularly two pictures painted by the artist in 1884. The reason for this restricted approach to Munch is two-fold. Firstly, these two pictures represent the total extent of Munch's exhibition of his work outside Scandinavia in the period up to and including 1889. Secondly, my thesis is concerned with the interaction between Nordic and European art up to 1889, and Munch is not significant in this time period as he was to be later. For the record, Munch's exhibitions from 1883 to 1889 are as follows:

1883 Kristiania, Nordic Industry and Art Exhibition
   Kristiania, Autumn Exhibition
1884 Kristiania, Autumn Exhibition
1885 Antwerp, *Exposition Universelle* (World's Fair)
   Kristiania, Autumn Exhibition
1886 Kristiania, Autumn Exhibition
1887 Kristiania, Autumn Exhibition
1888 Copenhagen, Nordic Art Exhibition
   Kristiania, Autumn Exhibition
1889 Kristiania, Student Society
   Kristiania, Autumn Exhibition

Coincidentally, despite the four year gap between the international exhibition of the pictures in Antwerp in 1885 and Paris in 1889, they were actually placed alongside each other in the Munch household in 1884. Inger Munch recalled ‘a pilgrimage to our flat. [Christian] Krohg and [Arne] Garborg and a whole number of young artists. It was a remarkable sight, these two pictures side by side, the bright and the dark’. 427
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The pictures concerned are *Morning* (fig. 115; 1884, Bergen Kunstmuseum) and *Inger Munch in Black* (fig. 114; 1884, Norwegian National Gallery). *Inger Munch in Black* is a portrait of the artist’s sister aged sixteen, and dressed in her black confirmation dress. The eyes, nose and lips are painted with tender care, but the ears, neck and particularly the hands are much more freely depicted. The face as a whole stands out from the rest of the picture, a pink-and-white beacon amid the gloomy background. Her dress is also dark, but has areas of a scuffed lighter colour that give it a three-dimensional quality. The small red necklace and silver ornament add a notable touch of colour. Inger possesses a dignified and solemn demeanour in keeping with her newly-attained status as an adult, but there is clearly also a degree of affection in Munch’s portrayal of his sister. Inger, five years younger, was a regular model for Edvard in his formative years as a painter. As early as 1882, her brother Andreas Munch complained that ‘We all, especially Inger, have to sit as models’.

*Inger Munch in Black* was the first picture to be exhibited by Munch outside Scandinavia – indeed his first to be shown outside Norway – when it was exhibited at the World’s Fair in Antwerp in 1885. However, it appears that it was a last-minute decision to take the picture to Antwerp. As the Munch expert Arne Eggum states: ‘In the spring of 1885 Munch was engaged on an unmistakably sex-inspired motif intended for the World Exhibition in Antwerp [which] opened in May. Munch explained to his friend Olav Paulsen, who was to accompany him to Antwerp, that ‘My motif is two girls after their bath. One of the beauties is stretched out in a languid position on a sofa [...] the other is sitting beside her drying herself’. Munch clearly illustrated his design for the two nudes in a sketch contained in his letter to Paulsen and, after ‘working til “the sweat poured”’, his two-metre-long painted version was virtually complete by the beginning of April 1885.

429 Andreas Munch (b. 1865) referring to Inger Munch (b. 1868) quoted in Prideaux, 2005, p. 47.
432 Ibid., p. 40.
Fig. 114. Edvard Munch, *Inger Munch in Black*, 1884, Norwegian National Gallery, oil on canvas, 97 x 67 cm.

Fig. 115. Edvard Munch, *Morning*, 1884, Bergens Kunstmuseum, oil on canvas, 96.5 x 103.5 cm.
However, in the three weeks or so prior to Munch’s departure for Antwerp on 27 April 1885, something clearly happened to the picture as it did not make the journey. The picture is now lost. Eggum explains that Munch would have painted his nude models at a studio in Maribøes Gate, as his father’s strong disapproval meant that he could not keep this type of picture at home. In fact, none of Munch’s female nudes from the 1880s painted in Norway have survived; the only extant nude referred to by Eggum was probably painted in Léon Bonnat’s studio in Paris in the autumn of 1889. The fact that Munch worked so hard on his large Antwerp picture suggests that his father was involved, directly or indirectly, in its disappearance or destruction, and that Edvard was then forced to take the much smaller (97 x 67 cm) and convenient-to-hand Inger Munch in Black instead.

Munch’s trip to Antwerp took place only a few months after he had become involved with the Kristiania Bohème, and particularly the radical novelist Hans Jaeger, whose ideas of sexual freedom, including the rejection of monogamy, would have been anathema to his pious father Christian Munch. Edvard’s picture of two nudes would have been seen by Munch senior as a clear manifestation of the libertarian ideas of his son’s new social circle. Sue Prideaux cites a diary held in the Munch museum written by Munch’s relative and assistant Ludvig Ravensberg. From this, Prideaux, in the midst of discussing Munch’s portrait of Karl Jensen-Hell (1885; private collection), says that ‘his father destroyed what he considered one of his best paintings because he judged his son had gone too far, presumably in the direction of nudity’. The prospective Antwerp double nude is a likely candidate because of the exceptional effort that we know Munch put into it. Prideaux then discusses a painting that Munch made at this time, which in her opinion was a portrayal of his father:

433 Prideaux, 2005, p. 54.
435 Ibid. p. 41.
438 Ludvig Ravensberg’s diary, 7 October 1909, referenced in Prideaux, 2005, p. 67 and p. 336, n. 19; Eggum, 1984, p. 42, notes Ravensberg’s diary date as 7 June 1909. Ravensberg was Munch’s aunt Henrietta’s grandson.
A painting he made of his father this year is almost necrotic, it stinks of hate and rotting flesh [...] the paint is put on with such furiously eloquent impasto that the flesh seems to be in the process of disintegrating. One eye socket is empty and from the other flashes the vengeful and all-seeing eye of a jealous god.\textsuperscript{440}

Although Eggum identifies the picture as \textit{Portrait Study of Dr. Munch}, Woll's \textit{catalogue raisonné} published twenty-five years later states that the model is unidentified (\textit{Study of an old man's head}, 1885-86, Munch Museum, Oslo).\textsuperscript{441} But if Prideaux's hypothesis is correct, it is tempting to see this picture, produced mainly with a palette knife, as Munch's expression of anger at the destruction of his picture(s) and the withholding of funds for artistic materials.

Munch had intended to go via Antwerp as a means of getting to the Paris \textit{Salon} in the spring of 1884 with a sponsorship arrangement organised by Frits Thaulow, but he was too ill to go.\textsuperscript{442} Thaulow repeated this offer in 1885, enabling Munch to travel.\textsuperscript{443} This was around the time that Munch began his five-year relationship with Thaulow's younger brother's wife, Millie Thaulow. Frits Thaulow and Edvard Munch were also very distantly related; Thaulow's mother was born Nicoline Lovise Munch, and Munch and Thaulow shared a great-great grandfather.\textsuperscript{444} Frits Thaulow was also the brother-in-law of Paul Gauguin from 1874 until his divorce from Ingeborg Gad in 1886, as Gauguin had married Ingeborg's sister Mette in 1873. As will be seen, Thaulow was also closely involved with \textit{Morning}, the other Munch picture under consideration in this section.

Gerd Woll states that \textit{Inger in Black} was shown 'at the World Exhibition in Antwerp in 1885',\textsuperscript{445} while Eggum states that Munch was represented at the World Exhibition in Antwerp by '\textit{Inger in Black} from 1884'.\textsuperscript{446} Sue Prideaux is less precise, but offers a description of Munch's movements:

\textsuperscript{440} Prideaux, 2005, p. 77.
\textsuperscript{441} Woll, 2009, p. 48, p. 136.
\textsuperscript{442} Ibid., pp. 52-53.
\textsuperscript{443} Ibid., p. 54.
\textsuperscript{444} Edvard’s great-grandfather was the priest Peter Sørensen Munch (1740-1802) and Frits’s great-grandfather the customs inspector Edvard Sørensen Munch (1738-93). These two are brothers, and sons of Søren Rasmussen Munch (1686-1748). Frits and Edvard therefore share the latter as their great-great grandfather. These names differ slightly in places from Prideaux, 2005, p. xi (before Chapter One).
\textsuperscript{445} Woll, 2009, p. 128.
\textsuperscript{446} Eggum, 1984, p. 41.
On the 27 April 1885 Munch was healthy enough to embark for Paris on the steamboat *Alpha*, bound for Antwerp with goods for the World Fair. When he boarded the *Alpha* he packed a picture in his luggage. At Antwerp he hung it in the arts section representing Norway. Presumably there was no hanging committee to gainsay him. Having made his mark he went on to Paris.447

Munch’s stay in Antwerp must have been brief indeed as the exhibition opened on 2 May and two days later he was in Paris.448 Due to Munch’s late change of picture, it seems unlikely that it was included in the official catalogue.449 This lack of printed information may account for the reviewer of the Antwerp exhibition in the *Gazette des beaux-arts* mentioning the names of sixteen Norwegian painters, but not that of Munch. However, the reviewer Camille Lemonnier adds Krøyer – born in Stavanger but part of the Danish group – to his Norwegian discussion, and names Hans Gude as ‘Jude’, all of which suggests that he was not well-acquainted with the Nordic contingent.450 Lemonnier begins his review:

> The Swedish, the Norwegians, the Swiss, with some exceptions and despite a most honorable application, are but directed in the opposite direction to their natural inclinations, they have not yet managed to locate a feeling for their own art; typical, inspired by the climate, by the social milieu, by the particular type of humanity of that latitude and the customs found in a group of men among the great collective of humanity. Trained in the orbit of people very familiar with the concept and handling of the arts, they feed their spiritual vitality by borrowing from the Belgians, the Germans, and the French principally.451

However, Lemonnier later mentions ‘the exquisite Norwegian peasant girl of M. Werenskiold’.452 Werenskiold was of course well versed in the art teachings of Germany and France, and particularly artists like Courbet, Millet, Corot and Bastien-Lepage. This typifies the dilemma of Nordic artists, who risked being accused of parochialism if they

---

447 Prideaux, 2005, p. 54.
448 Ibid., Munch writes a letter to his aunt dated 5 May 1885 referring to a visit to the theatre the previous day.
450 Camille Lemonnier, *Gazette des beaux-arts*, Tome XXXII, 2e Periode, 1885, pp. 431-432. The painters named were Narregaard, Sinding, Thaulow, Werenskiold, Kolstoe, Soot, Wentzel, Normann, Skramstad, Wergeland, Krogh, Munthe, Gude (as Jude), Heyerdahl, Nielsen (either Amaldus or Carl), Smith-Hald. The Norwegian-born Dane P. S. Krøyer is also included in the Norwegian section.
451 Ibid.
452 Ibid.
ignored the lessons of the Franco-centric art world, but could be accused of being copyists if they demonstrated a French-taught style.

Munch’s ‘visit to Paris lasted only a short time,’ around three weeks including travelling, and he most likely returned via the same route that he came, thus encountering the *Exposition Universelle* in Antwerp once again. It is therefore unlikely that there was time in Paris for Asta Nørregaard to paint her 1885 pastel of the artist (fig. 116). As Anne Wichstrøm points out, the pictorial depiction of a young radical like Munch by the relatively conservative Nørregaard is indicative of the close-knit nature of the Kristiania art world at that time.  

Fig. 116. Asta Nørregaard, *Portrait of Edvard Munch*, 1885, Munch Museum, Oslo, pastel, 127 x 80cm.

---

453 Eggum, 1984, p. 41.
Inger Munch in Black was next exhibited in Kristiania at the Autumn Exhibition of 1886 where ‘it was very poorly received by the critics’.\textsuperscript{455} Exhibited with Munch’s The Sick Child (fig.118; 1885-86),\textsuperscript{456} in which a much more radical approach was taken to the picture surface, the portrait of Inger also drew the critics’ venom, with Aftenposten describing it ‘as Munch’s “grim Louise Michel”’.\textsuperscript{457} Michel was a well-known anarchist and veteran of the Paris Commune of 1871, and the supposed originator of the black flag as an anarchist symbol, the fabric originally taken from her clothing. The conservative Norwegian press were thus able to associate Inger’s clothing in Munch’s picture with the left-wing anarchism of the ‘Paris mob’. According to Woll, Inger Munch in Black was exhibited later at the Nordic Art exhibition in Copenhagen in 1888, alongside the well-received Kristiania Bohemians (1887-88), the latter work succumbing to a fire on board a ship in January 1907 on its way to join the Rasmus Meyer collection in Bergen.\textsuperscript{458} Shortly after this, in 1907-8, Meyer acquired Morning, following the death of its previous owner Frits Thaulow in November 1906.

Morning is a wider picture than Inger in Black, depicting the full body and surroundings of the model, as opposed to a three-quarter length standing portrait. A girl with long hair sits on the edge of her bed looking away from the viewer. Munch describes the picture fully in an earlier letter to Olav Paulson dated 22 September 1884:

I’m working on a “girl”. I suppose you think it’s odd that I should be doing another “girl in the morning”, but the motif was just too lovely for me not to make use of it. It’s quite simply a girl who has risen from her chaste bed and is in the process – sitting on the edge of the bed – of pulling on her stockings. The bed is whiteish [sic], and there are white sheets, white nightgown, a bedside table draped in white, white curtains, and a blue wall. It’s the effect of the colour. I’m not sure whether I’ll be able to do this because it’s very difficult, but I’m hoping for the best.\textsuperscript{459}

\textsuperscript{455} Woll, 2009, p. 128.

\textsuperscript{456} 1886 Kristiania Høstutstillingen: No. 127 Portrett (Inger Munch in Black), No. 128 Studie (The Sick Child).

\textsuperscript{457} Eggum, 1984, p. 47.

\textsuperscript{458} Woll, 2009, pp. 128, 162.

\textsuperscript{459} Edvard Munch to Olav Paulsen, 22 September 1884, quoted in Woll, 2009, p. 124. There is a similar version of the quote in Eggum, 1984, p. 38, and Prideaux, 2005, p. 53.
The previous ‘girl in the morning picture’ that Munch is referring to is *Early in the Morning* (fig. 117; 1883; *Girl Kindling a Stove*), painted at Frits Thaulow’s Academy at Modum, and Munch’s entry for the 1883 Autumn Exhibition.⁴⁶⁰ This was the second year that an exhibition had been held in which the artists themselves rather than the state-organised Kristiania Art Association chose the exhibits. Among those who instigated the annual exhibition was Erik Werenskiold who, according to Munch, gave him ‘a good critic’ in *Dagbladet* for his 1883 exhibition picture.⁴⁶¹ Werenskiold apparently thought that a number of studies direct from nature submitted for exhibition by young artists were too similar to each other, but that Munch had ‘emancipated himself’ from this.⁴⁶²

Like *Morning* (fig. 115), the earlier picture *Early in the Morning* (fig. 117) features a model in a white blouse and a dark dress, with bare arms and long hair. However, *Morning* itself is a much more expressive and freely-painted work, more psychologically-penetrating in outlook, with the model assuming a contemplative, introspective expression. Her hair hangs loose, rather than pulled back in a ponytail, and her blouse is slightly open at the chest. These facets may symbolise a ‘looseness’ of morals despite Munch’s protestations that she was chaste.⁴⁶³ The use of light on the model’s skin and the subtle illumination of a decanter and glass on a tray in the background are all a measure of Munch’s progress in the year from 1883 to 1884. The diagonal positioning of the bed beginning in the bottom right-hand corner leads us into the picture and towards the illuminated glassware.

⁴⁶² Eggum, 1984, p. 34.
In 1984, Reinhold Heller wrote that *Morning* surpassed all other Norwegian painting of the time in its dominant whiteness and its rendering of light’s ability to dissolve forms, causing sharp contours to disappear, an effect Munch achieved through the unorthodox method of gouging parallel tracks into the wet paint with the handle of the brush. The intense light, the break-up of forms, the colouristic simplicity, all suggest an attempt directly to meet the criteria of Impressionism as then understood in Kristiania, an Impressionism apparently capable of being bent and adjusted to the volatile local artistic and political conditions.⁴⁶⁴

Although *Early in the Morning* was well received by Werenskiold, and also by Munch’s mentor Christian Krohg and the author Gunnar Heiberg,⁴⁶⁵ *Morning* fared much less well at the hands of the critics at the 1884 Autumn Exhibition. The conservative press

---

⁴⁶⁵ Prideaux, 2005, p. 52; Eggum, 1984, p. 34.
said that it exemplified ‘insipidity and tastelessness’ and possessed a ‘completely slapdash, almost dead-like colouring’. Even Andreas Aubert, who was more open-minded to developments in art, felt that Munch should offer a more ‘finished’ piece of work in future.

Prideaux quotes a further unidentified critic as saying that ‘the “seamstress” on the tousled bed was “so obviously vulgar”’. Interestingly, there were either two or three pictures by Paul Gauguin at the 1884 Autumn Exhibition, Prideaux claiming that there were two, and Claire Gilman stating that there were three paintings by Thaulow’s brother-in-law Paul Gauguin. Two of them, Madame Mette Gauguin in Evening Dress (1884) and Basket of Flowers (1884), later entered the collection of Kristiania’s National Gallery. This is coincidental because, in 1881, at the sixth Impressionist Exhibition in Paris, Gauguin had exhibited his own ‘seamstress’ picture, a nude study of the Gauguins’ maid sewing, seated on a similarly tousled bed (Nude Study, 1880; Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen). The critic Henry Havard described Gauguin’s nude as ‘knock-kneed and gamy [...] she is assuredly poorly made to awaken indiscreet desires’, and Gabriel Wissmann explained that ‘the blatant Realism of this woman sewing bothered the contemporary audience’. In both cases, there is the equating of the profession of a seamstress with coarseness and a perhaps dubious morality, which may be explained by the very low pay of a seamstress often occasioning a lapse into prostitution through sheer financial desperation.

Munch was naturally unhappy with the reception given to the picture and directed his resentment towards the exhibition as a whole, describing it as ‘worthy Norwegian worthiness’ and comparing it unfavourably to ‘a few pages of an Ibsen drama’.

Frits Thaulow, however, had faith in Munch’s Morning, and paid 100 Norwegian Krone for it.

---

466 Dagen, 15 November 1884, quoted in Eggum, 1984, p. 38; Morgenbladet, 4 November 1884, quoted in Eggum, 1984, p. 38.
467 Andreas Aubert in Aftenposten, 22 November 1884, quoted in Eggum, 1984, p. 38. See also Prideaux, 2005, p. 53.
468 Prideaux, 2005, p. 53.
469 Ibid.
472 Wissmann in Moffett, 1986, p. 344.
473 In Victorian England it was impossible to exist on the wages for piece-work sewing (as discovered by social investigator Henry Mayhew). Christian Krogh portrays an exhausted seamstress in Trett (Tired) (1885; Norwegian National Gallery).
474 Edvard Munch to Olav Paulsen, 14 December 1884, quoted in Eggum, 1984, p. 39. See also Prideaux, 2005, p. 54.
apparently twice the fee that Munch paid the model at Thaulow’s Academy. The picture was thus five years old when exhibited in Paris in 1889, at the ‘rather small Norwegian pavilion’. It was one of 125 oil paintings by sixty-six Norwegian artists; Norway was comparable in actual number of painters to Sweden and Denmark, but smaller by number of exhibits. The picture was listed very simply as Matin with no record of ownership. Prideaux suggests that it was ‘probably included because of its owner, Frits Thaulow, lived in Paris,’ while Eggum states that ‘the Norwegian adjudicating committee considered it inadvisable to allow him to exhibit a more radical picture than Morning (1884)).’ The former consideration seems the more likely in that Thaulow himself exhibited three oils and two pastels at the exhibition. However, although Thaulow certainly spent much time in Paris, he provided a Kristiania address for the exhibition catalogue.

Munch did not produce a large picture specifically for the Exposition Universelle, perhaps mindful of the fate of his earlier Antwerp picture. However, the main reason for the lack of availability of Munch’s work was that he was concentrating on home territory in the spring of 1889. Munch launched a substantial exhibition of 110 pictures at the Kristiania Student Society in April/May 1889, including Early in the Morning, The Sick Child and Morning. As the Exposition Universelle began on 6 May, six days before the Kristiana exhibition closed, it suggests that Morning had either been removed prematurely from the latter in order to be shipped to Paris with the other Norwegian pictures, or that it was late in arriving.

As in Antwerp four years previously, Munch’s work failed to even garner a mention from the Gazette des beaux-arts. Of the twelve Norwegian painters discussed, it is of interest that the French reviewer mentioned the Naturalist artist Gustav Wenzel’s identically-titled work Matin, which Hamel describes as ‘warmly intimate’. This is very likely Wenzel’s Breakfast II (Morning Mood, 1885; Norwegian National Gallery), a busy picture of six members of a family at a breakfast table, in stark contrast to Munch’s solitary and pensive figure. Wenzel’s Naturalistic picture of domestic harmony is a
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475 Prideaux, 2005, p. 54. See also Heller, 1984, p. 29.
477 Ibid.
479 Christiania in the catalogue, though the name had changed to Kristiania in 1877.
480 Heller, 1984, p. 43, p. 229 n. 25.
481 The artists were: Thaulow, Sinding, Munthe, Kleveland, Petersen, Skredsvig, Heyerdahl, Werenkiold, Wentzel, Backer, Jorgensen, Kolstoe.
482 Hamel, 1889, p. 379.
genre scene, whereas Munch’s picture captures the psychological feeling of contemplation; the only quality they share is the artist’s attempt to depict the effect of light. It is ironic that Wenzel’s *Carpenter’s Shop* (fig. 50) was considered so radical in 1881 that it led to a strike and the instituting of the independent Autumn Exhibition in 1882, yet in 1886, when Munch exhibited *Inger Munch in Black* and *The Sick Child* at that same exhibition, Wenzel attacked the latter work:

> I think it’s lousy, Munch. Shit. There’s no matter, no substance...
> Munch: I wasn’t painting substance. I was painting the exhausted movement of the eyelid, the lips whispering...
>
> You paint like a pig, Edvard. Shame on you...  

Fig. 118. Edvard Munch, *The Sick Child*, 1885-86, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 120 x 118.5cm.

---

483 Edvard Munch quoted in Prideaux, 2005, p. 87.
This is a clear illustration of the pace of change in Scandinavian art in the 1880s. During the decade National Romanticism had been challenged and overtaken by the radical Naturalism of painters like Krohg, Werenskiold and Wentzel, yet by 1886 Wentzel – his picture a *cause-célèbre* in 1881 – felt threatened by a painterly and expressive type of mood painting. Munch’s painting *Morning*, which was thought tasteless, slapdash and unfinished when exhibited in Kristiania in 1884, was by 1889 thought a safe option to send to Paris. It can be seen that Munch made no appreciable impact with his two exhibition ventures abroad in 1885 and 1889, but his controversial exhibits in Norway, and the support of painters and critics like Krohg, Werenskiold, Thaulow and Aubert laid the foundations for his later international success.
Vilhelm Hammershøi at the *Exposition Universelle* of 1889

In 1889, Vilhelm Hammershøi exhibited for the first time outside Scandinavia, contributing four of the 190 oil paintings that Denmark sent to the *Exposition Universelle* in Paris. In the catalogue the works are listed as follows: No. 44 *Étude*, No. 45 *Vielle Femme* (H. Hirschsprung), No. 46 *Jeune Fille* (A. Bramsen), No. 47 *Job* (K. Madsen).\(^{484}\) As explained below, there has been some confusion as to which pictures were actually sent to the exhibition, particularly the suggestion that *Portrait of a Young Woman. The Artist’s Sister Anna Hammershøi* (fig. 119; 1885) was not only included in the four (as cat. No.46), but proved influential when exhibited. As I demonstrate, this picture was not shown in Paris, however I will discuss it in addition to the other four. It was not only a vitally important work in Hammershøi’s early oeuvre – it provided him with his initial breakthrough in Copenhagen – but also caused a significant outcry following its rejection by the jury of the 1885 Neuhaus Prize at the Royal Danish Academy.

In the catalogue of the 1981 exhibition *Vilhelm Hammershøi: En retrospektiv udstilling* at Ordrupgaard (Copenhagen), it was asserted that Renoir saw Hammershøi’s *Portrait of a Young Woman. The Artist’s Sister Anna Hammershøi* at the 1889 *Exposition*, and that it may have influenced the former’s *Bathing Woman* of 1891,\(^{485}\) albeit that both artists may have shared a common source in Rembrandt’s *Bathsheba* (1654; Louvre, Paris).\(^{486}\) It further states that this picture was catalogue No. 46 at the *Exposition Universelle*,\(^{487}\) but later contradicts this by saying that *Young Girl Sewing* (fig. 126; 1887) was catalogue No. 46.\(^{488}\)

In Poul Vad’s seminal work *Vilhelm Hammershøi and Danish Art at the turn of the Century*, the author is surprisingly non-committal about the identity of the four pictures at the *Exposition*; however he does provide useful evidence from Frederikke Hammershøi’s scrapbook showing that Alfred Bramsen bought the work entitled *Study*.

---


\(^{485}\) Ordrupgaard, Copenhagen No. 13; It is difficult to ascertain the relevant Renoir picture, but the closest appears to be *Bathers* (1892-93; private collection) located at: [http://www.wikipaintings.org/en/pierre-auguste-renoir/bather-1893](http://www.wikipaintings.org/en/pierre-auguste-renoir/bather-1893) accessed 14 September 2013.


\(^{487}\) Ibid., p. 164.

\(^{488}\) Ibid., p. 165.
A Baker's Shop (fig. 132; 1888) in 1890 following its appearance at the 1889 Exposition.\textsuperscript{489}

In a further exhibition held at Ordrupgaard (and at Musée d’Orsay) in 1997, \textit{L’Univers Poétique de Vilhelm Hammershøi 1864-1916}, it was stated correctly that A Baker’s Shop and Young Girl Sewing were No. 44 and No. 46 respectively in Paris in 1889,\textsuperscript{490} and these facts were repeated in the exhibition catalogue at Gothenburg in 1999.\textsuperscript{491} At the exhibition at the Royal Academy of Arts in London in 2008, it is again detailed that Young Girl Sewing was No. 46 in Paris and, more significantly, that Portrait of a Young Woman. The Artist’s Sister was not exhibited in the French capital.\textsuperscript{492}

However, there is disagreement in two more recent publications. The 2009 catalogue for The Hirschsprung Collection in Copenhagen lists Portrait of a Young Woman. The Artist’s Sister as No. 46 at the Paris Exposition, while confirming the unanimous opinion that An Old Woman (fig. 123, 1886) and Job (1887; Hirschsprung Collection) were catalogue No. 45 and No. 47 respectively.\textsuperscript{493} In the catalogue for the major exhibition of 2012, Hammershøi in Europe (Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen), they list Hammershøi’s four pictures as Portrait of a Young Woman, An Old Woman, Young Girl Sewing and A Baker’s Shop,\textsuperscript{494} despite stating earlier in the text that ‘At the Universal Exposition Hammershøi himself showed a painting with a subject from the biblical story of Job’.\textsuperscript{495}

There can be no doubt that No. 44 in Paris was A Baker's Shop, despite the vague catalogue title of Étude. Not only do we have Frederikke Hammershøi’s scrapbook evidence mentioned above, but on a label stuck to the back of the picture is written ‘Studie (bagerbutik)...1889’, confirming that its original title was Study or Étude.\textsuperscript{496} No. 45 Vielle Femme was owned in 1889 by Heinrich Hirschsprung and is universally accepted to be the Old Woman in the Hirschsprung Collection (Inv. Nr. 146). Similarly,

\textsuperscript{491} \textit{Vilhelm Hammershøi}, Exh. Cat., Göteborgs Konstmuseum; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm; 1999, pp. 52 and 54.
\textsuperscript{493} Madsen et al., 2009, pp. 52-53.
\textsuperscript{495} Ibid., p. 40.
\textsuperscript{496} \textit{L’Univers Poétique}, 1998, p. 148.
No. 47 *Job*, which in 1889 was owned by Karl Madsen, can only be the *Job* in the Hirschsprung Collection (Inv. Nr. 3078). The picture was given back to the Hammershøi family by Madsen, and on the death of Anna Hammershøi was presented to the Hirschsprung Collection in 1956.

There only remains, therefore, the identity of Paris category No. 46 *Jeune Fille*, which has two candidates in the Hirschsprung’s *Portrait of a Young Woman* and Ordrupgaard’s *Young Girl Sewing*. The crucial clue is that *Jeune Fille* was owned by the Danish collector Alfred Bramsen at the 1889 exhibition as stated in the catalogue, and Bramsen had bought *Young Girl Sewing* in 1888 at a Salon des Refusés, following its rejection by the selection committee for the Danish Royal Academy’s annual exhibition at Charlottenborg. The picture can clearly be seen in two photographs of the Bramsen family home in the 1890s. *Portrait of a Young Woman*, on the other hand, belonged to the Hammershøi family; Vilhelm had said that it was not his to sell when Eilif Peterssen showed an interest on behalf of the Norwegian National Gallery. Its ‘family’ nature is emphasised by a photograph from the late 1880s of Anna Hammershøi playing the piano with her own large portrait directly above her as she plays. Not until 1896 did Hammershøi decide to part with the picture, selling it to Heinrich Hirschsprung for 1,200 kroner, encouraged in his purchase by Alfred Bramsen in the face of competition from the Nationalmuseum in Stockholm and Pontus Fürstenberg.

---

497 Krämer, 2008, pp. 15, 143.
500 Krämer, 2008, p. 46.
Thus the story of the exhibition of *Portrait of a Young Woman* in Paris and the oft-repeated claim of its effect upon a putative Renoir bathing scene is seen to be false.\(^{502}\) Additionally there is no evidence that Renoir visited the Danish capital prior to 1891, or had work exhibited in Copenhagen that might have precipitated a visit.\(^{503}\)

The definitive listing of Hammershøi’s four pictures at the 1889 *Exposition Universelle* is therefore as follows:

No. 44 *Étude* (fig. 132), *A Baker’s Shop* (1888; *En Bagerbutik*), 113.5 x 90 cm, Vejen Kunstmuseum.

No. 45 *Vielle Femme* (fig. 123), *An Old Woman* (1886; *En Gammel Kone*), 69.7 x 56.7 cm, Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen.

No. 46 *Jeune Fille* (fig. 126), *Young Girl Sewing. Anna Hammershøi, the Artist’s Sister* (1887), 37 x 35 cm, Ordrupgaard, Copenhagen.

No. 47 *Job* (1887), 168 x 126.5 cm, Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen.

Hammershøi was in Paris in the spring of 1889 at the same time as Krøyer, who was arranging the hanging of the Danish exhibits. Apparently, the Danish authorities had twenty bursaries totalling six thousand kroner to assist young artists with their *Exposition* expenses but, according to Alfred Bramsen ‘they could not even give Hammershøi a paltry 300 kroner’.\(^{504}\) Before a detailed discussion of Hammershøi’s four *Exposition* pictures (plus *Portrait of a Young Woman*) it is instructive to consider his relationship with Krøyer, who was his tutor at the newly-founded *Kunstnernes Studieskoler* from 1883.\(^{505}\) Hammershøi wrote to his brother Otto ‘As you perhaps know I go to Krøyer’s school every day from 8.30 till 4...then it’s on to the Academy where I draw from 5.30 to 7.30’.\(^{506}\) It is to his credit that Krøyer did not attempt to steer Hammershøi towards his own stylistic methods, saying that ‘I have a pupil who
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505 Tone Bonnén in Monrad et al., p. 225.

paints most oddly. I do not understand him, but believe he is going to be important and do not try to influence him.\(^5\)

Krøyer was lively and gregarious, Hammershøi shy and solitary, and this was reflected in their art. Krøyer's vibrant Naturalism, with much of his work sited outdoors, contrasted with the cool interiors of Hammershøi, who was thirteen years younger than his mentor. Vilhelm Wanscher, writing in 1915, saw merit in Hammershøi’s different approach: ‘After the torrid summer of Krøyer, it was wholesome for Danish tempers to sense the quiet of winter in Hammershøi’s art.’\(^5\) There is a suggestion here that Hammershøi’s calm serenity was closer to the Danish character than Krøyer’s playful exuberance. However, there is one important connection that binds tutor and pupil irrevocably together, and that is the treatment of light.

Knut Bergh says that Hammershøi’s pictures are ‘filled with an inner tension with an undertone of mysticism and hidden drama’,\(^5\) and this contrasts clearly with Krøyer’s open and immediate style, albeit that Krøyer’s works sometimes hint at an unexplained dramatic event. But Bergh adds that for Hammershøi ‘light is always the main theme’,\(^5\) and this is surely something that the two men share. Krøyer’s concern was to illustrate his mastery by means of the effect of light on local colour, with sunlight pouring through a window or the glow from a molten ingot altering the ‘natural’ colour of clothes, faces, walls and furnishings. In Hammershøi’s early works, the light is much more diffuse and undefined. It drifts into the picture, hinted at by shadow or a subtle change in the neutral background colouration.

**Portrait of Young Woman. The Artist’s Sister, Anna Hammershøi**

In 1885 Hammershøi decided to paint a picture in order to compete for the Neuhaus prize. Its requirements were ‘a female portrait, three-quarter view, lifesize’.\(^5\) To this end he engaged his nineteen-year-old sister Anna as his model, choosing someone he knew because, as he explained, ‘I would rather know them very well in order to paint them.’\(^5\)

---

\(^5\) Vilhelm Wanscher quoted by Hanne Finsen in *Vilhelm Hammershøi: En retrospektiv udstilling*, p. 8.
\(^5\) Ibid.
When considering possible influences upon Hammershøi for this work, other commentators have considered Hammershøi’s regard for the artists of the Danish Golden age. Hammershøi held in greatest esteem Christen Købke (b. 1810), and had high regard for Johan Thomas Lundbye (b. 1818), Vilhelm Kyhn (b. 1819), Jørgen Roed (b. 1808) and Christen Dalsgaard (b. 1824). It happened that there was a large Købke retrospective in 1884, and Anna-Birgitte Fonsmark has discussed recently how Hammershøi’s 1885 portrait of Anna has been considered in connection to Købke’s 1835 portrait of his own sister Cecilie Margrethe Petersen (see fig. 121). Fonsmark acknowledges that the Købke sister makes eye contact with the viewer and that the Hammershøi sister is more inner world than outer world, but adds that ‘besides their size, the two canvases share an intimacy’.

Fig. 119. Vilhelm Hammershøi, Portrait of a Young Woman. The Artist’s Sister, Anna Hammershøi, 1885, Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 112 x 91.5cm.

513 Hanne Finsen in Vilhelm Hammershøi: En retrospektiv udstilling, p. 8; Anna-Birgitte Fonsmark in Krämer and Sato, 2008, p. 29.
514 Fonsmark in Krämer and Sato, 2008, p. 30; The Hammershøi picture measures 112 x 91cm and the Købke 94 x 74cm.
Fig. 120. Julius Exner, *Portrait of the Artist’s Sister*, 1847, Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 94.7 x 67.7cm.

Fig. 121. Christen Købke, *Portrait of the Artist’s Sister, Cecilie Margrethe Petersen, née Købke*, 1835, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 94 x 74cm.

Fig. 122. Christen Købke, *Henriette Petersen, née Philipsen, the wife of Michael Christian Petersen*, c.1832, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 48 x 36cm.
In fact, the Købke picture that appears closer to that of the Hammershøi is another family portrait, *Henriette Petersen, née Philipsen, the wife of Michael Christian Petersen* (c.1832; fig. 122). This is a smaller picture, one of a pair of portraits, and with a slightly more elaborate background. However, the direction of the sitter’s face, her hand positions and her overall demeanour are more in keeping with Hammershøi’s picture than that of the other Købke work.

I propose that there is another Golden Age picture far closer to Hammershøi’s portrait than those of Købke, namely *Portrait of the Artist’s Sister* (fig. 120) by Julius Exner (b. 1825). Exner was a senior figure in the Danish art world by the time that Hammershøi began his painting and he was the first artist whose work was collected by Heinrich Hirschsprung.515 The Exner portrait possesses a lack of eye contact, a relaxed arm posture and a three-quarter-length format which, in contrast to the Købke pictures, includes the upper legs. This format is hardly surprising as the picture was Exner’s own entry for the 1847 Neuhaus prize, and met exactly the same criteria as Hammershøi’s entry nearly forty years later. Exner’s picture actually won the prize in 1847, which explains why it would have been a likely port-of-call for Hammershøi. Except for the position of the hands, it is also much closer to Hammershøi’s work than Rembrandt’s *Bathsheba*, which depicts a downward-looking nude holding a letter, with a male figure at her feet.516

Although Hammershøi and Exner’s pictures are of a different generation, they share a similarity of both body position and a gaze that does not confront the viewer. With its muted palette of grey, white and black, Exner’s work is again far closer to Hammershøi’s than that of Købke, particularly in its mood of quiet contemplation and introspection. In *Portrait of a Young Woman*, Anna Hammershøi is dressed entirely in black, brought forward in the picture plane by a background of white panelling. Her pale red lips provide the only exception to the otherwise muted palette. Hammershøi’s philosophy in this regard was explained when he said that ‘perhaps they can be called neutral and reduced colours. I’m utterly convinced that a painting has the best effect in terms of its colour the fewer colours there are’.517 Similarly, when compared with *Interior with the Artist’s Mother and Sister* (1884; private collection) painted the previous year, all the extraneous material – cutlery, furniture, apron – has been

---

515 Saabye et al., *100 years of Danish Art*, 2011, p. 110.
516 The possible correspondence with the Rembrandt can be traced back to Carl V. Petersen *Tilskueren* (Copenhagen, 1916), p. 524. See Vad, 1992, p. 36.
Just as with the colours, Hammershøi has pared the elements down until just the body, black clothing and background remain. Anna appears deep in thought and the picture conveys an atmosphere of total silence. Thorkild Hansen has described the mood of Hammershøi’s pictures: ‘time has stopped, the world been brought to silence, and eternity has commenced – without our having died first’.

The picture is typical of Hammershøi’s work in that it depicts a lone woman; he rarely painted solitary men. It is of interest that Hammershøi concentrates his detail upon the face and hands, using the same tactics that Jules Bastien-Lepage – much-revered by artists such as Krøyer – had employed with great success. Unlike Exner, Hammershøi did not win the prize, Felix Krämer proposing that the ‘muted palette and free brushwork’ were not appreciated by the conservative jury, although the former quality had proved no bar to Exner. Certainly the picture, with its lack of narrative and the figure’s spartan surroundings, must have appeared challenging at that time; even Karl Madsen, who was just beginning his career as an art critic, described it as ‘the strangest picture in that year’s show’. However, this did not deter Madsen from becoming one of the forty-one signatories to a letter of protest demanding that Hammershøi be given the prize. The letter was organised by the prominent art historian Emil Hannover, finally penned by Karl Madsen and was signed by such artists as Krøyer, L. A. Ring, Carl Locher, Bertha Wegmann and Julius Paulsen. In another letter penned concurrently, Krøyer wrote to Madsen describing those who had rejected the picture as ‘idiots, morons, the ultimate representatives of bigotry’ and urging him to ‘write something against this with pith and power. Spit on them. They deserve it’. This illustrates clearly the strength of feeling that progressive painters like Krøyer felt against the establishment, and a shared outlook that would lead eventually to an exhibition independent of state control, Den Frie Udstilling, in 1891.

See illustration Monrad et al., 2012, p. 17; Vad, 1992, p. 34.
Thorkild Hansen, in Vilhelm Hammershøi: En retrospektiv udstilling, p. 17.
Kasper Monrad, in Monrad et al., p. 81.
The Beggar (1880; Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek) by Jules Bastien-Lepage was bought by Carl Jacobsen who in the 1880s had a large ‘house museum’, the forerunner of the Glyptotek.
Vad, 1992, pp. 412-13, n. 34; Saabye (ed.), 100 Years of Danish Art, 2011, p. 201.
P S Krøyer to Karl Madsen, 22 April 1885, quoted in Saabye (ed.), 100 Years of Danish Art, 2011, p. 201.
In 1886 Madsen wrote of ‘the notorious Whistler, to whom Hammershøi is said to have a distinct resemblance’. This theme was echoed by Andreas Aubert when he saw *Portrait of a Young Woman* at an exhibition in Oslo in 1887:

Now that I for the first time see a work by Hammershøi, it turns out that his art is so like Whistler’s that the correspondence can hardly be explained save through a direct influence...I have therefore now inquired with Krøyer...whether Hammershøi has had occasion to see any painting by Whistler, or whether he has only been familiar with the etching from Whistler’s Mother in the *Gazette des Beaux Arts*. Probably the latter but no more, thought Krøyer. This entire matter thus acquires even greater interest.

In comparison with Hammershøi’s picture, *Whistler’s Mother* (fig.125; *Arrangement in Grey and Black No. 1. Portrait of the Painter’s Mother*, 1871) is positively ‘busy’, with its curtain, pictures on the wall, furniture and white lace additions. However, Aubert clearly noticed the attempt at the creation of a pictorial harmony using a highly-restricted palette, a lack of general ornamentation, and air of stillness and solitude. After Hammershøi’s death, his widow Ida had asserted that her husband had not been taught anything by Whistler. Certainly, Hammershøi would have gleaned little from the black-and-white engraving in the *Gazette des beaux-arts* published in 1883 (fig. 129) except subject matter and a sense of stark severity.

According to Karl Madsen, on a visit to Copenhagen the French critic Théodore Duret singled out *Portrait of a Young Woman* and *Young Girl Sewing* as ‘especially admirable and in a class superior to everything else he had seen of Danish art’, and recommended Hammershøi to Paris dealer Paul Durand-Ruel as a painter of the first rank.

---

528 Andreas Aubert, *Dagbladet*, Oslo, 1887, quoted in Vad, 1992, p. 414 n. 61.
530 *Gazette des Beaux-arts*, 28ème Année, 7ème Période, 2ème Tome, 1883, p. 10, as *Portrait de ma Mère*.
531 Karl Madsen quoted by Hanne Finsen in *Vilhelm Hammershøi: En retrospektiv udstilling*, p. 6.
An Old Woman

The earliest of Hammershøi’s four pictures for the Paris Exposition was An Old Woman (fig. 123; 1886), a portrait of the artist’s mother. The woman sits far to the left-hand-side of the canvas, a light source from the left emphasised by her illuminated face and the pale but substantial shadow that she casts. There are significant blocks of tone in the picture, but the grainy and irregular muted forms are far removed from the brightly-hued slabs of colour that, for example, Gauguin was to employ several years later. The portrayal of an old woman and a curtain in muted tones clearly evokes Whistler’s Mother, but again this is a far more austere and sparing depiction. In two other depictions of his mother in 1886, Hammershøi had employed Whistler’s horizontally-facing format, but in An Old Woman he uses a more frontal format, with the subject again avoiding the gaze of the viewer. Poul Vad has likened the woman in her voluminous black dress to ‘the image of a huge swinging bell’, an effect heightened by the shadow to the right of the sitter.

Several of the formal elements appear to have a purpose that is not immediately obvious. The slanting pale-brown skirting board that traverses the lower half of the composition provides an aid to anchoring the woman in position against the back wall; without this element she would float before it. The actual position of the woman, well to the left of the central axis, risks unbalancing the picture, so the artist employs a slender red curtain to provide a counterweight. Upon its exhibition at Charlottenborg in 1886, the large expanse of unadorned wall on the right of the picture provoked the critic of Dagens Nyheder to question:

why place her up against an utterly bare wall, which is more than twice as expansive as necessary and in its broad nudity can only give the picture a tedious character of desolation and blankness?

Poul Vad criticised this reviewer who had ‘not wanted, desired or been able to find any other answer than affectation’. Instead, the answer surely lies in Hammershøi’s determination to simplify as far as possible without causing a lack of pictorial cogency – hence the skirting board and curtain – and his belief that ‘the least emphasis has the

533 For example, The Artist’s Mother, Frederikke Hammershøi (1886; Private collection). See cat. 41 in Monrad et al., 2012, p. 63.
534 Vad, 1992, p. 60.
535 Anon., Dagens Nyheder, quoted in Vad, 1992, p. 73.
536 Vad, 1992, p. 73.
greatest impact’.\textsuperscript{537} Hammershøi was ‘seeking through the simplification of shape and colour to endow Naturalism with a new feel’,\textsuperscript{538} and Madsen described it as a ‘reaction to the bluff quality of Naturalism’.\textsuperscript{539} Where Krøyer had used light to clarify, Hammershøi was now using it less directly, as a filtering and more incidental agent, although scarcely less important to his work.

Hammershøi’s mother sits in splendid isolation, with no hint of the existence of another person in the room and a complete absence of narrative; nothing persuades us of something, or someone, hiding behind the red curtain in the manner of Ingres’s \textit{Paulo and Francesca} (fig. 174; 1819). It is this lack of narrative, or even a clue towards one, that led to the remark that Karl Madsen claimed to have overheard at Charlottenborg in 1886, where a spectator thought that the old woman looked as if she had been evicted from her apartment and was now ‘sitting out in the lobby meditating over the vagaries of fortune’.\textsuperscript{540} This story emphasises the public desire to impose a narrative, despite Hammershøi’s deliberate removal of all extraneous narrative elements, in direct opposition to the tradition in which he had been brought up. As Kasper Monrad says, ‘he painted genre pictures without any real genre content’.\textsuperscript{541}

Hammershøi’s type of pictures led critics to conside his close relationship with interior scenes from the Dutch seventeenth century. In addition to Rembrandt, painters such as Vermeer (b. 1632), Jan Steen (b. c.1626), and Pieter de Hooch (b. 1629) have all invited comparisons with Hammershøi, particularly in respect of depictions of domestic interiors. Naoki Sato devoted a chapter of the 2008 Royal Academy catalogue to this topic, with a particular emphasis on Pieter Janssens Elinga (b. 1623).\textsuperscript{542}

\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{537} Hansen in \textit{Vilhelm Hammershøi: En retrospektiv udstilling}, p. 16.
\item\textsuperscript{538} Monrad and Hornung, 2002, p. 29.
\item\textsuperscript{539} Karl Madsen, \textit{Politiken}, 4 June 1886, quoted in Ibid.
\item\textsuperscript{541} Kasper Monrad in Monrad et al., 2012, p. 14.
\end{itemize}
Fig. 123. Vilhelm Hammershøi, *An Old Woman*, 1886, Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 69.7 x 56.7cm.

Fig. 124. Gerard ter Borch, *Margaretha van Haexbergen (1614–1676)*, c.1666-67, Metropolitan Museum, New York, oil on canvas, 81.3 x 65.1cm.
However, one of the most pertinent criticisms occurred in the *Gazette des beaux-arts* review of the 1889 *Exposition* by Maurice Hamel. Many of the Danish artists at the *Exposition* (Anna Ancher, Michael Ancher, Johansen, Tuxen and Ring) were simply mentioned by name or in a solitary sentence in the article, with the obvious exception of Krøyer who garnered half a page. However, Hammershøi had obviously made an impression on the critic:

All those who have not gone beyond the horizon of the native school stay faithful to the spirit, the methods, the chiaroscuro of Holland, and in particular we recognise the influence of Terburg [Gerard ter Borch] and Van der Meer [Johannes Vermeer] in the studies of Hammershøi who seeks, by simplifying the touch, by releasing the abstract values of coloured matter, by blurring the contours in an amber-grey envelope, to place a mysterious transparency around his figures.543

---

543 Hamel, 1889, pp. 377-78.
Hamel's review is perceptive, because the painter to whom Hammershøi is closest in his rendition of *An Old Woman* is surely the Dutch artist Gerard ter Borch (1617-81). In the mid-seventeenth century, ter Borch painted a number of pictures of solitary women that foreshadow Hammershøi’s painting.\textsuperscript{544} In the example of *Margaretha van Haexbergen (1614–1676)* (fig. 124; c.1666-67), they share a floor and wall that is unpatterned and unadorned; both floor and wall are subject to variations in colour that result from the impact of diffused light. The figure is stark and wears a voluminous black dress, the only difference being a small quantity of jewellery. Like the Hammershøi picture, ter Borch’s woman is small in relation to her generous but stark surroundings, and equally the only mass of bright colour that offsets the dour setting is red, in this case a chair rather than a curtain. Hammershøi would have seen many examples of Dutch Golden Age painting in the galleries in his 1885 visit to Berlin, including works by Vermeer and Rembrandt, and a number by ter Borch such as *Paternal Admonition* (1654-65; Gemäldegalerie, Berlin). Ter Borch was also represented in Hammershøi’s other destination in 1885, Dresden.\textsuperscript{545} Hammershøi’s enthusiasm for these Dutch pictures is reflected in the extensive tour of the Low Countries that he undertook in 1887, the year after he painted *An Old Woman*. There were also Dutch pictures in the Royal Collection in Copenhagen, and Hammershøi may at some point have had access to study them.\textsuperscript{546}

Hammershøi’s picture was purchased by Heinrich Hirschsprung in the period 1886-88\textsuperscript{547} and, as we know, was certainly in his possession at the time of the 1889 Exposition. It remains to this day in the Hirschsprung Collection in Copenhagen.


\textsuperscript{545} *A Lady washing her Hands*, c.1655, Staatliche Kunstsammlungen, Dresden.

\textsuperscript{546} My thanks to Peter Nørgaard Larsen for informing me of this.

\textsuperscript{547} In *Vilhelm Hammershøi: En retrospektiv udstilling*, Ordrupgaard, Copenhagen, 1981, p. 164, it is stated that the picture was purchased in 1886 and resold to Heinrich Hirschsprung that same year. However, *The Hirschsprung Collection of Works by Danish Artists. Catalogue of Paintings and Sculpture*, p. 52, says that it was acquired in 1888.
Fig. 126. Vilhelm Hammershøi, *Young Girl Sewing, Anna Hammershøi, the Artist’s Sister*, 1887, Ordrupgaard, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 37 x 35cm.

Fig. 127. Nicolas Maes, *The Lacemaker*, c.1654-55, Museum Boijmans van Beuningen, Rotterdam, chalk on paper, 14.1 x 11.8cm.
**Young Girl Sewing**

In 1887, Hammershøi painted another picture of his sister, much smaller and more intimate than his three-quarter length portrait of two years previously, but no less controversial. Entitled *Young Girl Sewing. Anna Hammershøi, the Artist’s Sister* (fig. 126), it is a loosely-painted, close-up depiction of his sister in intense concentration. Unlike the previous picture of his mother, the figure occupies nearly half of the picture plane. Just as with *An Old Woman* there are clear correspondences with Dutch seventeenth-century painting, most notably Johannes Vermeer’s *The Lacemaker* (fig. 128; c.1669-70). Hammershøi’s work is one of his very smallest (37 x 35cm.), and Vermeer’s picture is actually his smallest known work, measuring only 24.5 x 21cm. Although Hammershøi’s tour of 1887 did not include Paris, we know from Krøyer that Hammershøi consulted the *Gazette des beaux-arts*, and would have surely seen the article on Vermeer in September 1883 that featured a full-page reproduction of Vermeer’s picture (fig. 129).\(^{548}\)

Hammershøi’s palette is particularly narrow in *Young Girl Sewing*, with grey, brown and white predominating. One hand is almost hidden, and even the minutiae of the sewing process are effectively hidden. As Kaspar Monrad has noted, the needlework is of minor importance; Hammershøi seems determined to remove as much pictorial content as possible, and in this respect he stands apart from his Danish contemporaries.\(^{549}\) In contrast, although Vermeer employed a plain background, he offsets this by using primary colours in the yellow of the girl’s dress, the dark blue of the cushion and the bright red of the thread. He also shows us the implements of the girl’s task, although the two pictures share the intensity of the girls’ concentration. It is also noteworthy that, in a significant number of places, Hammershøi has let the canvas become evident to the viewer, with the result that ‘its visible texture seems to become intermingled with the piece of material the girl is holding’.\(^{550}\) Additionally, the girl appears to be floating in front of the wall, with no sign of chair, floor or wall adornment. However, Hammershøi does achieve a three-dimensional effect, substantially because, as Poul Vad explains, ‘the light from the left contrapuntally engenders its dark counterpart in the right half of the face, and gives the head’s volume against the background a clearly defined plastic effect’.\(^{551}\) Vermeer also employs this technique with his *Lacemaker*, this time with the light source coming from the right.

---


\(^{549}\) Kasper Monrad in Monrad et al., 2012, p. 14.


\(^{551}\) Vad, 1992, p. 68.
Vermeer is also comparable with Hammershøi in their two similar works because of the soft-focus effects he achieves in parts of his picture. While not as indistinct or translucent as Hammershøi’s painting, the red and white threads in Vermeer’s work are far less in focus than the fingers and bobbins of his lacemaker. It has been strongly suggested that this was due to the use of a *camera obscura* in Vermeer’s modus operandi.\(^{552}\) Hammershøi’s picture feels less sophisticated, with looser brushwork and a less finished appearance. Any comparison between the two pictures needs to consider that, although Hammershøi saw further examples of Vermeer’s work on his trip to the Low Countries in 1887, he could not have seen *The Lacemaker* before he visited Paris in 1889. His observance of reproductions of *The Lacemaker*, exemplified by the *Gazette des beaux-arts* reproduction of September 1883 (fig. 129), would obviously have provided a much plainer and less distinct image for Hammershøi to consider, which may actually have suited his purpose.

---

\(^{552}\) For example, see Philip Steadman. *Vermeer’s Camera: Uncovering the truth behind the masterpieces* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp. 31 and 40.
The subject of the lacemaker, along with women performing other small intimate tasks such as reading or writing letters, or performing domestic duties, was a popular one with seventeenth-century Dutch artists. A number of artists had tackled the theme before Vermeer, such as Pieter Codde, Caspar Netscher, Jan Miense Molenaer, Gerrit Dou and Gabriel Metsu. One of the most prolific exponents of the theme was Nicolaes Maes, who painted at least five pictures of lacemakers and sewing women. In Maes’s pictures the protagonist only occupies a small proportion of the canvas area, but in the red chalk study (fig. 127), the sitter occupies a similar amount of area to Hammershøi’s picture, and is – with the exception of one hand – in a very similar pose. Note the dress cut off at exactly the same point, and the head tilted forward and outward from the body with the eyes covered. What is significant is that Hammershøi could have seen this drawing in his 1887 visit to Rotterdam and noted its affinity to the much-better-known Vermeer work. The pose, demeanour, mood and simplicity of the Maes drawing is certainly closer to Hammershøi’s picture than Vermeer’s.

Hammershøi did not attempt to exhibit Young Girl Sewing until the annual spring exhibition at Charlottenborg in 1888, where it received a similar fate as Portrait of a Young Woman, being rejected by the selection committee. However, the much larger and darker Job (1887; Hirschsprung Collection) was accepted. The further rejection of a work by Hammershøi added additional impetus to the demands for an independent jury. After Young Girl Sewing was shown at a later exhibition in 1888 of ‘refused work’ – also at Charlottenborg – it was purchased by Alfred Bramsen for DKK 200, and he was surely delighted when it won a bronze medal at the Exposition Universelle the following year. When it was shown at the 1891 Independent exhibition – an exhibition which its earlier rejection had helped to inspire – it was both praised and coveted by the important French critic Théodore Duret.

553 For representations of these pictures see Pictures and Quotes about Bobbin Lace, ‘Dutch Paintings’, http://gwydir.demon.co.uk/jo/lace/ref.htmNo. dutch, accessed 29 July 2013.
554 The drawing has been in the collection of what is now the Museum Boijmans van Beuningen since 1848: http://collectie.boijmans.nl/nl/work/MB%20199%20(PK), accessed 3 August 2013.
555 Lawrence Gowing suggests that if Vermeer ‘was particularly indebted to any one of [his predecessors] it was to Nicolaes Maes’ in respect of The Lacemaker. Lawrence Gowing, Vermeer (London: Faber and Faber, 1952), pp. 144-5.
Job

Job (1888; Hirschsprung Collection) is one of Hammershøi’s least discussed works, primarily because its poor physical condition has precluded its exhibition since the 1889 Exposition. Upon its display at Charlottenborg in 1888, it was already being described by the correspondent of Dagbladet as ‘a couple of hundred years old, with layers of darkened varnish’.\(^{558}\) Karl Madsen though that it was ‘the strangest picture ever painted in our cheerful country’,\(^{559}\) surpassing his earlier remark that Portrait of a Young Woman was the ‘strangest picture’ in the 1885 exhibition. Madsen clearly thought that Job, with its gloomy atmosphere and suffering human figure, was at odds with the Danish temperament, but this did not preclude him from buying the work. The picture, despite attempts to ‘recover’ it in the 1940s, is very indistinct today, the victim of ‘an unlucky chemical reaction in the pigments’.\(^{560}\) Perhaps, like Krøyer, Hammershøi had used bitumen in an attempt to create a darkened atmosphere, but this strategy clearly misfired. All that remains is the outline of a shape in the gloom, and a hand reaching into the only small area of light on the central left-hand side. Poul Vad describes the hand as ‘a specter’s hand, deformed and menacing’,\(^{561}\) and notes the totally rigidity of the figure and the phallic nature of the outstretched arm.\(^{562}\)

Vad’s observations are based on a number of studies that Hammershøi undertook for the work, particularly the charcoal sketch illustrated in fig. 130. This indicates that Hammershøi originally planned a more frontal figure rather than the figure that appears to turn away from the viewer in the final painting. According to Hammershøi’s mother, the artist spent some eighteen months working on the picture – presumably including his 1887 visit to Germany, Belgium and Holland – as opposed to the three year period that had been stated.\(^{563}\) This long, drawn-out process suggests an intense and sustained meditation on the nature of human suffering by Hammershøi. One can speculate on representations of Job by other artists that may have informed Hammershøi; Krøyer would certainly have mentioned Bonnat’s famous depiction of Job (1880; Musée Bonnat, Bayonne), a brightly-lit, Spanish-influenced, expressive, front-facing figure, in marked contrast to Hammershøi’s still and rigid human form encompassed in darkness.

\(^{560}\) Vad, 1992, p. 39.
\(^{561}\) Ibid., p. 40.
\(^{562}\) Ibid., pp. 40, 42.
Closer to home, Kristian Zahrtmann had painted *Job’s Comforters* (1887; Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen), a scene that was a literal representation of a passage from the Book of Job, and thus at the opposite end of the spectrum from Hammershøi’s exclusion of a motif suggestive of narrative content. Poul Vad rejects Georges de la Tour’s *Job being mocked by his wife* (c.1650; Musée Départemental d’Art, Epinal), another narrative picture which, despite the presence of an additional entity, is certainly closer to Hammershøi’s seated figure in composition.

However, it seems that these pictures were influential – if at all – in title only, because the work was only named after it was completed. Frederikke Hammershøi said that ‘Vilhelm has never thought that it should be a biblical picture’, and that Job had been chosen because it was ‘the best designation for a suffering human being’. Rather than trying to portray Job, Hammershøi had tried to represent a man immobilised by despair, and had then decided that Job was the best title, representing as it did a man who had undergone great torment. It may be that Hammershøi’s knowledge of Job’s suffering had been reinforced by artistic representations, and thus the title suggested itself to him but, as Vad points out, the title is an unfortunate one as it leads the viewer to search for a literary source such as that used by de la Tour and Zahrtmann.

Instead of looking for a corresponding painting as a source, we should consider the ‘Egyptian’ nature of the composition. In 1890, the painter J. F. Willumsen wrote to his fellow artist Johan Rohde: ‘are you enthusiastic over Hammershøi’s Job, is it not the model set up in the Egyptian pose...’ Vad discusses a study for the picture of a naked man in a more frontal Egyptian pose, but believes correctly that the raised arm in the final painting disrupts this notion of an Egyptian style.

---

566 Ibid., p. 43.
567 J. F. Willumsen to Johan Rohde, 8 December 1890, quoted in Ibid., pp. 42-43.
568 Ibid., p. 43.
However, there is a figure in Copenhagen that corresponds effectively with Hammershøi’s *Job*, particularly in the earlier studies like the charcoal figure of fig. 130, namely the statue of the Egyptian god Anubis that is now housed in the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek (fig. 131). This figure shares a passive rigidity with Hammershøi’s figure, is in a seated position, has a clenched right fist, and stares impassively ahead with blank eyes; such a source would certainly account for the remarked-upon stiffness in Hammershøi’s figure if he had this Egyptian statue in mind. Particularly similar to the charcoal study is the left hand of the statue, very large and flat as if compressed by a heavy weight. Carl Jacobsen had a large number of galleries at his ‘house-museum’ open to the public; around this time the sheer size of his collection led him to donate it to the state on condition that suitable premises could be found. It is difficult to believe that anyone with an interest in art in Copenhagen would not have visited Jacobsen’s prestigious collection, particularly as Hammershøi had a link through Krøyer, who knew the collector so well.
A Baker’s Shop

Perhaps the most radical work exhibited by Hammershøi at the 1889 Exposition was the only one then in his personal ownership. A Baker’s Shop (1889; fig. 132) was exhibited under the title Study (Étude) in 1889. Hammershøi intended the title to mean a considered representation rather than a preparatory sketch. In fact, he had completed a number of studies for his Study, before deciding upon a simplified format of horizontal bands of colour, interrupted by the presence of a female figure pictured from behind. In one preparatory picture, From a Bakery Shop (fig. 133; 1888), a woman reaches up to a top shelf, while another attends to something with her hands located just above a table. The two women are separated by a central overhead lamp. The basic content of bakery shelves, and a woman seen from behind and dressed in black with a hint of white apron, is established in this study. However, the final picture removes the second woman, table, lamp and upward-reaching gesture, in an act of simplification that leaves the emphasis on a picture composed of horizontal forms. Poul Vad describes this as the first use of the ‘plane-parallel compositional principle’ and enthuses that Hammershøi ‘brought it off with incredible daring and consistency’. This concept was expanded upon by Lena Boëthius who suggested that in Hammershøi’s Study ‘one could even think of modern artists like Mondrian or Rothko’, and by David Jackson, who proposed affinities with Malevich. Certainly these later artists spring to mind when observing the large block of colour that inhabits the bottom half of the picture; Vad describes this ‘nearly deep black counter’ as ‘pure inertia, stopped time’, giving the form a temporal as well as physical entity.

Another study, Study of a Woman (1888), shows what appears to be the same woman as in A Baker’s Shop in front of a table with a chair at far-right. A significant section of white apron is shown over her black dress on her right side, as well as a white apron cord around her middle and the suggestion of an apron on her left. In the final picture the large section of white apron disappears completely, and the apron is merely hinted at by a glint of cord around her middle and another brief white line on her left. Despite this minimisation, the hints of white add a three-dimensional bulk to the figure. In comparison with the study, the final human form is much reduced as a proportion of the picture plane, echoing Hammershøi’s earlier work An Old Woman.
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Fig. 132. Vilhelm Hammershøi, *A Baker’s Shop (Studie (Bagerbutik)*), 1889, Vejen Kunstmuseum, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown.

Fig. 133. Vilhelm Hammershøi, *From a Bakery Shop*, 1888, Schleswig-Holsteinische Landesmuseum, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown.
The figure in the final picture, described by Vad as a ‘ponderously sculptural woman’s figure’ appears too large to be Anna Hammershøi and too young to be her mother.\textsuperscript{574} The girl appears almost squashed between the table and counter and her baking accoutrements are as minimal as her features.\textsuperscript{575} The rear view of the figure again recalls the portrayal of women in pictures by Gerard ter Borch and other artists of the Dutch Golden Age, and also the Rückenfiguren of Caspar David Friedrich, whose revival in Norway was being championed around this time by Andreas Aubert.

In conclusion, Hammershøi has taken a scene that at least hints at a narrative element, and has then reduced it – in the manner of a chef – until only the concentrated essence of his original concept remains. The picture is not about the preparation and sale of bread, but a study of light and form.

\textsuperscript{574} Vad, 1992, p. 63.
\textsuperscript{575} Hanne Westergaard in Dreams of a Summer Night, 1986, p. 124.
CHAPTER FOUR: The Impact of Nordic Women Artists

Three Scandinavian women were given recognition at the Paris Salon in the period 1878-1889. Harriet Backer was awarded an Honourable Mention at the 1880 Salon with Solitude (1880; fig. 137). Bertha Wegmann achieved the same award the following year with Portrait de Mlle J. B... (fig. 145, Portrait of Jeanna Bauck), and in 1882 was awarded a third-class medal for Portrait de Ma Soeur (fig. 146, Madam Seekamp, the Artist’s Sister). In 1887, Emma Löwstädt-Chadwick also achieved an Honourable Mention for Five O’Clock (fig. 196, untraced). Because Löwstädt-Chadwick took a very different path from Backer and Wegmann – who both went to Munich then Paris – I will consider her separately in Chapter Five. In addition to Backer and Wegmann, I propose to consider two other closely-related artists. Firstly, Backer’s long-term painting companion Kitty Lange Kielland, who exhibited eight times at the Salon between 1879 and 1889, more than any other Nordic female artist. Secondly, Wegmann’s friend, housemate and painting companion Jeanna Bauck who, although less successful as an artist, was important for Wegmann in her early years in Paris as both a model and fellow painter.

All of the artists under consideration were born in the 1840s – Bauck (b. 1840), Kielland (b. 1843), Backer (b. 1845), Wegmann (b. 1847) – and studied in Munich. Like Erik Werenskiold and other Nordic male artists, the city provided a firm initial basis for artistic study. The Swedish artist Jeanna Bauck went to Germany to study in 1863, eventually arriving in Munich, where the Swiss-born Dane, Bertha Wegmann, was to join her in 1867. Like Erik Werenskiold, Bertha Wegmann was tutored by Wilhelm von Lindenschmit, although this must have been unofficial because women were not admitted to the Munich Academy. Both Bauck and Wegmann would have seen the Barbizon School works exhibited at the International Exhibition in Munich in 1869 – Corot, Rousseau, Courbet, Daubigny – and been aware that tutors like von Lindenschmit admired their work.

Just prior to the 1869 exhibition, Adolf Lier (1826-82) had begun a private school of landscape painting in Dresden. Lier had been to Paris in the 1860s where he had greatly admired the Barbizon School, and was personally responsible for inviting a
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number of French artists to the Munich exhibition, where he himself exhibited. A pupil at Lier’s landscape school was Hermann Baisch (1846-94), himself a keen advocate of the Barbizon School, but who had also studied seventeenth-century Dutch landscapes. A fusion of these two influences led Baisch to produce pale-tinted landscapes, often populated by strikingly-marked cattle in the foreground. Lier closed his academy in 1873 due to ill-health, and this may have precipitated Baisch’s move to Munich, where he later became tutor to Kitty Kielland.

An important arrival in Munich was that of Eilif Peterssen, who registered at the Academy in October 1873, just after his twenty-first birthday. Peterssen had initially gone to Karlsruhe, which tended to attract Norwegian artists due to the presence of the much-respected professor and landscape painter Hans Gude. Peterssen left for Munich around the same time that Kitty Kielland arrived in Karlsruhe to study landscape with Gude. It seems likely that Peterssen moved to Munich because his concerns at this time were with history painting rather than landscape, and his appointed tutor at the Munich Academy was Wilhelm von Diez, a painter of bucolic historical scenes. However, the evidence of Peterssen’s most successful early work, the melodramatic *Christian II signing the Death Warrant of Torben Oxe* (1875-76; fig. 170), suggests that he identified more closely with the Protestant ‘specific event’ historical painting of the Munich tutors Karl von Piloty and Wilhelm von Lindenschmit; for example, Piloty’s *Seni before the body of Wallenstein* (1855) and Lindenschmit’s *Ulrich Von Hutten* (1869; fig. 2). Peterssen, despite his youth, was clearly a gifted artist, and was happy to share his knowledge – and earn some money – by tutoring the women artists excluded from the Academy. In 1874, Harriet Bauck arrived in Munich to receive private tuition from Lambert Linder and then study under Peterssen. She was joined in Munich the following year by Kitty Kielland. Thus by 1875, Bauck, Wegmann, Backer and Kielland were all based in Munich.
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579 A good example of the Dutch genre is Aelbert Cuyp’s *Landscape near Rhenen: Cows Grazing and a Shepherd playing the Flute* (c.1650-55), which Baisch would have seen in the Louvre on his study trips to Paris.
582 Munich Academy Matriculation Book 1841-1884.
The Swedish Bauck and Danish Wegmann shared accommodation in Munich, as did the two Norwegians Backer and Kielland. The former pair were long-established in Munich by the time the Norwegians arrived, and I find no evidence that they interacted artistically with Backer and Kielland, or that they were taught by Peterssen. In fact, Wegmann also supplemented her income in Munich by teaching. Backer and Kielland, and Bauck and Wegmann, later shared respective accommodation in Paris, and it is easy to see the reasons behind this. These women could support each other artistically, financially and emotionally, where their status as women artists in a predominantly male milieu – and the threat of financial hardship – was often problematic. They could share accommodation that doubled up as both living quarters and studio space, thus keeping expenditure to a minimum. Additionally, they could pose as models for each other; Bertha Wegmann painted Jeanna Bauck some twenty times leading to great success in Paris. An early example of the converse arrangement can be seen in figure 134 below:

Fig. 134. Jeanna Bauck, *The Danish Artist Bertha Wegmann painting a Portrait*, late 1870s, Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, oil on canvas, 100 x 110cm.
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In Bauck’s picture, she skilfully makes Wegmann the protagonist, emphasising her dexterity and concentration at the easel and illuminating her with light from the window on the right. In contrast, the male sitter is rigid in his pose and his torso is dark in colouration and recedes to the back of the picture. There are a number of clues here to the way that the two artists endeavoured to keep their studio/accommodation as comfortable as they were able, and to their chosen profession. Clockwise from the left, there is a large folder that contains drawings and sketches, a Japanese parasol, a plaster bust, plants and flowers, a bottle of wine, and a box that appears to contain tubes of paint. The duality of a living and painting space is perfectly illustrated here.

Harriet Backer was taught by Peterssen in Munich from 1874-78, and we know that she also attended life classes in the evening, organised by the Academy.\(^{586}\) Meanwhile in Karlsruhe, Kielland expressed the difficulties of attending a life class. In a letter to Peterssen written in January 1874, she described how she and three other female ‘determined creators’ attended a Saturday morning class, ‘sitting amongst the men and drawing from the model. The men expressed great surprise at our good behaviour, what they thought we might do, is completely beyond my comprehension’.\(^{587}\) During her spell in Karlsruhe, Kielland assimilated Hans Gude’s approach to plein-air painting, exemplified by *The Big Rock* (1874; Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo) in which she depicted a wooden rowing boat moored next to a large, solid piece of rock, itself framed by a small-leafed tree. The overall tone is muted and atmospheric, with rolling grey clouds washing over a mountainous background. The picture may have been inspired by Gude’s more dramatic *Thunderstorm Study* (1873; *Tordenveirsstudie*) of the previous year, in which her tutor depicts a rowing boat on a stormy sea in front of a huge slab of rock. The significant difference between tutor and pupil is that Kielland’s picture is unpopulated.

Kielland came to Munich in 1875, the same year that another significant Norwegian woman painter, Asta Nørregaard, arrived to study with Peterssen.\(^{588}\) Kielland stayed for three years, but unlike Backer and Nørregaard, any tuition she received from Peterssen was on an informal basis. As did so many Nordic artists in Germany and Paris, Kielland took advantage of the long summer holidays to return to Scandinavia to find motifs to which she could apply the tuition that she had received. Kielland concentrated on the countryside of Jæren, a rural area accessible from her family home in Stavanger. In

\(^{586}\) Valmestad, p. 32; Bonsdorff, p. 292.

\(^{587}\) Kitty Kielland to Eilif Peterssen, 30 January 1874 quoted in Valmestad, 1990, p. 36.

1877, she painted *Peat Bogs at Lagjæren*, and returned to the area again the following summer in the company of Frits Thaulow.\(^{589}\) *En plein air* painting at Jæren was not without its problems. In the summer of 1878, she wrote to Eilif Peterssen:

> It is a fight and a struggle with that violent wind, which blows sand into your head and through your eyes and ears, lands in all the colours in my palette and last but not least, covers up the entire work. I get so irritated that I scream out with all my might and the wind answers me with clouds of sand and powerful dust storms.\(^{590}\)

In 1879, Kielland rejoined her compatriot Harriet Backer to live permanently in Paris, Backer having enrolled at the Académie Trélat in the autumn of 1878.\(^{591}\) Although unrepresented at the 1878 *Exposition Universelle*, both women would have celebrated the success of their Munich-based Norwegian friends Hans Heyerdahl, whose *Adam and Eve* (fig. 4) gained him a third-class medal, and particularly Eilif Peterssen whose *Judas Iscariot* (fig. 172) won a second-class medal. Although Kielland was a few months later than Backer in settling in Paris, she was the first to be accepted for the *Salon*, debuting in 1879 with *Jæren, in Norway* and *Norwegian Coast*.\(^{592}\) A study for one of these two works, titled *View of Ogna, Jæren* (fig. 135, 1878), shows a rock-strewn stream emptying itself between giant boulders into a dark blue sea. Marit Lange asserts that the *Salon* picture based on this study ‘still bear[s] the hallmark of Gude and his Realism’.\(^{593}\) In the study, Kielland appears to demonstrate a more painterly style, one that is less dependent on signifiers of Norwegian life and landscape: rowing boat, large rock, picturesque tree. She appears to have rejected the Romantic realism of Gude, and replaced it with a starker, less rigid realism that did not shy away from an austere landscape without significant props (the sheep, bottom right, are almost camouflaged by the background). It is a move away from the darker tones of the Munich school and towards a fresher palette. However, Kielland never lost her admiration for the work of Gude and his depictions of landscape in which water – river, lake and sea – was a significant feature.\(^{594}\)
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590 Kitty Kielland to Eilif Peterssen, summer 1878, quoted in Valmestad, 1990, p. 36.
592 No. 1691 *De Jaedderen, en Norwége*, No. 1692 *De la cote de Norwége*.
593 Marit Lange in Gunnarsson, 2006, p. 283.
594 Email Marit Lange to Jan Cox, 1 February 2015.
Fig. 135. Kitty Kielland, *View of Ogna, Jæren*, 1878, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 40 x 65.5cm.

Fig. 136. Harriet Backer, *The Departure (Avskjeden)*, 1878, Norwegian National Gallery, oil on canvas, 81.5 x 99cm.
Meanwhile, prior to leaving Munich in 1878, Harriet Backer spent a long time producing a composition entitled \textit{The Departure} (fig. 136), a photograph of which she used as her entry picture to Mme Trélat’s academy.\textsuperscript{595} This picture, with its clearly-delineated figures in a compact interior, intensity of expression, and clothing of red, black and blue, appears redolent of the work of Wilhelm Leibl, who had painted his \textit{Village Politicians} (fig. 5) the previous year. \textit{The Departure} is a clear indication of Backer’s skill. This emotionally-charged work, with echoes of the theme of Tidemand’s \textit{The Youngest Son’s Farewell} (fig. 38), has been assembled by Backer to showcase her ability to capture tiny details, such as the gleam of the gold-coloured coffee urn and the small metal studs in the chair back. The dark clothes, furniture and fittings all profess its Munich origins. Backer apparently found the fees at Mme Trélat’s too high for her meagre budget, but her skills were so apparent to the professors who, after seeing the photograph ‘asked her to execute a charcoal drawing of a life-size nude,’ and she was then awarded an assisted scholarship place.\textsuperscript{596} The tutors who came to Mme Trélat’s to ‘correct’ the students’ work were a highly prestigious triumvirate of French artists, primarily Léon Bonnat and Jean-Léon Gérôme, plus Jules Bastien-Lepage,\textsuperscript{597} but any input the latter provided is little remarked upon by the Scandinavian artists, perhaps because he only corrected Backer, Nørregard and Wegmann for one term each.\textsuperscript{598} In a letter written in 1880, the Swedish artist Johan Ericson stated that Bonnat had ‘mentioned his surprise that there are so many talented women in the Nordic countries; he has never before seen women possessing so solid a basic training...there must be a very good Academy and excellent teachers there’.\textsuperscript{599} In fact, these artists had received their most important training in Munich, where the emphasis on the academic traditions of firm outline and clear detail, based on drawing from the life, would have met with Bonnat’s approval.

Bonmat was by far the most important tutor as far as Backer was concerned. Kitty Kielland wrote to Peterssen in 1879 that ‘Harriet ...receives daily support from her teachers who ensure that she makes very good progress’\textsuperscript{600} and Harriet herself wrote to Peterssen four days later: ‘Bonmat gives a lot of praise, always points out what is good in a study, and recommends that one continue in the same direction, meanwhile,

\textsuperscript{595} Challons-Lipton, 1998, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{596} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{597} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{598} Anna Wichstrøm, ‘Asta Nørregaard: Aspects of Professionalism’, \textit{Woman’s Art Journal}, Vol. 23, No. 1, Spring/Summer, 2002, p. 3; Backer and Nørregaard were taught by Bastien-Lepage in the spring term of 1880; Wegmann in the autumn term of 1880.
\textsuperscript{600} Kitty Kielland to Ellif Peterssen, 12 March 1879, quoted in Ibid. p. 107.
Gérôme screams and scolds’. In the same letter, Backer was happy to report that Bonnat had said ‘Mlle Backer is very well organised for painting. She is a born painter. Her efforts should be encouraged and she should be given the means to continue her studies in Paris. She will one day honour her country’. The respect was mutual as later that year Backer reported that ‘my work is going quite well, only because both Gérôme and Bonnat have been ruthlessly strict with me’, and added that ‘studying under Bonnat ‘was the best thing I could have done here, even if I had enough money to work independently’. Kielland had been the first to exhibit at the Salon, but it was Backer who was to achieve success there, receiving an Honourable Mention in 1880 for her picture Solitude (fig. 137). Bonnat’s philosophy of ‘First the composition, then the mood. First the shape, then the colour...Seek value, seek simplicity’ was encapsulated in Backer’s painting. Backer had first begun her composition when based in Munich, travelling to Schliersee in the mountains south of Munich, where she produced a composition that was lit – like so many of her later works – by light from a window at the side of the picture.

Deliberately depicting an old interior, the ingress of light from the large window allowed Backer to offset the ‘Munich’ browns and blacks with freshly whitewashed walls and window surround, and an ochre-coloured floor. The eye is drawn to the brightly-coloured devotional object in the cupboard on the far wall, which provides a contrast to the generally sombre tones of the picture. The version of the picture exhibited at the Salon includes a figure – at the behest of Bonnat – which the original composition did not. The pensive woman at the table adds psychological depth and drama to the work; Backer wrote in her autobiography:

A Norwegian lady was kind enough to model. I borrowed a black medieval-like costume from Eilif Peterssen and bought a lace pillow in an antique shop down by the quay. So came the lacemaker into the picture, which was named ‘Solitude’.
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Fig. 137. Harriet Backer, *Solitude*, 1880, private collection, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown.

Fig. 138. Cornelis Bisschop, *The Apple Peeler (Girl peeling an Apple)*, 1667, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown.
Backer’s success at the *Salon* may also have been aided by the Bonnat connection; we know from his dealings with Krøyer that he had contacts with the *Salon* jury. Her work was reproduced in the *Gazette des beaux-arts*, and reviewed favourably in the magazine by the eminent writer, curator and art historian Philippe de Chennevières, who described:

> a dreamy young woman abandoning her lacework in a very well portrayed Norwegian interior and whose brilliant atmosphere recalls that of the painting of Mr. Bisschop.\(^{607}\)

Chennevières was clearly unaware that it was a German rather than Norwegian interior, but was manifestly praising Backer’s work by comparing it with Dutch Golden Age artist Cornelis Bisschop (1630-74). Bisschop had painted several pictures of thoughtful-looking women, but it seems likely that he had in mind Bisschop’s Vermeer-esque picture *The Apple Peeler* (1667; fig. 138) from the Rijksmuseum: Both feature a woman occupied with a small task looking downward and deep in thought, with an emphasis on the light coming in from a good-sized window, and with an additional squared window feature revealing objects behind, towards the top right. There is a shared air of peaceful contemplation.

The following year, Backer submitted *L’Andante* (1881; Stavanger Art Museum) to the *Salon*, in which she surprisingly returned to the dark browns of the Munich school. The only concession to colour is the vivid red dress of a pianist who sits at her instrument in front of a wall of Old Master paintings. However, these paintings on the wall appear glazed with the same brown varnish that permeates the furniture, piano and flooring. The only concession to light is a small patch on the left-hand-side, where a tapestry is pulled up over a doorway to reveal a small window(s) at the very back of this picture. It is hard to agree with Sasha Newman and Tone Skedsmo who state that *Andante* initiated ‘a lifelong involvement with the study of daylight penetrating into and defining interior spaces’,\(^{608}\) as *Solitude*, from a year earlier and with far greater daylight penetration, was surely that picture.

*Andante* did not win any recognition from the *Salon*. Backer herself felt that the slightly pretentious title – a musical term meaning a moderately slow tempo – was caused by her being still under the Munich influence, and that she would have chosen a simpler
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\(^{607}\) de Chennevières, 'Le Salon de 1880', 1880, p. 66.

name if it had been later in her career. She was surely also influenced by Eilif Peterssen, who had titled a picture *Andante. Høstkveld ved Ask* (*Andante. Autumn Evening in Ask*; Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo) in 1879. As mentioned above, the tone is also redolent of Munich. What makes Backer’s picture even more surprising in its dark tones is that it is based on the much brighter ‘Room of the White Queen’ at the Musée de Cluny in Paris. The theme for her picture may have occurred to Backer because her younger sister Agathe was an international concert pianist and composer with whom Harriet had toured in earlier years.

Like Backer, Jeanna Bauck was also from a musical family – her father (Carl) Wilhelm Bauck was a composer and writer on music, and her sister a pianist also. After arriving in Paris in 1879, Bauck debuted at the *Salon* the following year with *Summer Evening in Sweden* (fig. 139; 1880). Bauck’s picture is a bright landscape of detailed vegetation that recalls the willow tree landscapes of Corot (fig. 8), but Bauck’s picture is far ‘busier’ than a Barbizon composition, suggestive of a highly fecund landscape, with an atmosphere that contrasts starkly with one of Kielland’s two entries for the *Salon* that same year.
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611 No. 180 *Soir d’été en Suède* – See also Dobiaschofsky, ‘Bauck, Jeanna Maria Charlotta – Soir d’été’.
http://www.dobiaschofsky.com/?a=g7111167&p=1&search_k=BAUCK,%20JEANNA%20MARIA%20CHARLOTTA&auktion=A116&top=7112167& memo=&lot=10414, accessed 9 May 2014; The picture is signed [18]80 Paris. It is a sad reflection of Bauck’s lack of recognition that the estimate price in May 2013 for this significant work was only CHF 5,000, about £3,500.
Kielland’s picture was *Peat Bogs* (fig. 140; 1880), exhibited at the *Salon* under the title of *A Sombre Day in Norway*.\(^{612}\) Kielland was described in the *Salon* catalogue at this time as a pupil of Gude, but unlike Backer, she did not study at an Academy. Harriet Backer wrote to Eilif Peterssen in June 1879 that ‘Kitty decided to travel to Pelouse in Cernay and has now begun on two paintings directly from nature under his direction’\(^{613}\). Although Backer and Kielland lived and painted together in Munich and Paris, their shared arrangements did not extend to tuition. Kielland did not receive formal tuition from Peterssen in Munich – as Backer did – but later letters reveal that they were in regular communication with each other to discuss art. Similarly, although Backer and Asta Nørregaard both enrolled at Mme Trélat de Lavigne’s in Paris, Kielland did not. Her interest was in landscape rather than figure painting, although she did attend anatomy classes at the Académie Colarossi.\(^{614}\) However, we know Kielland saw merit in the teaching at Trélat’s, writing that because of her training there, Backer’s work showed ‘much more boldness and deliberation’.\(^{615}\) Nørregaard only stayed at Trélat’s for one year (1879-80), which may have been due to financial reasons.\(^{616}\)
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\(^{612}\) No. 2005 *Un jour sombre en Norwége*.


\(^{614}\) Thanks to Marit Lange for pointing this out.


Léon Germain Pelouse (1838-91) was a painter well known to P. S. Krøyer among other Nordic artists. He had debuted at the Salon in 1865, and was awarded a medal at the 1874 Salon with Valley of Cernay, and the Legion d’Honneur following the 1878 Exposition Universelle. He had spent time in Brittany, but from the spring of 1879, he and his family were based at Cernay-la-Ville, a small artists’ colony south-west of Paris, which both Erik Werenskiold and P. S. Krøyer visited, almost certainly to see Pelouse. Torsten Gunnarsson expresses the view that in Peat Bog Kielland achieves ‘both drama and monumentality, mainly through her vivid painting of the sky’. He adds later that Kielland’s ‘advanced’ technique was due to the way in which Pelouse had taught her ‘to retain something of the character of the first sketch in the finished painting’. This is interesting because there is a great deal of concordance between Peat Bog and one of Pelouse’s two Salon entries for 1880, Rocky Coast at Concarneau (fig. 141). Marianne Saabye’s description of Pelouse’s painting – ‘no figures, no pandering to the picturesque, but a realism full of fresh air and light’ – could apply equally to Kielland’s picture. They both share a large, brooding sky and a firm horizon line that divides the picture across the middle. They also share the feeling that the viewer is looking far into the distance, above a bleak and desolate terrain in the foreground. Thanks to his reputation, Pelouse would have had his pictures far better placed at the Salon than Kielland. The Danish artist Christian Zacho commented that many of ‘the gang from Brittany’ had ‘their pictures […] very well placed, Pelouse of course above all’.
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617 Saabye, Krøyer, p. 486. Saabye dates Kielland’s pupillage with Pelouse from the spring of 1880, but Eilif Peterssen’s letter of June 1879 informs us that it began in the summer of 1879.
619 Saabye, Krøyer, pp. 33-47.
621 Ibid., p.158.
622 No. 2925 Banc de rochers à Concarneau.
623 Saabye, Krøyer, p. 45.
Fig. 140. Kitty Kielland, *Peat Bogs (Torvmyr)*, 1880, private collection, oil on canvas, 120 x 133cm.

Fig. 141. Léon-Germain Pelouse, *Rocky Coast at Concarneau*, 1880, Musée des Beaux Arts, Brest, oil on canvas, 132 x 171cm.
Kielland was perhaps not yet fully part of that ‘gang’, but must have joined in 1880, judging by the title of her Breton depiction at the 1881 Salon (see below). From his base at Cernay, Pelouse ‘travelled with a small flock every summer to various places in Brittany’.625 Kielland had already painted en plein air at Jaeren in Norway; much later in her career she was to describe what conditions were like to paint there:

I had a two metre canvas that I was working on; it was firmly lodged in its case; the tornado caught it and whirled it upside-down in the air. The painting was saved by falling out and landing in a brook – the very brook that was in the painting.626

Certainly, Kielland is able to transform a scene of desolation into a landscape picture that leads the eye to the distant horizon, before we appreciate the contrast of large, rolling, grey and cream-coloured clouds set above a marshy close-cropped terrain, pock-marked with mirrors of torpid water that reflect the sky. Kitty’s brother, the writer Alexander Kielland, had written a short story entitled Torvmyr (Peat Bog), published in Ude og Hjemme in December 1879 and based on one of his sister’s preparatory drawings.627 Alexander uses the device of a raven that soars above the peat marshes and decries man’s inability to leave nature alone. That is not to say that Kielland was not capable of capturing a much brighter tone, as Bauck had clearly done. In the same year, Kielland painted Flowering Trees in Cernay (fig. 142; 1880), and there is a pronounced contrast between this French depiction and the Norwegian scene of Peat Bog. Just like Gunnarsson with Peat Bog, Challons-Lipton sees the influence of Pelouse in Flowering Trees, in the building up of the image ‘layer by layer’.628

She also discerns the free handling and loose delineation of Corot in the late 1860s and early 1870s,629 though it appears that Kielland’s work possesses a brightness and clarity of foliage that mark it apart from Corot. At this juncture, it seems reasonable to propose that whereas Kielland had an affinity with the area of Jaeren near her home city that she knew so well, the Cernay picture has a more academic feel to it.

625 Saabye, Ibid., p. 38.
627 Gunnarsson, 1998, p. 157. Also Kent, p. 121, where the author wrongly attributes the name ‘Abroad and at Home’ to Kitty’s drawing rather than the magazine Ude og Hjemme.
629 Ibid.
Fig. 142. Kitty Kielland, *Flowering Tree in Cernay (Blomstrende Tre i Cernay)*, 1880, private collection, oil on canvas, 47 x 57cm.
Fig. 143. Kitty Kielland, *Washing-Place in Brittany* (*Vaskeplass I Bretgane*), 1882, private collection, oil on canvas, 53 x 87cm.

Fig. 144. Léon Pelouse, *A Washing Place, Morning in Brittany* (*Un Lavoir, le Matin, en Bretagne*), 1869, oil on canvas, Musée des Beaux-arts de Nantes, 176 x 220cm.
Kielland had been to Douarnenez in Brittany in 1880, and her picture for the Salon of 1881 was a composition entitled *Douarnenez Wood (Finistère).* The fishing port of Douarnenez was one of the many Breton locations at which Pelouse painted. The following year, Kielland painted *Washing-Place in Brittany* (fig. 143; 1882) in which she depicts vivid gold, red, yellow and green vegetation that acts as a foil to the dark tree trunks and sombrelly-clad figures. The subject matter is a clear reference to Pelouse’s 1869 Salon entry *A Washing Place, Morning, Brittany* (fig. 144), both featuring women doing their washing in an oval-shaped pool at the very start of the day. While Pelouse’s time of day is explicit in the title, Kielland cleverly uses shadow on the pale green field (left) to indicate a low morning sun streaming down the valley from the right. Kielland met Jules Breton in her 1880 trip, and Kielland’s picture certainly has echoes of Breton’s depiction of French working women. Breton, who had begun painting at Douarnenez in 1865, submitted *Washerwomen of the Brittany Coast* to the Salon in 1870, the year after Pelouse’s picture, but had previously depicted Breton women washing clothes in pools in *A Spring on the Seashore* (1866), exhibited at the 1867 *Exposition Universelle.*

Interestingly, *Washerwomen* came up for auction in 2009 and was acquired for the same Grohmann Collection ‘Man at Work’ compilation in Milwaukee that holds one version of Krøyer’s *Smiths at Hornbæk* (fig. 65). As the titles inform us, both Jules Breton’s pictures are coastal scenes, whereas Kielland and Pelouse share an inland Brittany setting, almost certainly near the architecturally-picturesque inland town of Rochefort-en-Terre, where Kielland, Backer and Pelouse stayed from June 1881 to March 1882. Kielland painted both *Wheatfield at Rochefort* (1881; *Kornåker i Rochefort*, private collection) and – her only picture at the 1882 Salon – *View of Rochefort.* She was described in the Salon catalogue as a pupil of both Hans Gude and Léon Pelouse.

---

630 No. 1250 *Le Bois de Douarnenez (Finistère).*
631 No. 1892.
633 No. 375. Breton was not from Brittany, but is believed to have had Breton ancestry.
634 No. 1458 *Vue de Rochefort.*
Wheatfield at Rochefort depicts the small figure of a woman sitting in front of a high field of wheat, with trees dotted among the crop, and a long line of trees, top right, that give the work a sense of depth and recession. The small figure, and the vegetation (wheat, grass, trees) that covers three-quarters of the canvas, are in opposition to works like Bastien-Lepage’s The Haymakers (1877; fig. 49a), shown at the Salon of 1878, and featuring a proportionately large female figure and an otherworldly atmosphere missing entirely from Kielland’s sunny picture. Similarly, there is no hint of the monumentality of the female protagonist in Breton’s The Gleaner of 1877 (fig. 12). In complete contrast, Harriet Backer, working slowly as ever, painted four pictures of interiors in Brittany. One of these works, Interior from Brittany (1881-82; Royal Collection, Oslo), was her sole entry at the 1882 Salon.635

If the 1881 Salon did not provide success for Backer and Kielland, it marked a glorious debut for Bertha Wegmann who – as the more French-sounding Berthe Vegman – exhibited Portrait de Mlle J. B. (fig. 145) to great effect, garnering an Honourable Mention at her first attempt. Wegmann was studying at the Académie Trélat at this time. She had arrived there for the year 1880-81 just as Backer and Nørregaard left, but her study period did correspond with seven other Nordic women artists, most notably Helene Schjerfbeck.636 Wegmann gave her address in the Salon catalogue as 27 Rue des Feuillantines, the house of the Socialist theorist Georg Gerson Trier, who was at this time working for a Danish trading house in Paris. Trier’s mother was Cecilie Melchior, whose family had long-term contact with Wegmann – two of Wegmann’s four pictures at the 1889 Exposition Universelle were lent by the Melchior family. Cecilie’s brother Moritz Gerson Melchior (1816-84) was a patron of the arts and both commissioned and appeared in From a Roman Osteria (1866; Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen), painted by Carl Bloch. Moritz also provided funding for Wegmann when she was a student in Munich.637 The Melchiors had been close friends with Hans Christian Andersen, who had died in 1875 when a guest at one of their properties.

635 No. 86 Intérieur Breton.
Fig. 145, Bertha Wegmann, *Jeanna Bauck, The Artist*, 1881, Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, oil on canvas, 106 x 85cm.

Fig. 146, Bertha Wegmann, *Madam Seekamp, the Artist’s Sister (Portrait de ma soeur)*, 1882, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 109 x 100.5cm.
Wegmann’s fine portrait of her fellow artist Jeanna Bauck shows the Swede in her *atelier*, her profession indicated by the large-scale palette and brushes complete with attendant rags. She is lit from above and behind and the light animates the fine strands of her hair and her dark clothing. She is adorned by gold-coloured jewellery, including a gold locket on a chain and a gold ring on her left hand. Bauck stares directly at the viewer, confident and assured, and full of a calm intelligence indicated by the book she clasps. The figure is propelled towards us from a neutral background, reminiscent of Hammershøi’s technique, and the indoor vegetation helps to frame the head of the figure. The well-observed sombre clothing is offset by the display of white at collar and cuffs.

One view of the portrayal of Jeanna Bauck is that ‘the portrait emits energy, willpower and sensuality, with the play of the light in the unruly locks and the ivy growing wild by the window’, while Anna Lena Lindberg considers that it was ‘thematically radical in its rendering of a woman in her newly-won professional role’. Certainly, Jeanna Bauck appears as self-assured as any Nordic painter in Paris; there were around 150 Nordic women artists in the city in the 1880s. It is informative to consider other award-winning pictures at the *Salon*. In a year when no first class medals were awarded, three of the thirteen second class medals were won by Alfred Gillou, Édouard Manet and John Singer Sargent. Gillou was one of the ‘Gang from Brittany’, well-known to both Pelouse and Krøye. He was born in Concarneau and won his award for depictions of his native town. Manet and Sargent are more pertinent, in that their entries were portraits. It seems likely that Manet’s award had more to do with a belated recognition by the *Salon*, as he was in poor health by this time. His portraits of Henri Rochefort – politician and founder of *L’Intransigeant* – and a somewhat hackneyed picture of a M. Pertuiset posing in front of a dead lion, are far removed from his powerful works of the 1860s. However, Bonnat had introduced Wegmann to the work of Manet, and there are echoes in Wegmann’s picture of Manet’s *Berthe Morisot au bouquet de violette* (1872; Musée d’Orsay). Both pictures feature a portrayal of a female artist, left cheek illuminated by a light source, dressed in black and staring confidently at the viewer, although we do not know if Wegmann saw this specific work.

640 Wichstrøm quoted in Ibid., p. 75, n. 15.
641 No. 1076 & No. 1077
In contrast to Manet, Sargent was a rising star in Paris, and at the salon he exhibited a portrait of Amalia Subercaseaux (fig. 147), wife of a Chilean diplomat, and the sister-in-law of Picasso’s future patron, Eugenia Errazuriz. Just like Wegmann’s portrait, it shows a strong and confident woman engaging directly with the viewer, albeit in more opulent surroundings. A reviewer, Paul Mantz of *Le Temps*, discussed Sargent’s portrait in a manner that could equally have applied to Wegmann’s. He contrasts Sargent’s picture with Manet’s *Portrait de M. Pertuiset* (1881; São Paulo Museum of Art) and Bonnat’s *Portrait de Léon Cogniet* (1880; Musée d’Art modern et contemporain, Strasbourg):

This painting, where light tone prevails, can at first sight seem a little strange. But it isn’t Mr. Sargent’s fault. Mr. Manet, with his violet shadows and Mr. Bonnat with his red, heated backgrounds, have so baffled the public, that when they see a white dress, milky greys, fresh flowers [...] they no longer recognise the truth because they are so accustomed to lies.

---

Fig. 147, John Singer Sargent, *Madame Ramón Subercaseaux*, c.1880-81, private collection, oil on canvas, 165 x 110cm.

643 No. 2108 *Portrait de M. R. S*..
The *Salon* jury clearly appreciated the freshness, airiness and light of Wegmann’s picture, and the naturalness of the pose of the figure, in contrast to the more typically stilted academic posture.

Wegmann met with further success the following year. She now gave her address in the 1882 catalogue as that of her sister in Copenhagen, having returned from Paris to Denmark that year.\(^{645}\) It was with a portrait of her sister (fig. 146) that she now was awarded a third-class medal, again in a year when no first-class medals were awarded.\(^{646}\) This was a great achievement, the highest award at the *Salon* gained by a Nordic female artist in the period under consideration (1878-1889). Again the female protagonist looks directly at the viewer, and again addresses us with confidence and assuredness. There are many skilful details, such as the beautiful gleaming wooden legs of the table, the texture of the fabrics and the freshness of the flowers, but it is the way that the sheer delicacy of the ball of white wool with its attendant strand of yarn has been captured that must have impressed the judges.

The only year that all four artists under current consideration – Backer, Kielland, Wegmann and Bauck – exhibited together at the Paris *Salon* was 1882. Bauck’s *Salon* entry, her second and final one, was a landscape entitled *Under the Old Willows*.\(^{647}\) Bauck described herself in the catalogue as a pupil of Mme Wegmann. Unfortunately, the picture cannot be located at the present time. Just as Wegmann had returned to Copenhagen, so Bauck returned to Munich. We know that she kept in touch with Bertha Wegmann, because an 1887 portrait of her by Wegmann was exhibited at the *Exposition Universelle* in 1889 (fig. 166).\(^{648}\) Additionally, she painted a portrait of Jeanna’s sister, the pianist Hanna Lucia Bauck,\(^{649}\) which is in a much more Impressionistic style. This picture presents a Berthe Morisot-type portrayal of a woman reading a picture in an interior, utilising both complementary and bright local colour in the manner of Pissarro, but with a much looser, broad brush application. The picture is undated but was exhibited in Berlin in 1894.\(^{650}\) The length of the association between the two women is demonstrated by another Wegmann portrait of Bauck dated c.1905 in the Aarhus Kunstmuseum.

\(^{645}\) Saabye, *100 years of Danish Art*, 2011, p. 145.
\(^{646}\) No. 2591 *Portrait de ma Sœur*.
\(^{647}\) No. 129 *Sous les vieux saules*.
\(^{648}\) No. 175 *Portrait de Mlle I. B... (sic.)*.
\(^{649}\) Bertha Wegmann, *Portrait of the Swedish Pianist Hanna Lucia Bauck*, Hirschsprung Collection, Copenhagen.
Bauck was the only one of the four artists under discussion not to exhibit at the *Exposition Universelle*, but she continued to have an influence on other women artists. From approximately late 1896 to 1904 she supervised a women’s art school in Berlin. One of her first pupils was Paula Becker (later Modersohn-Becker), an important early proponent of Expressionism. As Eric Torgersen has written:

> For the first time, now [October 1896], [Becker] had a female teacher, Jeanna Bauck, who made a strong impression on her. Taking the course of her development into her own hands, Paula decided while working under Bauck to change her emphasis from landscape painting to portraiture; she would hold to this course for the rest of her life.\(^{651}\)

In 1905, the German author Wilhelm Schölermann – in an article that downplayed Bauck’s Parisian studies in favour of her German career and ancestry – stated ‘I should like to add that Jeanna Bauck takes rank among the most serious women painters of to-day’.\(^{652}\)

As discussed previously, Harriet Backer’s submission for the 1882 *Salon* was another interior, entitled *Interior from Brittany*, now in the Royal Collection in Oslo.\(^{653}\) However, this effort, like later entries, did not gain Jury recognition, although the picture was purchased to provide part of the people’s gift to King Oscar II in recognition of his silver wedding anniversary that same year.\(^{654}\) Backer’s debut success with *Solitude* was never replicated at the *Salon*, but this lack of official recognition did not stop her continuing with her theme; indeed it was obviously much discussed with her housemate Kitty Kielland as both of them produced interiors in 1883 (figs. 149 and 150), neither destined for the *Salon*. It is instructive to compare them, bearing in mind that Backer’s composition is approximately three times the size of Kielland’s. First the similarities. Both pictures feature women artists as models in what might have been described in that period as roles appropriate to their gender, namely reading and sewing. As we have seen so often, the artist used a compatriot painter as model,

---

651 Eric Torgersen, *Dear Friend: Rainer Maria Rilke and Paula Modersohn-Becker* (Chicago: Northwestern University, 1998), p. 30. The dates given by Wilhelm Schölermann (below) are 1897-1904, but it seems likely that the women’s art school opened in the autumn of 1896.


653 See Valmestad, 1990, p. 34.

Harriet Backer in the case of Kitty Kielland,655 and Asta Nørregaard in the case of Harriet Backer.656 The identity of Backer’s model is confirmed by Nørregaard’s own self-portrait, *In The Studio* (fig. 148; 1883), from the same year.657

Fig. 148. Asta Nørregaard, *In the Studio*, 1883, Norske Selskab, Oslo, oil on canvas, 65 x 44cm.

---

657 For a full discussion of this work see Wichstrøm, 2002, pp. 3-10.
In The Studio shows Nørregaard sharing Backer’s concerns to capture of the effects of light entering a room from a window, but in a more direct manner that recalls the large window and darkened interior of Krøyer’s Village Hatters (fig. 17), shown at the Salon in 1881. Note the skilful manner in which Nørregaard has depicted both a direct light hitting her canvas and a more diffuse light echoing the slim, imprisoning bars of the window. Nørregaard depicts herself between her own painting of an altarpiece for Gjøvik church and a copy of Titian’s The Madonna of the Rabbit (c.1525-30), which she has presumably reproduced from the original in The Louvre. Nørregaard proudly places herself directly between her contemporary work and the Old Master tradition. As Anna Wichstrøm has noted when comparing Nørregaard’s atelier picture with that of Kielland (fig. 150):

[Kielland’s] is both a bourgeois home and a work place for two. Painted in the same year as In the Studio, its atmosphere could not be more different. Although a representation of...self-affirmation and professional achievement, the Nørregaard figure is strangely small in the room, her stillness contributing to an impression of isolation.

Kielland’s studio picture, with its plants and Japanese ornamentation, portrays a cosy domesticity absent from Nørregard’s sombre and professional portrayal. Backer did not reject her housemate Kielland as a model at this time however, as in the same year she painted a blue-toned portrait of Kitty (visible to the right of fig. 150). In 1883, Kielland also produced her own Blue Interior, a picture of a girl reading in a small Norwegian living room, the background wall coloured a striking pale blue, a tone which permeates much of the picture.

---

660 Malerin Kitty L. Kielland, 1883, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo.
Fig. 149. Harriet Backer, *Blue Interior (Blått Interiør)*, 1883, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 84 x 66cm.

Fig. 150. Kitty Kielland, *Atelier Interior (Harriet Backer)*, 1883, Lillehammer Kunstmuseum, oil on canvas, 42.5 x 37cm.
To return to the 1883 Backer/Kielland comparison, in both pictures the figure is seated on a chair and displays a downward gaze, oblivious to the presence of the viewer. In each there are a number of flowerpots and household plants, clear evidence of a wish to brighten up the studio surroundings. Kielland’s painting contains a small picture of a beach scene and a framed small portion of Backer’s contemporary portrayal of Kielland, as mentioned above. Backer’s picture contains a picturesque image of a smoking steamship, and the presence of two other pictures in the room is indicated by their reflection in a large gold-framed mirror. The truncated mirror corresponds to the cut-off gold-framed portrait in Kielland’s work. Both pictures have indications of a discreet light source, a thin strip of light on the right of Backer’s picture and an illuminated buttress at the top right in Kielland’s work. They also share what Sasha Newman and Tone Skedsmo describe as a ‘mood of peace, contemplation and silence’.661 Where the two pictures differ is in colour and tone. Kielland’s picture is the more muted, as various shades of brown predominate in the floor, walls, chairs, wicker baskets, picture frame, plant pot, and background of the framed portrait. She also resisted the temptation to add bright colour to the Japanese parasol and tones down the firm colouration of Backer’s own portrait of her. Even the pale blue of the sky in the beach scene is a paler blue than that of Backer’s steamship depiction.

Backer, by contrast, provides vibrant reds of both cabinet and flowers, a deep blue of the chair covers, and fresh bright greens in the leaves of the plant. The concentration of colour is near the window and, in contrast with Kielland’s work, there is a much greater emphasis on chiaroscuro. Newman and Skedsmo express the opinion that Blue Interior ‘is a key work in late nineteenth-century Norwegian painting, standing midway between the Naturalism of the 1880s and the mood painting of the 1890s’.662 This seems broadly correct. Backer’s work has a more painterly look than that exemplar of Naturalism, Werenskiold’s Peasant Burial (fig. 48), but falls short of the explicit shadows and all-pervading blue light of Backer’s own By Lamplight (1890; Bergen Kunstmuseum). Blue Interior was reviewed by Andreas Aubert in March 1884, and it is easy to spot his well-informed references to Solitude and Andante:

662 Ibid.
But in this delicate and yet so healthy painting, where each atom is colour, Miss Backer has conquered a new and rich field. She no longer has any renaissance motifs or Cluny interiors. She has acquired a full foothold in our own time, not only as a fine and mature artist, but also a fresh and more immediate one.663

Much of the discussion of Kielland’s oeuvre centre around her two versions of After Sunset of 1885 and 1886 and her Summer Night of 1886 (figs. 154-156), because these works are cited as particularly early examples of a Neo-Romanticism in Norwegian art,664 linked to a love of the Norwegian landscape and the feeling that the light of the Norwegian summer night was unique and worthy of national pride. What appears undiscussed – certainly in English language publications – is that Kielland exhibited a picture entitled Summer Night in Norway as early as the Salon of 1883.665 The whereabouts of this picture is currently unknown,666 but Kielland had spent the summer of 1882 at Jæren, where she painted another picture of the peatbogs. On this occasion the scene included a small horse and cart just below the horizon line,667 and her Salon picture was most likely to be a depiction of the Jæren area.668

None of the featured women artists exhibited at the 1884 Salon. Instead, Backer took the opportunity to make her first and only visit to Kitty Kielland’s painting area, Jæren, in the summer of 1884.669 Berthe Wegmann, meanwhile, had a new pupil, Marie Triepcke, who had grown up in Copenhagen of German parentage. Triepcke was passionately keen to become an artist, and was aided in this by a school friend Ida Hirschsprung, daughter of Harald Hirschsprung, the eldest brother of art collector Heinrich.670 Triepcke had been inspired by the work of P. S. Krøyer when she saw The Italian Village Hatters at Charlottenborg in 1882: ‘It made a powerful impression on me – almost a shock – I was carried away and enthusiastic.’671

---

665 No. 1310 Nuit d’été en Norvège.
666 Email Marit Lange to Jan Cox, 1 July 2014.
667 Peatbog at Jæren (Torvmyr på Jæren), 1882, Norwegian National Gallery.
668 My thanks to Marit Lange for pointing this out to me.
671 Ibid., p. 115; Triepcke would have been aged 14, not the 11 or 12 she recollected later.
She took lessons from Wegmann in the winters of 1883-84 and 1884-85, and it seems likely that it was during this period, when she was aged sixteen or seventeen, that she was the subject of Wegmann’s portrait *A Young Woman, Marie Triepcke, Sitting in a Boat* (fig. 151; c.1884). Wegmann’s work shows the influence of her time in Paris, as she has produced a gentle and delicate portrait of Marie sitting in a boat and clutching a parasol. Her neck is enveloped in pearls, and her innocent expression is accentuated by the purity suggested by the white flower on the seat next to her. Wegmann may well have seen Berthe Morisot’s *A Summer’s Day* (1879; National Gallery, London) at the fifth Impressionist Exhibition of 1880, a work which shares a very close portrayal of a woman with a parasol in a wooden boat. In technique, the slightly claustrophobic Triepcke portrait is closer to the intimate portrayals of women by Mary Cassatt than to Morisot’s much looser Impressionism. Triepcke recalled:

> I was a model for Bertha Wegmann for a large portrait, which was painted in Tivoli’s Garden, down by the moat— at that time, that setting was not part of the public space for Tivoli’s guests, but it was idyllic with tall trees, water lilies, ducks, and where only a few were allowed in. My sitting time stretched over a half of a year, and I confided in Bertha Wegmann, that my goal was to try to become a painter, and she saw my work and motivated me and promised me to write to Krøyer and ask him to teach me.  

On her return from Paris, Wegmann was – in 1882 or 1883 – the first woman to be elected to the plenary session of the Danish Royal Academy of Art, and was also awarded the Academy’s highest honour, the Thorvaldsen Exhibition Medal. She was thus ideally placed to help the young Triepcke’s initiative to set up ‘The Little School’, where women painters could band together to share both premises and artist-tutors who could correct their work in the manner of Bonnat and Gérôme in Paris.

---


674 *Woman Painters in Scandinavia*, 2002, p. 151, gives the date as 1882. It is 1883 in Madsen et al., 2009, p. 145.

According to Patricia Berman, ‘Wegmann, Krøyer, Kyhn, and several other Danish artists opened classes to female students in Copenhagen’, while Lise Svanholm mentions Laurits Tuxen as a ‘corrector’. Tuxen’s pupils including Harriet Backer’s sister Margrethe. Triepcke finally went to Paris in 1888, where she was a pupil of Puvis de Chavannes; her fellow student Anna Ancher recalled that she was ‘so beautiful, she just had those pure, classical features’. It was in Paris that Triepcke again met P. S. Krøyer; in addition to the art school connection, she modelled for him in 1887 in the painting The Duet (1887; Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen). They married a few months later in July 1889 and, like many female artists, marriage appears to have been a precursor to the end of Triepcke’s professional aspirations. It is surely notable that Backer, Kielland and Wegmann all remained unmarried, except to their art. Biographical details regarding Jeanna Bauck remain sparse, but there is no indication of marriage as signified by a change in surname.

---

676 Patricia Berman, 2007, p. 166.
678 Email Marit Lange to Jan Cox, 1 February 2015.
Wegmann was the only one of the four considered artists to exhibit at the 1885 Salon, showing a picture catalogued as *<Me Voici>; Portrait*. She followed this in 1886 with the even less descriptively titled *Portrait*, on both occasions retaining her Francophone name of Berthe Vegman – perhaps hoping to invoke that of Berthe Morisot – and giving her address as Copenhagen. In 1885 she was described in the Salon catalogue as born in Switzerland and in 1886 as born in Switzerland of Danish parents. One senses that Wegmann was doing all she could to distance herself from a possible German connection, with the Franco-Prussian War still fresh in the memories of the French. The picture that fits best with the 1886 exhibition in its subject, size and sheer quality of composition is *Portrait of Cecilie Trier, née Melchior* (fig. 152). According to family tradition (the painting remained in the family until 2011), Cecilie is reading a letter from her son Georg Gerson Trier, who had provided accommodation for Wegmann in Paris back in 1881; this picture was owned by Cecilie until her death in 1891.

![Fig. 152 Bertha Wegmann, Portrait of Cecilie Trier, née Melchior, 1885, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 125.9 x 140.2cm.](http://soeg.smk.dk/Vark.asp?Type=Udvidet&ObjectId=83856)

---

680 No. 2373 – literally translated as *<Here I am>*.

681 No. 2369.

In the portrait, Wegmann shows the sexagenarian Mrs. Trier looking directly at the viewer, holding a letter in one hand and a magnifying glass in the other. Wegmann here demonstrates her great skill in capturing fabric textures, elements of colour, and the contrasts of light and shade, as well as producing a very affectionate and sympathetic portrayal. If this was Wegmann’s 1886 Salon entry, the French jury felt unable to award it a second-class medal; again, no first class were awarded at the Salon that year. Wegmann had no Salon entries in 1887 or 1888, but in the former year she painted another significant portrait of Jeanna Bauck (fig. 166), which was exhibited at the 1889 Exposition Universelle. 1887 was also the year when Wegmann was made a full member of the Royal Danish Academy and appointed to the selection committee member at Charlottenborg.\textsuperscript{683} It is fair to say that Wegmann was pre-eminent among Danish women artists at this time. She closed the decade with a final portrait exhibited at the Salon of 1889, Portrait de M. le Dr. P. D...,\textsuperscript{684} and four pictures at the Exposition Universelle of the same year.

In 1885, Backer and Kielland travelled to Risør, a small coastal area in southern Norway, and more specifically, a place called Bossvik (or Bosvik or Bossevig).\textsuperscript{685} It was at Bossvik that Kielland found the motif of perhaps her most famous pictures. She discovered a house built as a summer residence in 1756 with a peaceful lakeside setting. The building, with minor modifications, is still extant today, though its air of solitude has been somewhat compromised (fig. 153).

Marit Lange states that Backer painted exclusively landscapes that summer, selling Landscape with Red House (1885) to Frits Thaulow later that year.\textsuperscript{686} Backer had earlier painted a small warmly-coloured Paris interior, misleadingly titled Pentecost Eve (fig. 163; 1885), as the date of Pentecost Eve (25 May 1885) inscribed below her signature was the one on which she would have presented the picture to the author Jonas Lie and his wife Thomasine, on the occasion of their silver wedding anniversary.\textsuperscript{687}

\textsuperscript{684} No. 2630.
\textsuperscript{685} Lange, De Drogo till Paris, 1988, p. 128.
\textsuperscript{686} Ibid.
Kielland’s first version of the picture was exhibited at the 1885 Autumn Exhibition in Kristiania, where Andreas Aubert believed that its unique ‘Norwegian-ness’ was underpinned by robust European practice.\textsuperscript{688} His belief that it took a Norwegian to capture the genus loci of the Norwegian landscape is reflected in his comments that ‘in a French subject, it would have been difficult for [Kielland] to capture the depth of feeling, the intensity of mood of the old manor with its history and its memories standing alone and silent in the summer evening’s lingering, slowly fading light’.\textsuperscript{689} Kielland returned to Paris early in 1886 buoyed up by the positive reception of the picture, and decided to ask Erik Werenskiold to forward a photograph of her original composition in order that she could paint a second version fresh for the forthcoming Salon.\textsuperscript{690}

\begin{flushright}
Fig. 153.
Summer Residence in Bossvik, built 1756, photograph.
\end{flushright}

\textsuperscript{688} Marit Lange in \textit{Dreams of A Summer Night}, p. 158.
\textsuperscript{689} Andreas Aubert, ‘Nydtidskrift’, 1885, p. 526, quoted in Ibid.; Valmestad, p. 71.
Fig. 154. Kitty Kielland, *After Sunset (Efter Solnedgang)*, 1885, The Royal Collection, Oslo, oil on canvas, 83 x 117cm.

Fig. 155. Kitty Kielland, *After Sunset (Efter Solnedgang)*, 1886, Stavanger Kunstmuseum, oil on canvas, 80 x 115.5cm.
It is obviously important to compare the two versions of the picture (figs. 154 and 155). Hoffman and Malmanger are broadly correct when they propose that

the two versions differ only slightly. In the second the hat of the woman is a different shape and color, and her reflection is not as clear as in the earlier work. In general, there is a slight blurring of the detail in the second version, resulting in a decreased emphasis on surface texture. The local color is also less strong, giving way to a stronger overall tonality. This version may represent Kielland’s desire to place more importance on the mood of the work than on the particulars of the idyllic scene.

Close examination reveals that the colour of the main body of the hat has migrated from a straw colour to a mid-green, but the shape of the hat is little changed. Similarly, the woman’s clothing has changed from a blue-grey to a dark maroon. The major feature is the darkened green tone that applies to both land and water in the second version. It appears later in the evening and the elements seem bound together as part of an overall colour scheme rather than as separate motifs. It is also a move away from the Naturalism exemplified by Peasant Burial and towards an art based on mood and atmosphere, just as Blue Interior was for Backer.

Kielland, who had exhibited at five consecutive Salons between 1879 and 1883, was very upset by the rejection of her new picture. After the Jury’s decision in April 1886 she wrote to Erik Werenskiold:

It is inconceivable, dare I say, for I have good judges with me, Dagnan [-Bouveret], [Gustave] Courtois and [Henri] Fantin-Latour, they find it more than strange […] Pelouse however, who saw my stuff once last winter, felt that I had gone onto the wrong track, that I painted like Puvis de Chavannes. Then he saw on my face that I wasn’t sorry…he said, yes, and like Monet and Manet [too]. It was clear that we no longer understand each other and [yet] he is the youngest thinking on the landscape jury this year [!]

There is, however, no sign of Pelouse’s name among the forty jurors for the painting section of the 1886 Salon. Instead, among the people elected we find Léon Bonnat, Tony Robert-Fleury (tutor to Emma Löwstädt-Chadwick), Jules Breton and Pierre Puvis de Chavannes himself. It is easy to see why Pelouse was not happy – his own style

---

693 Kitty Kielland to Erik Werenskiold, April 1886, quoted by Lange, Ibid., translated by Jan Cox. See a slightly different partial translation in Valmestad, 1990, p. 66.
694 Jury, Section de Peinture, Catalogue of 1886 Paris Salon.
varied little, and his two (accepted) entries for the 1886 Salon, *The Islet of the Geese* and *The Plateau of Montjoie*, dominated by sparsely-clad trees, are very akin to Kielland’s 1882 *Washing Place in Brittany* (fig. 143), a style from which she had now moved on. Pelouse would have felt he was vindicated when his latter picture was bought directly from the Salon by the state for the Musée de Luxembourg. Interestingly, at its present location in the Musée d’Orsay, the picture is dated as 1872.

The reference to Monet (though not perhaps Manet) is understandable, as Kielland’s second version of *After Sunset* is certainly more Impressionistic in its looseness of handling and the feeling of a snapshot in time. There has been much discussion of the possible influence of Puvis de Chavannes on both Kielland’s work and the onset of mood painting. The work that is often cited is *The Sacred Grove* (1884; Musée de Lyons) exhibited at the 1884 Salon. Marit Lange, for example, says that it contained features which ‘were precisely the [ones] which Kitty L. Kielland had noted and which inspired her own choice of a theme like *After Sunset*. That *The Sacred Grove* was well-known in Norwegian art circles is evidenced by Karl Jensen-Hjell’s portrait of Kalle Løchen entitled *At the Window* (1887; fig. 157), in which Puvis de Chavannes’s picture forms a backdrop to the portrayal of the ill-fated actor/artist. However, it seems likely that the picture Pelouse had in mind was Puvis de Chavannes’s *The Poor Fisherman* (1881; Musée d’Orsay), which produced a lively debate at the 1881 Salon. The simplified picture of the forlorn fisherman in a rowing boat in a lonely landscape, added to its greenish-tinged atmosphere, has definite resonances with Kielland’s picture.

---

697 Marit Lange in *Dreams of a Summer Night*, 1986, pp. 159-60.
Fig. 156. Kitty Kielland, *Summer Night*, 1886, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 100.5 x 130.5 cm.

Fig. 157. Karl Gustav Jensen-Hjell, *At the Window*, 1887, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 73.5 x 99.5 cm.
Valmestad expands the argument further, bringing in *Summer Night* (1886; fig. 156), which was painted at Fleskum in 1886, and exhibited in Oslo later that year, and then in revised form at the 1887 *Salon*. Valmestad discusses how Lange considers the 'dwindling evening light, shape simplification and the harmonisation of the colours' as common to Puvis and Kielland, but that Marit Werenskiold deems *Summer Night* as possessing 'no influence whatsoever of the artistic world of Puvis', and instead favoured the impact of the French naturalists of the Barbizon school. Lange clarifies that she is discussing the specific theme of 'a closed water mirror reflecting the sky, with all the platonic and symbolical implications', and not mood painting in general. It is impossible to be definitive about the possible degree of contribution of Puvis de Chavannes and Corot to Kielland's work, but what can be asserted securely is that feelings of Nordic stillness in the summer night are present – as Gunnarsson has argued – in works as early as Krøyer's *Fishermen on the Beach at Skagen* (1883; fig. 158) and in Christian Skredsvig's *Summer Night, Moonlight in Nordmarken* (1884; private collection). The former picture was present at the 1884 *Salon* in the form of the pastel version (1884; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm) which helped garner Krøyer's medal. Valmestad has independently highlighted Skredsvig's 1884 picture as an example of the early exploration of *stemnings* (mood) landscape. She also produces a large list of mood paintings that covers the period 1884 to 1889, but none as early as Krøyer's *Fishermen*. Of course, Krøyer's picture is densely populated, but it possesses a great feeling of stillness and lassitude in the summer evening. The defining theme of Kielland's *Summer Night* is surely mood above all, rather than Puvis de Chavannes's fresco-like depictions or Corot's more literal landscapes. Similarly, there is indication in Kielland's picture of the anti-Realist emotional charge that is present in Eilif Peterssen's own *Summer Night* (1886; fig. 175), painted that same summer at the same location, the lake *Dælivannet*. As Gunnarsson states, Kielland's 'simplification of the forms is due to the subdued light rather than to any desire for stylisation.' She is using the diminishing light of the Nordic evening to create mood, just as Krøyer did, but using a
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700 Valmestad, 1990, p. 66; No. 1318 *Nuit Claire de Norvège*.
702 Email Marit Lange to Jan Cox, 1 February 2015.
705 Valmestad, 1990, p. 64
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significantly darker, green-toned key to produce an air of stillness and solitude, as opposed to the earthly ennui of Krøyer’s figures.

Andreas Aubert was keen to point out that there was something unique about the Nordic light: ‘Our summer night with its dwindling twilight...in contrast to the short and suddenly dark evenings of southern Europe.’

Similarly, Christian Skredsvig contrasted the painterliness of lakes and pools swathed in Nordic summer twilight with the ‘valueless’ sunlight in work by southern European artists, whose landscapes ‘look like they [were] painted in the vicinity of a glaring coal plant!’

Nordic mood painting could thus perform twin roles: ‘the perfect vehicle for expressing nationalist sentiments’ and also a means of differentiating Nordic art from its French counterparts. When Kielland exhibited After Sunset and Summer Night among her four paintings at the 1889 Exposition Universelle the French critic André Michel said that:

---

708 Andreas Aubert, Morgenbladet, 22 February 1886, quoted in Valmestad, 1990, p. 87.
they speak to us above all with a vibrant tenderness of their homeland, of the brilliant, icy waters, the splendid of the harsh winters, of the sweet magic of the slow twilight and the clear summer nights...where the twilight of summer lingers in the skies with an exquisite sweetness, the clear nights give the painters, late-comers, a singularly alluring motive, admirably suited to capture the eye of an artist.\(^7\text{11}\) Following her success in getting \textit{Summer Night} accepted at the \textit{Salon}, Kielland was also successful in 1888 and 1889 with pictures entitled \textit{Norwegian Landscape} and \textit{A Calm Day}.\(^7\text{12}\) Harriet Backer had meanwhile continued with her indoor theme, exhibiting an interior at the 1885 \textit{Salon},\(^7\text{13}\) and continued with this when she joined Kielland, Werenskiold, Peterssen, Skredsvig and others at Fleskum in the summer of 1886. While the other artists were painting almost exclusively outdoor scenes, Backer preferred to paint scenes of \textit{bonde} interiors from the buildings near the Fleskum farm.

At the 1886 Autumn Exhibition in Kristiania, at which Munch’s controversial \textit{Sick Girl} was shown, Kielland exhibited four works including \textit{Summer Night}; at that time known by the title \textit{By the Tarn}.\(^7\text{14}\) Backer had to wait for a second exhibition in November to show her pictures;\(^7\text{15}\) here she exhibited \textit{Interior} – presumably returned hotfoot from Paris – and \textit{In a Farm Living-Room} (1886; \textit{I en Bondestue}, private collection), the latter picture a farm interior at Knabberud, north west of the farm at Fleskum.\(^7\text{16}\) Liv Valmestad is adamant that claims of a second ‘Fleskum summer’ in 1887 are incorrect,\(^7\text{17}\) and refers to a letter from Kitty Kielland to Sophie Werenskiold of 8 May 1887 to explain that this was because of Erik Werenskiold’s illness.\(^7\text{18}\) Fortunately, Marit Lange is able to explain why this misunderstanding has occurred in the past. Because the version of Backer’s \textit{Bondeinterior, Skotta I Bærum} in the Norwegian National Gallery (fig. 161; 1887) is signed and dated ‘Skotta 87’ and \textit{A Country Cobbler} (fig. 159; 1887) is signed and dated ‘Knabberud 1887’, assumptions were made – including at one time by Lange herself – of a second Fleskum summer. However, it was Backer alone of the 1886 grouping who returned there the following year.\(^7\text{19}\)


\(^7\text{12}\) No. 1407 \textit{Paysage Norvégien}; No. 1454 \textit{Un jour calme}.

\(^7\text{13}\) No. 83 \textit{Intérieur}.

\(^7\text{14}\) No. 105 \textit{Ved Kjærnet} – Marit Lange suggests \textit{By the Tarn} which seems more accurate than Valmestad’s \textit{By the Pond} (Valmestad, 1990, p. 57).

\(^7\text{15}\) Valmestad, 1990, p. 58.

\(^7\text{16}\) No. 247, No. 248; Ibid., pp. 58, 123, 128.

\(^7\text{17}\) Ibid., p. 8., n. 21.

\(^7\text{18}\) Valmestad, 1990, p. 8, n.21.

\(^7\text{19}\) Email from Marit Lange to Jan Cox, 10 July 2014.
Marit Lange states that ‘in 1886 and 1887 there followed interiors [by Backer] from Knabberud farm by Dælivannet in Bærum’, 720 both Knabberud and Skotta are within walking distance of the Fleskum farm. Valmestad contends that A Country Cobbler and also Fleskum at Blekevollen (Bergen Billedgalleri) were ‘produced as studies in 1886 and presented as finished works the following year’. 721 The version of the latter that is accessible to view, 722 – entitled På Blekevollen – is signed and dated ‘Fleskum 86’, whereas the version in the Bergen Billedgalleri – if it is a different picture – appears to be officially dated 1887. 723 Valmestad also refers to The Town Cobblers (A Country Cobbler) in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm (fig. 159) as being dated 1886, whereas the museum accord with the dating on the picture ‘Knabberud 1887’. What can be stated is that it is not always easy to tell what is a study that was a precursor to a later and more definitive work, or a study in the sense of a swiftly executed small picture. Backer is able to vary her style from the loose and sketchy to the more academic and refined, always aiming for mood over narrative.

Fig. 160. Harriet Backer, *Bondestue i Rochefort-en-Terre, Bretagne*, 1881, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 31 x 41cm.

Fig. 161. Harriet Backer, *Bondeinteriør, Skotta I Bærums*, 1887, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 38 x 48cm.
Although there is a looseness of handling in much of the picture, the lovingly-crafted depiction of a large cabinet taking up much of the right side of *A Country Cobbler* (fig. 159) proclaims it a completed work. The idea of painting a rural, rather than an urban or studio, interior was not a new one to Backer. She had painted a farm living room at Rochefort-en-Terre in 1881 (fig. 160). What is different is that Backer has migrated from the effects of direct sunlight to the much more nuanced light filtered through a curtain before providing illumination for the shoemaker and his assistant. In her 1887 composition *Bondeinteriør*, *Skotta i Bærum* (fig. 161), she examines how two sources of light interact, emanating from window and open door respectively. The bare and stark interior, populated by a woman sewing next to a baby’s cradle, is in stark contrast to another of Backer’s 1887 compositions, *Chez Moi* (fig. 162) which was her entry for the 1888 *Salon*.

Marit Lange describes *Chez Moi* as ‘perhaps her most representative work from her time in Paris’ and also that it ‘exhibits the conservative elements of Harriet Backer’s art’.724 It is certainly interesting how Backer uses loosely-delineated brushstrokes to depict a spartan farm interior, yet returns to a near-academic style to show off the much more sophisticated accoutrements of a Parisian apartment. *Chez Moi* depicts Asta Lie, daughter of the famous Norwegian writer Jonas Lie, at the piano.725 On this occasion, Backer has light passing through different combinations of glass, blind and curtain in order to provide a variety of impacts of light upon such objects as the walls, framed pictures hung upon it and the pianist and her score. The concern with light seems as central to Backer and Kielland as it was to Krøyer in the 1880s.
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The setting, Backer and Kielland’s studio apartment at 19 Rue de l’Université in Paris, is identical to Backer’s earlier *Pentecost Eve* (fig. 163), painted for Jonas Lie and his wife. Although the chest-of-drawers has been replaced by a piano and the clock by a large plant, it is the same window, devoid of fittings, the same mirror, and most pertinently of all, the same fireplace identified by the two cast-iron firedogs at its base. The tone of the two pictures could not be more different; the smaller, earlier picture, destined to become a gift, has hues of red and pink that give it warmth. It is freely painted and light flows in. By contrast, the later *Salon* work, feels sombre and subdued, with the light filtered and diffused. However, compared to Backer’s 1881 *Salon* picture *Andante* – also featuring a woman at the piano – it does have a lighter and more modern feel. The classical paintings in heavy gilt frames have been replaced by modern pictures in simple frames, the grand piano by an upright, and the antique tapestry by simple net curtains. *Chez Moi* clearly succeeded in the market for which it was intended. At the 1889 *Exposition Universelle* it was awarded a silver medal and was then bought by the Norwegian National Gallery in 1890.\(^7\)

Fig. 162. Harriet Backer, *Chez Moi*, 1887, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 88.5 x 100cm.

Fig. 163. Harriet Backer, *Pentecost Eve*, 1885, Sold: Blomqvist, Oslo, June 2014, No. 25, oil on canvas, 38.5 x 46cm.
The *Exposition Universelle* was a marvellous showcase for Nordic artists, and women were well represented. Although Harriet Backer only exhibited two works, Kitty Kielland showed four, as did Bertha Wegmann. Jeanna Bauck was concentrating on teaching by this time, but appeared again as Wegmann’s model. Backer and Kielland were among the ten women painters (15%) in the sixty-six strong Norwegian contingent, while Sweden had an amazing 27% of women in their entourage, including Emma Löwstädt-Chadwick. The small Finnish contingent of twenty painters boasted four women (20%), but Bertha Wegmann had only four female contemporaries among the numerically largest Danish contingent (7%). Harriet Backer, as stated above, won a silver medal for *Chez Moi*, which – unlike Viggo Johansen’s identically-named picture at the same exhibition – kept its French title both before and after the exhibition, the difference being that it showed a French rather than Scandinavian scene. Backer’s other entry was also painted in 1888, the year before the exhibition.

1888 was the year when Backer finally returned permanently to Norway after ten years in the French capital. *Homework Discussion: Living Room in Eggedal* (fig. 164) was painted in the mountains about fifty miles north-west of Kristiania. It was one of two pictures Backer painted in her slow, methodical manner that summer, the other being a smaller landscape entitled *Landscape, Eggedal* (1888; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm). One is reminded of Krøyer’s tactic of painting an indoor and an outdoor picture in parallel with each other. As in *Bondeinteriør, Skotta I Bærum* (fig. 161), Backer is again dealing with two sources of light, converging from two windows upon the seated figures. Marit Lange makes an interesting point about the picture:

> Contact between individuals, even one as carefully suggested here, is found very rarely in Harriet Backer’s art. The figures [are intended to] deepen the mood of the interior, but the action in no way takes over. It was not easy to rise above the fear of being characterized as ‘Düsseldorf’, and thus be associated with Adolph Tidemand and his depictions of the Norwegian farming community. The imprecise action in her interiors can be seen as a conscious reaction against the Düsseldorfer’s anecdotal painting.
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In other words, Backer was determined to paint a modern depiction of rural life, and avoid the sentimental, the nostalgic and the anecdotal, just as Erik Werenskiold had been with *Peasant Burial* three years previously. Her picture is concerned with light and mood. Unfortunately, Werenskiold was not enamoured of Backer’s picture. He wrote to Gerhard Munthe from the *Exposition Universelle* in May 1889: ‘Harriet has two interiors, among which the red one from Eggedal... She has [caught] the smooth heads, good heads, but [as to] her ability to create an event, it’s...rather negligible’.729

The picture is mostly a reddish-brown depiction of wood, counterbalanced by the blue reflections from the shirt of the main character. The look of distraction on the face of the younger boy was not difficult for Backer to capture. Despite sitting for ‘only’ an hour at a time, the model Halvor Gulbrandsen Teige, interviewed in 1963, explained that ‘It was hard enough for a kid to sit as still as a mouse as long as the sun shone

---

through the two windows. It occurred to me [that it was] not very hard to imagine that I was more interested in what was going on outside’.  

Norwegian art received little coverage in the *Gazette des beaux-arts* at the exposition; among a few lines, Maurice Hamel was content to mention that he remembered the interiors of Wentzel, Backer and Jorgensen. However, he was keener on the work of Kitty Kielland. Among her four pictures at the *Exposition* was *After Sunset*, which finally achieved the exhibition in Paris denied to it at the *Salon*. Hamel had already seen it in Copenhagen the previous year, and had then waxed lyrical in the *Gazette des beaux-arts*:

> By saying things in the simplest way, Mlle Kielland succeeds in attaining a more penetrating impression. What translucent purity in her landscape, *After Sunset*! How the white house with its large red roof softly sinks its reflection in the water which the evening sky glazes with pale reds and greens.

At the 1889 *Exposition* Hamel clearly included *Summer Night* in his broad-brush review, speaking of 'the smoothness of the impression which gives such charm to the lakes of Kietty (sic) Kielland'. Kielland’s two other exhibition pictures were a studio interior and a Jæren picture entitled *After the Rain*. The former is unidentified, but a possible candidate is *Arne Garborg in the Painter’s Studio in Paris* (1887; fig. 165). In this picture Garborg, the author of *Bondestudentar*, is in the Kielland/Backer studio in Paris, well-dressed, smoking and reading. 1887 was the year that Garborg married his wife Hulda, but failed to be re-elected to his job in Norway as state auditor following the publication of his radical novel *Mannfolk* in 1886. Kielland had moved away from the Naturalism of her 1883 studio interior (fig. 149) to a more stylised, modern rendition. She was not scared of using areas of primary colour in order to enliven the muted tones of wall and floor, most notably a red and green parrot swinging on a perch at the very top of the picture. Garborg looks very much at home as an urbane man in an urban setting.

---
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734 Norvège No. 46 *Nuit d’été*, Hamel, 1889, p. 379.
735 Norvège No. 48 *Intérieur d’atelier* and No. 47 *Après la pluie*. 
Fig. 165. Kitty Kielland, *Arne Garborg in the Painter’s Studio in Paris*, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, 1887, oil on canvas, 65.5 x 46.5cm.
After the Rain was the picture – just like Backer’s Chez Moi – that earned Kielland a silver medal at the Exposition,\(^{736}\) and this depiction of her much-beloved Jæren was bought by the French state directly from the exhibition.\(^{737}\) Similar to the studio interior, After the Rain is likewise not easily identified. Kielland, who returned to Norway in 1889 following her ten years in Paris, was on the Norwegian organising committee at the Exposition and the following year expressed her thoughts:

> I thought that the German influence was passed, but I was afraid that the French could have influenced us. No, what we learned abroad was well-assimilated, it has gone into the Norwegian blood and only strengthened our national feeling.\(^{738}\)

Backer and Kielland’s achievements in their near-contemporary decade in the French capital were crowned by their success at the Exposition. The author Torleiv Kronen, an authority on French influence in Norwegian culture, summed it up thus:

> …for ten years, they created a purely Norwegian art, thus at the Universal Exhibition in Paris, the “école norvégienne” was characterized as one of the most individualistic and nationalistic groups.\(^{739}\)

For the Dane Bertha Wegmann, finally returning in the catalogue to her original Teutonic-sounding name, this was an opportunity to exhibit four portraits, all Danish-owned. Her first offering was the 1882 portrait of her sister Anna Seekamp (fig. 146), the most successful picture exhibited by a Nordic woman artist at the Salon in the 1880s.\(^{740}\) The picture was at that time in her sister’s possession in Copenhagen, and was acquired by the Statens Museum for Kunst in 1917.

\(^{736}\) Lange in Dreams of A Summer Night, 1986, p. 158.
\(^{738}\) This translation is an amalgamation of a version from Liv Valmestad and a translation of Marit Lange’s Swedish version; the books quote different page numbers: Valmestad, 1990, p.91 , Kitty Kielland, ’Lidt om norsk Kunst’ in Samtiden, 1890, p. 223; Marit Lange, De Drogo till Paris, 1988, p. 145. ’Lidt om norsk Kunst’ in Samtiden, 1890, p. 224.
\(^{740}\) Danemark No. 173 Portrait de Mme S...
Her second and third pictures were both owned the Melchior family, *Portrait de M. M.*
741 by Mlle Melchior and *Portrait de M. T.* 742 by M. Melchior. As ever, identification is
difficult, but the former is very likely the portrait of Moses Melchior (1825-1912) by
Wegmann now in the Frederiksborg Palace Museum painted in 1884 743 the year before
Wegmann painted Moses’ sister Cecilie (fig. 152). The third picture, owned by M.
Melchior, could be of one of the Trier family, either Gerson, Wegmann’s Paris landlord,
or his brother Theodor. Contrary to the information in *Den Store Danske*, 744
Frederiksborg Palace staff state that they do not own a Wegmann portrait of Gerson
Trier, but possess a study of him by an artist unknown, with a comparable study of
Theodor. 745 Wegmann clearly chose pictures for Paris in 1889 that were easy to access,
from her sister and from life-long supportive patrons.

The final picture in Paris was owned by Ida Ruben, wife of textile manufacturer
Bernhard Ruben, 746 and mother of Ella Ruben, who later married the Danish painter
Hans Nikolaj Hansen. Despite the picture being catalogued as *Portrait de Mlle I. B.*
747, the Hirschsprung Collection confirm that it is their 1887 *Portrait of the Swedish Painter
Jeanna Bauck* (fig. 166) that was exhibited. 747

741 Danemark No. 174.
742 Danemark No. 176.
743 Email (a) from Erik Westengaard, Head of Operations and Security, Frederiksborg Palace, to
Jan Cox, 18 July 2014, confirming that the portrait was exhibited at the 1889 *Exposition
Universelle*.
744 Gerson Trier, Dansk Biografisk Leksikon
%C3%A6rer/Gerson_Trier, accessed 5 June 2014.
745 Email (b) from Erik Westengaard to Jan Cox, 18 July 2014.
746 Saabye (ed.), *100 Years of Danish Art*, 2011, p. 145.
747 Danemark No. 175; Madsen et al., *Hirschsprung Katalog Malerier og Skulpturer*, 2009, p.
182.
It seems appropriate that this section began with a Bauck depiction of Wegmann and concludes with a Wegmann depiction of Bauck, symbolic of the mutually beneficial relationship of women artists in this period. In the 1887 picture, Wegmann shows a different side of Bauck from her 1881 Paris rendition. Bauck is dressed in her black finery, with contrast provided by the rich gold of a lorgnette between hand and mouth, and chain below. Her carefree artist’s demeanour has been replaced by that of a sober, serious and reflective woman, one who has known the artist for twenty years and is not afraid to reveal her cares and concerns. Despite the review of the Danish section in the *Gazette des beaux-arts* being larger (over a page and a half) than that of Norway,
Sweden and Finland put together, and fourteen artists being mentioned (including Anna Ancher), there was no critical recognition of Wegmann on this occasion. However, like Backer and Kielland, she too won a silver medal at the exhibition, a fact unmentioned by the majority of writers on the artist. Kielland, Backer and Wegmann, like many other Nordic artists such as Krøyer, turned their back on the Paris Salon after the 1889 Exposition. It was now time to move in new artistic directions, and discover new exhibition locations.

748 Hamel, 1889, pp. 376-378.
749 Pierre Sanchez, Les Catalogues des Salons XVI (1890-1892), 2007 [1890], p. CLXIII.
Chapter Five: Nordic Success in France 1878-1889

In the preceding chapters I have discussed a considerable body of work by Nordic artists and art that met with success at the Paris Salon in the period 1878 to 1889. It is clearly impractical to analyse in detail every Nordic artist who received an award there, but in the chapter that follows every artist who was successful at the Salon, as summarised in Appendix 1, is mentioned. A minority of artists – and their pictures – have clearly disappeared from general view in the intervening decades, even within their home countries. Therefore, this chapter is intended to provide a basis for future scholarship in addition to my own necessarily selective analysis of artists and their works.

1878 Exposition Universelle

It is known that at the Exposition Universelle of 1878 at least seven Nordic artists were given awards: Gustaf Cederström (1845-1933), Auguste Hagborg (1852-1921), Ludvig Munthe (1841-96), Hans Heyerdahl (1857-1913), Eilif Peterssen (1852-1928), Alfred Wahlberg (1834-1906) and Carl Bloch (1834-90).\footnote{See Salon de 1889: Catalogue des ouvrages exposés au Palais des Champs-Élysées, le 1er mai 1889 (Paris: L. Baschet, 1889), Norvège, Suède and Danemark, pp. 244-245, 279, 156; Also Sanchez, catalogue of 1890 Salon, pp. CXXXIV, CXL, CXLX.} Heyerdahl’s third-class medal with \textit{Adam and Eve expelled from Paradise} (1877; fig. 4) has already been discussed in Chapter One. The Swedish landscape painter Alfred Wahlberg’s era of success in Paris came in the 1870s. Born in Stockholm, Wahlberg went to Düsseldorf in 1857 and studied under Hans Gude,\footnote{Karl Warburg, ‘Hermann Alfred Leonard Wahlberg’, \textit{Från vår Kunstverld} (Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1881), p. 79.} returning to Stockholm in 1862.\footnote{Gunnarsson, 1998, p. 122.} Wahlberg was then encouraged by King Charles XV to continue his career in Paris in 1866 rather than a German city, perhaps because Charles had favoured the Danes in their conflict with Prussia in 1864.\footnote{Gunnarsson, 1998, p. 122.} Wahlberg was well aware of the Barbizon school in France, and this may have also affected his decision. Torsten Gunnarsson emphasises Wahlberg’s pivotal role in the transition from ‘Düsseldorf’ to a French-based \textit{plein-air} Realism, as he was the first Swedish landscape painter to head for Paris.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 120, 122.} This transition is exemplified by comparing Wahlberg’s \textit{Swedish Landscape, Motif from Kolmården} (1866; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm) with \textit{View near Vaxholm} (1872; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm) (figs. 167-168).
Fig. 167. Alfred Wahlberg, *Swedish Landscape. Motif from Kolmården*, 1866, Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, oil on canvas, 169 x 226 cm.

Fig. 168. Alfred Wahlberg, *View near Vaxholm (Landscape from Vaxholm)*, 1872, Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, oil on canvas, 71 x 110 cm.
The former picture, with its starkly-lit trees, strongly-contrasting clouds and Romantically enhanced landscape, harks back to earlier Nordic works that in turn reprise the Dutch seventeenth-century landscapes of Jacob van Ruisdael. Examples are Carl FALCRANTZ's _The Waterfall at Trollhätten_ (1828; Malmö Konstmuseum) and J. C. Dahl's _Landscape in Kauphanger with a Stave Church_ (1847; Grev Wedels Plass, Oslo). _Landscape from Vaxholm_ on the other hand is a calm and undramatic composition, Realist in concept, but with Impressionist-style dabs of paint on the vegetation and a still, grey sky that pacifies rather than animates the scene. Gunnarsson sees this innovative picture as 'a milestone in the history of Swedish landscape painting', because of its introduction of French technique to the Scandinavian landscape tradition. As ever, the French art establishment were happy to give credit to a foreign painter who had absorbed some of their own methods; Wahlberg was awarded an initial medal at the _Salon_ of 1870, a second-class medal at the 1872 _Salon_, made a _Chevalier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur_ in 1874, and finally a first-class medal and _Officier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur_ at the 1878 _Exposition Universelle_.

Wahlberg’s seven pictures at the 1878 exhibition were by far the largest of the Swedish contingent, as most painters submitted one or two works. In a well-balanced approach, three of his works were titled from Sweden and three from France (Beaulieu, Brittany, Gascony), with one neutral forest scene. After submitting a picture of Dieppe at the 1878 _Salon_, Wahlberg presented one or two works at a six further _Salons_ from 1880 to 1889, on these occasions with an exclusively Swedish theme. He received no further recognition during this period but, of course, he had already received a first-class medal and _Légion d'honneur_, so there was little room for additional acknowledgment.

At the 1889 _Exposition Universelle_, Wahlberg was again a substantial exhibitor, showing eight pictures of which seven had specifically Swedish titles. In the _Gazette des beaux-arts_, Maurice Hamel fails to mention Wahlberg among the thirteen Swedish painters he discussed in his very brief review of the Swedish section of the _Exposition_, and it seems likely by this date that Wahlberg’s pioneering endeavours
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757 Sanchez, Salon de 1889, Catalogue 1889 _Exposition Universelle_, Suède, p. 279.
758 Salón de 1878, Catalogue 1878 _Exposition Universelle_, Suède, p. 217.
759 Sanchez, Salon de 1889, Catalogue 1889 _Exposition Universelle_, Suède, p. 279.
760 Hamel, 1889, pp. 378-79.
had been both emulated and overtaken. It is noteworthy that the Nationalmuseum in
Stockholm’s collection of Wahlberg’s paintings concentrates on the period 1863 to
1879, while the Göteborg Konstmuseum has six oils from 1865 to 1884. Certainly,
Wahlberg’s *Maritime Landscape in Moonlight* (1888; Ateneum, Helsinki) appears to
hark back to the grey tones of Grez-sur-Loing in the early 1880s. Additionally, when
comparing it with Eilif Peterssen’s *Summer Night* (fig. 175; 1886), Wahlberg was still
using moonlight in the manner of Romantic nineteenth-century artists like Carl Gustav
Carus, rather than as a subtle device that hints at mood and mystery. As Gunnarsson
says ‘Wahlberg’s own role was simply to provide the initial impetus...his own art cannot
be called radical from a European point of view...[His contribution] was more that of a
steward and disseminator of French ideals than of an independent innovator’.\textsuperscript{761}

The other recipient of the *Légion d’honneur* at the 1878 *Exposition Universelle*, aside
from the Norwegian-born but German-domiciled Ludvig Munthe, was the Danish
painter Carl Bloch, mentioned previously as a precursor to the depictions of fishing
families by Krøyer and Michael Ancher (see fig. 80). The 1878 exhibition was not
viewed as a success for Nordic artists, as few had emulated Wahlberg and absorbed
the more modern French techniques by this stage. One anonymous critic is quoted as
saying that ‘art vegetates in Denmark, lives slightly in Sweden, and doesn’t exist at all
in Norway\textsuperscript{762} and, in general, the criticism of Danish art at the exhibition was severe,
leading to calls for a revitalisation.\textsuperscript{763} Numerically, the Danish contingent was
dominated by Carl Bloch and the deceased P. C. Skovgaard (d. 1875), who each
contributed eight of the seventy-six oil paintings shown.

Although Bloch’s painting style may have been considered somewhat old-fashioned, it
clearly struck a chord with the *Exposition* judges, and Bloch was awarded a first-class
medal and made a *Chevalier de l’ordre de la Légion d’honneur*. His large history
painting *Christian II imprisoned in Sønderborg Castle* (1871; fig. 169) was in the finest
tradition of academic history painting, which had long been considered to be at the
pinnacle of achievement by the French art establishment. Christian II had become King
of Denmark in 1513, and four years later he ordered the execution of the nobleman
Torben Oxe, an event dramatically recreated by Eilif Peterssen in his first substantial
history painting *Christian II signing the Death Warrant of Torben Oxe* (1875-76; fig.
170). After being deposed in 1523, Christian was eventually imprisoned in 1532 in

\textsuperscript{761} Gunnarsson, 2006, p. 299.
\textsuperscript{762} Jacobs, 1985, p. 107.
\textsuperscript{763} Monrad and Hornung, 2002, p. 1.
Sønderborg Castle, where he spent the next seventeen years in captivity. In this picture, which illustrates an apocryphal story, Bloch demonstrated his skill in a number of ways, not least the beautifully-executed crumbling brickwork that surrounds the deposed king. The gold-coloured seat held by a sad-looking servant contrasts with the drabness of the surroundings. The hourglass in the window symbolises the passage of his imprisonment, and his meagre fare awaits. The picture illustrates the tale that Christian walked round his table so often that his thumbnail cut a groove in it, and the air of melancholy is palpable. Christian stares at the viewer, both knowing and resigned, and we share in his ennui. It is the human element of both king and servant, rather than an idealised depiction, that makes Bloch’s painting so successful.
It was executed in 1871, and six years earlier Danish art historian Julius Lange had drawn attention to just this quality in similar paintings:

The distinction of Bloch’s large historical pictures which have aroused so much attention...seems to be not only the mighty, almost violent energy of the emotion expressed in them, but also the fact that one felt that they issued from an artist whose whole mode of perception had been spurred by scenes of real life, the life of today.\(^{764}\)

The picture was also reviewed at the *Exposition* in the *Gazette des beaux-arts*, where the critic initially praised but then decided that, good though it is, the painting tells us nothing new:

The vast tableau of M. Bloch *The Captive King* is certainly a highly-admirable work. The prince is slumped and languid in his misfortune. The old soldier, his companion, is full of sympathetic respect. The table, the walls, the accessories are well-executed. The work is above the general standard of the *Exposition Universelle*. But no particular artistic temperament is revealed. It’s the good painting of an educated man, sensitive, distinguished even, which stays on the edge of art and doesn’t open a pathway into the forest.\(^{765}\)

Bloch subsequently produced many works for Frederiksborg Castle, under the direction of the brewer J. C. Jacobsen,\(^ {766}\) notably a portrayal of another royal event, this time from 1594: *The seventeen-year-old Prince Christian (Christian IV) recipient of the dying Chancellor Niels Kaas’ keys to the Vault in the Castle, where the Kingdom’s Crown and Sceptre are kept* (1880; Frederiksborg Castle). This reminder of Denmark’s glorious past would have been particularly pertinent as Kaas had been involved in the sixteenth century in settling the governance of Schleswig-Holstein, which Denmark had subsequently lost in the war of 1864. Bloch did not exhibit at the Paris *Salon* between 1878 and 1889, but he was one of twelve Danish painters – including Krøyer, Brendekilde, Michael Ancher, Julius Exner, Viggo Johansen – to exhibit at the Berlin Academy of Art’s major exhibition in 1886.\(^ {767}\) Bloch exhibited a further five pictures at the *Exposition Universelle* in 1889, but with no notable critical reaction, and it is fair to say that his European success peaked at the 1878 exhibition.

\(^{764}\) Julius Lange, ‘Nyere dansk Genremaleri’, 1865, in *100 Years of Danish Art*, p. 109.
\(^{765}\) ‘Les Écoles Étrangères de Peinture’, *Gazette des beaux-arts*, 1878, p. 158.
\(^{766}\) The founder of the Carlsberg brewery and father of the art collector Carl Jacobsen,
\(^{767}\) No. 114, *Die Diener lässt den Hund ein* (*The Servant takes the dog in*). See also Saabye, *Krøyer*, p. 147. n. 7.
Eilif Peterssen, nearly twenty years younger than Bloch, and far more cosmopolitan, was also successful at the 1878 Exposition, gaining a silver medal.\textsuperscript{768} As previously stated, following his spell in Karlsruhe with Gude, he spent three years in Munich. His major work from that period, \textit{Christian II signing the Death Warrant of Torben Oxe}, attracted considerable attention at the time and is still considered important today. Before it was completed it was purchased for the Verbindung für Historische Arts in Stuttgart,\textsuperscript{769} and Knut Berg states that it is `the masterpiece of Norwegian historical painting,’ tempering this opinion by adding `a genre which is otherwise not especially rich in Norwegian art’.\textsuperscript{770} The reason for this is perhaps because the political control of Norway resided in Copenhagen for many centuries, and it is surely significant that Peterssen, who had studied in Copenhagen in his teens, depicted a specifically Danish piece of history. Certainly, this is a piece of history painting in the Germanic tradition of Karl von Piloty and Wilhelm von Lindenschmit and far removed from the Norwegian National Romanticism of Tidemand and Morten Müller’s \textit{Sinclair’s Landing at Romsdal} (1876), whose dual authorship meant that landscape was as important as action in this depiction of an historical event.

\textsuperscript{768} \textit{Salon de 1889, 1889 Exposition Universelle}; Norvège, p. 245
\textsuperscript{769} Eilif Peterssen, Norsk Biografisk Leksikon, \url{http://nbl.snl.no/Eilif_Peterssen}, accessed 5 May 2014.
In Peterssen’s picture, his painterly skill is matched by his ability, through the use of character and expression, to recreate a scene of tension as the death warrant is about to be signed. Peterssen left Munich in 1878, but did not join the general exodus for Paris. However, he did exhibit two pictures at the *Exposition* which led to the silver medal, a portrait and a depiction of the moment when *Judas Iscariot* (fig. 172; 1878) identifies Christ by means of a kiss. Peterssen mentions an earlier version of the picture *Judas Iscariot* (fig. 171; 1877) in a letter to his parents in March 1877, and two months later wrote to them:

*I have worked diligently every day and now my ‘Judas’ is ready, and I’ve exhibited it here the last week at the Art Association. It has made quite a stir, especially among artists, but it doesn’t seem that I’m getting rid of it yet. It is altogether too serious a subject for the general public and the majority say that they would not have it on their wall. I’m sending it from [Munich] to Stuttgart, then home for exhibition in Christiania and will (between ourselves) offer it to the National Gallery. If they don’t bite, I’ll send it to the big show in Berlin in the autumn.*

In this letter, Peterssen was clearly trying to impress his parents, and at the same time demonstrate that, at the age of twenty-four, he had strong international connections. Biblical themes were clearly in vogue with the Norwegians in Munich, as Heyerdahl was working on *Adam and Eve* (fig. 4) at this time. It is suggested that Peterssen’s choice of theme was provided for him by Henrik Ibsen’s play *Emperor and Galilean* (1873), in which Judas appears in a vison to the main character, the Roman Emperor Julian the Apostate. Peterssen had painted his first portrait of Ibsen in 1876 and would have had plenty of time to talk to the playwright about the content of this work.
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771 No. 40 *Portrait*; No. 39 *Judas Ischariote*.
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Fig. 171. Eilif Peterssen, *Judas Iscariot (Judas Iskariot)*, 1877, Lillehammer Kunstmuseum, oil on canvas, dimensions unknown.

Fig. 172. Eilif Peterssen, *Judas Iscariot (Judas Iskariot)*, 1878, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 82 x 100.5cm.
Fig. 173. Lippo Memmi (Barna da Siena), *The Judas Kiss*, c.1344, detail, Collegiata of Santa Maria Assunta, San Gimignano, fresco.

Fig. 174. Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres, *Paolo and Francesca*, 1819, Musée des Beaux-arts, Angers, oil on canvas, 50 x 41cm.
The theme of the ‘Judas kiss’ in Western art can be traced back at least as far as a fresco by Giotto in the Scrovegni chapel in Padua (c.1305), but Peterssen’s stretch-necked protagonist has more in common with that painted by Lippo Memmi in the Collegiata in San Gimignano, c.1344 (fig. 173). We obviously cannot be sure if Peterssen had seen this work, either in person or reproduction, but he visited Venice in 1875 and was keen to study Italian art of the past. Mention must be made that the picture also has strong resonances with Ingres’s Paolo and Francesca (1819; fig. 174), painted in Rome, in which Paolo, with a long, straight, distended neck, kisses a passive Francesca.

It is interesting to study the fate of the two major versions of Judas painted by Peterssen. The first version, about which Peterssen had written to his parents, shows a sly, long-necked Judas lunging towards a calm Christ, whose pale white face is illuminated by a small candle in Judas’s right hand. Christ is not idealised, except in his passivity. Judas almost looks deformed, his elongated neck stretching unnaturally from beneath his all-covering cloak. When it was exhibited in Kristiania in the summer of 1877, the critic Lorentz Dietrichson had both praise and criticism for Peterssen. He countered the suggestion that Peterssen had portrayed Christ in too human a form, but was unhappy with the ‘simple, vile, sinister villain, he has depicted’. However, he reached the conclusion that the picture was both ‘new and significant evidence regarding Eilif Peterssen’s true talents, as well as the seriousness and the skill with which our lofty young artist labours’. Peterssen’s second version is certainly toned down in comparison with the first. Christ is more reactive to the situation and made more contemplative. Judas is made less villainous, and given a covering beard and a more conventional neck posture. The event appears more natural, less contrived, and its Munich-style dark colouration clearly found favour with the Exposition judges in the same manner as Heyerdahl’s work. Unlike so many of his contemporaries, Peterssen did not head for Paris at the end of the 1870s, but instead went to Italy from 1879 to 1883, no doubt influenced by his earlier visit to Venice. He later followed Krøyer to Skagen, where he made his first visit in 1883. In 1886, he joined his compatriot Erik

775 Peterssen, Judas Iskariot, accessed 5 June 2014.
776 Peterssen, Norsk Biografisk Leksikon, accessed 5 May 2014.
Werenskiold and other Nordic artists in showing in Berlin, exhibiting a Venetian scene in a style that had become more Impressionistic during the 1880s. Peterssen then spent the summer of 1886 at the farm at Fleskum Backer and Kielland, plus Werenskiold, Skredsvig and Gerhard Munthe, all friends in Munich in the 1870s. It was here that he created *Summer Night* (fig. 175; 1886) that is central to any discussion of mood painting in Norway, and which Peterssen later sent to the 1887 Paris *Salon* and the 1889 *Exposition Universelle*. The viewer is looking downwards towards the surface of the lake, thus leaving just a hint of a horizon line mid-picture. Instead, the sky is mirrored in the lake surface, and the reflected moon is key to the ambiance of the picture. Its significance is that, along with Kitty Kielland’s same-titled work, it heralds the beginning of a Neo-Romantic movement in Norwegian painting.

As stated previously, however, it differs from Kielland’s *Summer Night* (fig. 156) in that it carries a dreamier, more emotional feeling, heightened by a hyper-real clarity of representation that evokes mood, as opposed to the representation of landscape. There is an evocation of life and death represented by the sturdy, upright trunk and the dying birch limb stretched out across the water. Norwegian nationalism is now evoked by the feeling and emotion of the Nordic summer night, and not just by its physical characteristics. When it was exhibited in Kristiania at the 1886 Autumn Exhibition, it was one of two pictures that received the most critical praise, the other being a third Dælivannet lake image, Christian Skredsvig’s *St. John’s Eve* (1886; Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen). While Skredsvig’s work shares the stillness of Peterssen’s, compared with *Summer Night* it is an earthly composition; natural not supernatural. Andreas Aubert wrote of Peterssen’s picture that he could ‘go in and rest his arm on the tree trunk, lean his head against his hand and stare down into the depths, lost in the waking dreams of the night’.

---
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Fig. 175. Eilif Peterssen, *Summer Night*, 1886, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 133 x 151 cm.

Fig. 176. Eilif Peterssen, *Nocturne*, 1887, Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, oil on canvas, 200 x 250 cm.
As Gunnarsson has pointed out, the following year Peterssen painted *Nocturne* (fig. 176; 1887), a larger reprise of the same scene, in which a nude female figure enacts Aubert’s words.\(^784\) This evidence, and that of *Judas Iscariot*, suggests that Peterssen both read criticism of his work and was responsive to it. Although *Summer Night* went unrewarded at the 1887 *Salon*, it was the key work among Peterssen’s three pictures that resulted in the gold medal at the 1889 *Exposition*, placing him in Norway’s top three painters at the exhibition.\(^785\)

The sole Nordic success at the 1878 *Salon* was achieved by the Swede Hugo Salmson. Salmson had gone to Paris ten years earlier on a travel grant, and had become ambitious for *Salon* success.\(^786\) To this end, he embraced the French-based Realism of Jean-François Millet as filtered through the art of the German Max Liebermann. In the 1870s Liebermann produced a number of pictures of peasants at work in the fields, such as *Potato Harvest in Barbizon* (1874-75; Museum Kunstpalast, Düsseldorf) and *Workers in a Turnip Field* (c.1876), the latter proving a great success at the *Salon* of 1876. Andrea Meyer speculates convincingly that ‘Liebermann may have borrowed from Millet [...] the horizontal structuring of the picture plane into a kind of foreground stage on which the major or single figures move.’\(^787\) Liebermann’s characters in these pictures are grubbier than, for example, Millet’s *The Gleaners* (1857; Musée d’Orsay), giving a sense of direct contact with the soil itself. In Salmson’s picture *Hoeing Sugar Beet in Picardy* (fig. 177; 1878), the artist arranges his figures in a long diagonal from right to left, just as in *The Gleaners*. They share with Liebermann the sense of figures on a foreground stage, but in the dirtiness of their occupation they seem to steer a middle ground between the grime of Liebermann and Millet’s hard-working but clean peasantry. It is not clear how Salmson was able to exhibit *Hoeing Sugar Beet* at the contemporaneous *Exposition Universelle* and *Salon* in 1878,\(^788\) but it was at the latter that he was awarded an Honourable Mention. The judges would have liked the fact that a Swedish painter was painting a French subject in a French style, and its simplicity may have won them over, but it lacks the dynamism, construction and human interaction of the picture that Salmson submitted to the *Salon* the following year.

---


\(^785\) Hans Heyerdahl also received a gold medal, Erik Werenskiold was awarded a Grand Prix.


\(^788\) 1878 *Exposition Suède* No. 56, 1878 *Salon* No. 1999, *Bineurs de betteraves, en Picardie*. 
Fig. 177. Hugo Salmson, *Hoeing Sugar Beet in Picardy*, *(Bineurs de betteraves, en Picardie)*, 1878, Göteborgs Konstmuseum, oil on canvas, 151 x 245cm.

Fig. 178. Hugo Salmson, *An Arrest in a Picardy Village*, *(Une arrestation dans un village de Picardie)*, 1879, Musée de Picardie, Amiens, ex Musée d'Orsay, oil on canvas, 230 x 180cm.
In 1879, Salmson was again successful with a work set in Picardy, entitled *An Arrest in a Picardy Village* (fig. 178; 1879). This year there were two Nordic prize-winners, Salmson being joined by his compatriot August Hagborg in receiving a third-class medal. Salmson addressed the theme of rural infanticide; a downcast young mother stands forlornly while an older woman denounces her to a police officer. That this was a significant social issue at this time was highlighted again by Knut Hamsun, when the protagonist’s wife committed just this offence in the book *Growth of the Soil*, written in 1917, but set in the nineteenth century. Salmson, employing the grey tones of French naturalism, cleverly used the houses on either side of the street to funnel the viewer towards the three key characters at the centre of the picture. The picture was immediately bought by the French state for 5,000 francs, but in 1896 was put on long-term loan to the Musée de Picardie in Amiens, where it joined Salmson’s much smaller *Portrait of a Young Swedish Girl* (c.1883) which the museum had purchased in 1883.

August Hagborg had received a third-class medal at the 1878 *Exposition Universelle* and was then awarded a third-class medal at the *Salon* of 1879, the two exhibitions being different, though not entirely unconnected, entities. Hagborg arrived in France around 1875 and began painting on the coast of Normandy later that decade; he was to live in France for the majority of his life. In 1879 he exhibited a painting depicting the people of Agon, on the west side of the Cotentin peninsula. His picture was entitled *High Tide in the Channel* (1878; fig. 179), a slightly misleading nomenclature, in that it depicts the aftermath of a high tide where local people could harvest the ‘fruits of the sea’ that had been deposited. It is suggested by the Musée de Saint-Maur, where the picture is currently located, that it shows local farmers supplementing their income by collecting shrimps and perhaps clams, and also harvesting kelp. Hagborg uses a more muted palette than Salmson, omitting primary colours completely, and his grey clouds are darker and more atmospheric. The picture has a heightened atmosphere, suggesting a strong source of light despite the gloowering sky. It is clearly idealised, showing the people as relaxed despite their toils.

---
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It is no coincidence that all three prize winning pictures by the Swedes in 1878 and 1879 were set in France and used French techniques. The critic Edmond Duranty is explicit about this. At the 1878 *Exposition Universelle* he said that ‘The strong artists like Salmson and Heyerdahl...are the artists who France or Germany have naturalised’. It is claimed in the 2008 catalogue of the exhibition of Nordic art in Lille that Hagborg’s work was ‘the first important Scandinavian picture to be purchased by the French state under the Third Republic’, though this honour was clearly shared with Salmson’s *Arrestation*. The picture also gave Hagborg kudos among the Nordic painting community; his painting was bought direct from the *Salon* by the French state and his acumen in selling his work in France apparently earned him the epithet ‘the banker’. Hagborg’s picture represents the concept of the ‘juste milieu’ artists who steered a middle path between the Naturalism of the Barbizon artists and the more painterly effects of the Impressionists, sharing the latter’s concerns with the effect of
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796 Kristoffer Arvidsson, ‘August Hagborg, Swedish, 1852-1921’, Goteborgs Konstmuseum: [http://emp-web-34.zetcom.ch/eMuseumPlus?service=direct/1/ResultListView/result.t2.artist_list.$TspTitleLink$0, link&sp=10&sp=Artist&sp=FieldValue&sp=0&sp=3&sp=5simpleList&sp=0&sp=5detail &sp=0&sp=F&sp=T&sp=2](http://emp-web-34.zetcom.ch/eMuseumPlus?service=direct/1/ResultListView/result.t2.artist_list.$TspTitleLink$0, link&sp=10&sp=Artist&sp=FieldValue&sp=0&sp=3&sp=5simpleList&sp=0&sp=5detail &sp=0&sp=F&sp=T&sp=2), accessed on 8 June 2014.
light. It also reflects the tradition and dependability of the non-industrial rural peasantry in comparison with their urban counterparts. 797

Hagborg and Salmson received no further awards from the Salon, but they did receive critical notices at the following year’s Salon in 1880. Hagborg exhibited a picture entitled *On the Beach at Agon* and Salmson a work entitled *The Poppy Threshers* (c.1880; fig. 180). 798 The French critic Paul Mantz reviewed both in *Le Temps* in June 1880:

> We know M. August Hagborg. He forgets the shores of Sweden for the coasts of the Channel. Last year he had a very solid success with *High Tide*. The public is less ardent today, perhaps because in *The Beach at Agon*, the execution is a little too loose, but the artist has, as before, much of the feeling of "the spot". It is there where his most assured asset lies [...] M. Hugo Salmson, who arrived in Paris long before Mr. Hagborg, seeks similar effects. The Swedish artist has found in *The Poppy Threshers of Picardy* the subject for an excellent picture. Even the colours are somewhat near those of his compatriot. The vigorous figures are silhouetted under a whitish sky, running with silvery clouds. But here, the execution is comparatively stronger. *The Poppy Threshers* is well-constructed. They have a just and simple movement. If M. Salmson later returns quietly to Stockholm, it is clear that he has not wasted his time in France. 799

Hagborg’s picture is only known from a collotype reproduction, 800 but it seems clear that the artist has painted a variant of his previous theme, this time incorporating two central ‘fishing’ characters of opposite gender looking directly at each other, a wide-pronged rake, a character digging (centre-background), and a cart loaded with kelp. The latter element is given a far greater prominence in this later picture. Frank Claustrat suggests that both were painted at the same time (1878), 801 although *On the Beach at Agon* is generally dated 1880 when it appeared at the Salon.

---

797 Musée Saint-Maur, accessed 5 June 2014.
798 No. 1770 *Sur la plage d’Agon (Manche)*; No. 3412 *Les batteurs d’oeillettes en Picardie*.
Although unable to compare the colour of Hagborg and Salmson’s 1880 Salon entries, it is not unreasonable to compare Salmson’s Poppy Threshers with Hagborg’s earlier work (fig. 179), and they do indeed share a strong similarity of grey and white glowering sky, although Salmson’s use of a strong blue for the jacket of one of his central characters is notable. Salmson again employs the long diagonal line of figures that had served him well in Hoeing Sugar Beet and adds a little vignette of a small child blowing on the embers of a fire to keep it alight. It again shares the feel of a constructed stage scene. Notably, this picture is a very rare instance of a British public gallery possessing a Nordic work that was exhibited at the Paris Salon during this period. Following his success in 1879, the French critics seemed keen to engage with Hagborg’s work in 1880. Philippe Burty in L’Art wrote:

M. Kroyer came from Denmark to paint a Sardinery at Concarneau. Are there no sardineries in his own country? That would interest us more! - M. Hagborg also presses upon our shores, and has painted, not without merit, The Beach of Agon in the English Channel. Alas! beaches abound this year, beginning with Émile Vernier, who is the best of all. Painters, for trading purposes, have found ways to combine the requirements of pot-au-feu [i.e. eating] with the pleasures of holidaying. - What can be more typical than Evening, The Island of Waderon, Sweden, by M. Wahlberg! and Steamboat Station in Norway, a background of icy cliffs

802 No. 3781 La vente du coquillage, à Saint-Wast-la-Hougue (Manche).
of glistening snow, by M. Smith-Hald! And the *Coasts of Skåne at sunset*, by M. Carl Skanberg! Today when everyone properly knows his artist’s trade, everyone should enamour themselves jealously of the beauties of their own country! True art will sink in cosmopolitanism such as it almost sinks in academicism. There must be agreement between studios to draw *cordon sanitaires.* Burty’s views are interesting. After suggesting that Krøyer, and perhaps Hagborg, should consider painting their own native coastal scenes, he quickly asserted that a Frenchman is the most proficient at depicting the coast. He then suggested that some Nordic painters are combining commercial considerations with those of holidaying in France (!), and gives examples of how other Nordic artists are quite capable of remaining true to their homeland. He believed that art itself suffered if artists strayed from depicting the treasures of their own countries. What he completely failed to acknowledge is that it was these very depictions of France by Hagborg and Salmson that led to the only Nordic successes at the *Salons of 1878 and 1879*. As we know, Krøyer had already depicted fishing scenes in his own country, and then went to Skagen in 1882 where he engaged most successfully with the subject.

Philippe de Chennevières in the *Gazette des Beaux-arts* also noted Hagborg and Smith-Hald’s pictures:

> M. Hagborg, [is the painter of] a beautiful *Beach of Agon*, where naturally the grey of the sand is all-important; but he distrusts the bluish reflections, this is where he falls down. His fishermen and fisherwomen are a good stab; the execution is however a little slender. The State has done well to acquire *Steamboat Station in Norway* by M. Smith-Hald. The figures in the foreground are painted more solidly than those of M. Hagborg, and the icy light that runs across the lake surrounded by snowy mountains is rendered with a rare pleasure.

Chennevières clearly preferred the dreamy, wistful figures of Smith-Hald’s composition, redolent of the atmosphere of work by Bastien-Lepage, to Hagborg’s depiction of working people that appear closer to Millet. Surprisingly, considering its purchase by the French State, Smith-Hald’s picture received no *Salon* award, and he was given no official *Salon* recognition until 1887.

---

803 No. 3551 *Une Station de bateaux à vapeur en Norvège*; No. 3543 *Côte de Scanie, en Suède; coucher de soleil.*
806 Now in the *Palais des Beaux-Art*, Lille; see Scottez-de Wambrechies (ed.), 2008, pp. 120-121.
Hagborg exhibited at the *Salon* every year from 1879 to 1889, and Salmson also exhibited in most years during this period. It was Salmson who was much more successful. In addition to the French government purchasing *An Arrest in a Picardy Village* (1879; fig. 178) and *Portrait of a Young Swedish Girl* (1873), they also bought *At the Fence at Dalby in Skåne* (Musée d’Orsay, Paris) from the 1884 *Salon* and *The Little Gleaner* (fig. 181) from the 1885 *Salon*.\textsuperscript{807} The last named picture cleverly presents a fair-haired, blue-eyed, red-cheeked young Swedish girl, suggestive both of a softer but still monumental version of Jules Breton’s *The Gleaner* (fig. 12; 1877), and of the seated girl in Jules Bastien-Lepage’s *The Haymakers* (fig. 49a; 1877. From 1884 onwards Salmson had turned his pictorial attention away from Picardy towards his native Sweden; the combination of depicting Scandinavian subject matter using French techniques was clearly successful commercially. Alongside *The Little Gleaner* at the 1885 *Salon*, Salmson exhibited *At Grandmother’s House* (1885; *Besöket Hus Mormor*) which was also his only exhibit at Berlin in 1886.\textsuperscript{808} At the 1889 *Exposition Universelle*, Hagborg exhibited eight works but went unrewarded. Salmson, on the other hand, exhibited only five works, including *An Arrest* (fig. 178) and *At the Fence*,\textsuperscript{809} but received major recognition when he was made a *Chevalier de l’ordre de la Légion d’honneur*. In his generally positive discussion of Swedish art at the *Exposition* in the *Gazette des Beaux-arts*, Maurice Hamel appeared to find Salmsn and Hagborg somewhat ‘old hat’. In his brief review, he declared ‘After Salmson [and] Hagborg, the frenchified painters, still a little timid, newcomers have bounded to the forefront.’\textsuperscript{810} As with so many Nordic artists, Salmson and Hagborg ceased exhibiting at the *Salon* in the years after the high-water mark of the 1889 *Exposition*.

\textsuperscript{807} See Scottez-de Wambrechies (ed.), 2008, pp. 186-87 and pp. 188-89. This catalogue fails to record the exhibition of No. 2188 *La Petite Glaneuse* (*The Little Gleaner*) at the 1885 *Salon*.
\textsuperscript{808} Paris (1885) No. 2189 *Chez grand’mère*; Berlin (1886) No. 979 *Bei der Grossmutter*.
\textsuperscript{809} No. 105 *Une arrestation*; - Picardie; No. 106 *A la barrière*; - Suède.
\textsuperscript{810} Hamel, 1889, pp. 378-79.
The period 1880-82 was a successful one for Nordic painters at the Salon, with eight awards being gained in this period. Seven of these works have already been discussed, the exception being by the little-known Karl Uchermann. Uchermann was born in the Lofoten Islands, studied in Munich in the 1870s under Karl von Piloty, and specialised in animal painting, particularly dogs. In 1881, his *Break during the Hunt* (1880) received an Honourable Mention and was purchased by the Musée des Beaux-Arts de Bordeaux.\footnote{Anne Falahat, ’Karl Uchermann’, *Store Norske Leksikon*, \url{http://nbl.snl.no/Karl_Uchermann}, accessed 9 June 2014.}

Other Honourable Mentions during this period were achieved by Harriet Backer with *Solitude* (fig. 137) and Bertha Wegmann *Portrait of the Artist Jeanna Bauck* (fig. 145). Four third-class medals were awarded: Albert Edelfelt for *Conveying the Child’s Coffin* (fig. 54), P. S. Krøyer for *The Italian Village Hatters* (fig. 17), Christian Skredsvig for *A Farm at Venoix* (fig. 56) and Bertha Wegmann for *Madam Seekamp, the Artist’s Sister*.
(fig. 146). The highest award went to Albert Edelfelt, a second-class medal for *Divine Service by the Sea* (fig. 55).

Carl-Gustav Hellqvist, a Swedish history painter, exhibiting at Munich in 1879 and at the Paris *Salon* every year from 1882 to 1886, before ill-health curtailed his career. His high-point was the award of an Honourable Mention in 1883 for *Valdemar Atterdag holding Visby to Ransom, 1361* (1882; fig. 182).<sup>812</sup> This substantial work was purchased by the very wealthy businessman Fredrik Bünsow and donated to the Nationalmuseum in Stockholm in 1891.<sup>813</sup> It depicts the Danish King Valdemar IV watching while the people of the Swedish town of Visby on the island of Gotland fill three large beer barrels with silver and gold in return for sparing the town from destruction.<sup>814</sup> Hellqvist’s highly-detailed and busy picture is generally painted in muted tones, but with striking red contrasts, particularly surrounding the king, and touches of blue and yellow. It was the first Nordic history painting to receive recognition in Paris since Carl Bloch at the *Exposition Universelle* of 1878. Hellqvist’s final offering at the *Salon*, in 1886, was another large history scene depicting the carrying of the corpse of the great Swedish King Gustavus Adolphus, again using muted grey tones with red highlights.<sup>815</sup> Hellqvist died in 1890 aged just thirty-eight.
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<sup>812</sup> No. 1190 *Mise à rançon de la Ville de Visby par Waldemar Atterdag, roi de Danemark, en 1361*.


<sup>814</sup> Sanchez, Catalogue ‘Salon de 1883’, 1883, p. 108.

<sup>815</sup> No. 1181 *Embarquement du corps de Gustave-Adolphe, roi de Suède.*
The other two award winners in 1883 were also Swedish, and both received third-class medals. They were linked in other ways too – both Richard Bergh and Carl Larsson were among the wave of Nordic artists who decamped to Grez-sur-Loing in the spring of 1882, and included Christian Skredsvig, Christian Krohg, Nils Kreuger, Carl Nordström and Emma Löwstadt. Larsson had begun his French career in 1878, exhibiting *Amor Mercurius* (lost) at the 1878 *Exposition Universelle* and a portrait of his ill-fated fellow painter *Carl Skånberg, the Artist* (1878; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm) at the 1878 *Salon*. There then followed a hiatus during which his work was turned down for the 1882 *Salon*, and his arrival at Grez. It was at this point that Larsson abandoned oils in favour of watercolour, and during a hard-working stay in Grez in the winter of 1882-83, he produced two works that were accepted by the *Salon*. These two pictures, *October* (fig. 183; *The Pumpkins*) and *November* (fig. 184; *Hoar-Frost*) gained him a third-class medal in 1883.
Fig. 183. Carl Larsson, *October, Les Potirons*, 1882, Göteborgs Konstmuseum, watercolour on paper on canvas, 73 x 54.5cm.

Fig. 184. Carl Larsson, *November, La Gelée Blanche*, 1882, Göteborgs Konstmuseum, watercolour on paper on canvas. 73 x 54cm.
October is painted from an aspect that looks up towards the subject using a typically muted Grez palette, enlivened by the touches of orange for the pumpkins. As we know, the depiction of rural peasantry in conjunction with vegetable or cereal crops was a favourite motif for Naturalist artists. November is presented through a frosty lens and is another vignette of clog-wearing rural peasantry. Its French exhibition title, Gelée Blanche (Hoar Frost), complete with subject matter of a solitary man with a walking stick, suggests that Larsson was acquainted with Camille Pissarro’s Gelée Blanche (1873; Musée d’Orsay), which had been exhibited at the first Impressionist exhibition of 1874, prior to Larsson’s arrival in France.

Richard Bergh had also been based at Grez-sur-Loing and had resorted to the time-honoured stratagem of using a fellow artist as a model. His sober and honest depiction of fellow Swede Nils Kreuger (fig. 185), cigarette in hand and brushes at the ready, was Bergh’s Salon debut. It clearly impressed the judges as he was awarded a third-class medal, rather than an Honourable Mention.

Fig. 185. Richard Bergh, Portrait of the Painter Nils Kreuger, 1883, Statens Museum for Kunst, Copenhagen, oil on canvas, 120.5 x 102.5cm.
Bergh and Larsson met with no further *Salon* recognition in the 1880s, but exhibited there regularly. In 1884, Bergh showed *After the Sitting* (fig. 186), a slightly risqué work in which a young, blushing model dresses after a session of nude modelling while the artist Carl Jaensson plays his violin, staring at the progress of his composition. Bergh tilts the angle of the composition so that the viewer looks directly at the semi-clothed girl. There are clearly elements of *Japonism* in the composition, namely the 'flattening, simplification and cropping' that are all evident, and the artist’s emphasis is on the display of the tonal possibilities of his limited palette. As Michelle Facos notes, the contrast between the active painter and passive model is more a comment on the reality of the situation rather than on the woman’s subjugated role. This is a ‘modern’ (semi) nude for 1884, with none of the classical, allegorical or ‘bather’ references that had traditionally been considered necessary for the *Salon*. In this consideration, and also the combination of musical instrument and female figure allied to a compressed view, it echoes Gauguin’s *Suzanne Sewing: Study of a Nude* (1880; Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Copenhagen), which was exhibited at the Sixth Impressionist Exhibition in 1881.

---

819 No. 186 *La fin de la séance.*
In 1885, Bergh’s picture was shown at an exhibition in Sweden organised by Bergh and Ernst Josephson entitled From the Banks of the Seine, in which they were joined by Carl Larsson, Nils Kreuger, Anders Zorn, Bruno Liljefors and Karl Nordström.\textsuperscript{823} This exhibition was a representation of pictures by those who were opposed to the highly-conservative Swedish Royal Academy, and its title a direct statement of the French influence that these young artists wished to propagate. Later in 1885, Josephson and Larsson organised another exhibition, even more provocative and direct in its title, The Opponents. This exhibition proved a successful launch-pad for the French-influenced young Swedish artists, who succeeded in selling works to both the state-controlled Nationalmuseum and to collectors, in particular the ubiquitous Pontus Fürstenberg.\textsuperscript{824} Carl Larsson, meanwhile, had exhibited two further watercolours at the 1884 Salon, one of which, The Lake at Grez-sur-Loing (1883; Louvre graphic arts dept., ex Musée d’Orsay),\textsuperscript{825} was bought by the French state.\textsuperscript{826}

Larsson’s work is highly typical of the muted tones of ‘grey Grez’, and represents a piece of the atmospheric Naturalism that was so prevalent at the colony. Again, the influence of Japanese prints is clear in the simplicity of the scene and cropped field of vision. As early as 1885, Larsson had written ‘as an artist, Japan is my native country.’\textsuperscript{827} After exhibiting a watercolour of the great French actor Coquelin at the 1885 Salon, the following year he showed a watercolour depicting Fürstenberg’s new gallery in Stockholm, Interior of the Fürstenberg Gallery (1885; fig. 187).\textsuperscript{828} The picture both celebrates and demonstrates the support that Fürstenberg and his wife gave to the young artists. Not only does it show both the Fürstenbergs and their magnificent gallery, but they had also bought the picture and are recorded at the Salon as its owners. Additionally, the work features Ernst Josephson painting a portrait of Göthilda Fürstenberg surrounded by rich furnishings and works of art.\textsuperscript{829} It was Göthilda’s

\textsuperscript{823} Ibid., pp. 16-17.
\textsuperscript{824} Ibid., p. 20.
\textsuperscript{825} No. 2935 L’étang; - à Grez-sur-Loing.
\textsuperscript{826} Scottez-de Wambrechies (ed.), 2008, pp. 166-67.
\textsuperscript{828} No. 2951 Portrait de M. Coquelin, de la Comédie Française, dans le rôle de «Crispin du Légataire universel»; No. 3028 La Galerie Furstenburg, à Gothembourg.
\textsuperscript{829} Kristoffer Arvidsson, Göteborgs Konstmuseum, ‘Carl Larsson, Interior of the Fürstenberg Gallery’, http://emp-web-34.zetcom.ch/eMuseumPlus?service=direct/1/ResultDetailView/result.inline.list.t1.collection_list.$TspTitleImageLink.link&sp=13&sp=Sartist&sp=SfilterDefinition&sp=0&sp=3&sp=1&sp=SdetailView&sp=12&sp=5detail&sp=0&sp=T&sp=0&sp=SdetailList&sp=0&sp=F&sp=Scollection&sp=12143, accessed 14 June 2014.
money that financed the whole enterprise, as she had married Pontus in 1880 after the death of her disapproving father in 1879 left her a substantial fortune.

Larsson had met the artist Karin Bergöö at Grez-sur-Loing in 1882 and married her the following year. Similarly, Bergh had married Helena Klemming in 1885, and at the 1886 Salon he exhibited The Artist’s Wife (1886; fig. 190), a portrait that captured his wife’s keen intelligence.  

She is shown with scissors dangling from one hand and a thimble on the other, with her gold wedding ring and bracelet contrasting with these silver-coloured instruments. Pontus Fürstenberg had already bought Bergh’s 1885 Salon picture, Girl Picking Flowers (1884; Göteborgs Konstmuseum) and this latest picture was promptly purchased by him also. The support given by Fürstenberg to both Bergh and Larsson was substantial and important to them in this period.

---

830 No. 181 Ma Femme.
831 No. 214 En Suède, à la tombée do soir.
In 1887, Bergh’s *Salon* picture was *Hypnotic Séance* (1887; fig. 188), a depiction of the fashionable physician Axel Munthe hypnotising a patient.\(^{832}\) The picture’s French title *Une Suggestion* relates to the idea of suggestibility while in a hypnotic state that had been publicised in print in 1884 by the French physician Hippolyte Bernheim.\(^{833}\) The viewer is drawn to two sets of eyes, the upturned white eyes of the hypnotised patient and the bespectacled eye of a captivated female viewer. It is intentionally unsettling and dramatic.

As Facos has noted, Bergh’s picture is concurrent with a similarly-themed work by André Brouillet,\(^{834}\) *A Clinical Lesson at the Salpêtrière* (1887; Université Paris Descartes), which was exhibited at the French exhibition in Copenhagen in 1888.\(^{835}\) The 1889 *Exhibition Universelle* was a triumph for both painters. Larsson exhibited a huge triptych of works representing the renaissance, the rococo and modern art (1888-89; *Renaissance, Rococo, Modern Art*; Göteborgs Konstmuseum).\(^{836}\) This work, representing art from the renaissance to the present day is, like so many of the pictures under discussion, part of the Fürstenberg bequest that is now housed in the
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\(^{832}\) No. 191 *Une Suggestion*; Facos in Varnedoe (ed.), 1988, p. 52.
\(^{833}\) Hippolyte Bernheim, author of *De la Suggestion dans l’État hypnotique et dans l’État de Vielle* (Paris: Octave Doin, 1884).
\(^{834}\) Facos in Varnedoe (ed.), 1988, p. 52.
\(^{835}\) See illustration in Saabye, *Krøyer*, p. 97, Ill. 106.
\(^{836}\) Suède No. 67. *Triptyque: La Renaissance; le XVIIIᵉ siècle; l’art moderne.*
Göteborgs Konstmuseum. *Rococo*, with its references to Boucher and Fragonard, possesses a lightness and delicacy that were to characterise Larsson’s later depictions of family life that have proved enduringly popular with the Swedish public. *Modern Art* (fig. 189), with its Japanese figure, half-completed Eiffel Tower and top hat bearing the initials of Pontus Fürstenberg, contains references to influences, patronage and modernity. Larsson achieved a gold medal for his three sizeable canvases, but a consideration of the numerous awards to Nordic artists at the *Exposition* suggests that many were awarded as much in respect of past achievements than for what they were now exhibiting. Larsson’s work lacks the intimacy of his earlier pictures; he has tried to include a broad range of ideas on a grand scale with a limited degree of success. Maurice Hamel had this to say in his review in the *Gazette des beaux-arts*:

Larsson, whose triptych could serve as an emblem for this pliant art, is laughing and distinguished, enjoying himself with sketches, some rapid notations of tender harmonies, and waiting until the time is ripe for the vital works.

In other words, Larsson was marking time with these pictures, and was capable of better. Hamel was much kinder to Bergh; ‘the wisest, the most sincere, the most nimble also in imagination’. Bergh’s five pictures included three previous *Salon* works, plus a *Portrait de Mlle B.* that may be of the artist Julia Beck.

---

837 Björn Fredlund, ‘Carl Larsson i Göteborgs konstmuseum’, 2001, [http://emp-web-34.zetcom.ch/eMuseumPlus?service=direct/1/ResultDetailView/result.inline.list.t1.collection_list.$TspTitleLink.link&sp=13&sp=Sartist&sp=SfilterDefinition&sp=0&sp=1&sp=SdetailView&sp=13&sp=Sdetail&sp=0&sp=T&sp=0&sp=SdetailList&sp=0&sp=F&sp=Scollection&sp=12147](http://emp-web-34.zetcom.ch/eMuseumPlus?service=direct/1/ResultDetailView/result.inline.list.t1.collection_list.$TspTitleLink.link&sp=13&sp=Sartist&sp=SfilterDefinition&sp=0&sp=1&sp=SdetailView&sp=13&sp=Sdetail&sp=0&sp=T&sp=0&sp=SdetailList&sp=0&sp=F&sp=Scollection&sp=12147), accessed 18 May 2014.

838 Hamel, 1889, p. 379.

839 Ibid.

840 No. 10 *<Ma femme>*; No. 11 *Portrait de M. Nils Kreuger*; No. 13 *A la tombée du soir*. No. 12 *Portrait de Mlle B.*; The portrait of Julia Beck dates from 1882 (Nationalmuseum, Stockholm), while according to Pontus Grate in *Dreams of a Summer Night*, 1986, p. 73, the portrait of the artist Eva Bonnier (1889; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm) was not exhibited until the 1900 *Exposition Universelle*. 
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Fig. 189. Carl Larsson, *Modern Art*, 1888-89, Göteborgs Konstmuseum, oil on canvas, 248 x 235 cm.

Fig. 190. Richard Bergh, *The Artist’s Wife*, 1886, Göteborgs Konstmuseum, oil on canvas, 105.5 x 89 cm.
Bergh was instrumental in the hanging of the Swedish contingent of pictures, and he was rewarded by the French with the bestowal of both the Grand Prix and the Chevalier de l’ordre de la Légion d’honneur. Bergh and Albert Edelfelt were the only two Nordic painters at the exhibition to receive this top combination of honours. It was perhaps fitting that Bergh had included the affectionate and perceptive portrait of his wife (fig. 190) in his portfolio. The Exposition opened in May 1889, and the following month Helena Bergh died from throat cancer aged twenty-six.\(^{842}\)

There was limited success for the Nordic nations at the Salon in 1884 and 1885, aside from the major triumph of Krøyer who gained a second-class medal in a year in which no first class were awarded. Recognition was limited to three Honourable Mentions for lesser-known Norwegian artists: Johannes Martin Grimelund, Adelsteen Normann and Otto Sinding. These three artists have a number of connections, not least that they all painted in the Lofoten Islands, located off the north coast of Norway inside the Arctic Circle; Normann and Sinding both won their Salon recognition with Lofoten depictions.

Grimelund had studied at Karlsruhe from 1871 with Hans Gude, alongside Eiliff Peterssen, Otto Sinding having arrived there in 1869. In 1875 Grimelund went to Paris, making his debut at the Salon the following year.\(^{843}\) In 1876, he also exhibited at the Centennial International Exhibition in Philadelphia, where he was awarded a silver medal.\(^{844}\) Grimelund based himself in France for the rest of his life after marrying a French girl, but travelled widely in search of motifs.\(^{845}\) After exhibiting pictures of France at the Salon from 1878 to 1883, in 1884 he exhibited two pictures of Belgium, and it was these that led to his Honourable Mention.\(^{846}\) His Mexico Dock in Antwerp (fig. 191, 1884) is a Realist depiction of steamboats and sailboats, with heightened lighting that recalls the theatrical staging of Hagborg’s High Tide in the Channel (fig. 179). Grimelund continued to exhibit port scenes – Antwerp, London, Dunkirk,
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\(^{842}\) Kristoffer Arvidsson, ‘Richard Bergh, The Artist’s Wife’, Göteborgs Konstmuseum, [http://emp-web.34.zetcom.ch/eMuseumPlus?service=direct/1/ResultDetailView/result inline.list.t1.collection list.$TspTitleLink.link&sp=13&sp=Sartist&sp=SfieldValue&sp=0&sp=0&sp=3&sp=SdetailView&sp= 0&sp=Sdetail&sp=0&sp=F&sp=Scollection&sp=l7775](http://emp-web.34.zetcom.ch/eMuseumPlus?service=direct/1/ResultDetailView/result inline.list.t1.collection list.$TspTitleLink.link&sp=13&sp=Sartist&sp=SfieldValue&sp=0&sp=0&sp=3&sp=SdetailView&sp= 0&sp=Sdetail&sp=0&sp=F&sp=Scollection&sp=l7775), accessed 18 June 2014.


\(^{846}\) No. 1106 Station balnéaire; Belgique; No. 1107 Le Mexico-dock, à Anvers.
Marseilles – before another depiction of Antwerp won him a third-class medal in 1888.\textsuperscript{847}

Grimelund exhibited four pictures at the 1889 \textit{Exposition Universelle}, two scenes of Antwerp, one of Sweden, and one of Norway, and was rewarded with a Bronze Medal. He exhibited at the \textit{Salon} for around a quarter of a century,\textsuperscript{848} and was awarded the \textit{Légion d'honneur} in 1892.\textsuperscript{849} An Impressionistic view of the Lofoten Islands, \textit{Fishermens' Houses at Svolvær, Lofoten} (1892; Musée d'Orsay) was bought by the French state in 1893.\textsuperscript{850}

Otto Sinding married Hans Gude's step-daughter in 1873, and followed Eilif Petterssen to Munich to study under Karl von Piloty,\textsuperscript{851} registering six months after his compatriot in April 1874.\textsuperscript{852} He also gained a medal at Philadelphia in 1876\textsuperscript{853} and contributed alongside Werenskiold to the 1879 edition of Asbjørnsen's Norwegian folktales.\textsuperscript{854} After
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\textsuperscript{847} No. 1192 \textit{Le port d'Anvers (The Port of Antwerp; Trondheim Kunstmuseum).}
\textsuperscript{848} Falahat in Scottez-de Wambrechies (ed.), 2008, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{849} Østby, ‘Johannes Grimelund’, accessed 18 June 2014.
\textsuperscript{850} Ibid. The Musée d’Orsay state that their picture was exhibited at the \textit{Exposition de la Société internationale} rather than the \textit{Salon de la Société nationale des beaux-arts}.
\textsuperscript{852} Munich Academy Matriculation Book 1841-84.
moving permanently to Munich in 1881, Sinding went on his first study trip to the Lofotens that winter.\textsuperscript{855} I propose that the Lofoten islands performed two main functions for the artists of this period. Firstly, its dramatic light fulfilled the preoccupation with the effects of light that was so prevalent in this period. Secondly, at a time when artists were finding that success lay in the depiction of the ‘other’ in relation to growing industrialisation, the perceived remoteness of the Lofoten Islands made them seem exotic and intriguing.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure192.png}
\caption{Otto Sinding, \textit{View of Reine in Lofoten}, 1883, Norwegian National Gallery, Oslo, oil on canvas, 104 x 155cm.}
\end{figure}

Although it is not stated explicitly, it seems likely that Adelsteen Normann accompanied Sinding on at least some of these study trips to the Lofotens, and Normann appears to have gone to the Lofotens before Sinding. Norway’s leading art auctioneers Grev Wedels Plass have in recent times sold paintings by Normann entitled \textit{View of Reine in Lofoten}, signed and dated 1880, and another \textit{View of Reine in Lofoten} from 1881.\textsuperscript{856} Back in his studio in Munich in 1883, Sinding painted \textit{View of Reine in Lofoten} (fig. 192; 1883) and in the same year Normann painted \textit{Summer Night in the Lofotens} (1883; Royal Palace, Oslo) and then exhibited a \textit{View of Reine in Lofoten} at the 1884 \textit{Salon}\textsuperscript{857} Depictions of Reine were clearly a popular theme, and it was this last-mentioned picture that earned Normann his Honourable Mention.\textsuperscript{858}

\textsuperscript{855} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{856} Sold Grev Wedels Plass, Oslo, 30 November 2009, No. 12; Sold Grev Wedels Plass, Oslo, 27 April 1998, No. 29.
\textsuperscript{857} No. 1818 Vue de Reine, à Lofoten; - Norvège.
\textsuperscript{858} There is obviously a possibility that the two works by Normann are the same picture.
As Anne Falahat has noted, Grimmelund 'was always assured to find good company when he undertook his summer voyages to the north',\textsuperscript{859} and it would obviously make sense for companionship reasons for artists to sail and paint together. Sinding’s qualities are summed up well by Marit Lange, who describes his ‘synthesising, decorative style, an emotional perception of the subject and bold use of colour’\textsuperscript{860} At the 1885 \textit{Salon}, it was Sinding who earned the only Nordic success, his two pictures of the Lofoten islands following on from Normann’s success the previous year. They were entitled \textit{Laplanders saluting the returning Sun after the long Winter’s Night} and \textit{A Funeral in the Lofoten Islands} (locations unknown), and clearly contained depictions of the people of northern Norway and the Lofotens, as well as landscape views.\textsuperscript{861}

Sinding exhibited another Lofotens picture at the 1887 \textit{Salon},\textsuperscript{862} but at the 1889 \textit{Exposition Universelle} he showed two views of Hardanger which earned him a silver medal.\textsuperscript{863} He was praised by Maurice Hamel in the \textit{Gazette des beaux-arts}. After discussing the qualities of Danish and Swedish art, Hamel wrote: ‘With the exception of Thaulow and Sinding who are above all skilful painters, Norwegian art doesn’t have this lively look or urban grace’.\textsuperscript{864} Normann continued to show Lofoten works in Paris, exhibiting at the \textit{Salons} of 1887, 1888 and 1889. It was in 1887 that the British-based correspondent of the \textit{Art Journal} praised Normann, writing that ‘here there is no want of colour, or form, or texture: It is nature itself, put on to canvas with the palette knife’,\textsuperscript{865} perhaps a reference to the wider and thicker brush strokes that Normann was now using.\textsuperscript{866} Normann lived in Germany for the majority of his life, and it was as a board member of the Berlin Arts Association in 1892 that he invited his younger compatriot Edvard Munch to hold a one-man exhibition in the city. Munch’s exhibition was highly controversial, became a \textit{cause célèbre}, and led to the Berlin Secession.\textsuperscript{867} Thus Normann’s actions had a radical effect on the history of Scandinavian art.

\textsuperscript{859} Falahat in Scottez-de Wambrecht, 2008, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{860} Lange in Gunnarsson, 2006, p. 293.
\textsuperscript{861} No. 2261 \textit{Lapons saluant le soleil, revenant après la longue nuit d’hiver}; - Norvège septentrionale; No. 2262 \textit{Funérailles, à Lopoten}; - Norvège septentrionale.
\textsuperscript{862} No. 2204 \textit{L’hiver dans le Lofoten}.
\textsuperscript{863} Norvège No. 82 \textit{Printemps}; - Hardanger (Norvège); No. 83 Été; - Hardanger (Norvège).
\textsuperscript{864} Hamel, 1889, p. 379.
\textsuperscript{865} Anon., ‘The Paris Salon No. 1’, \textit{Art Journal}, 1887, unpaginated.
\textsuperscript{867} Prideaux, 2005, pp. 135-37.
The 1886 *Salon* was also one of modest success for Nordic artists. The Swede Edvard Rosenberg and the Dane Laurits Tuxen both gained Honourable Mentions. Little is known about Rosenberg. He debuted at the *Salon* in 1883 with two pictures of his native Sweden and the following year followed Hagborg in showing pictures of the Manche department of Normandy, namely the area around Carolles that was nicknamed 'the valley of the painters'. In 1886 he exhibited *Winter in Sweden* (*Late Winter – Motif from Stockholm area*) at the *Salon* and this led to his award.\(^{868}\) He again exhibited a Stockholm region landscape in 1887, and also a work at the 1889 *Exposition Universelle* given the simple title *Landscape*.\(^{869}\) No medal was awarded. The size of the work (166 x 272 cm) and the fact that it was bought in 1889 by the Nationalmuseum in Stockholm suggest that *Landscape* could be *Autumn Day after Mist* (1889) in the Nationalmuseum collection.

By contrast, Laurits Tuxen is a well-known artist who was at the centre of the Danish and European art world towards the end of the nineteenth century, painting many large-scale pictures of European royalty (see fig. 194). He was the subject of a major retrospective at Skagens Museum in Denmark in the summer of 2014.\(^{870}\) Tuxen twice studied under Bonnat in Paris, 1875-76 and 1877-78,\(^{871}\) paying a visit to Skagen in between in the summer of 1876, where other painters included Michael Ancher, Karl Madsen and the Greek artist Jean Altamura.\(^{872}\) Like his close friend Krøyer, he made his debut in Paris in 1878, but unlike Krøyer it was at the *Salon* rather than the *Exposition Universelle*. Tuxen was not happy with the picture of *Susanna at her Bath* (1878; private collection, France) that he showed,\(^{873}\) but despite his reservations the painting found a buyer.\(^{874}\) Bonnat was mildly critical of the standard of Tuxen and Krøyer’s nudes at this time, Tuxen reporting ‘he had said of both of us that the nude form was not so well suited to us – in that area we had nothing special to say, but rather in folk-life pictures in the open air’.\(^{875}\) However, Tuxen soon began work on a more dynamic representation of *Susanna at her Bath* (1878; private collection) which he exhibited at

\(^{868}\) No. 2056 *L’Hiver en Suède; - étude.*
\(^{869}\) Suède No. 98 *Paysage.*
\(^{870}\) Skagens Museum, TUXEN – farver, friluft og fyrster (colour, countryside and crown), 3 May – 14 September 2014.
\(^{872}\) Mette Bøgh Jensen, 2011, p. 292.
\(^{873}\) No. 2162 *Suzanne au bain.*
Charlottenborg in the spring of 1879.\textsuperscript{876} This latter picture, clearly based on Jean-Léon Gérôme’s *Moorish Bath* (1870; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), was regarded as a fine example of modern (i.e. French) technique, and Tuxen’s adoption of ‘progressive’ French artistic practice led to him being put in charge of a new Life School in Copenhagen (Kunstnernes Frie Studieskoler) where male students could ‘draw and paint from live models and be introduced to “valeur” painting and French naturalism’.\textsuperscript{877} The Life School proved so popular that P. S. Krøyer soon joined his friend as an additional tutor.\textsuperscript{878}

---

\footnote{876}{Saabye, *Krøyer*, p. 22.}
\footnote{878}{Svanholm, 2004, p. 40.}
After a six-year gap, Tuxen again exhibited at the *Salon* in 1884, in the interim showing alongside Krøyer and Michael Ancher at the International Art exhibition in Vienna in 1882.  

After exhibiting a female portrait in 1884, he exhibited a similarly-themed work in 1886, *Portrait of Ottilia Jacobsen* (1882-83; fig. 193), which was rewarded with an Honourable Mention.  

Tuxen’s portrayal of the wife of the brewer and art collector Carl Jacobsen is beautifully lit, with touches of white and gold that stand out against the black background. Mention must also be made of the huge canvas of the Danish Royal Family and their English, Russian and Greek relatives that Tuxen painted between 1883 and 1886. *Christian IX and Queen Louise with their Family in the Garden Room at Fredensborg* (1883-86; Frederiksborg Palace) measures 4.4 x 6.7m and was exhibited at the Paris *Salon* of 1887, where it was recorded as on loan from the city of Copenhagen. The picture includes a small British contingent on the left-hand side, Prince Edward (later Edward VII) with his Danish wife Princess Alexandra (daughter of Christian IX) and their son, the ill-fated Prince Albert Victor (1864-92). A smaller version of the picture is in the Amalienborg Museum (fig. 194).  

In Berlin in 1886, Tuxen exhibited another royal picture, *Queen Olga of Greece with*
her daughter, and in the same year married the Belgian Ursule de Baisieux. At the 1888 Salon he exhibited a self-portrait and a portrait whose title suggests Ursule’s mother Olympe, rather than the artist’s new wife. In that same year, Tuxen was heavily involved in the large exhibition of French art in Copenhagen, achieving little success via Theo Van Gogh in obtaining Impressionist works for the exhibition.

In Krøyer’s painting of the exhibition committee (see fig. 109), Tuxen and Krøyer are the sole Danish representatives standing in a bespoke pairing in the top right-hand corner. Tuxen showed five pictures at the 1889 Exposition Universelle including the de Baisieux portrait and that of Ottilia Jacobsen (fig. 193), and Nude Female (1880) now in the Hirschsprung Collection. Ottilia’s husband Carl used his considerable influence to rehang the Danish contingent at the Exposition, over the heads of Krøyer and Michael Ancher. Tuxen received no medal, because he was Hors concours, i.e. out of competition because he was a jury member.

Nordic artists achieved four Honourable Mentions at the 1887 Salon. In addition to those for Viggo Johansen’s An Evening Conversation (see fig. 107) and the little-known Norwegian Frithjof Smith-Hald (also known as Carl Frithjof-Smith), there were awards for the Swedes Emma Löwstädt-Chadwick and Allan Österlind. Emma Löwstädt had trained for six years at the Swedish Royal Academy of Art before moving to Paris around 1882. She first exhibited at the Salon in 1881, the same year as the wealthy Bostonian Frank Chadwick whom she later married. She spent the winter painting with the Finn Amélie Lundahl at Concarneau, which led to a very large Salon painting for 1882, Off to Sea (fig. 195; c.1882). Its Brittany origins are clearly spelled out, with the female figure wearing typical Breton costume and the large letter ‘C’ for Concarneau on the side of the boat. Painted in a typically muted Naturalist palette lacking reds, greens or yellows, but brightened by a pale blue sea, the picture suffers perhaps from a degree of whimsicality in its depiction of a strong fisherman lifting his doll-like child. It illustrates a sanitised version of fishing and rural life that Löwstädt-Chadwick perpetuated in many of her Salon pictures between 1882 and 1888.
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882 No. 1181 Königin Olga von Griechenland mit Tochter. Olga was married to the Danish-born King George I of Greece, and their daughter was the aunt of Prince Philip, Duke of Edinburgh.
883 No. 2416 Portrait de l’artiste, perhaps the self-portrait dated 1887 in the collection of Skagens Museum; No. 2415 Portrait de Mme de B...
884 Saabye, Krøyer, p. 97.
885 No. 167 Italienne sortant du bain.
886 Saabye, Krøyer, p. 100.
887 No. 1483 Portrait de Mlle C...
889 No. 1719 Départ pour la mer.
Fig. 195. Emma Löwstadt-Chadwick, *Off to Sea*, c.1882, private collection, oil on canvas, 292 x 213cm.

Fig. 196. Emma Löwstadt-Chadwick, «*Five o’Clock*>», c.1887, picture untraced, engraving.
A typical example is *Breton Girl Leading a Goat* (c.1885), Löwstädt-Chadwick’s 1885 *Salon* entry, featuring a small wan-faced Breton girl wearing clogs and leading a bearded goat through icy pastures. After Löwstädt married the wealthy Bostonian artist Frank Chadwick in 1882, they were strongly associated with the artists’ colony at Grez-sur-Loing, where the couple eventually bought the Pension Laurent, one of the two famous artists’ hotels in Grez. Despite having three children, Emma pursued her art career, and it seems likely that Frank’s money made possible her travels to find motifs for her work, including being perhaps the first Scandinavian artist in St. Ives. A photograph of the family in the forest of Fontainbleau in the early 1890s suggests that plenty of childcare was available. Löwstädt-Chadwick exhibited at the *Salon* every year from 1881 to 1888, and at the 1889 *Exposition*, where she again showed one of her 1888 *Salon* pictures *The Shepherd Girl*, but she went unrewarded.

She was one of eight Swedish women artists who signed the petition to the Swedish Royal Academy in March 1885, marking her down as one of the ‘Opponents’ of the established order. Her *Salon* success came in 1887 with the picture *“Five o’Clock”* (fig. 196; c.1877), later described as a sympathetic presentation of five old women and a cat taking their five o’clock tea’, when it was shown in New York in 1888. The picture is untraced, known only from the black and white engraving, and illustrates many of the difficulties in locating the artist’s work. Not only is her name spelt in numerous different ways (including at the Paris *Salon*) but her works appear poorly represented in public collections in both Sweden and France. The picture refers to the French belief that tea should be taken at five o’clock, as practised in England; the painting perhaps owes its roots to Mary Cassatt’s *The Tea* (*Le Thé* or *Five O’Clock Tea*; Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), which was exhibited at the fifth Impressionist exhibition of 1880.
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890 No. 502 *Bretonne conduisant une chèvre*; Sold Anaf Art Auctions, Lyon, 11 April 2006, No. 126.
891 *Women Painters in Scandinavia*, p. 146.
893 Ibid., p. 39.
894 1888 *Salon* No. 528; 1889 *Exposition Universelle Suède* No. 78: *Gardeuse de moutons*.
897 The child in her undated work *A Sleeping Child* in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, is of the right age to be her 1886 *Salon* entry No. 472 *Ma fille – portrait*. 
Fig. 197. Allan Österlind, *Baptism, (La Baptème)*, 1886, Ateneum Art Museum, Helsinki, oil on canvas, 114.5 x 201cm.

Fig. 198. Allan Österlind, *A Death-Bed in Brittany, (A la Maison Mortuaire en Bretagne)*, c.1886, Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, oil on canvas, 91 x 127cm.
Like Löwstädt-Chadwick, Allan Österlind was born in Stockholm in 1855. He settled in France in the late 1870s, and exhibited there for over half a century, including at the Salon in 1884, 1887, 1888 and 1889. Like Löwstädt-Chadwick, he too was an ‘Opponent’ in 1885, and an exhibitor at From the Banks of the Seine in Stockholm in the same year. They shared a third parallel of gaining Honourable Mentions at the 1887 Paris Salon. Österlind’s two pictures showed events at opposite ends of the spectrum of life, one a Baptism (fig. 197; 1886) and one A Death-Bed in Brittany (fig. 198; c.1886). The first shows women and children awaiting the arrival of a newly-baptised baby, the second a distraught mother grieving for a small child. The latter picture has equivalence with the pictures of weeping fishermens’ wives that were popular in Victorian England by such painters as Walter Langley and Frank Bramley. Bramley’s A Hopeless Dawn (1888; Tate Britain) shares the rude flooring, religious symbolism, burning candle and collapsed female figure of Österlind’s work. Baptism was also exhibited in Minnesota in 1887 and again at the 1889 Exposition Universelle, along with another oil and seven watercolours. Maurice Hamel was pleased to describe Österlind as ‘the sensitive storyteller of Baptism in Brittany, the charming humourist of Toothache [watercolour]. Österlind was awarded a silver medal.

The Nordisk Familjebok, published in Stockholm in 1922, asserts that both Death-Bed in Brittany and his 1888 Salon entry End of the Day were bought by the French state, so the possibility exists that the Nationalmuseum picture is a preliminary version or study. Both Löwstädt-Chadwick and Österlind were typical in that they utilised the people of Brittany as exemplars of an idealised rural mode of living that provided a subject matter that was acceptable to both Salon judges and critics alike.

---

899 No. 1818 Le baptême; No. 1819 A la maison mortuaire.
900 Minneapolis Industrial Exposition, No. 393 Baptism; Exposition Universelle, Suède No. 88 Le Bapteme.
901 Hamel, 1889, p. 379.
1888 was a good year for Nordic art at the *Salon*. In addition to the award of the *Légion d’Honneur* to P. S. Krøyer and Albert Edelfelt, the only first-class medal in the period under consideration was given to Nils Forsberg. There was also a third-class medal for Johannes Grimelund, and Honourable Mentions for the Swedes Oscar Björck and Anders Zorn. Edelfelt and Zorn will be discussed later in this chapter.

Oscar Björck, born in 1860, was one of the youngest Nordic painters to achieve success in Paris in the 1880s. After graduating from the Swedish Academy of Arts in 1881, where he had been a friend of Anders Zorn, he arrived at Skagen in July 1882 in the company of fellow artist Elias Erdtman.\(^{903}\) Although it is claimed that Björck knew Krøyer in Paris,\(^ {904}\) there is no evidence that Björck had been there before the summer of 1882. It is not clear exactly what precipitated Björck’s arrival in Skagen, twenty-three days after Krøyer’s first arrival there,\(^ {905}\) but Björck was clearly appreciative of Krøyer’s art, writing ‘Krøyer made a very profound impression on me through his kindly,
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\(^ {903}\) Jensen in Saabye, *Krøyer*, p. 73.  
\(^ {904}\) Svanholm, 2004, p. 69.  
\(^ {905}\) Saabye, *Krøyer*, pp. 73, 331.
open personality, his glorious talent and the enormous ease with which he used both pencil and brush." There must exist the possibility that Björck had seen *The Italian Village Hatters* (fig. 17) and *Messaisha* in Gothenburg in 1881. Björck’s art clearly made a swift impression on Krøyer too, for in the month that Björck arrived, Krøyer wrote to Heinrich Hirschsprung: ‘There are also a couple of Swedish painters here, young men, one very gifted.’ Björck also appeared as a figure in three of Krøyer’s major paintings of artists eating and drinking, *Artists’ Luncheon at Brøndums Hotel* (fig. 94; 1883), *Artists at the Breakfast Table in Grez* (fig. 96; 1884) and *Hip, Hip, Hurrah!* (fig. 112; 1885-88), always looking youthful and sometimes wearing a hat. At Skagen the following year (1883), Georg Brandes spoke well of ‘the very young Björck, everyone’s favourite, with the most enormous mass of hair I have ever seen’, explaining perhaps why he often covered it.

After a trip to Paris in the winter of 1883-84 which clearly included a visit to Grez, Björck returned to Skagen for a third consecutive summer in 1884. Here he painted his best-known picture *The Boat is Launched* (fig. 84), a depiction of fishermen that relates closely to Krøyer’s *Fishermen hauling a net at Skagen’s North Beach. Late afternoon* (1882-83; fig.85) of the previous summer. In 1885, Björck went to Italy, and spent the winter working on a large (246 x 168cm.) nude of *Susanna* (1885-86; Göteborgs Konstmuseum), which was bought by the philanthropist August Röhss, who presented it to the museum. The picture, and its device of using a biblical story in order to present the nude, has strong parallels with Laurits Tuxen’s earlier use of the same subject. Björck finally made his debut at the Paris *Salon* in 1886 with *Portrait de Mme B...*, and received his due reward in 1888 with an Honourable Mention for *Roman Blacksmiths* (1887; private collection).

In 1887 he had exhibited a picture of Skagen fishermen in Minneapolis, possibly *The Boat is Launched*. *Roman Blacksmiths* was purchased for the Corcoran Gallery in Washington D. C. in 1896, but was auctioned off in 1979. However, a study exists in Göteborgs Konstmuseum (fig. 199). There is a direct relationship between this picture
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907 Annette Johansen, ‘Kunstnerkolonien på Skagen’, quoted in Ibid., p. 73.
908 Georg Brandes quoted in Ibid., p. 75.
909 No. 241 *Portrait de Mme B...*; Björck is known to have painted a portrait of the Norwegian artist Harriet Backer.
910 No. 270 Forgerons; - Rome.
911 Minneapolis Industrial Exposition No. 350 *Fishermen at Skagen.*
and Krøyer’s own *Salon* picture from 1881 *Italian Village Hatters* (fig. 17), with mutual dark room, hot fire, an incoming shaft of light and a male child at work. In 1888 Björck made his fourth and final visit to Skagen, and then at the *Exposition* of 1889 he exhibited two portraits, one of his wife and one of the composer and politician Gunnar Wennerberg. These portraits exemplified the route that Björck was now to take, making money from fashionable portraiture and abandoning his Naturalism of the 1880s. He was rewarded at the *Exposition* with a silver medal, but went unmentioned in the *Gazette des beaux-arts*.

Nils Forsberg, nearly twenty years older than Björck, arrived in France in 1867 and spent the years 1868-71 at the *atelier* of Léon Bonnat, the very first Swedish artist to do so. He was joined in 1869 by Gustaf Cederström. Both artists were in Paris during the Franco-Prussian war of 1870-71. In 1878, Forsberg exhibited two pictures at the *Exposition Universelle*, a portrait and *Acrobat Family before the Circus Manager* (1878; fig. 200). This latter picture of an emaciated child acrobat in an uncomfortable position, being prodded by a harsh looking trainer and observed by an unconcerned prosperous circus owner with a fat cigar, was a piece of social commentary by Forsberg. The painting was given a subtitle at the *Salon*, ‘before the Tallon law’, a reference to the law protecting children promoted by Eugène Tallon in the early 1870s. The picture is a more dramatic precursor of the misery of child circus performers depicted in Fernand Pelez’s *Grimaces and Misery* (1888; Petit Palais, Musée des Beaux-arts de la Ville de Paris) with its theme of the exploitation of the young in the circus.

Forsberg exhibited at the *Salon* every year from 1878 to 1884, but with portraits rather than social or historic subjects. As early as 1883, we know he was planning a large history painting, because a study for *Death of A Hero* in the Göteborgs Konstmuseum is signed ‘N. F. 1883’. The finished version of this huge picture (fig. 201) is signed and dated 1888 and was exhibited at the *Salon* of that year, being awarded an exceptional first-class medal.
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913 No. 20 *Portrait de ma femme*. There is a substantial portrait of *The Artist’s Wife* dated 1885 in the Nationalmuseum, Stockholm; No. 19 *Portrait de M. le minister G. Wennerberg*.


915 Suède No. 18 *Les saltimbanques; avant la loi Tallon*. 


It is useful to analyse why the French gave the picture the highest possible honour.

Fig. 200. Nils Forsberg, Acrobat Family before the Circus Manager (Les Saltimbanques), 1878, Göteborgs Konstmuseum, oil on canvas, 145 x 214.5cm.

Fig. 201. Nils Forsberg, Death of a Hero (Souvenir of the Siege of Paris 1870-71) (La fin d’un héros - souvenir du siège de Paris (1870-71)), 1888, Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, oil on canvas, 300 x 450cm.
Firstly, it is a picture in the great tradition of French history painting. Secondly, it shows that a foreign artist was able to represent an emotional moment in French history. Set inside Nôtre Dame Cathedral, an iconic building used as a temporary hospital in the Franco-Prussian War, ‘the painter had personally stayed in Paris during these events and had, as a nurse, cared for the wounded’. In summary, Forsberg had painted a picture in a French manner, of an event in French history in which he personally had assisted. He again exhibited the work at the 1889 Exposition Universelle and gained a silver medal. It was purchased that same year and presented to the Nationalmuseum in Stockholm by August Röhss, the same philanthropist who had bought Björck’s Susanna.

Fig. 202. Alfred Wallander, New Year’s Morning, 1887, Minneapolis Institute of Fine Arts, oil on canvas, 226 x 168cm.

The 1889 *Salon* was inevitably a low-key affair for Nordic artists, coinciding with the substantial showcase provided by the *Exposition Universelle*. However, it did provide awards for two Swedes, an Honourable Mention for Alfred Wallander and a third-class medal for Anders Zorn that continued his success of the previous year. Wallander’s exhibition career in France was brief, and he is much better known for his later ceramic work than his paintings. After debuting at the *Salon* in 1886, the following year he submitted *New Year’s Morning* (fig. 202; 1887), a Christmas card image of an old couple trudging home through the snow from church.\footnote{No. 2448 *Le matin du jour de l’an.*} That the picture appealed to the viewer (perhaps an American view of ‘old Sweden’) is evidenced by its purchase by officials of the Minneapolis Industrial Exposition of 1887, when it was exhibited there with an advertised price tag of US$1,500.\footnote{Minneapolis Industrial Exposition, *Catalogue of Paintings*, 1887, p. 11, No. 361 *New Year's Morning*.} Sweden sent fifty-four pictures to the exhibition including works by Ernst Josephson, Oscar Björck, August Hagborg, Nils Kreuger and Bruno Liljefors.\footnote{Ibid., pp. 11-12.} Wallander exhibited two further pictures at the *Salon* of 1889 and he was rewarded with an Honourable Mention.\footnote{No. 2696 *Une chanson amusante*; No. 2697 *Dévotion*; - *intérieur dans une église suédoise*. Both untraced.} He did not exhibit with the Swedish contingent at the *Exposition Universelle*, and 1889 appears to be the conclusion of his *Salon* career.

Anders Zorn achieved the fastest ascent to fame of any Nordic artist of the period, rising from an Honourable Mention at the 1888 *Salon* to a gold medal and *Légion d’honneur* at the 1889 *Exposition*. Zorn’s success was associated with both his talent and his cosmopolitanism. After leaving the Academy of Fine Arts in Stockholm in 1881, he visited southern Europe and North Africa, before settling in London in the spring of 1882.\footnote{Karl Asplund, *Anders Zorn, His Life and Work* (London: The Studio, 1921), pp. 5-6.} After several years in London, he spent the winter of 1886-7 in Spain and, more importantly, that of 1887-88 in St. Ives. During the 1880s, Zorn had worked in watercolour, painting with an attention to detail that created an appearance of oils. His most famous work of this period, *Our Daily Bread* (fig. 208; 1886), is a depiction of Zorn’s mother preparing a meal in a dry ditch for farm labourers. It is painted from a low perspective, looking upward past Zorn’s mother to the workers on the skyline above. The high horizon line, peasant subject matter and unconventional perspective make this picture highly redolent of the oeuvre of Jules Bastien-Lepage, who was the acknowledged master of this genre for Nordic painters in the 1880s (fig. 49a).
Fig. 203. Anders Zorn, *Fisherman at St. Ives, Un Pêcheur or Un Pêcheur à Saint-Ives en Cornouailles*, 1888, Musée des Beaux-arts, Pau, ex Musée d’Orsay, oil on canvas, 128 x 86cm.

Fig. 204. Anders Zorn, *Outside*, 1888, Göteborgs Konstmuseum, oil on canvas, 133 x 197.5cm.
In St. Ives, Zorn became friendly with the American artist Edward Emerson Simmons, the veteran of the artists’ colony at Concarneau, model for the painter in the book *Guenn: A Wave on the Breton Coast* (1884), and friend of Bastien-Lepage. In between playing chess and taking tea, it was Simmonds, said Zorn, who ‘got me to begin oil painting’. This was corroborated by Simmons who ‘helped [Zorn] set out his palette... he jokingly called himself my pupil (I had told him what materials to buy). Zorn was unsuccessful at St. Ives in his attempt to establish friendly relations with his fellow-Swede Emma Löwstädt-Chadwick, instead getting on better with the Finn Helene Schjerfbeck. He was, however, far more successful in his mastery of oils. One of his first works was *Fisherman at St. Ives* (fig. 203; 1888), which shows a fisherman and a woman leaning on a wall staring out across the harbour, with a small moon high on the horizon. Its soft tones suggest a Whistlerian arrangement in pink, grey and brown, Zorn having seen Whistler’s work when living in London, while the French critic Paul Metz observed ‘the unbleached tones of pale cigars’. Zorn explained that the picture represented what he thought of as the fisherman flirting ‘with a girl in a fashion I thought unique to this area’, i.e. without them looking at each other.

After the winter, Zorn moved to Paris, and was persuaded to enter the picture for the *Salon*. The picture, which was ‘exceedingly well positioned’ at the exhibition, earned Zorn an Honourable Mention at the very beginning of his oil painting career. The following year he exhibited two contrasting oils at the *Salon, Outdoors* (fig. 204; 1888) and *Mme. Clara Rikoff* (1889; Zorn Museum, Mora). The first picture depicts three women, two nude and one semi-nude, seated on pink-grey rocks about to bathe, at Dalarö in eastern Sweden. Zorn placed two ‘nude girls in a position in which I often found them’ and his model ‘in a number of different positions...But I only found my picture when she rested and felt unobserved. This summer was a creative joy.’

---

924 Edward Simmons, *From Seven to Seventy*, pp. 169-70, quoted in Ibid., p. 32.
926 The suggestion that Whistler was actually in St. Ives at this time in Varnedoe (ed.), 1988, p. 268, is incorrect. Whistler had been there in 1884.
927 Paul Metz quoted in Asplund, 21, p. 27.
928 Zorn, p. 57, quoted in Hagans, 2009, p. 32. See also Jacobs, 1984, p. 162, where the ‘area’ is specified as England.
929 Zorn, p. 58, quoted in Hagans p. 36.
930 No. 2765 *A Yair; - Suède*, No. 2766 *Portrait de Mme R...*.
931 Zorn, p. 59, quoted in Hagans, p. 36.
Zorn’s work was clearly noticed at the Salon. From Arles, Vincent Van Gogh wrote to his brother Theo ‘People were also saying that there’s something extraordinary by a fellow called Zorn’.932 Theo replied ‘Zorn has female bathers at the seaside, somewhat in the genre of In Arcady by Harrison, which you remember perhaps’,933 a reference to Alexander Harrison’s picture of nudes (Musée d’Orsay) that had been a great success at the 1886 Salon. Zorn’s picture would have been noticeable for its clear Nordic references of rock and rowing boat, and the feeling that the women were bathing in cool waters, as opposed to the traditional heat and vegetation of southern Europe. The contemporary French critic George Lafenestre wrote ‘The arrangement of the figures...is piquant, natural, unexpected...The impression is life, new and easily rendered’.934 Zorn’s other picture was a large portrait of banker’s wife Clara Rikoff, holding a fur coat, and completed in blue and grey tones that recall both Whistler and the society portraits of John Singer Sargent.

Concurrently at the Exposition Universelle, Zorn exhibited three oils and four watercolours. The oils included Fisherman at St. Ives, accompanied by portraits of the Commissioner-General for the Exposition, Antonin Proust (1888; private collection), and of Coquelin Cadet (fig. 205; 1889), the French actor and younger brother of Constant Coquelin, who had been painted in watercolour by Carl Larsson in 1885.935 It is clear that Zorn was portraying the very heart of the French establishment, both political and cultural, so his success in France is unsurprising. However, this is allied to a bravura portraiture technique, particularly in the case of the actor. Both men are depicted in brown sepia tones, with works of art referencing their love of the arts. Proust is portrayed as relaxed but serious, Zorn concentrating the detail on the head, while using a more painterly technique in the surrounding areas.
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933 Theo Van Gogh to Vincent Van Gogh, Paris, 8 May 1889, Ibid.
935 No. 148 Un pêcheur; No. 149 Portrait de M. A. P...; No. 150 Portrait de M. C.C...
His portrait of Coquelin has a great sense of movement, capturing the actor in mid-performance, and bringing out his character and energy. The handling is loose, with large, broad strokes of paint in the actor’s clothes and surroundings, yet the face and expressive hands are so full of life that the viewer concentrates on these features.

George Lafenestre wrote that ‘Mr. Zorn unites an entirely personal feeling for lighting’s nuances and...sensitive intelligent life with a feeling for modern aspects...in his portraits of M. Antonin Proust and M. Coquelin Cadet’, while in 1921, Karl Asplund wrote ‘It is astonishing to see how, in one of his first large portraits in oil, Zorn has...achieved such perfect mastery of the style of the period’. Despite this strong portfolio of oils, it was for his watercolours that Zorn received his gold medal, specifically Une Première (1888; Nationalmuseum, Stockholm), another Nordic bathing

937 Asplund, 1921, pp. 29-30.
scene, this time of a mother leading her son into the water for the first time.\(^{938}\) In the *Gazette des beaux-arts*, Maurice Hamel was content to mention 'Zorn, a virtuoso of the watercolour'.\(^{939}\) However, Lafenestre was less keen on Zorn’s watercolour portrait of the dancer *Rosita Mauri* (1888; Göteborgs Konstmuseum), complaining of 'a sickly over-excitement, an excessive need for rumpled cloth, for blurring, for tricks'.\(^{940}\)

Although Zorn clearly engaged fully with the French art world, he felt that his fellow Scandinavians and the Americans were often more sympathetic to his art, sensing a reluctance on the part of some sections of the French art world to appreciate that a foreign artist could match the standards of their native painters.

Even more successful than Zorn at the 1889 *Exposition Universelle* was the Finnish artist Albert Edelfelt. Along with Richard Bergh, he was the only other Nordic artist to be awarded both a *Grand Prix* and the *Légion d’honneur* (Krøyer had received his *Légion d’honneur* the year before). Unlike Zorn, Edelfelt was a veteran of the Paris *Salon*, exhibiting every year from 1877 to 1889 with the exception of 1887 when he exhibited alongside Krøyer and leading Impressionists\(^{941}\) at the Galerie Georges Petit instead.\(^{942}\) Edelfelt had begun studying in France in 1874, and his early pictures at the *Salon* (1877-79) and the 1878 *Exposition* (where Finland was in the Russian part of the catalogue) were large paintings from Finnish and Swedish history, exemplified by his 1878 *Salon* picture *Duke Carl insulting the Corpse of Klaus Fleming* (1878; Ateneum Art Museum, Helsinki), also exhibited at Munich in 1879.\(^{943}\) His breakthrough picture *Conveying the Child’s Coffin* (fig. 54) owed a debt to the *plein-airism* and stoic figures of Bastien-Lepage, whom Edelfelt had first met in 1875,\(^{944}\) but with a more Realist approach to the non-figurative elements. At the 1880 *Salon*, this was the picture that the critic of the *Gazette des beaux-arts*, Philippe de Chennevières, had described as 'worth more than the third-class medal it was awarded', the medal being the first to be won at the *Salon* by a Finnish artist.\(^{945}\)
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The Salon of 1880 was a triumph for the French artist Pascal Dagnan-Bouveret, who was awarded a first-class medal for An Accident (1879; Walters Art Museum, Baltimore), a peasant interior depicted in a Naturalist manner, complete with a full range of characters of different ages, genders and facial expressions. Edelfelt had been a close friend of Dagnan-Bouveret since at least 1877; both had been students of Jean-Léon Gérôme in the 1870s. The year after Dagnan-Bouveret’s triumph, Edelfelt painted his portrait (1881; Musée Georges-Garret, Vesoul), signing it ‘A SON AMI DAGNAN – A EDELFELT’, and entering it for the 1881 Salon. Edelfelt captured his fellow artist’s keen intelligence and is particularly skilful at depicting the edge of the pinned canvas on which Dagnan-Bouveret is working. Edelfelt consolidated his position in 1882, when he achieved a third-class medal for Divine Service by the Sea (fig. 55), a picture that again owed a debt to Bastien-Lepage, with its heightened representation of rural people. Additionally, it possessed a psychological aspect to the facial depictions that invoke parallels with Dagnan-Bouveret’s An Accident. Edelfelt’s picture was purchased by the French state direct from the Salon.

Fig. 206. Albert Edelfelt, Portrait of Louis Pasteur, 1885, Musée d’Orsay, Paris, oil on canvas, 154 x 126cm.

947 No. 839 Portrait de M. Dagnan-Bouveret.
In 1886, Edelfelt exhibited a *Portrait of Louis Pasteur* (fig. 206) which garnered justified critical attention.\(^{948}\) The critic of the *Gazette des beaux-arts* compared it with a portrait of Pasteur by Léon Bonnat:

> The painting of M. Edelfelt shows us M. Pasteur absorbed in his research. His head bent, he concentrates his gaze upon the glass jar where a flap of bloody flesh is hanging: This is the terrible spine of a rabid rabbit which, by the effort of his genius, will turn into a most healing balm extracted from the most horrible evil. The picture is excellent and full of interest; light plays freely on the vessels of the laboratory, and yet no detail distracts from the grandeur of the subject.\(^{949}\)

Because the picture was bought by the French state, he produced a second version for Pasteur himself, who had greatly liked the picture.\(^{950}\) In Edelfelt’s ‘fallow’ year of 1887, Dagnan-Bouveret exhibited a picture of Breton women in typical regional costume attending a religious *pardon*. With its upward tilt, crisp black and white costumes, and muted Naturalist tones, *Breton Women at a Pardon* (1887; Museo Calouste Gulbenkian, Lisbon) inspired Edelfelt’s 1888 *Salon* picture *Women outside the Church at Ruokolahti* (fig. 207; 1887).\(^{951}\) Although I agree with the link to Dagnan-Bouveret’s picture, as proposed by Ojanperä and Saabye,\(^{952}\) I propose that there are also strong affinities with Zorn’s *Our Daily Bread* (fig. 208; 1886), not just in the upward tilt and the closely observed vegetation, but particularly in Edelfelt’s central figure, a woman whose face and white bonnet are much more akin to Zorn’s mother than the coiffed Breton women of Dagnan-Bouveret. At the 1889 *Exposition Universelle*, Edelfelt dominated the Finnish entry – now catalogued separately from the Russians – exhibiting eleven of the fifty-six oils, and a watercolour. Edelfelt received the *Grand Prix* for the *Portrait of Louis Pasteur*, recommended by the president of the painting jury Ernest Meissonier.\(^{953}\) Despite this accolade, Maurice Hamel in the *Gazette des beaux-arts* was not impressed with the Finnish show:

> Finnish art is an annexe of Swedish art: the same French education, the same genial observation, the same sense of nature among Edelfelt, Gallen [-Kallela] and [von] Becker.\(^{954}\)

---

\(^{948}\) No. 881 *Portrait de M. Pasteur."

\(^{949}\) Anon. (Alfred de Lostalot?), ‘Salon de 1886 – premier article’, *Gazette des beaux-arts*, 1886, pp. 459-60.

\(^{950}\) Riitta Ojanperä in Scottez-de Wambrechies, 2008, p. 74.

\(^{951}\) No. 934 *Devant l'église*; *Finlande.*

\(^{952}\) Riitta Ojanperä in Scottez-de Wambrechies, p. 68; Saabye, *Krøyer*, p. 203.

\(^{953}\) Huusko, 2004, p. 313.

\(^{954}\) Hamel, 1889, p. 379.
Fig. 207. Albert Edelfelt, *Women outside the Church at Ruokalahti*, 1887, Ateneum Art Museum, Helsinki, oil on canvas, 129.5 x 158.5 cm.

Fig. 208. Anders Zorn, *Our Daily Bread*, 1886, Nationalmuseum, Stockholm, watercolour on paper, 68 x 102 cm.
Edelfelt was the most integrated of all Nordic artists in France, speaking the language and mixing with important figures such as the gallery owner Georges Petit. David Jackson suggests that a lack of patronage in Finland meant that Paris was a better option for picture sales, and certainly there is little evidence of support from Nordic collectors like Hirschsprung or Fürstenberg. Despite his cosmopolitanism, Edelfelt retained a strong degree of Nationalism, reflected in his positive portrayals of the rural people of Finland, and was a vocal campaigner for Finland’s own pavilion at the 1900 Exposition Universelle. He was able to combine a modern view of European life with a brilliantly-executed, although not radical, technique. As Gabriel Weisberg says, Naturalism could be utilised for the portrayal of contemporary themes, dress and society, but the quality of painting was still the prime objective. As four major painters from the four main Nordic countries – Krøyer, Werenskiold, Zorn, Edelfelt – have all demonstrated, ‘the more effective the painter, the better the Naturalism’.

---

956 Ibid.
958 Ibid.
CONCLUSION

The profile of Nordic art in Europe rose considerably between the years 1878 and 1889. After the relative lack of success at the 1878 Exposition, younger artists embraced the teaching of the French schools, often following initial training either at home or in Munich, where male students could be taught at the Academy by tutors who shared their Protestant background. Female students were also drawn to Munich, where they could receive unofficial tuition and participate in evening classes, thus immersing themselves in the artistic milieu. Many students were attracted to Paris after visiting or participating in the 1878 Exposition, or after seeing the large exhibition of French art in Munich in 1879, where the Barbizon School predominated. A particular place of tuition in Paris for Nordic artists was the atelier of Léon Bonnat, and its sister school for women artists, that of Mme Trelat where Bonnat and Gérôme ‘corrected’. Bonnat’s tuition suited these artists because it was radical by Nordic standards, yet not too radical. It still emphasised sound drawing and compositional skills, based on a study of the Old Masters, and also the importance of tonal values and the composition as an entity.

The painters who studied in France predominantly adopted the juste-milieu or middle way style of painting, which took as its initial model the sombre scenes of peasant life by Millet, Corot, Breton and Courbet. Any input from the Impressionists tended towards the Impressionistic Realism of Manet and Caillebotte rather than more radical artists, although Nordic artists were not averse to using Impressionist techniques in the manner of their great idol Jules Bastien-Lepage, who painted the figure, particularly the exposed face and hands, in fine detail, but was happy to use a much looser style for earth, sky and foliage. Initially, success in France signified by Salon recognition came to Nordic artists who lived in the country and painted French subject matter. As their confidence grew, they found the subject matter that they were seeking during their trips back to the north during the long summer holidays. The artists successfully applied their French-learned techniques to subject matter that emulated that which they had found in their travels around France, as exemplified by the fishermen of Skagen. Success in Paris, at that time the centre of the art world, was important to these artists as it enhanced their reputation both at home and internationally.
After producing their own representations of rural working people, the 1880s saw the emergence of a uniquely Nordic subject matter, the capturing of a scene where mood rather than landscape based upon the Nordic summer night was the priority of the artist. Although Krøyer arguably produced the first example of this in 1883 (fig. 158), this oeuvre took flight with the depictions by Kielland and Peterssen at Fleskum in the summer of 1886, after which critics like Aubert were able to extol the virtues of painting that the Nordic artists’ more southerly counterparts were unable to replicate.

Although Erik Werenskiold took part in the Fleskum summer, his attempts to move away from pure Naturalism did not prove as successful. However, he remained a central figure in the Norwegian art world, and his Peasant Burial (fig. 48), a key work of the period, illustrated how Naturalism could move away from depictions of labour towards the manifestation of a politically-empowered rural class. This thesis has challenged the universally accepted view of Courbet’s Burial at Ornans as a role model for Werenskiold’s picture and instead posited James Guthrie’s A Funeral Service in the Highlands (fig. 40) as bearing a far-closer relationship to Werenskiold’s work in its size, class and type of people, sense of enclosure, the use of models, and the lack of motion. Most significant of all is the fact that these are austere Protestant funerals as opposed to the rich trappings of Courbet’s Catholic ceremony. The subject of religion – particularly the Calvinist upbringing of many Nordic artists – is little-discussed in available literature, but it seems certain that depictions of rural people earning their living through honest toil resonated with them, even though they were not religious.

P. S. Krøyer can be considered similar to Werenskiold in that he was at the centre of Danish artistic life but, unlike his Norwegian counterpart, his virtuosity placed him above his fellow artists. His sheer technical brilliance, attention to detail, and his overarching quest to capture in paint the effects of light led to a highly successful international career, particularly in France where his talents were recognised by Salon juries and critics alike. He benefitted from the financial support of second and third-generation businessmen, descendants of Jewish immigrants to Scandinavia, who used their wealth to support the arts. Particularly important to Krøyer throughout the late 1870s and into the 1880s was the sponsorship of the tobacco manufacturer Heinrich Hirschsprung and the Swede Pontus Fürstenberg, who purchased major pictures. Krøyer’s overriding preoccupation was the depiction of light, and it is noticeable that after the furore over The Italian Village Hatters, he was careful that his depictions of peasant life erred on the side of Naturalism rather than Realism, and was deficient of a
social or political message. His time at Skagen illustrated the social divide, where artists and innkeepers did not mix socially with fishermen and their families, but instead were involved in a symbiotic economic relationship.

Harriet Backer, Kitty Kielland, Bertha Wegmann and Jeanna Bauck exemplified the difficulties that faced Nordic women artists in Europe in the 1870s and 1880s. Excluded from academies and ateliers, they had to locate private tuition or enrol at Mme Trelat’s in Paris, but this latter option was beyond the means of many women without a bursary or scholarship. Finance was a major problem and women artists rented small flats that could serve as both living quarters and studio, thus keeping costs to a bare minimum. Despite the inherent prejudices of the French art establishment, they were able to achieve success at both Salon and Exposition Universelle. This success in France gave them prestige at home, which they were able to utilise to further their careers. The Norwegian pair benefitted from the artistic relationships they formed in Munich, particularly the long-lasting friendship of Eilif Peterssen, which ensured they remained at the centre of the art world in Norway when they returned home at the end of the 1880s.

Edward Munch and Vilhelm Hammershøi became far more famous in the period after 1889, particularly the former who has dominated considerations of Nordic art in recent years, in both output of scholarship and prices at auction. It is notable that Munch’s international career was very slow to get off the ground, there being a seven-year gap between his debut at Antwerp in 1885 and his controversial show in Berlin in 1892. His emphasis on mood rather than subject and light became more fashionable as the Naturalism of the 1880s gave way to the Symbolism of the 1890s. It is also of interest that the artistic climate had changed such that Munch’s Morning seemed a much more radical picture in 1884 than in 1889, and also that Munch’s two international appearances attracted no noticeable press coverage.

Hammershøi’s brief exhibiting career in France in 1889 signified both a beginning and an end of the exposure of his art to a French audience. Despite being given more coverage in the Gazette des beaux-arts than any other Danish artist except Krøyer, he did not feel that the experience had been worthwhile, and retreated to his native Copenhagen, where his atmospheric interiors, pregnant with stillness, now have a strong international reputation which is reflected in increased commercial valuations. His four pictures at the Exposition opened up the possibility that light and form could
take precedence over subject and narrative, and that a picture could be reduced to its essential elements, the lack of superfluous distractions concentrating the viewer’s gaze.

In 1878, Nordic art had seemed insignificant in European terms. Modest success at the Paris Salon was only achieved by Salmson and Hagborg who lived in France and embraced French techniques and subject matter. In 1880, Albert Edelfelt had shown that Nordic subjects could achieve success in Paris, although again painted in an internationally-embraced style of Naturalism that had its roots in the Realism of Barbizon, now interpreted and modified by the more aesthetic, less socially-concerned oeuvre of Jules Bastien-Lepage. Success in the 1880s, as exemplified by the dazzling depictions of light by P. S. Krøyer and the incisive portraiture of Bertha Wegmann, was closely related to the skill of the artist and the facility to create works whose individuality and character stood out. This did not preclude minor awards for more traditional depictions of the far north that appealed because they represented an intriguing ‘other’, further removed from industrialised Europe than the farmers and fisherman of the continental mainland. The greatest success at the Salon of the period went to Nils Forsberg, who had trained in France, took part in the Franco-Prussian war, and depicted a contemporary French historical scene. Paris was the accepted centre of the art world, and success at the Salon the recognised measure of international achievement for painters of all nations, despite the inbuilt bias towards French art and artists. Forsberg’s success was recognised by the French as the success of an adopted Frenchman; it seems highly unlikely that a Swedish historical scene would have been rewarded so handsomely.

At the Exposition of 1889, the generous judges made sixty-six awards to Nordic painters (see Appendix 1), not including those given an Honourable Mention. These included four Grand Prix and five Légion d’honneur. The Exposition was a high-watermark for Nordic Naturalism, the synthesis of French technique and often Nordic subject matter that produced a particularly Nordic approach to a European theme. Some of the artists who achieved success in the 1880s continued to exhibit at the Salon after 1889, but many like Krøyer did not. Just as there had seemed a collective will to head for Paris in the late 1870s, the zeitgeist now led Naturalist painters to return to their home countries carrying knowledge, techniques, contacts, prestige and awards with them. Nordic art had made its first impact on the art of Europe.
Appendix 1 – Awards for Nordic Artists in Paris 1878-1889

A) Artists and Awards

1878: Exposition Universelle
Bloch Carl 1st class medal, Chevalier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur
Cederström Gustaf 2nd class medal
Hagborg August 3rd class medal
Heyderahl Hans 3rd class medal
Munthe Ludvig 1st class medal, Chevalier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur
Peterssen Eilif 2nd class medal
Wahlberg Alfred Officier de l'Ordre de la Légion d'honneur

1878 Salon
Salmson Hugo Hon. mention

1879 Salon
Hagborg Auguste 3rd class medal
Salmson Hugo 3rd class medal

1880 Salon
Backer Harriet Hon. mention
Edelfelt Albert 3rd class medal

1881 Salon
(Ko 1st class medals awarded)
Krøyer P. S. 3rd class medal
Skredsvig Christian 3rd class medal
Uchermann Karl Hon. mention
Wegmann Bertha Hon. mention

1882 Salon
(Ko 1st class medals awarded)
Edelfelt Albert 2nd class medal
Wegmann Bertha 3rd class medal

1883 Salon
Bergh Richard 3rd class medal
Hellqvist Carl-G. Hon. mention
Larsson Carl 3rd class medal

1884 Salon
(Ko 1st class medals awarded)
Grimalund Johannes Hon. Mention
Krøyer P. S. 2nd class medal
Normann Adelsteen Hon. mention

1885 Salon
(Ko 1st class medals awarded)
Sinding Otto Hon. mention

1886 Salon
Rosenberg Edvard Hon. mention
Tuxen Laurits Hon. mention

1887 Salon
(Ko 1st class medals awarded)
Löwstädt-Chadwick Emma Hon. mention
Johansen Viggo Hon. mention
Österlind Allan Hon. mention
Smith Carl F. Hon. mention

1888 Salon
Björck Oscar Hon. mention
Edelfelt Albert Chevalier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur
Forsberg Nils 1st class medal
Grimalund Johannes 3rd class medal
Krøyer P. S. Chevalier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur
Zorn Anders Hon. mention

1889 Salon
(Wo 1st class medals awarded)
Wallander Alfred Hon. mention
Zorn Anders 3rd class medal
1889 *Exposition Universelle* (Medal and prize winners only)

Ancher  
Anna  Silver medal

Ancher  
Michael  Gold medal

Bache  
Otto  Gold medal

Backer  
Harriet  Silver medal

Bergh  
Richard  Grand Prix, Chevalier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur

Berndtson  
Gunnar  Silver medal

Björick  
Oscar  Silver medal

Bratland  
Jacob  Silver medal

Brendekilde  
Hans  Bronze Medal

Edelfelt  
Albert  Grand Prix, Chevalier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur

Ekström  
Pierre  Bronze Medal

Forsberg  
Nils  Silver medal

Gallen-Kallela  
Akseli  Silver medal

Gløersen  
Jacob  Silver medal

Grimelund  
Johannes  Bronze medal

Hammershøi  
Vilhelm  Bronze Medal

Hansteen  
Nils  Bronze Medal

Haslund  
Otto  Bronze Medal

Henningsen  
Erik  Bronze Medal

Heyerdahl  
Hans  Gold medal

Järnefelt  
Eero  Gold medal

Jerdorff  
August  Silver medal

Jørgensen  
Sven  Bronze Medal

Johansen  
Viggo  Gold medal

Josephson  
Ernst  Silver medal

Keyser  
Elisabeth  Bronze Medal

Kielland  
Kitty  Silver medal

Kleinez  
O  Bronze Medal

Kolstø  
Fredrik  Bronze Medal

Kreuger  
Nils  Bronze Medal

 Krohg  
Christian  Bronze Medal

Krøyer  
P. S.  Grand Prix

Larsson  
Carl  Gold medal

Liljefors  
Bruno  Silver medal

Liljelund  
Arvid  Bronze Medal

Lindholm  
Berndt  Silver medal

Locher  
Carl  Bronze Medal

Munthe  
Ludvig  Silver medal

Neilsen  
Amaldus  Bronze Medal

Niss  
Thorvald  Silver medal

Nordström  
Karl  Silver medal

Normann  
Adelsteen  Bronze Medal

Österlind  
Allan  Silver medal

Pauli  
Georg  Bronze Medal

Pauli (Hirsch)  
Hanna  Bronze Medal

Paulsen  
Julius  Silver medal

Petersen  
Pilif  Gold medal

Philipsen  
Theodor  Bronze Medal

Salmson  
Hugo  Chevalier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur

Schjerfbeck  
Helene  Bronze Medal

Seligmann  
Gustaf  Bronze Medal

Sinding  
Otto  Silver medal

Skovgaard  
Joakim  Bronze Medal

Skredsvig  
Christian  Chevalier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur
Soot       Eyolf     Silver medal
Tegner     Hans      Gold medal
Thegerström Robert  Bronze or Silver Medal
Therkildsen Michael  Silver medal
Wallander  Alfred    Gold medal
Wegmann    Bertha    Silver medal
Werenskiold Erik     Grand Prix
Westerholm Victor    Silver medal
Wentzel    Gustav    Silver medal
von Wright  Ferdinand Bronze Medal
Zahrtmann  Kristian Bronze Medal
Zorn       Anders    Gold medal, Chevalier de l'ordre de la Légion d'honneur

B) Paris *Salon* — Pictures by Nordic Artists that received Awards

1878 *Salon*    
Salmson     Hugo     No. 1999 *Bineurs de betteraves, en Picardie*  
(Sugar beet hoers, in Picardy)

1879 *Salon*    
Hagborg     Auguste  No. 1501 *Grande Marée dans la Manche*  
(High Tide in the Channel)
Salmson     Hugo     No. 2687 *Une arrestation dans un village de Picardie*  
(An arrest in a Picardy Village)

1880 *Salon*    
Backer      Harriet  No. 126 *Solitude*  
Edelfelt    Albert   No. 1333 *Le convoi d’un enfant (Finlande)*  
(Conveying the Child’s Coffin)

1881 *Salon*    
Krøyer      P. S.     No. 1266 *Le chapelier de village*  
(The Italian Village Hatters)
Skredsvig   Christian No. 2187 *Une ferme à Venoix (Normandie)*  
(A Farm at Venoix)
Uchermann   Karl      No. 2274 *Halte à la chasse (Break during the Hunt)*  
Wegmann     Bertha    No. 2319 *Portrait de Mlle J. B...*  
(The Artist Jeanna Bauck)

1882 *Salon*    
Edelfelt    Albert   No. 966 *Service Divin au bord de la Mer ;Finlande*  
(Divine Service by the Sea)
Wegmann     Bertha    No. 2591 *Portrait de ma soeur*  
(Madam Seekamp, The Artist’s Sister)

1883 *Salon*    
Bergh       Richard  No. 191 *Portrait de M. K...*  
Hellqvist   Carl-G.  No. 1190 *Mise à rançon de la ville de Visby par Waldemar Atterdag, ri de Danemark, en 1361*  
(Valdemar Atterdag holding Visby to ransom, 1361)
Larsson     Carl     No. 2957 *Les potirons (watercolour)*  
(The Pumpkins)
           No. 2958 *La gelée blanche (watercolour)*  
(Hoarfrost)
1884 Salon
Grimelund Johannes No. 1106 Station balnéaire; Belgique (Seaside Resort, Belgium)
No. 1107 Le Mexico-dock, à Anvers (The Mexico Dock at Antwerp)
Krøyer P. S. No. 1240 Pêcheurs de Skagen (Danemarck); coucher de soleil No. 1241 Les déjeuner des artistes, à Skagen (The Artists' Breakfast at Skagen)
Normann Adelsteen No. 1818 Vue de Reine, à Lofoten; - Norvège (View of Reine in the Lofoten Islands)

1885 Salon
Sinding Otto No. 2261 Lapons saluant le soleil, revenant après la longue nuit d'hiver; - Norvège septentrionale (Laplanders saluting the sun returning after the long winter night - northernmost Norway)
No. 2262 Funérailles, à Lopoten; - Norvège septentrionale (A Funeral in the Lofoten Islands - northernmost Norway)

1886 Salon
Rosenberg Edvard No. 2056 L'Hiver en Suède; - étude (Winter in Sweden - Study)
Tuxen Laurits No. 2329 Portrait de Mme J... (Portrait of Ottilia Jacobsen)

1887 Salon
Löwstädt-Chadwick Emma No. 483 <Five o'clock>
Johansen Viggo No. 1294 Chez Moi (Afterpassia or An Evening Chat)
Österlind Allan No. 1818 La baptême (The Christening)
No. 1819 A la maison mortuaire (House of Mourning in Brittany)
Smith Carl F. No. 2220 Gardeuse d'oies (The Goose Girl)
No. 2221 A l'église (At the Church)

1888 Salon
Björck Oscar No. 270 Forgerons; - Rome. (Blacksmiths - Rome)
Forsberg Nils No. 1014 La fin d'un héros-souvenir du siège de Paris (1870-71) (The end of a Hero - remembrance of the Siege of Paris)
Grimelund Johannes No. 1192 Le port d'Anvers (The Port of Antwerp)
No. 1193 A Fjellbacka; - Suède (Mountain Back - Sweden)
Zorn Anders No. 2580 Un pêcheur (A Fisherman at St. Ives)

1889 Salon
Wallander Alfred No. 2696 Une Chanson Amusante (An amusing Song)
No. 2697 Dévotion; - intérieur dans une église suédoise (Worship; Interior of a Swedish Church)
Zorn Anders No. 2765 A l'air; - Suède
No. 2766 Portrait de Mme R...
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