

*politisch-sozialen Sprache in Deutschland*, ed. Otto Bruner, Werner Conze, and Reinhart Koselleck (Stuttgart: Klett-Cotta, 1978), 4:93–131. See also *Deutsches Wörterbuch von Jacob und Wilhelm Grimm* (1885; facsimile reprint, Munich: Deutscher Taschenbuch, 1984), 12: col. 2446. All of the examples given here were cultural: “moderne art, moderner geschmack, die moderne kunst, wissenschaft u. ähnl., moderne sprachen, in gegensatz zu den alten. . . .” This edition of Grimm’s dictionary used lowercase letters for all substantives. For an illuminating discussion of the concept of contemporaneity in France in the early nineteenth century, see George Boas, “Il faut être de son temps,” *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 1 (1941): 52–65. Writing in 1863, Charles Baudelaire formulated the following understanding of the transience of modernity: “By ‘modernity’ I mean the ephemeral, the fugitive, the contingent, the half of art whose other half is the eternal and the immutable.” Although Baudelaire was influential in France, few German critics seemed to be aware of his work before the last years of the century. Gumbrecht, “Modern, Modernität, Moderne,” 120–26, argues that with the increasing emphasis upon transience, instead of simply on the new, the word *modern* was emptied of meaning, leading to the forging of a new concept from the existing military term *avant-garde*.

7. [Avenarius], *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 4 (Nov. 1887): 44, states that “modern art should resemble modern life” in a review of Albert Ilg, *Moderne Kunstliebhaberei* (Vienna: Graeser, 1887). The two reviews cited were Karl Freiherr von Perfall, “Die Berliner Kunstausstellung,” *Der Kunstwart* 6, no. 17 (June 1893): 265, reprinted from the *Kölnische Zeitung*; and Alfred Freihofner, “Die Münchner Kunstausstellungen III,” *Der Kunstwart* 7, no. 1 (Oct. 1893): 11.

8. This is not the place to try to cite studies from the exceptionally large number of books and articles that have examined and argued over the meaning of *modernism* in recent years. One study, however, Robert Jensen’s *Marketing Modernism in Fin-de-Siècle Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), is particularly pertinent for this book in its emphasis upon the Central European contribution to the formation of the canon. Privileged to read Jensen’s manuscript early in my own work on this book, I want to acknowledge his influence upon my thinking, even though our approach and, often, our conclusions are fundamentally different.

9. A lively and illuminating treatment of the “problem of the public” and of the construction of concepts of the public in polemics about the art of the eighteenth-century French Salons is presented in Thomas E. Crow, *Painters and Public Life in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1985), 1–23.

Not long ago I discovered a kindred spirit in a dissertation completed in 1933 in Heidelberg. Ernst A. Franke was led by the same curiosity to seek to understand the role of the crowds, whose voices, silenced, were accessible only through their critics and accusers. Or as he concisely stated: “Over this public the most contradictory opinions of scholars, critics, and artists prevail, a cacophony in which only one voice is missing—that of the public itself, if one could allow them to voice their own defense, they would have a difficult time, for all of the others are wholly united on one thing: that this public understands absolutely nothing about art” (“Publikum und Malerei in Deutschland von Biedermeier zum Impressionismus” [Ph.D. diss., Ruprecht-Karls-Universität zu Heidelberg, 1934], 9). Inevitably, we share the same methodology, working through the art journals, though he relied more heavily on memoirs and accounts written after the events. The chronological range of his work is far wider, covering the entire nineteenth century of German painting, requiring an analysis through a series of topics. His aim was to demonstrate that, given the “headstrong stance” of many artists and critics in pursuit of purely artistic ends, the public bore only minimal blame for “today’s almost complete alienation” between painting and the public (iv). My argument is less direct or censorious because our assumptions and perceptions are, perforce, determined by the separation of more than half a century of racism, holocausts, world wars, international crises, domestic conflicts, and politicization of artistic movements. Nevertheless, Franke’s plaint over the profound alienation of the public from “today’s newest art” retains its resonance at the beginning of this century.

## Part I, Chapter 1

### Contemporary Art for the Modern Nation

1. Citing Max Jordan, director of the Berlin museums, York Langenstein reports that the painting was commissioned by the Society for Historical Art (Verbindung für historische Kunst), which paid 20,300 marks for the work (*Der Münchner Kunstverein im 19. Jahrhundert: Ein Beitrag zur Entwicklung des Kunstmarkts und des Ausstellungswesens* [Munich: UNI-Druck, 1983], 186). The Prussian minister of culture then acquired the painting for Kaiser William II through the lottery. Anton von Werner reported in his memoirs that William II saw the work when it was exhibited in the academy building in February 1889 and ordered that it be purchased for the National Gallery (Werner, *Erlebnisse und Eindrücke, 1870–1890* [Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn, 1913], 555). For a careful identification of the figures, both historical and allegorical, see Friedrich Pecht, “Die Münchener Ausstellungen von 1888: Die deutsche Historienmalerei,” *Die Kunst für Alle* 3, no. 19 (July 1888): 292–93; for a double-page plate of the painting, see *ibid.* 4, no. 24 (Sept. 1888).

2. The Congress of Vienna, in 1815, reduced the number of independent principalities from more than 300 to 38, which were loosely joined in the German Confederation, comprising 5 different kingdoms (Prussia, Bavaria, Saxony, Hanover, Württemberg), 1 grand duchy (Baden), 4 free cities (Frankfurt, Lübeck, Bremen, Hamburg), 11 middle-sized duchies or states, and 13 small states. In 1866, after the Austro-Prussian War, the confederation was dissolved, and a new confederation of states, the North German Confederation, was formed under the dominance of Prussia. Bavaria, Württemberg, Baden, Luxembourg, and Hesse-Darmstadt retained their independence from this confederation until the defeat of the French in the 1870–71 war. John C. G. Röhl, in *The Kaiser and His Court: Wilhelm II and the Government of Germany*, trans. Terence F. Cole (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 112–15, argues that the empire was a “league of monarchs” and cites the continued existence of legations between, for example, Berlin and Baden, Berlin and Bavaria, or Baden and Bavaria.

3. A concise description of the regional, class, and religious variables in the empire is provided by David Blackbourn, *Populists and Patricians: Essays in Modern Germany History* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1987), 13–19; Blackbourn also vividly analyzes Germany’s political fragmentation, its “patchwork of small worlds,” in his book *The Long Nineteenth Century: A History of Germany, 1780–1918* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998), prologue and chap. 2. Directly addressing the interaction between nation building and cultural aspirations in his survey of this period, Wolfgang J. Mommsen, *Bürgerliche Kultur und künstlerische Avantgarde: Kultur und Politik im deutschen Kaiserreich, 1870 bis 1918* (Frankfurt am Main: Propyläen-Studienausgabe, 1994), 7–18, makes a useful distinction between the various cultural milieus—aristocratic, bourgeois, religious, socialist—that cut across the unity of the nation.

Celia Applegate, in her creatively conceived book *A Nation of Provincials: The German Idea of Heimat* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1990), analyzes the tension between local, regional loyalties and national aspirations in the building of national identity in nineteenth-century Germany. On the issue of national consolidation after the unification, see Geoff Eley, “State Formation, Nationalism, and Political Culture in Nineteenth-Century Germany,” in *From Unification to Nazism: Reinterpreting the German Past* (Cambridge: Unwin Hyman, 1986), 61–84; and Helmut Walser Smith, *German Nationalism and Religious Conflict: Culture, Ideology, Politics, 1870–1914* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 5–15.

A perceptive analysis of the concept and function of culture in the self-definition of the German nation was made by Norbert Elias in *The Civilizing Process: The Development of Manners*, trans. Edmund Jephcott (New York:

Urizen Books, 1978), 6, originally published as *Über den Prozess der Zivilisation* (Basel: Haus zum Falken, 1939). His analysis is well summarized in the following: “Kultur mirrors the self-consciousness of a nation which had constantly to seek out and constitute its boundaries anew, in a political as well as a spiritual sense, and again and again had to ask itself: ‘What is really our identity?’” A more recent analysis of the significance of cultural nationalism is Thomas Nipperdey, “In Search of Identity: Romantic Nationalism, Its Intellectual, Political, and Social Background,” in *Romantic Nationalism in Europe*, ed. J. C. Eade (Canberra: Humanities Research Centre, Australian National University, 1983), 1–15. A further provocative essay on the complexities of German identity, nationalism, and art comes from Hans Belting, *The Germans and Their Art: A Troublesome Relationship* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1998).

4. Werner, *Erlebnisse*, chap. 3, presented his own account of these events at Versailles. For further documents, accounts, and analysis of Werner’s work on this painting, see Peter Paret, *Art as History: Episodes in the Culture and Politics of Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988), 165–80. Dominik Bartmann, ed., *Anton von Werner: Geschichte in Bildern*, exh. cat. (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 1993), 332–69, provides excellent color plates and careful analysis of all of his major paintings; see also Bartmann, *Anton von Werner: Zur Kunst und Kunstpolitik im Deutschen Kaiserreich* (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1985), 96–122.

5. Werner, *Erlebnisse*, 30–34.

6. Compare Werner’s painting with Adolph von Menzel’s *Coronation of King William I* (1865), set in the great cathedral in Berlin. On the military nature of the ceremony, see Paret, *Art as History*, 179–80.

7. Both of Bartmann’s books on Werner contain extended descriptions and illustrations of Werner’s paintings of the imperial triumphs and activities. An insightful analysis of the influence of French artists upon Werner’s work is Thomas W. Gaehtgens, “Anton von Werner und die französische Malerei,” in Bartmann, *Anton von Werner: Geschichte in Bildern*, 49–61.

8. For an incisive analysis of Werner’s policies and accomplishments, see Peter Paret, *The Berlin Secession: Modernism and Its Enemies in Imperial Germany* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1980), 14–19. This book on the Berlin art world in the 1890s is the single most important work for any reader who is curious about the politics of art and the relationship between art and politics in this crucial period in German history. A pioneering study in the inter-

action between art history and political history and an essential resource that has served as a basis for much of the work done in this field in the last two decades, Paret's book remains unsurpassed. Taken together with his *Art as History*, which is an innovative reading across culture and politics and across a century, his study of images of war, *Imagined Battles* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1997), and his essays in *German Encounters with Modernism, 1840–1945* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), Paret's work represents the search for an understanding of the human past that we call "history" at its best.

9. A concise overview of policies and statistics about the financing of art in Prussia is available in Wilfried Feldenkirchen, "Staatliche Kunstfinanzierung im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Kunstpolitik und Kunstförderung im Kaiserreich: Kunst im Wandel der Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte*, ed. Ekkehard Mai, Hans Pohl, and Stephan Waetzoldt (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1982), 35–54.

10. A survey of a variety of national symbols in the nineteenth century in Germany appears in the informative book by Robin Lenman, *Artists and Society in Germany, 1850–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), chap. 1. This book, an invaluable addition to the growing bibliography in this field, is based on Lenman's extensive archival research, which first appeared in a series of significant essays and in an earlier book published in Germany, *Die Kunst, die Macht, und das Geld: Zur Kulturgeschichte des kaiserlichen Deutschland, 1871–1918*, trans. Reiner Grundmann (Frankfurt am Main: Campus Verlag, 1994).

For a concise statement of the close association of nature with the idealization of the German people, see George L. Mosse, *The Crisis of German Ideology: Intellectual Origins of the Third Reich* (New York: Grosset and Dunlap, 1964), 13–24. Major exceptions to the rural landscape setting were built later: the national monument to William I in Berlin (1897), the Hamburg Bismarck monument (1906), and the immense Leipzig Battle of Nations monument dedicated in 1913 at the edge of the city suburbs on the site of the defeat of Napoleon in 1813. Even here, however, a 30-meter-high hill was created upon which to erect the 91-meter monument; from there one could survey the entire battlefield and an adjacent one on the other side of the city. Other monuments to famous individuals, from poets to national leaders, were frequently created by municipalities and set in places of honor within the cities.

The dates given for the monuments here are those of completion or dedication. The literature on national monuments is huge, beginning with publications from the late nineteenth century. A good early survey of monuments celebrating Germany's victory over France in 1871

is Friedrich Pecht, "Deutsche Siegesdenkmäler: Zum 25. Jahrestage des Frankfurter Friedens, 2 Mai 1871," *Die Kunst für Alle* 11, no. 14 (Apr. 1896): 209–11, with photographs of twenty monuments, three of which are full-page plates. Pioneering analyses of the types and ideology of monuments are Thomas Nipperdey, "Nationalidee und Nationaldenkmal in Deutschland im 19. Jahrhundert," *Historische Zeitschrift* 206 (1968): 529–85; George L. Mosse, *The Nationalization of the Masses: Political Symbolism and Mass Movements in Germany from the Napoleonic Wars through the Third Reich* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1975), chap. 3; and Lutz Tittel, "Monumentaldenkmäler von 1871 bis 1918 in Deutschland: Ein Beitrag zum Thema Denkmal und Landschaft," in *Kunstverwaltung, Bau- und Denkmal-Politik im Kaiserreich*, ed. Ekkehard Mai and Stephan Waetzoldt (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1981), 215–75.

11. Tittel, "Monumentaldenkmäler," 238, cites the repeated calls and plans for national monuments to be in rural settings, including this one from Dr. Ernest Jakob Broicher's *Das Kaiser Wilhelm-Denkmal auf Hohensyburg* (Essen, 1901), 15. The continuing ideological importance of the national monuments was reiterated almost a century later by the installation on 2 September 1993, Sedan Day, of a replica of the statue of William I at Deutsche Eck, the confluence of the Rhine and Mosel Rivers. The original statue at this site, dedicated in 1897, was destroyed by U.S. soldiers at the end of World War II. Another symbolic celebration occurred in the summer of 1995, when the shell of the old Berlin Reichstag was wrapped by Christo and Jean-Claude. What had aroused controversial debate over national identity in the German parliament in Bonn before permission was given turned into a joyful celebration, not of the old empire, but of the hope for a newly unified democratic society. See the thoughtful essay "Looking for Germania," by Patricia Herminhouse and Magda Mueller, which introduces their edited collection of essays *Gender and Germanness: Cultural Productions of Nation* (Providence, R.I.: Berghahn Books, 1997), 1–8. Another essay in the same collection, Mariatte C. Denman's "Visualizing the Nation: Madonnas and Mourning Mothers in Postwar Germany," 189–201, considers the continuing controversial nature of finding visual representations for Germany's commemoration of its difficult past and present identity. This problem continues to play itself out in the ongoing political debates and indecision in Berlin over a Holocaust memorial.

12. See, e.g., "Zum Kaiser Wilhelm-Denkmal in Berlin," *Die Kunst für Alle* 5, no. 7 (Jan. 1890): 97–100, the lead article on the winning designs for the William I monument, with illustrations for all of the designs; Pecht, "Deutsche Siegesdenkmäler," *ibid.* 11, no. 14 (Apr. 1896): 209–11, with photographs of many monuments; and Gr. [Georg

Gronau], "Berlin," *ibid.* 13, no. 4 (Nov. 1897): 60–61, which reports on crowds thronging the Berlin Academy to see designs for the national monument honoring Bismarck. See also Kirsten Belgum, "Displaying the Nation: A View of Nineteenth-Century Monuments through a Popular Magazine," *Central European History* 26, no. 4 (1994): 457–74, which analyzes the construction of a national ideal through the articles on monuments in the *Gartenlaube*; and Karen Lang, "Monumental Unease: Monuments and the Making of National Identity in Germany," in *Imagining Modern German Culture: 1889–1910*, ed. Françoise Forster-Hahn (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1996), 275–99, a valuable analysis of the role of national monuments in the creation of German national identity.

**13.** The debate in *Der Kunstwart* began with an article by W. Koopmann, "Künstlerische Persönlichkeit," in the 1 March 1890 issue and ended with a counterstatement by Herman Helferich [Emil Heilbut], "Ueber Denkmälerkunst," *ibid.* 3, no. 21 (Aug. 1890): 337–39. Koopmann fully supported the ideals of the monuments; Heilbut found them lacking any aesthetic or historical value. Throughout the 1890s articles appeared that were critical of official monuments, particularly those that celebrated the imperial dynasty, e.g., Franz Servaës, "Unsere Nationaldenkmäler," *ibid.* 9, no. 4 (Nov. 1895): 60, which asks, "Ob nicht unsere gesamte nationalpatriotische Denkmalwirtschaft mit der Zeit unheilbar diskreditiert worden ist?"

**14.** A contemporary account of the discovery and development of the panorama was published in two articles by S. Hausmann, "Die Erfindung der Panoramen," *Die Kunst für Alle* 7, no. 13 (Apr. 1889): 198–202, and "Die neueste Entwicklung der deutschen Panoramamalerei," *ibid.* 5, no. 17 (June 1890): 257–63; the latter article was reprinted in *Der Kunstwart* 3, no. 18 (June 1890): 280–81. Stephan Oettermann, *Das Panorama: Die Geschichte eines Massenmediums* (Frankfurt am Main: Syndikat, 1980), trans. Deborah Lucas Schneider under the title *The Panorama: History of a Mass Medium* (New York: Zone Books, 1997), provides an excellent comprehensive study of the varieties of panoramas shown in towns and country fairs through the early and mid-nineteenth century, followed by a lengthy analysis of the panorama mania at the end of the century; my page references are to the German edition. See also Oettermann, "Die Reise mit den Augen—'Oramas' in Deutschland," in *Sehsucht: Das Panorama als Massenunterhaltung des 19. Jahrhunderts*, exh. cat. (Bonn: Stroemfeld/Roter Stern, 1993), 41–51. A briefer treatment is Evelyn J. Fruitema and Paul A. Zoetmulder, eds., *The Panorama Phenomenon* (The Hague: Foundation for the Preservation of the Centenarian Mesdag Panorama, 1981). On Schinkel, see Barry Bergdoll, *Karl Friedrich Schinkel: An Architecture for*

*Prussia* (New York: Rizzoli International Publications, 1994), 23–27; and Kurt W. Forster, "Schinkel's Panoramic Planning of Central Berlin," *Modulus* 16 (1983): 62–77.

The panorama mania was discussed in the 1890 article by Hausmann, "Die neueste Entwicklung," 257, who reported that shares of the Société Française des Grands Panoramas soared from one hundred francs to eight hundred francs with the news of the extraordinary sales of entrance tickets to the panorama, which had become virtually a "Kultbild." In his memoirs Werner repeatedly used the term "Panorama-Manie" to describe the proliferation of panoramas and their valuable contracts for leading academic artists (see, e.g., Werner, *Erlebnisse*, 277). From November 1878 to May 1880 eighteen panorama companies were incorporated in Belgium, most of which were subsidiaries of two competing Belgian organizations that created local front branches to establish patriotic panoramas in cities across Europe. During the 1880s thirty-three Belgian companies established forty-four major panorama buildings in cities from Russia to the United States (see Isabelle Leroy, "Belgische Panoramagesellschaften 1879–1889: Modelle des internationalen Kapitalismus," in *Sehsucht*, 74–83).

The great panoramas in which the viewer was encircled by the painting should not be confused with the Kaiser Panorama, opened in 1883 in the Kaisergalerie in Berlin, which operated on the opposite principle. Established by August Fuhrmann, the Kaiser Panorama presented a sequence of hand-colored stereoscopic photographic slides of current events and places to viewers seated around a large drumlike apparatus. The slides in the center revolved past the binocular holes for the viewers. By 1914 more than a thousand series were circulating through 250 branches, providing the latest journalistic photographs to viewers (see Erhard Senf, "Das kostümierte Imperium," in *Die Metropole: Industriekultur in Berlin im 20. Jahrhundert*, ed. Jochen Boberg, Tilman Fichter, and Eckhart Gillen [Munich: Verlag C. H. Beck, 1986], 28–29).

**15.** Oettermann, *Das Panorama*, 193–96, provides description and plans of the Frankfurt Sedan panorama. *The History of Munich Art*, written by Friedrich Pecht, is quoted in Hausmann, "Die neueste Entwicklung," 258.

**16.** Oettermann, *Das Panorama*, 188–93, and "Die Reise," 49; both supply detailed information and illustrations on the financing, construction, and operation of the panoramas.

**17.** Werner, *Erlebnisse*, 337–40, 344–54, 373–78, 394–410. Werner's text recounting his planning and execution of the panorama is liberally sprinkled with preparatory sketches. Floor plans, a section elevation of the rotunda, and building specifications can be found in

R—r, "Das Sedan-Panorama am Alexanderplatz in Berlin," *Centralblatt der Bauverwaltung*, no. 12 (22 Mar. 1884): 114–16. Journals at this time frequently identified their reporters and correspondents with abbreviations such as *hn* or *R—r* and symbols such as \* or † or #. For a three-foot-long reproduction of the canvas, plans, and a graphic illustration of the interior view of the panorama, see Oettermann, *Das Panorama*, 204–11. More photographs and extensive documentation of the panorama are in Bartmann, "Das Sedan-Panorama mit den drei Dioramen," in Bartmann, *Anton von Werner: Geschichte in Bildern*, 270–83. Werner reported in *Erlebnisse*, 277, 331, that he had been approached by a Belgian company in 1880 to do a Battle of Sedan but that he had signed a contract to do one with a group of Berlin financiers, the Sedan-Panorama-Aktiengesellschaft-Berlin, a front for a Belgian *société anonyme*.

**18.** The citation from *Deutsche Kunstgeschichte* appears in Hausmann, "Die neueste Entwicklung," 258. Adolf Rosenberg in *Kunstchronik* provided a high level of coverage of the panoramas (see his claim for them as the new art form in "Die Kunst auf der Berliner Hygieneausstellung," *Kunstchronik* 18 [May 1883]: col. 556). A conservative art historian, recognized for his three-volume study of nineteenth-century art, and the arts editor of the Berlin daily newspaper the *Post*, Rosenberg wrote most of the contemporary reviews for the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* and for *Kunstchronik* in the 1880s and 1890s.

Ludwig Pietsch's review in the *Vossische Zeitung* (2 Sept. 1883) is cited in Oettermann, *Das Panorama*, 209–10. The oldest and most conservative of the critics, with a national readership in the 1880s and 1890s, Pietsch was most influential in Berlin. Pietsch, who began his tenure as a critic for the *Vossische Zeitung* in 1864 and served in that capacity for more than forty years, was one of the first traveling art critics, sent by his paper on more than a hundred trips across Europe, as well as to the Near East and North Africa. For a contemporary assessment of Rosenberg and of Pietsch, see Paul Schultze-Naumburg, "Deutsche Kunstkritiker," *Die Kunst für Alle* 10, no. 12 (Mar. 1895): 177–78. On the high standing and liberal position of Berlin's oldest and premier newspaper, see Klaus Bender, "Vossische Zeitung (1617–1934)," in *Deutsche Zeitungen des 17. bis 20. Jahrhunderts*, ed. Heinz-Dietrich Fischer (Pullach bei München, Germany: Verlag Dokumentation, 1972), 25–40.

**19.** Richard Muther, "Bruno Piglhein," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 22 (1886–87): 167–72. These comments were made in a larger review of the work of Bruno Piglhein, who in 1886 completed the second most popular panorama, one of the Crucifixion in Jerusalem. For a contemporary assessment of Muther's importance as an art historian and critic in the promotion of the new art in Germany, see

Paul Schultze-Naumburg, "Deutsche Kunstkritiker," *Die Kunst für Alle* 10, no. 11 (Mar. 1895): 165–66. The reviews cited are Friedrich Pecht, "Anton von Werner und das Jahr 1870," *ibid.*, 1, no. 14 (Apr. 1886): 194; and Prof. Dr. Franz von Reber, "Das Rundbild der Stadt Rom von Prof. Jos. Bühlmann und Prof. Alex. Wagner," *Die Kunst unserer Zeit* 1 (1890): 1–10. See also the note on Prof. Max Koch's panorama concerning the arrival in Constantinople of the imperial couple in *ibid.*, 2 (1891), supplement.

**20.** Hausmann, "Die neueste Entwicklung," 263, quotes the attack on the barbarism of panoramas. The second critique came from E[duard] von Hartmann, "Dioramen und Panoramen," *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 18 (June 1888): 154–55, taken from his book *Philosophie des Schönen*. Hartmann's views on current panoramas were cited in a later attack upon Werner whose author found it entirely logical that the Berlin artist had created a panorama since "nothing is more unartistic than a panorama" (see Friedrich Freiherr von Khaynach, *Anton von Werner und die Berliner Hofmalerei* [Zürich: Verlags-Magazin, 1893], 29–30).

**21.** Paul Schumann reported on the parodies in "Sommerfest des Künstlervereins 'Mappe' zu Dresden," *Die Kunst für Alle* 1, no. 23 (Sept. 1886): 352. Oettermann, *Das Panorama*, 190, discusses the panorama workshops. As late as 1896 publicity and enthusiasm accompanied the opening of a great panorama in Berlin designed by A. v. Kossak and Julian Falat depicting Napoleon's disastrous retreat from Russia (see an illustration and a double-page spread of scenes from the panorama in *Moderne Kunst* 11 [1897]). The report on the opening of this latest panorama in *Die Kunst für Alle* 11, no. 16 (May 1896): 254, noted that the investors hoped this depiction of the mood of the retreat would serve to counter the increasing lack of interest in panorama paintings.

**22.** Published by Friedrich Bruckmann's Verlagsanstalt für Kunst und Wissenschaft in Munich, the journal appeared twice monthly, with the first issue appearing on 1 October 1885. In 1899, under Hugo Bruckmann, *Die Kunst für Alle* was joined with *Dekorative Kunst*, founded by Julius Meier-Graefe in 1897, to form *Die Kunst*. Appearing in two separate volumes twice monthly, each kept its own name under the rubric *Die Kunst*. For information about the cultural journals, see Karl Ulrich Syndram, *Kulturpublizistik und nationales Selbstverständnis: Untersuchungen zur Kunst- und Kulturpolitik in den Rundschauzeitschriften des Deutschen Kaiserreiches (1871–1914)* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1989); and Rüdiger vom Bruch, "Kunst- und Kulturkritik in führenden bildungsbürgerlichen Zeitschriften des Kaiserreichs," in *Ideengeschichte und Kunstwissenschaft: Philosophie und bildende Kunst im Kaiserreich*, ed. Ekkehard Mai, Stephan Waetzoldt, and Gerd Wolandt (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1983), 313–47. Differing analyses of

- the function of these reviews and journals in creating a public for art can be found in Michael Bringmann, "Die Kunstkritik als Faktor der Ideen und Geistesgeschichte: Ein Beitrag zum Thema 'Kunst und Öffentlichkeit' im 19. Jahrhundert," in *ibid.*, 253–78; and Birgit Kulhoff, *Bürgerliche Selbstbehauptung im Spiegel der Kunst: Untersuchungen zur Kulturpublizistik der Rundschauzeitschriften im Kaiserreich (1871–1914)* (Bochum, Germany: Universitätsverlag Dr. N. Brockmeyer, 1990).
- 23.** Friedrich Pecht, "Vor Eröffnung der ersten Münchener Jahres Ausstellung 1889," *Die Kunst für Alle* 4, no. 19 (July 1889): 289–90.
- 24.** Friedrich Pecht, "Buonaventura Genelli," in *Süd-deutsche Zeitung* 190 (13 Apr. 1862), quoted in Michael Bringmann, *Friedrich Pecht (1814–1903): Maßstäbe der deutschen Kunstkritik zwischen 1850 und 1900* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1982), 101. Pecht's call for making art "the common property of all of the people" was in direct opposition to the views of the influential critic Conrad Fiedler, whose significant assertion that only the educated, cultivated elite could understand or appreciate genuine art and that democratizing of art would result in sheer mediocrity was published in his article "Über Kunstinteressen und deren Förderung," *Deutsche Rundschau* 6 (Oct. 1879): 49–70, analyzed and cited in Kulhoff, *Bürgerliche Selbstbehauptung im Spiegel der Kunst*, 47–54.
- 25.** The scholarly world already had its professional art historical journal, the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* (Leipzig), edited by Carl von Lützow (1832–1897), begun in 1866, which increasingly covered major contemporary artists. Circulation figures are from Bringmann, *Friedrich Pecht*, 224, citing Klaus Achim Hübner, "Die Kunst für Alle, Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Kunstzeitschrift" (Phil. diss., Berlin, 1954), 51, 53. Of the leading reviews, *Die Gesellschaft* (Munich, 1885–1902) had a circulation of 1,000 in 1890; *Die Gegenwart* (Berlin, 1872–1931) and *Deutsche Rundschau* (Berlin, 1874–1942) each had a circulation of fewer than 5,000 after 1888; and *Freie Bühne* (Berlin, 1889–1922) reached 1,000 subscribers by 1898. Further circulation figures and information about these reviews are available in Syndram, *Kulturpublizistik*; Heinz-Dietrich Fischer, ed., *Deutsche Zeitschriften des 17. bis 20. Jahrhunderts* (Pullach bei München, Germany: Verlag Dokumentation, 1973); and Fritz Schlawe, *Literarische Zeitschriften, 1885–1910* (Stuttgart: J. B. Metzlersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1961).
- 26.** For a contemporary biographical account, see F. v. Reber, "Friedrich Pecht: Zu seinem 80. Geburtstage, 2 Oktober 1894," *Die Kunst für Alle* 10, no. 1 (Oct. 1894): 2–6. Further biographical information, an extended analysis of his ideas, and a full bibliography of Pecht's writing are to

be found in Bringmann, *Friedrich Pecht*, which stoutly, and correctly, defends the journal under Pecht's direction against facile charges in current scholarship regarding his editorial treatment of the modern movement. Friedrich Pecht, "Anton von Werner und das Jahr 1870," *Die Kunst für Alle* 1, no. 14 (Apr. 1886): 193–98, discusses the Sedan panorama and includes plates of two of the dioramas. On national monuments, for example, see Pecht's coverage of the first competition for the William I monument in Berlin in *ibid.* 5, nos. 4 (Nov. 1889) and 7 (Jan. 1890) and 7, no. 1 (Oct. 1891).

**27.** Friedrich Pecht, "An unsere Freunde," *Die Kunst für Alle* 1, no. 7 (Jan. 1886): 92–94. Werner Hofmann, in the exhibition catalogue for the Menzel exhibition at the Washington and Berlin National Galleries, cited the title of George Boas's article "Il faut être de son temps," from the *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 1 (1941): 52–65, in his discussion of the centrality in nineteenth-century painting of "the clear uncompromising creed expressed in the maxim 'one must belong to one's time.'" Boas's title, which originated with Daumier, became, Hofmann argues, a "moral imperative, giving contemporaneity all the aura of an article of faith." In France this had led to "the doctrine of Impressionism, an exclusive approach that sacrificed everything beyond the scope of immediate visual experience" (see Werner Hofmann, "Menzel's Universality," in *Adolph Menzel, 1815–1905: Between Romanticism and Impressionism*, ed. Claude Keisch and Marie Ursula Riemann-Reyher, exh. cat. [New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1996], 91).

That the demand for contemporaneity took on "the aura of an article of faith" was certainly true for Pecht and for most other critics at the end of the century. The source of disagreement lay in how one defined and expressed that contemporaneity. This doctrine of contemporaneity drove Pecht's argument for a national art but meant for him not a sacrifice of everything beyond the immediate optical experience but an enhancement of everything having to do with the life of contemporary people within the nation. This understanding of the "demand for contemporaneity" is admirably presented by Linda Nochlin in "'Il faut être de son temps': Realism and the Demand for Contemporaneity," in *Realism* (New York: Penguin Books, 1971), chap. 3, in which she explores the various meanings and manifestations of contemporaneity as "one of the central issues, if not the very crux, of nineteenth-century Realism." Her definition of the Realist understanding of contemporaneity expresses well Pecht's view: "confronting the concrete experiences and appearances of their own times with an earnest and serious attitude and a fresh, appropriate imagery—was the only valid approach to creating an art of and for their own epoch."

28. For Pecht's views on academic art, see, e.g., his "Die beiden Münchener Ausstellungen für 1888," *Die Kunst für Alle* 2, no. 13 (Apr. 1887): 195, and "Anton von Werner und das Jahr 1870," *ibid.*, 1, no. 14 (Apr. 1886): 193.
29. Friedrich Pecht, "Zum 70. Geburtstage Adolf Menzels," *ibid.*, 1, no. 5 (Dec. 1885): 62. Articles, catalogues, and books published on Menzel during his long lifetime and in the century since his death are extensive. It will suffice to cite a handful from the journals of this period, including those commemorating his death in 1905 and the major retrospective held shortly afterward in the National Gallery in Berlin: Max Jordan, "Adolf Menzel," *ibid.* 20, no. 12 (Mar. 1905): 265–71; Franz Wolter, "Erinnerungen an Adolf Menzel," *ibid.*, 273–76, all plates and illustrations in this issue being Menzel's works; H.R. [Hans Rosenhagen], "Die Menzel-Ausstellung in der Nationalgalerie zu Berlin," *ibid.*, no. 15 (May 1905): 361–64; A[venarius], "Adolf Menzel," *Der Kunstwart* 9, no. 5 (Dec. 1895): 71; Max Schmid-Aachen, "Adolf Menzel," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 31, n.s. 7 (1895–96): 49–69; G. [Walther Gensel?], "Menzels Begräbnis," *Kunstchronik*, n.s. 16 (Feb. 1905); "Die Menzel-Ausstellung in der Berliner National-Galerie," *ibid.* (Mar. 1905); H[ugo] von Tschudi, "Adolf Menzel," *Pan* 2, no. 1 (1896): 41–44; Max Jordan, "Menzel und die Nationalgalerie," *Moderne Kunst* 20 (1905–6): 97–99; H[elene] Vollmar, "Adolf Menzel: Zum achtzigsten Geburtstag," *ibid.* 10 (1895–96): 54–60; *idem*, "Adolph Menzel," *ibid.*, 19 (1904–5): 177–81; *idem*, "Menzel in Kissingen," *ibid.*, 20 (1905–6): 101. For one of the few publications on Menzel in English, see the excellent essays and full-color plates in Keisch and Riemann-Reyher, *Adolph Menzel*.
30. [Friedrich Pecht], "Unsere Bilder," *Die Kunst für Alle* 4, no. 12 (Mar. 1889): 186, with a full-page plate of the painting. A useful and well-illustrated study of genre painting in the late nineteenth century in Germany including a color reproduction of the Schwabe work is Martina Sitt and Ute Ricke-Immel, *Angesichts des Alltäglichen: Genremotive in der Malerei zwischen 1830 und 1900*, exh. cat. (Cologne: Böhlau Verlag, 1996).
31. See Friedrich Pecht, "Die Münchener Ausstellungen von 1888," *Die Kunst für Alle* 3, no. 18 (June 1888): 276, for Pecht's reference to plagues; and "Zum Beginn des zehnten Jahrgangs," *ibid.*, 10, no. 1 (Oct. 1894): 1.
32. On the Kulturkampf, see Michael B. Gross, "Kulturkampf and Unification: German Liberalism and the War against the Jesuits," *Central European History* 30, no. 4 (1997): 545–66; Smith, *German Nationalism*, 19–49; Margaret Lavinia Anderson, "The Limits of Secularization: On the Problem of the Catholic Revival in Nineteenth-Century Germany," *Historical Journal* 38 (1995): 647–70; Ronald Ross, "Enforcing the Kulturkampf in the Bismarckian State and the Limits of Coercion in Imperial Germany," *Journal of Modern History* 56 (Sept. 1984): 456–82; Jonathan Sperber, *Popular Catholicism in Nineteenth-Century Germany* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984), chaps. 5–6; and, on actions in the southern states, Ellen Lovell Evans, *The German Center Party, 1870–1933: A Study in Political Catholicism* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1981), chap. 3. On the antisocialist laws, see Vernon Lidtke, *The Outlawed Party: Social Democracy in Germany, 1878–1890* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1966).
33. Sperber, *Popular Catholicism*, 222–33, has a good description and analysis of the mass demonstrations, pilgrimages, and celebrations that formed the heart of Catholic resistance to the anti-Catholic measures.
34. See Smith, *German Nationalism*, 50–113; and Ronald J. Ross, "Catholic Plight in the Kaiserreich: A Reappraisal," in *Another Germany: A Reconsideration of the Imperial Era*, ed. Jack R. Dukes and Joachim Remak (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 1988): 73–94. The Protestant Church protested against the reintroduction in 1896 of Catholic processions in Heidelberg, Pforzheim, and Mannheim, according to Helmut Walser Smith, "Religion and Conflict: Protestants, Catholics, and Anti-Semitism in the State of Baden in the Era of Wilhelm II," *Central European History* 27, no. 3 (1994): 295.
35. Pecht described Menzel's painting in detail twice: in "Unsere Bilder," *Die Kunst für Alle* 7, no. 16 (May 1892): 249, accompanying the double-page spread, and earlier in *ibid.*, 1, no. 5 (Dec. 1885): 70. The work was shown in official exhibitions in Berlin in 1880, 1882, 1885, 1886, 1892, and 1895 and in Munich in 1891. Pecht also published a double-page spread of another religious procession, Karl Marr's *The Flagellants*, which he approved of highly despite its historical setting in an earlier era and country (see Pecht, "Die erste Münchener Jahres-Ausstellung 1889, II," *ibid.*, 4, no. 20 [July 1889]: 306, and for the plate, *ibid.*, 5, no. 1 [Oct. 1889]).
36. P.S., "Karlsruhe," *ibid.*, 7, no. 14 (Apr. 1892): 218. The Elvehjem Museum of Art at the University of Wisconsin reports in *artscene* 2, no. 3 (1998), that Theodore Esser's *Strike of the Blacksmiths* (1892) was purchased by a University of Wisconsin political scientist who taught in Berlin and Leipzig in 1911–12 and was donated to the university by a later owner.
37. On Pecht's attitudes toward socialism, see Bringmann, *Friedrich Pecht*, 160–61. For Pecht's discussion of Béraud's painting, see *Die Kunst für Alle* 6, no. 2 (Oct. 1890): 30. There is a certain irony in Pecht's reproach of German artists: Joris Karl Huysmans had similarly

criticized French artists a decade earlier for their failure to follow the lead of Menzel in painting factory scenes, according to Gabriel Weisberg, *The Realist Tradition: French Painting and Drawing, 1830–1900*, exh. cat. (Cleveland: Cleveland Museum of Art, 1981), 4. Pecht also wrote about workers (see, e.g., *Die Kunst für Alle* 4, no. 23 [Sept. 1889]: 354–55, a discussion of Bockelmann's *Streikszenen*; and *ibid.*, 6, no. 7 [Jan. 1891]: 106, 108, with a reproduction of a painting on class conflict by the Danish artist Axel Helmsted, *Stadtratssitzung*).

**38.** A well-documented and well-illustrated catalogue examining the artistic responses to the European-wide phenomenon of strikes in the nineteenth century is Agnete von Specht, *Streik: Realität und Mythos*, exh. cat. (Berlin: Deutsches Historisches Museum, 1992). On strikes, see Lidtke, *Outlawed Party*, 299, 301–5, 245 n. 13, 292–93, where he gives the number of striking miners in the Ruhr in 1889 as 120,000. In 1891 the socialists changed the name of their party to the Social Democratic Party.

**39.** Friedrich Pecht, "Vor Eröffnung der zweiten Münchener Jahres-Ausstellung 1890," *Die Kunst für Alle* 5, no. 19 (July 1890): 291–92.

**40.** Bringmann makes this point in *Friedrich Pecht*, 161.

**41.** For example, Herman Helferich [Emil Heilbut], "Studie über den Naturalismus und Max Liebermann," *Die Kunst für Alle* 2, nos. 14–15 (Apr.–May 1887): 212, 224, explicitly connected Liebermann to Courbet and to Zola's anarchists. A decade later, with memories of the Paris Commune fading, Courbet's appearance in the Munich exhibition in 1869 was interpreted much more positively (see J. E. Sattler, "Courbet in Muenchen," *Pan* 2, no. 3 [Nov. 1896]: 241–42). A thorough examination of Courbet's reception in Germany is Werner Hofmann and Klaus Herding, eds., *Courbet und Deutschland*, exh. cat. (Hamburg: Hamburger Kunsthalle, 1978). The bloody suppression of the Commune and the subsequent vilification of the working classes in the international press is treated at length in Albert Boime, *Art and the French Commune: Imagining Paris after War and Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1995), 1–26, 186–208. A discerning analysis of contemporary perceptions of the relationship between Bohemia and the Commune is presented by Jerrold Seigel in *Bohemian Paris: Culture, Politics, and the Boundaries of Bourgeois Life, 1830–1930* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1986), 181–212. On the preoccupation with respectability, see George L. Mosse, *Nationalism and Sexuality: Respectability and Abnormal Sexuality in Modern Europe* (New York: Howard Fertig, 1985).

**42.** Friedrich Pecht, "Die Münchener Jahres-Ausstellung von 1891," *Die Kunst für Alle* 6, nos. 22–23 (Aug.–Sept.

1891): 337–38, 354. The portrait of Bleichröder was probably one painted by Emile Wauters in 1888, reproduced in Fritz Stern, *Gold and Iron: Bismarck, Bleichröder, and the Building of the German Empire* (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1979).

**43.** In *Die Kunst für Alle* from 1885 to 1909, lead articles were published on the following: Böcklin, 1887, 1893, 1895, 1897, 1901 (2), 1902 (4); Liebermann, 1887 (2), 1897, 1901, 1904, 1907; Klinger, 1894 (2), 1895, 1902 (2), 1909; Uhde, 1886 (2), 1899, 1901, 1907; Lenbach, 1896, 1902, 1904; Menzel, 1885, 1895, 1905; Thoma, 1897, 1904, 1909; Stuck, 1899, 1903 (2); F. A. Kaulbach, 1899 (2), 1904; A. Keller, 1897, 1905, 1908; Leibl, 1892, 1901; Richter, 1885–86 (2); Habermann, 1898, 1906; Hofmann, 1899; and Werner, 1886.

**44.** Otto von Leixner, *Die Ausstellung von 1877*, vol. 1 of *Die moderne Kunst und die Ausstellungen der Berliner Akademie* (Berlin, 1878), 53, quoted in Friedrich Gross, *Jesus, Luther und der Papst im Bilderkampf 1871 bis 1918: Zur Malereigeschichte der Kaiserzeit* (Marburg, Germany: Jonas Verlag, 1989), 352. A succinct summary of the critical acceptance of Liebermann's early work with useful documentation from newspapers and contemporary books is Stefan Pucks, "'Talentierte, aber schmutzig': Max Liebermanns Frühwerk im Spiegel der deutschen Kunstkritik," in *Max Liebermann: Der Realist und die Phantasie*, ed. Jennis E. Howoldt and Birte Frenssen, exh. cat. (Hamburg: Dölling und Galitz Verlag, 1997), 58–63. For discussion of the myth of the *pétroleuses*, women of the French Commune who allegedly acted as incendiaries in the burning of Paris, see Boime, *Art and the French Commune*, 38–39, 196–99.

**45.** Helmut R. Leppien, *Der zwölfjährige Jesus im Tempel von Max Liebermann* (Hamburg: Kulturstiftung der Länder in Verbindung mit der Hamburger Kunsthalle, [1989]). For an analysis of Liebermann's early work and of the conflict over *Jesus in the Temple*, see Paret, *Berlin Secession*, 42–49. A friend of Liebermann's, Erich Hancke, wrote an extended account of this affair in his indispensable book *Max Liebermann: Sein Leben und seine Werke*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Bruno Cassirer, 1923), 131–42. The essays in Sigrid Achenbach and Matthias Eberle, eds., *Max Liebermann in seiner Zeit* (Berlin: Nationalgalerie, Staatliche Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz, 1979), provide historical documentation of Liebermann's career, as well as excellent plates.

The most complete guide to Liebermann's paintings is Matthias Eberle, *Max Liebermann, 1847–1935: Werkverzeichnis der Gemälde und Ölstudien*, 2 vols. (Munich: Hirmer Verlag, 1995), including a thorough documentation of *Jesus in the Temple* (1:159–62). Other recent exhibition catalogues and books include several published on



the occasion of the commemoration of Liebermann's birth date: Angelika Wesenberg, ed., *Max Liebermann—Jahrhundertwende*, exh. cat. (Berlin: Ars Nicolai, 1997); Howoldt and Frenssen, *Max Liebermann*, with a short study titled "Der zwölfjährige Jesus im Tempel: Ein Bild zwischen Kritik und Anerkennung," 105–14; Dorothee Hansen, ed., "Nichts trägt weniger als der Schein": *Max Liebermann, der deutsche Impressionist*, exh. cat. (Bremen, Germany: Kunsthalle, 1996); and Günter Meißner, *Max Liebermann*, 4th rev. ed. (Leipzig: E. A. Seemann, 1998).

46. Only a few of the derogatory phrases directed at the painting, these are cited in Bettina Brand, *Fritz von Uhde: Das religiöse Werk zwischen künstlerischer Intention und Öffentlichkeit* (Heidelberg: Bettina Brand, 1983), 231n; Günter Busch, *Max Liebermann: Maler, Zeichner, Graphiker* (Frankfurt am Main: S. Fischer, 1986), 38; Paret, *Berlin Secession*, 44–45. Hancke, *Max Liebermann*, 133–34, provides a lengthy excerpt from Pecht's article. Pecht then praised paintings by Ernst Zimmermann before returning to the other two paintings Liebermann exhibited in Munich that year, *Gänserupferinnen und Arbeiter im Rübenfeld*, in which Pecht referred to "eine Anzahl Damen, deren Häßlichkeit nur durch die seiner, in einer Reihe, wie die Spatzen auf einem Telegraphendraht, aufgestellten Runkelrübenjäterinnen übertroffen wird."

47. The quotations from the stenographic reports of the Bavarian Landtag, 15 Jan. 1880, p. 595, appear in Ludwig Leiss, *Kunst im Konflikt: Kunst und Künstler im Widerstreit mit der "Obrigkeit"* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1971), 97–99. Maria Makela includes a translation of part of Dr. Daller's speech in *The Munich Secession: Art and Artists in Turn-of-the-Century Munich* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1990), 33; and her chapter "The Politics of Parody: Some Thoughts on the 'Modern' in Turn-of-the-Century Munich," in Forster-Hahn, *Imagining Modern German Culture*, 185–207, contains a brilliant analysis of the dynamics of Munich's art world. George L. Mosse wrote extensively on the relationship between anti-Semitic stereotypes and the high value placed upon bourgeois concepts of respectable behavior. A good introduction to his analysis is "Jewish Emancipation: Between *Bildung* and Respectability," in his *Confronting the Nation: Jewish and Western Nationalism* (Hanover, N.H.: Brandeis University Press, 1993), 131–38.

48. Hancke, *Max Liebermann*, 131–34, related the story of Luitpold's visit, and printed the full text of the parliamentary debate, 139–40.

49. See David Blackburn, "Progress and Piety: Liberals, Catholics, and the State in Bismarck's Germany," in *Populists and Patricians*, 143–67; Shulamit Volkov, "Anti-

semitism as a Cultural Code in Imperial Germany: Reflections on the History and Historiography of Anti-semitism in Imperial Germany," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 23 (1978): 25–46; Smith, "Religion and Conflict," 298–314; and idem, "The Learned and the Popular Discourse of Anti-Semitism in the Catholic Milieu of the Kaiserreich," *Central European History* 27, no. 3 (1994): 315–28. An illuminating description of Protestant and Catholic newspaper allegations of the Jewish corruption of German society can be found in Stern, *Gold and Iron*, chap. 18, esp. 502–3 on Catholic linking of Jews with the Kulturkampf. On Treitschke's article, see Andreas Dorpalen, *Heinrich von Treitschke* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1957), 240–47. The article, titled "Unseres Aussichten," appeared in *Preussische Jahrbücher* 44 (Nov. 1879): 572–73. An English translation of parts of the text can be found in Peter G. J. Pulzer, *The Rise of Political Anti-Semitism in Germany and Austria* (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964), 249.

50. Leppien, *Der zwölfjährige Jesus*, 21–25, describes Liebermann's unpleasant reception in the beer halls, where he was reviled as the "Herrgottsschänder." Hancke, *Max Liebermann*, 133, also recounts the difficulties Liebermann encountered before he finally fled Munich. Stoecker's sermon is cited in Jenns E. Howoldt and Birte Frenssen, "'Der zwölfjährige Jesus im Tempel': Zwischen Kritik und Anerkennung," in Howoldt and Frenssen, *Max Liebermann*, 108, quoting Gudrun Kummich, "Max Liebermann 'Der zwölfjährige Jesus im Tempel': Das christliche Bildthema eines 'jüdischen' Malers im Spiegel der Kritik" (M.A. thesis, Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, 1994), 105.

51. A significant new understanding of the painting has emerged in Katrin Boskamp's "'Der zwölfjährige Jesus im Tempel': Zur Geschichte eines ungeliebten Bildes," in her *Studien zum Frühwerk von Max Liebermann mit einem Katalog der Gemälde und Ölstudien von 1866–1889* (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlag, 1994), 75–115; her meticulous examination of the work now hanging in Hamburg established that Liebermann altered the original work by overpainting. Boskamp cites the French comment about the "little girl" in the painting hung in the 1884 exhibition at the Galerie Georges Petit in Paris, comparing it with the negative descriptions in the German reports. Hancke, *Max Liebermann*, 133 and 454, quoted the comment about "talking with his hands" from the French critic Edmond Duranty in his 1879 review of the First Munich International published in *Les Beaux Arts Illustrés*; Hancke also reported on the 1907 exhibition.

52. Werner, *Erlebnisse*, 557. A reproduction of Menzel's lithograph appeared in 1895 accompanying an article written by Richard Graul for Menzel's eightieth birthday in

*Die Kunst für Alle* 11, no. 6 (Dec. 1895). A careful analysis of Menzel's deliberate utilization of eastern European Jews as models for his "realistic" anti-Semitic stereotypes and of Liebermann's equally deliberate rejection of Jewish models and stereotypes is Peter Dittmar, "Der zwölfjährige Christus im Tempel von Adolph Menzel: Ein Beispiel für den Antijudaismus im 19. Jahrhundert," in *Idea. Werke, Theorien. Dokumente: Jahrbuch der Hamburger Kunsthalle*, VI, ed. Werner Hofmann and Martin Warnke (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1987), 81–96. For a contemporary view of Menzel's depiction of modern Jewish types, see Max Jordan, *Das Werk Adolf Menzels, 1815–1905* (Munich: Verlagsanstalt F. Bruckmann, 1905).

Cartoons developing the stereotype of the Jew appeared with great regularity in the early 1880s. In addition to those shown in the illustrations, see the following examples from *Fliegende Blätter*: "Eine vorsichtige Mutter," in 75, no. 1884 (1881): 79; "Schaufel-Fuchs," 75, no. 1885 (1881): 82–83; "Wie du mir, so ich dir," 75, no. 1892 (1881): 144; "Neue Krankheit," 75, no. 1897 (1881): 181; "Ein Prozesshansl," 75, no. 1896 (1881): 173; "Ueberflüssiger Respekt," 75, no. 1899 (1881): 196–97; 76, no. 1902 (1882): 14; "Nach eigenem Maß," 76, no. 1916 (1882): 124; "Lohn und Strafe," 77, no. 1941 (1882): 115; "Marcus der Täufer," 80, no. 2021 (1884): 121–23; and "Falsch verstanden," 81, no. 2049 (1884): 139.

**53.** Boskamp, "Der zwölfjährige Jesus im Tempel," develops a sophisticated interpretation of Liebermann's intentions based on her examination of the creation and composition of the painting, to which I allude only briefly here.

**54.** For my comments here I am indebted to David Blackburn's superb study, *Marpingen: Apparitions of the Virgin Mary in Bismarckian Germany* (New York: Random House, Vintage Books, 1995).

**55.** The first major articles on Liebermann were by Herman Helferich [Emil Heilbut], "Studie über den Naturalismus und Max Liebermann," *Die Kunst für Alle* 2, nos. 14–15 (Apr.–May 1887): 209–14, 225–29. A decade later, at the time of Liebermann's first great retrospective in Berlin, Heilbut wrote another strong endorsement of Liebermann's work with the same title under his pseudonym in *ibid.* 12, no. 15 (May 1897): 225–28.

**56.** F[ranz von] Reber, "Fritz von Uhde," *Die Kunst für Alle* 1, nos. 15–16 (May 1886): 207–11, 219–23; Dr. Karl Voll, "Neues von Fritz von Uhde," *ibid.* 14, no. 15 (May 1899): 226–28; Franz Wolter, "Fritz von Uhde's neuestes Werk," *ibid.* 16, no. 8 (Jan. 1901): 183–86; Fritz von Ostini, "Fritz von Uhde," *ibid.* 23, no. 1 (Oct. 1907): 1–15. A full-page reproduction of Uhde's *Christus und die Jünger von Emaus*

was included in the inaugural issue of *Die Kunst für Alle*, 1, no. 1 (Oct. 1885), opposite 14. Pecht's article in the *Allgemeine Zeitung* in 1883, a review of the Second Munich International Art Exhibition in Munich, is cited in Brand, *Fritz von Uhde*, 39. Reber's "Fritz von Uhde" was a carefully reasoned article in which he traced Uhde's development and discussed each major painting at length. He was, however, also critical of Uhde's first few naturalist paintings, especially *Die Trommelübung* and *À la campagne* (both 1883), which he found to be unfortunate experiments in relentless realism.

**57.** Max Liebermann, in "Jozef Israëls," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 36, n.s. 12 (1900–1901): 145–56, recorded his deep appreciation for the work of Israëls. For analyses of Liebermann's long fascination with seventeenth-century Dutch painting, Dutch landscape, and community life, see Angelika Wesenberg, "Holland als bürgerliche Vision: Bode und Liebermann," in *Wilhelm von Bode als Zeitgenosse der Kunst*, ed. Angelika Wesenberg (Berlin: Nationalgalerie, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 1995), 43–54; Margreet Nouwen, "Mal Heimat Holland," and Holly Richardson, "Landschaftsmalerei ist die schwerste Kunst. . . ." in Howoldt and Frenssen, *Max Liebermann*, 11–20 and 21–31; and Barbara Gaehtgens, "Holland als Vorbild," in Wesenberg, *Max Liebermann—Jahrhundertwende*, 83–92.

**58.** Hans Rosenhagen, *Uhde: Des Meisters Gemälde in 285 Abbildungen* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1908), xxvii, xxx.

**59.** Reber, "Fritz von Uhde," 222.

**60.** Fritz von Ostini, "Fritz von Uhde," *Die Kunst für Alle* 23, no. 1 (Oct. 1907): 12. In 1895, Paul Schultze-Naumburg pointed out in "Deutsche Kunstkritiker," *ibid.* 10, no. 11 (Mar. 1895): 166, that Ostini, as editor of the art section of the *Münchener Neuesten Nachrichten* from 1887 to 1895, was among the earliest supporters of Liebermann and the Munich Secessionists. After the turn of the century he became increasingly conservative. His continued strong support of Uhde was demonstrated in his monograph *Uhde* in the popular series *Künstler-Monographien* (Bielefeld, Germany: Velhagen & Klasing, 1902).

**61.** Adolf Rosenberg, "Die akademische Kunstausstellung in Berlin von 1884, III: Die Malerei," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 20 (1884–85): 94, with a plate of Uhde's drawing of the child with Jesus; *idem*, "Die Jubiläumskunstausstellung in Berlin, III: Die Münchener Schule," *ibid.* 22 (1886–87): 10–11. See also K. Cassius, *Spottvogel im Glaspalast: Epigramme in Wort und Bild auf die Münchener Jahres-Ausstellung 1889* (Munich: Verlag von Ulrich Putze, Kunsthandlung, 1889), 26.

62. Brand, *Fritz von Uhde*, provides a thorough analysis of these works and their reception, particularly within Protestant circles. A contemporary assessment is "Religiöse Kunst," *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 12 (Mar. 1888): 154–56. Herman Grimm, an art historian, strongly opposed painting that interpreted the Gospel stories in terms of current social issues in "Armeleutemalerei," *Deutsche Rundschau*, excerpted in *Der Kunstwart* 7, no. 2 (Oct. 1893): 27. Hermann Lücke, "Fritz von Uhde," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 22 (1886–87): 355, used the phrase "Christus des vierten Standes," though he did not give it a negative connotation. Wilhelm Lübke, however, characterized Uhde's disciples at the Last Supper as "famosen alten Zuchthausknaben" with "Mörderphysiognomie" in his article "Neueste Kunst," *Westermann's Illustrierte Deutsche Monatsheft* 37, half-vol. 74 (1893), 43, cited in Brand, *Fritz von Uhde*, 98. Brand points out that the figure of Peter at the left of the painting was actually a portrait of the composer Anton Bruckner. One of Germany's most popular art historians, Lübke published *Geschichte der deutschen Kunst von den frühesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart* (1888) and *Grundriss der Kunstgeschichte* (1869), which went through eleven editions.
63. Brand, *Fritz von Uhde*, 103, cites the Protestant critiques by von Soden, "Unsere Kunst, 7. Die religiöse Kunst I," *Die Christliche Welt* 2:64–65, and by Heinrich Merz, "Die neue 'realistische' Schule und Herr von Uhde," *Christliche Kunstblatt* 31 (1889): 33–38. The critique from a Catholic journal was by Paul Keppler, "Gedanken über die moderne Malerei," *Zeitschrift für christliche Kunst* 28, n.s. 4 (1892–93): 243, quoted at length in Urban Rapp, "Kirche und die Kunst der Zeit 1888–1920," in "*München leuchtete*": *Karl Caspar und die Erneuerung christlicher Kunst in München um 1900*, ed. Peter-Klaus Schuster, exh. cat. (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1984), 55.
64. On the formation of the Protestant League, see Smith, *German Nationalism*, 50–61; on the effort to develop a new Protestant art, see the essay by Ekkehard Mai, "Programmkunst oder Kunstprogramm? Protestantismus und bildende Kunst am Beispiel religiöser Malerei im späten 19. Jahrhundert," in Mai, Waetzoldt, and Wolandt, *Ideengeschichte und Kunstwissenschaft*, 431–59.
65. See *Die Kunst für Alle* 11, no. 19 (July 1896): 300; and "Die Biercksche Christus-Ausstellung," *ibid.* 13, no. 20 (July 1898): 305–9, with illustrations from the exhibition throughout the issue. Opening in Berlin, the exhibition traveled across Germany in 1897, including stops in Hamburg, Hanover, and Breslau. The exhibition in Breslau, sponsored by the Schlesische Kunstverein and held in the Theodor Lichtenberg art gallery, was received with great interest, according to reports in *Deutsche Kunst* 1, nos. 15–16 (Jan. 1897): 177, 186–87. Brand, *Fritz von Uhde*, 184–88, provides reproductions of the paintings from the exhibition, as does Gross, *Jesus, Luther und der Pabst*, 246–51, with a lengthy analysis of the exhibition. See also Wolfgang Kirchbach, "Religiöse Kunst," *Die Kunst unserer Zeit* 9, 1st half-vol. (1898): 97–136.
66. This artistic and commercial venture for the panorama had been preceded only four years earlier by an official archaeological expedition to Palestine funded by the Prussian education ministry. The intellectual and political developments surrounding these archaeological expeditions to the Middle East in the 1880s and 1890s are laid out coherently in Suzanne L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 192–99.
67. See Richard Muther, "Bruno Piglhein," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 22 (1886–87): 167–72, from which the quotation is taken; v.B., "Das neue Münchener Panorama," *Kunstchronik* 12 (June 1886): cols. 617–20; and Max Bernstein, "Von einem Panorama," *Die Kunst für Alle* 2, no. 7 (Jan. 1887): 105–10. The panorama crowned Piglhein's artistic career, won him the title of professor, and established his position within the Munich art world; in 1892 he became the first president of the Munich Secession. Insured for 90,000 gulden, the panorama was moved in 1892 from Munich to Vienna, where it burned not long after its installation (*Die Kunst unserer Zeit* 3, 1st half-vol. [May 1892]: unpaginated notes). *Das Atelier* 2, no. 37 (May 1892), reported that the panorama was valued at 200,000 marks when it burned.
- For a contemporary assessment of the importance of Piglhein's work and for information about his trip to Palestine and the later legal proceedings regarding the panorama, see the lengthy obituary by Gottfried Böhm, "Bruno Piglhein †," *Die Kunst unserer Zeit* 5, 2nd half-vol. (1894): 84–86, as well as "Bruno Piglhein †," *Die Kunst für Alle* 9, no. 22 (Aug. 1894): 342; R. [Hans Rosenhagen], "Bruno Piglhein," *Das Atelier* 4, no. 15 (Aug. 1894): 1–2; and the tribute in A[nn]a Spier, "Die Ausstellung der Münchener Secession 1894," *Die Kunst unserer Zeit* 5, 2nd half-vol. (1894): 102–4. *Die Kunst für Alle* 6, no. 15 (May 1891): 237–38, published a long report on the lawsuit in London. See also Oettermann, "Das Panorama von Jerusalem und die Kreuzigung Christi," in Oettermann, *Das Panorama*, 216–19, accompanied by a three-foot-long color photographic reproduction of the Crucifixion panorama; the English edition has a small black-and-white version, fig. 4.46.
68. Catholic art also flourished, as did the building of new churches, requiring monumental art in both confessions. Two articles in Mai, Waetzoldt, and Wolandt, *Ideengeschichte und Kunstwissenschaft*, discuss the Catholic

revival: Paul Mai, "Kirchliche Kulturpolitik im Spannungsfeld zwischen Staatskirche und Ultramontanismus—Bisium Regensburg," 397–408; and Harald Siebenmorgen, "'Kulturkampfkunst': Das Verhältnis von Peter Lenz und der Beuroner Kunstschule zum Wilhelminischen Staat," 409–30. Gross, *Jesus, Luther und der Pabst*, provides an exhaustive study from a Marxist perspective of both Catholic and Protestant religious art in imperial Germany. Several exhibitions in the early 1980s explored the relationship between the revival of religious art and the rise of the avant-garde in Germany. Werner Hofmann, *Luther und die Folgen für die Kunst*, exh. cat. (Hamburg: Hamburger Kunsthalle, 1983) explored the Protestant sources of abstract art; and the Catholic revival of church art leading to the work of the Munich expressionists was the focus of an exhibition organized by Peter-Klaus Schuster, "München leuchtete."

An article on Eduard von Gebhardt appeared in *Die Kunst unserer Zeit* 10, 1st half-vol. (1899): 91–114, including twelve plates; see also F. Schaarschmidt, "Eduard von Gebhardt: Zum sechzigsten Geburtstag," *Die Kunst für Alle* 13, no. 17 (June 1898): 257–63, with plates. Gross, *Jesus, Luther und der Pabst*, provides multiple reproductions of the work of the artists who contributed to this religious art revival.

69. For a lengthy defense of Uhde's *Der Gang nach Bethlehem*, see "Dritte Münchener Jahresausstellung," *Kunstchronik*, n.s. 3 (Dec. 1891): col. 106. Further details on the reception of Uhde's painting can be found in Brandt, *Fritz von Uhde*, 124–25; and Makela, *Munich Secession*, 94–96.

70. Horst Ludwig, *Kunst, Geld und Politik um 1900 in München: Formen und Ziele der Kunstfinanzierung und Kunstpolitik während der Prinzregentenära (1886–1912)* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1986), 32–34; and Leiss, *Kunst im Konflikt*, 103–4, reproduce portions of Jäger's speech in the Landtag and Freiherr von Stauffenberg's defense of Uhde, whose work he characterized as belonging "zu den tiefempfundensten religiösen Bildern der Gegenwart." For an imaginative and inspired reading of Thomas Mann's *Gladius Dei* (1901), see Schuster, "München leuchtete," 29–36.

71. A prime example of these thoughtful critiques is Reber's review of Uhde, "Fritz von Uhde," *Die Kunst für Alle* 1, nos. 15–16 (May 1886): 207–11, 219–23.

72. Friedrich Pecht, "Über die Nachahmung in den bildenden Künste," *ibid.* 1, no. 10 (Feb. 1886): 132–33; *ibid.*, "Die Münchener Ausstellung von 1888," *ibid.* 4, no. 1 (Oct. 1888): 8. Pecht's term for French art was *Hetärenmalerei*. This identification of the French with aristocratic decadence had a long tradition in German writing. Norbert

Elias, who traces the opposition between superficial French *Civilisation* and authentic German *Kultur*, points out in *The Civilizing Process*, 8–9, 34, that Kant had defined this antithesis between the "civilized" frenchified courtly classes in eighteenth-century Germany, who were distinguished by the "delicacy" of their behavior, from the middle-class intellectuals and writers, whose creative productivity became "an expression of the German self-image" that reached beyond class definition to a national self-definition.

73. Fritz Bley, "Edouard Manet," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 19 (1883–84): 241–42, on sensation-seeking culture and Manet; 242–43 and 247, defining Impressionist painting; and 243, 246–48, on Courbet, Zola, and Baudelaire. The catalogue, with an introduction by Zola, was published for the retrospective exhibition arranged by Antonin Proust and Théodore Duret at the École des Beaux-Arts in 1884 in Paris. The book published during the exhibition, from which Bley drew his account of Manet's artistic career and from which he quoted negative French critics, was Edmond Bazire, *Edouard Manet* (Paris: Quantin, 1884).

The four woodcut illustrations in the *Zeitschrift* article, reproduced from Bazire's book, included a portrait by Fantin-Latour of Manet and Manet's portrait of Zola. On Zola's role in the promotion of Impressionism and for a harsher interpretation of Bley's article, see Robert Jensen, *Marketing Modernism in Fin-de-Siècle Europe* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1994), 150–54, 202–3, and 323.

74. The description of the process of painting was taken from a statement by Charles Ephrussi, editor of the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* and cousin of Carl Bernstein, whose collection of French Impressionist paintings was shown in Berlin in 1883. Bley credited Ephrussi and Zola with being the "most eloquent heralds of Impressionism." Information about the posthumous exhibition is provided in George Heard Hamilton, *Manet and His Critics* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1969), 263–71. It is instructive to note that it was 1899 before the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* devoted full articles to contemporary French artists; 1900 before it printed an article on French Impressionist artists; and twenty years before it published another article on Manet (see Ferdinand Laban, "Im zwanzigsten Jahre nach Manets Tode," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 39, n.s. 15 [1903–4]: 25–35). The first article on Manet in *Die Kunst für Alle* did not appear until 1899, Julius Meier-Graefe's "Die Stellung Eduard Manet," *Die Kunst für Alle* 15, no. 3 (Nov. 1899): 58–64, accompanied by plates and illustrations of eight paintings.

75. Otto Brandes referred explicitly to the Impressionists as "Communards," charging that one of the Commune leaders, Gustave Paul Cluseret, who had been condemned to death, associated with these artists and had exhibited

paintings at an Independents' Salon (*Die Kunst für Alle* 1, no. 24 [Sept. 1886]: 353). Cluseret, a French officer who had fought in Africa, Crimea, and Italy and in the American Civil War, was a member of the Commune; however, he lived until 1900. Brandes's discussion of Neo-Impressionist paintings was in "Die Impressionisten in der Ausstellung der 'Indépendants,'" *ibid.*, 2, no. 16 (May 1887): 238. In a longer review of the Paris Salon in the next issue, Brandes explained the crucial importance of the Salon for establishing an artist's reputation. He paid particular attention to the good reception of German paintings shown in the Salon—Uhde's *Das Abendmahl*, Liebermann's *Flachsscheuer in Laren*, Kuehl's *Segelmacher*, and Hitz's baptismal scene (Brandes, "Der Pariser Salon 1887," *ibid.*, no. 17 [June 1887]: 257–61). Pecht's article is "Über den heutigen französischen Impressionismus," *ibid.*, no. 22 (Aug. 1887): 337–39. Curiously, Pecht does not mention Edouard Manet in this article, although he must have been familiar with Fritz Bley's article on Manet in the *Zeitschrift*.

**76.** A useful discussion of how German critics defined impressionism at this time—and failed to make distinctions between the classical Impressionists and the Post-Impressionists—can be found in Jensen, *Marketing Modernism*, 4–5, 203–8. See also Josef Kern, *Impressionismus im Wilhelminischen Deutschland* (Würzburg: Königshausen u. Neumann, 1989); and Evelyn Gutbrod, *Die Rezeption des Impressionismus in Deutschland 1880–1910* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 1980), for information about German patrons who promoted and collected French Impressionist art.

**77.** The German terms most often used were *Hellmalerei* (light-color painting), *Freiluftmalerei* (open-air painting), and *Freilichtmalerei* (outdoor painting). For an article about painting in the Bavarian countryside, see K. Raupp, "Auf Frauenchiemsee," *Die Kunst für Alle* 4, no. 1 (Oct. 1888): 9–12, accompanied by a photograph, "Pleinairisten auf Frauenchiemsee 1888," showing five men dressed in suits and hats sitting at their easels under umbrellas painting a peasant woman against the backdrop of a lake and low-lying hills.

**78.** See the following articles by Pecht in *Die Kunst für Alle*: "Über die Nachahmung in den bildenden Künste," 1, no. 10 (Feb. 1886): 133; "Die Münchener Ausstellungen von 1888: Die deutsche Malerei," 3, no. 18 (June 1888): 278; and "Die Münchener Ausstellung von 1888: Nachträge," 4, no. 1 (Oct. 1888): 5. Criticism of Uhde's triptych *Die heilige Nacht* at the Third Munich International was sufficiently negative to drive Uhde to repaint the work, producing a conventional manger-and-angel nativity in the place of a scene set in the midst of poor peasant life (see *ibid.*, 4, no. 2 [Oct. 1888], for a double-page plate

of the original version of the triptych). The Dresden Art Gallery purchased the final work as well as the original wings, which had been completely replaced. Pecht's positive evaluation of Uhde was published in "Die erste Münchener Jahres-Ausstellung 1889," *ibid.*, no. 20 (July 1889): 307. For an example of an adamant dismissal, probably by Pecht, of the worth of Uhde and Liebermann, see "Künstler und Käufer," *ibid.*, 5, no. 24 (15 Sept. 1890): 376–77, and "Über die Beurteilung von Bildern," *ibid.*, 6, no. 10 (Feb. 1891): 152–55.

**79.** Herman Helferich [Emil Heilbut], "Studie über den Naturalismus und Max Liebermann," *Die Kunst für Alle* 2, nos. 14–15 (Apr., May 1887): 209–14, 225–29, quotations on 210–11, 214, 225. The sketches illustrated are *Die Geschwister*, *Kleinkinderschule in Amsterdam*, *Das Tischgebet*, *Die Konservenmacherinnen*, and *Beim Netzflicken*. See Schultze-Naumburg's "Deutsche Kunstkritiker," *ibid.*, 10, no. 11 (Mar. 1895): 164, for his evaluation of Herman Helferich, where he reveals that this was a pseudonym for the art historian Emil Heilbut. Schultze-Naumburg described him as a natural-born feuilleton writer who superbly expressed his own impressions and feelings about contemporary art. An impassioned supporter of the new art who traveled widely across Europe and Great Britain, Heilbut first drew attention in an 1886 article in *Nation*, while the article on Liebermann in *Die Kunst für Alle* was considered a classic within a decade.

**80.** On the use of the term *intransigent*, see Boime, *Art and the French Commune*, 27–35; and Stephen F. Eisenman, "The Intransigent Artist or How the Impressionists Got Their Name," in *The New Painting: Impressionism, 1874–1886*, ed. Charles S. Moffett (San Francisco: Fine Arts Museums, 1986), 51–59.

**81.** Helferich, "Studie über den Naturalismus und Max Liebermann," 226.

**82.** The quoted phrases are from Adolf Rosenberg, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der deutschen Kunst nach den Ausstellungen in Berlin und München," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 15 (1879–80): 43. On Liebermann during the decade of the 1880s, see *ibid.*, 319; *ibid.*, 16 (1880–81): 394, with the illustration *Stopfende Alte am Fenster*; *ibid.*, 17 (1881–82): 376, with the illustration *Freistunde im Amsterdamer Waisenhaus*; Adolf Rosenberg, "Die internationale Kunstausstellung in München," *ibid.*, 19 (1883–84): 260; *Kunstchronik* 23 (1887–88): cols. 635, 718; and *ibid.*, 24 (1888–89): col. 584.

**83.** Uhde's etching of Christ and a child from *Lasset die Kindlein zu mir kommen* was published in *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 20 (1884–85): opposite 92. Rosenberg frequently made snide references to Uhde in *Kunstchronik*,

for example, in n.s. 1 (Nov. 1889): col. 69 or *ibid.* (Feb. 1890): col. 259, where he refers to Uhde as "der Hohepriester der Gemeinde." The two reviews from 1887 are Hermann Lücke, "Fritz von Uhde," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 22 (1886–87): 349–58; and Adolf Rosenberg, "Die Akademische Kunstausstellung zu Berlin," *ibid.* 23 (1887–88): 51.

**84.** A.R. [Adolf Rosenberg], "Berliner Kunstausstellungen," *Kunstchronik* 20 (1885): col. 399; see also his critique of Liebermann in "Die Jubiläumskunstausstellung in Berlin, IV," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 22 (1886–87): 46. Muther is quoted from R[ichard] Muther, "Die internationale Kunstausstellung in München," *ibid.* 23 (1887–88): 291–92, with the illustration *Altmännerhaus in Amsterdam*.

**85.** Ludwig Kaemmerer, "Max Liebermann," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 28, n.s. 4 (1892–93): 249–57, 278–86, quotations from 250–51, 257.

**86.** Muther, "Die internationale Kunstausstellung in München," *ibid.* 23 (1887–88): 290–91, 308–14, 329–33, quotation from 330.

**87.** Ludwig, *Kunst, Geld und Politik*, 41, 51, 53. See Alfred Gotthold Meyer's brief reference to the complaints that were being made about the thick, relief-like application of paint in Liebermann's *Schweinemarkt in Haarlem*, in "Dritte Münchener Jahresausstellung," *Kunstchronik*, n.s. 3 (Dec. 1891): col. 103. In the 1892 parliamentary debates the speakers used the Germanized French terms *Pleinairismus* and *Pleinairmalerei*.

**88.** Gerhard Kratzsch, *Kunstwart und Dürerbund: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Gebildeten im Zeitalter des Imperialismus* (Göttingen, Germany: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 113–33. Kratzsch reports that in 1888–89 Woldemar von Seidlitz, later director of the Dresden museums, provided desperately needed financial support to keep the journal going but that the journal remained in shaky condition until 1894, when Georg D. W. Callwey, in Munich, took over the financial side of the publication, leaving the editorial side to Avenarius. Kratzsch's book is an invaluable source of information about the journal, though the weight of his book is on the period after the Dürerbund (Dürer League) was formed in 1902. Another important study, specifically on the reception of art in the journal, is Ingrid Koszinowski, *Von der Poesie des Kunstwerks: Zur Kunstrezeption um 1900 am Beispiel der Malereikritik der Zeitschrift "Kunstwart"* (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlag, 1985).

**89.** Avenarius's reprinting articles from other journals brought several protests; see, e.g., his response to the edi-

tor of *Die Moderne*, who objected to his reprinting a long article by Heinrich Hart (*Der Kunstwart* 4, nos. 15 [May 1891]: 237 and 17 [June 1891]: 269. See also Kratzsch, *Kunstwart und Dürerbund*, 110–11).

**90.** See *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 16 (May 1888): 225, in a review by the conservative painter and poet Arthur Fitger from the *Weser Zeitung*; and *ibid.* 2, no. 5 (Dec. 1888): 67.

**91.** "Vom Tage," *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 24 (Sept. 1888): 353–54.

**92.** Otto von Leixner, *Die Ausstellung von 1878*, vol. 2 of *Die moderne Kunst und die Ausstellungen der Berliner Akademie* (Berlin, 1879); [Avenarius], "Religiöse Kunst," *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 12 (Mar. 1888): 156. The following articles were: Adolph Hausrath, "Auf die moderne protestantische Malerei," *ibid.*, no. 15 (May 1888): 207; Adolph Ehrhardt, *ibid.*, no. 16 (May 1888): 227; Sprechsaal, *ibid.*, no. 18 (June 1888); [Avenarius], "Die Malerei auf der Münchner Ausstellung, II," *ibid.* 2, nos. 1 (Oct. 1888): 9 and 2 (Oct. 1888): 22. This quotation is from Avenarius's review of a pamphlet by Albert Ilg, *Moderne Kunstliebhaberei* (Vienna: Graeser, 1887) in *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 4 (Nov. 1887): 44.

**93.** Georg Voß, "Gurlitts Kunstsalon in Berlin," *Die Kunst für Alle* 1, no. 4 (Nov. 1885): 56–57. Voss reported on the "frische frohe Farben" of Böcklin's early painting and of his more recent ones "die ihm so begeisterte Anhänger unter den Jungeren, aber auch ebensovielen unversöhnliche Feinde unter den Älteren erworben haben." For information on the Bernstein collection, the Gurlitt exhibition, and press responses, see Nicolaas Teeuwisse, *Vom Salon zur Secession: Berliner Kunstleben zwischen Tradition und Aufbruch zur Moderne, 1871–1900* (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1986), 98–107; and Barbara Paul, "Drei Sammlungen französischer impressionistischer Kunst im kaiserlichen Berlin—Bernstein, Liebermann, Arnhold," in *Sammler der frühen Moderne in Berlin*, ed. Thomas W. Gaehtgens, special issue of *Zeitschrift des deutschen Vereins für Kunstwissenschaft* 42, no. 3 (1988): 11–15. Teeuwisse, 107, cites Ludwig Pietzsch's condemnation of the exhibition in the *Vossischen Zeitung* (10 Oct. 1883), 1st supplement: "Der Widerspruch in diesen Malereien gegen Alles, was ein Bild zum Kunstwerk und zum Gegenstand des Wohlgefallens für Augen und Geist macht, ist zu krass!!"

**94.** Fritz von Uhde to Fritz Gurlitt, 13 Dec. 1887, quoted in full in Brand, *Fritz von Uhde*, 247–48. Georg Voß, in "Eine Ausstellung der Hellmaler," *Die Kunst für Alle* 3, no. 12 (Mar. 1888): 187–88, reviewed paintings by Schlittgen, Skarbina, Kuehl, Kalckreuth, Klaus Meyer, H. Neuhaus, and Stremel.

95. Voß "Berlin," *ibid.*, 4, no. 9 (Feb. 1889): 142, considered the most important part of the second exhibition to be the paintings of Wilhelm Leibl, which had not been seen in Germany for some time. For recent studies on Leibl, see Boris Röhrli, *Wilhelm Leibl: Leben und Werk* (Hildesheim, Germany: Georg Olms Verlag, 1994); and Klaus Jörg Schönmetzler, *Wilhelm Leibl und seine Malerfreunde* (Rosenheim, Germany: Rosenheimer Verlag, 1994).

Adolf Rosenberg reviewed the third Hellmaler exhibit in January 1890 (A.R., "Die Gurlittsche Kunstausstellung in Berlin," *Kunstchronik*, n.s. 1 [Feb. 1890]: col. 259). Writing with his usual acerbity, he singled out Lesser Ury for his "exaggerated caricatures" of naturalistic-impressionistic interiors, and Fritz von Uhde, the "high priest" of the group. For the criticism of Gurlitt, see R.S., "Ausstellung der Hellmaler," *Berliner Tageblatt*, 10 Jan. 1889, cited in Teeuwisse, *Vom Salon zur Secession*, 121.

Later reviews of Lesser Ury's paintings include A.R., "Aus Berliner Kunstausstellung: Lesser Ury," *Kunstchronik*, n.s. 4 (Apr. 1893): cols. 377–78, a very negative appraisal; Max Schmid, "Salon Gurlitt," *Das Atelier* 3, no. 61 (May 1893): 3–4; *Die Kunst für Alle* 8, nos. 14 (Apr. 1893): 219 and 18 (June 1893): 283; Albert Dresdner, "Berliner Kunstbrief," *Der Kunstwart* 6, no. 15 (May 1893); Albert Dresdner, "Berliner Kunstbrief," *ibid.* 7, no. 13 (Apr. 1894): 201; and O. Bie, "Lesser Ury," *ibid.* 8, no. 22 (Aug. 1895): 344–45; "Lesser Ury," *ibid.* 9, no. 2 (Oct. 1895): 29.

Bie points out Ury's total absorption with color and light from his first work and the difficulties he encountered in gaining acceptance for his work. Supported by Gurlitt's gallery, which held several collective exhibitions of his work, Ury achieved solid recognition by the mid-nineties as a modern mood painter. An early monograph on his work maintained that Ury was "the earliest standard-bearer of impressionism" in Germany (Lothar Brieger, *Lesser Ury: Graphiker der Gegenwart* [Berlin: Verlag Neue Kunsthandlung, 1921], 5. See also Karl Schwarz, *Lesser Ury* [Berlin: Verlag für Jüdische Kunst und Kultur, 1920]; Alfred Werner, "The Strange Tale of Lesser Ury," *Leo Baeck Institute Year Book* 19 [1974]: 197–207, which discusses Ury's prickly relationship with Liebermann; and Emily D. Bilski, "Images of Identity and Urban Life: Jewish Artists in Turn-of-the-Century Berlin," in *Berlin Metropolis: Jews and the New Culture, 1890–1918*, exh. cat. [Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999], 106–23).

96. See Georg Voß, "Ein Berliner Realist," *Die Kunst für Alle* 3, no. 11 (Mar. 1888): 168–70, where he discusses Skarbina as heavily influenced by the "new French realism" of Manet and Bastien-Lepage. This positive assessment of Skarbina's work was published in the issue preceding Voss's review of the Hellmaler exhibit. In 1892 the *Zeitschrift* published an earnest defense of Skarbina's painting, claiming that he should be ranked along with

Liebermann as pioneering new art that reestablished Germany's place in the international art world. The article, probably written by Henriette Mendelsohn, was given the byline hn: "Franz Skarbina," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 27, n.s. 3 (1891–92): 49–54. See also Franz Hermann [Meissner], "Atelier-Studien III: Bei Franz Skarbina," *Das Atelier* 1, no. 13 (May 1891): 7–9; and Margrit Bröhan, *Franz Skarbina*, exh. cat. (Berlin: Ars Nicolai, 1995), 28; an earlier catalogue was curated by Irmgard Wirth: *Der Berliner Maler Franz Skarbina: Ein Querschnitt durch sein Werk* (Berlin: Berlin Museum, 1970). An analysis of one of Skarbina's important cityscapes from the mid-1890s is included in John Czaplicka, "Pictures of a City at Work, Berlin, circa 1890–1930: Visual Reflections on Social Structures and Technology in the Modern Urban Construct," in *Berlin: Culture and Metropolis*, ed. Charles W. Haxthausen and Heidrun Suhr (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1990), 8–17.

97. Georg Voß, "Eine Ausstellung der Hellmaler," *Die Kunst für Alle* 3, no. 12 (Mar. 1888): 187–88.

98. "Bildende Kunst," *Der Kunstwart* 2, no. 4 (Nov. 1888): 56–58, reprinted from *Kölnische Zeitung* (28 Oct. 1888). A note appended to the article stated that it had already created opposition and that E. Bendemann, speaking for many artists, was publishing a response in the *Kölnische Zeitung*. For identification of Bode as the author and for a reprint of the full text, see Angelika Wesenberg, "'Zur Förderung der deutschen Kunst': Wilhelm Bode als kunst-kritischer Anonymus," in *Wilhelm von Bode als Zeitgenosse der Kunst*, 83–94. A contemporary assessment of Bode's significance in creating the modern German museum official and in transforming the Berlin museums into internationally recognized art centers can be found in Woldemar von Seidlitz, "Wilhelm Bode: Rückblick auf eine Museumsthätigkeit von funfundzwanzig Jahren," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 33, n.s. 9 (1897–98): 1–4. For further information, see Wilhelm von Bode, *Mein Leben* (Berlin, 1930); a new two-volume edition is *Wilhelm von Bode: Mein Leben*, ed. Thomas W. Gaehtgens and Barbara Paul (Berlin: Ars Nicolai, 1997).

99. Wolfgang Kirchback, "Was ist Hellmalerei?" *Der Kunstwart*, 2, no. 12 (Mar. 1889): 177–79. Kirchback provided no further citation for the quotation except to mention that the pamphlet had been reviewed previously in the journal. The pamphlet may have accompanied the second Gurlitt Hellmaler exhibit, or it may have been a pamphlet in the series *Gegen der Strom*, edited by Arthur Ilg. For other examples of cartoons on the use of technological innovations by modern artists, see "Der Landschaftsmaler auf der Studienreise," *Fliegende Blätter* 91, no. 2301 (1889): 75; and "Wie man ein modernes Bild macht," *ibid.*, no. 2307 (1889): 133.

- 100.** Neumann's article was "Die neue Richtung unserer Malerei," *Der Kunstwart* 2, no. 13 (Apr. 1889): 198–200. A decade later Neumann published a less positive view of the current scene, *Der Kampf um die Neue Kunst*, 2nd ed. (Berlin: Verlag von Hermann Walther, 1897). Neumann began teaching at Heidelberg in 1894 and became a professor there in 1897. He subsequently held professorships at Göttingen, Kiel, and again at Heidelberg.
- 101.** Cornelius Gurlitt, "Was ist Hellmalerei?" *Der Kunstwart* 2, no. 22 (Aug. 1889): 337–39. For a contemporary assessment of Cornelius Gurlitt's importance as one of the first critics to promote the new art forms, see Paul Schultze-Naumburg, "Deutsche Kunstkritiker," *Die Kunst für Alle* 10, no. 11 (Mar. 1895): 162–63. Writing also in *Gegenwart*, *Die Kunst unserer Zeit*, and *Westermann's Monatshefte*, Gurlitt attracted attention to his spirited but measured approach. Avenarius's review appeared as "Erste Münchner Jahresausstellung," *Der Kunstwart* 2, no. 24 (Sept. 1889): 378–79.
- 102.** For the poem, see Cassius, *Spottvogel im Glaspalast: Epigramme in Wort und Bild auf die Münchener Jahresausstellung 1889*, 8–9.
- 103.** C[arl] von Vincenti, "Entwicklung der deutschen 'Freilichtmalerei,'" *Der Kunstwart* 3, no. 11 (Mar. 1890): 169–71. For a brief discussion of the acquisition of Liebermann paintings for the Berlin National Gallery, see Christopher B. With, *The Prussian Landeskunstkommission, 1862–1911: A Study in State Subvention of the Arts* (Berlin: Gebr. Mann Verlag, 1986), 114–15. See particularly the critique in Momme Nissen "Zweite Münchener Jahresausstellung, I," *Der Kunstwart* 3, no. 21 (July 1890): 330. On open-air painting as a comfortable international salon style, see Jensen, *Marketing Modernism*; and Götz Czymmek, ed., *Landschaft im Licht: Impressionistische Malerei in Europa und Nordamerika, 1860–1910*, exh. cat. (Cologne: Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, 1890).
- 104.** F.A. [Avenarius], "Bildung," *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 3 (Nov. 1887): 25–27; idem, "Unsere Künste: Zum Überblick," *ibid.*, no. 1 (Sept. 1887): 1. See also Kratsch, *Der Kunstwart*, chap. 3–4. Avenarius's views were part of the larger rejection of the materialism and rationalism of modern society by publicists and intellectuals in Germany who have been identified by scholars as cultural pessimists. In these years Avenarius, however, was far from a pessimist; he was sustained by the buoyant optimism of the reformer and by his belief in the strength of the German culture and people. An indispensable study evoking the mentality of influential cultural leaders in the early years of the twentieth century is Gary D. Stark, *Entrepreneurs of Ideology: Neo-conservative Publishers in Germany, 1890–1933* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1981), esp. chap. 3.
- 105.** On Avenarius's call for imagination, see F.A., "Von der Freude am Kunstwerk," *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 20 (July 1888): 281–83; for the creation of a broad base for art, see "Sprechsaal," *ibid.*, 2, no. 5 (Dec. 1888): 75–76. On art education, see the review of Alfred Lichtwark's work through the Hamburger Kunsthalle to raise public appreciation for art, *ibid.*, 1, no. 5 (Dec. 1887): 54–55. On the revival of graphic arts, see "Bildende Künste," *ibid.*, no. 12 (Mar. 1888): 159–61; and Georg Hirth, "Die graphischen Künste in Deutschland," *ibid.*, 2, no. 18 (June 1889): 278–81. An invaluable and exhaustive study of the revival of graphic art at the end of the century, with particular attention to the role of Alfred Lichtwark, is Henrike Junge, *Wohlfelige Kunst: Die Verbreitung von Künstlergraphik seit 1870 und die Griffelkunst-Vereinigung Hamburg-Langenhorn* (Mainz: Verlag Philipp Zabern, 1989). See Avenarius's brief criticism of Werner's *Kronprinz Friedrich Wilhelm an der Leiche des Generals Abel Douay bei Weißenberg* as a painting that evokes patriotism but is not art in *Der Kunstwart* 4, no. 19 (July 1891): 298.
- 106.** For an early analysis of Böcklin's reception, see Paul Schumann, "Arnold Böcklin," *Die Kunst für Alle* 15, no. 13 (Apr. 1900): 298–300, reviewing Alfred Lichtwark's study of Böcklin, *Die Seele und das Kunstwerk* (Berlin: Bruno & Paul Cassirer, 1899). See also Lutz Tittel, "Die Beurteilung Arnold Böcklins in der Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst von 1866 bis 1901," in *Arnold Böcklin, 1827–1901: Gemälde, Zeichnungen, Plastiken. Ausstellung zum 150. Geburtstag*, ed. Dorothea Christ, exh. cat. (Basel: Schwabe & Co., 1977), which supplies the sales figures; Ingrid Koszinowski, "Böcklin und seine Kritiker: Zu Ideologie und Kunstbegriff um 1900," in Mai, Waetzoldt, and Wolandt, *Ideengeschichte und Kunstwissenschaft*, 279–92; and Elizabeth Tumasonis, "Böcklin's Reputation: Its Rise and Fall," *Art Criticism* 6, no. 2 (1990): 48–71.
- 107.** Friedrich Pecht, "Zu Arnold Böcklins 60. Geburtstag," *Die Kunst für Alle* 3, no. 2 (Oct. 1887): 17–20, with all illustrations and plates in this issue by Böcklin. The overenthusiastic commendation came from Max Lehrs, *Arnold Böcklin: Ein Leitfaden zum Verständnis seiner Kunst* (Munich: Photographische Union, 1897), 14. Lehrs's book was reviewed in *Kunstchronik*, n.s. 9 (Oct. 1897): cols. 41–42. See also the report on the whole issue on Böcklin in *Illustrierte Zeitung*, no. 2310 (1887), which contains an article by Aemil Fendler that is reprinted in *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 3 (Nov. 1887): 30–31. Later tributes included Franz Hermann Meissner, "Arnold Böcklin: Eine Studie," *Die Kunst unserer Zeit* 5, 1st half-vol. (1894): 21–34; Cornelius Gurlitt, "Arnold Böcklin," *Die Kunst für Alle* 9, no. 2 (Oct. 1893): 17–23, heavily illustrated; Carl Neumann, "Zu Arnold Böcklins siebenzigstem Geburtstag," *ibid.* 13, no. 1 (Oct. 1897): 1–9, with twenty-one illustrations and four full-page plates of paintings not



shown in previous issues; Hugo von Tschudi, "Arnold Böcklin," *ibid.*, 16, no. 11 (Mar. 1901): 251–56; and Heinrich Wölfflin, "Arnold Böcklin: Bei Anlass von Schicks Tagebuch," *ibid.*, 17, no. 1 (Oct. 1901): 1–17, the last two both richly illustrated.

The trajectory of Böcklin's fame can be roughly followed by a cursory look at the purchases for the Berlin National Gallery. In 1877 Böcklin received a commission from the recently opened National Gallery on the recommendation of the director, Max Jordan, for a painting, *Die Gefilde der Seligen* (1877–78), for which he received 15,000 marks. *Pietà* (1873) was purchased for 36,000 marks in 1888, though it was not shown for six years because of legal problems; and *Der Frühlingstag* (1883) and *Meeresbrandung* (1876) were purchased in 1897. One of his best-known works, *Meeresidylle*, also known as *Triton und Nereide* (1875), was rejected by the purchasing committee and the director in 1875, when the price was 12,000 marks, only to be acquired from a private collection in 1910 for 180,000 marks plus an annual pension to the heirs. Both *Pietà* and *Meeresidylle* have been missing since 1945. For information on the National Gallery purchases, see With, *Prussian Landeskunstkommission*, 79–84, 132–34.

**108.** The quotation "the most German painting, the genuine imaginative painting," which also referred to Max Klinger, is from *Der Kunstwart* 6, no. 2 (Oct. 1892): 18. Tittel, "Die Beurteilung Arnold Böcklins," 125–29, relates the failure of the jury to award the gold medal to Böcklin in 1884.

**109.** F.A. [Avenarius], "Bildung," *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 3 (Nov. 1887): 26. For further examples of Avenarius's views on Böcklin, see *ibid.*, 2, no. 2 (Oct. 1888): 22; *ibid.*, 4, no. 4 (Nov. 1890): 58a–61a; *ibid.*, no. 19 (July 1891): 297; and *ibid.*, 5, no. 17 (June 1892): 262–63. The reference to Böcklin as the spiritual leader is from Herman Eichfeld, "Die dritten Münchener Jahresausstellung, I," *ibid.*, 4, no. 20 (July 1891): 315. The charge of "artistic parthenogenesis" was suggested in -n-, "Die 63. akademische Kunstausstellung zu Berlin, I," *ibid.*, 5, no. 17 (June 1892): 263. The reporter, who used only an initial as a byline, complained that this exhibition was a discouraging collection of cheap imitations of earlier works—"Auch-Künstlertum"—including a particularly tedious example of a *Meeres-Idyll* descended from Böcklin's painting of the same name. Avenarius also complained repeatedly about the complete lack of genuine fantasy in the works of those who copied Böcklin's figures; in one review he pointed out that these weak efforts, titled "Mermaid" or "Alpen Fairy," usually only produced a pretty girl wearing a negligee.

**110.** Avenarius, "Die Malerei auf der Münchner Ausstellung, III," *Der Kunstwart* 2, no. 2 (19 Oct. 1888): 22.

**111.** See Koszinowski, "Böcklin and seine Kritiker," on this generational issue.

**112.** Friedrich Haack, "Arnold Böcklin: Zu seinem 70. Geburtstage," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 33, n.s., 9 (1897–98): 5–13.

**113.** A[venarius], "Die Internationale Kunst-Ausstellung in Berlin, II," *Der Kunstwart* 4, no. 19 (July 1891); Max Lehrs, "Max Klinger's 'Brahms-Phantasie,'" *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 30, n.s. 6 (1894–95): 113. Lehrs, a professor of art history, began his work in the Dresden Print Collection in 1883, serving as its director in 1896–1904 and again in 1908–24. See also Friedrich Haack, "Böcklin und Klinger: Eine vergleichende Charakteristik," *Die Kunst für Alle* 11, no. 1 (Oct. 1895): 1–4; Julius Vogel, "Altes und Neues von Max Klinger," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 32, n.s. 8 (1896–97): 153; and Friedrich Gross's lengthy treatment of the rejected genius in "Das Künstler-Genie als Heiland oder Märtyrer," in *Jesus, Luther und der Pabst*, chap. 6.

**114.** Gerhard Winkler, *Max Klinger* (Leipzig: E. A. Seemann, 1984); Dieter Gleisberg, ed., *Max Klinger, 1857–1920*, exh. cat. (Leipzig: Edition Leipzig, 1992); and *idem*, "'Er war ihr Stolz, ihre Bewunderung': Max Klinger im Kreise seiner Freunde," in *Max Klinger: Zeichnungen, Zustandsdrucke, Zyklen*, ed. Jo-Anne Birnie Danzker and Tilman Falk, exh. cat. (Munich: Prestel Verlag, 1996), 15–30, provide the most complete information about Klinger's life and work. Klinger's *Surprise Attack at the Wall* had the dubious distinction of being one of the paintings whose purchase by the Berlin Nationalgalerie was vetoed by William II (see Christopher With, *Prussian Landeskunstkommission*, 109–10).

For an explication of the autobiographical nature of Klinger's early graphics, see Dieter Gleisberg, "'Ich muß mir stets ein kleines Monument errichten': Max Klinger in seinen Selbstdarstellungen," in *Max Klinger, 1857–1920*, 13–25. For a careful analysis of shifts in the critical approaches to Klinger's career, see Elizabeth Pendleton Streicher, "'Zwischen Klingers Ruhm und seiner Leistung': Max Klingers Kunst im Spiegel der Kritik, 1877–1920," in Danzker and Falk, *Max Klinger*, 45–55. I am grateful for her willingness to share with me the manuscript of her systematic study. See also Streicher's "Max Klinger's *Malerei und Zeichnung*: The Critical Reception of the Prints and Their Text," in Forster-Hahn, *Imagining Modern German Culture*, 229–50.

**115.** However, for a very negative response, see Adolf Rosenberg, "Die akademische Kunstausstellung in Berlin," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 18 (1882–83): 367–78, which charged that Klinger's graphics alternated between the trivial and the fantastic, conveying subject matter that was unpleasant, repetitive, and too drawn-out.

**116.** For a sensitive analysis, see Robin Reisenfeld, "Max Klinger: *Eine Liebe* (Opus X)," in *The German Print Portfolio, 1890–1930: Serials for a Private Sphere*, exh. cat. (Chicago: David and Alfred Smart Museum of Art, 1992), 35–43. A useful introduction to the graphic cycles is Kirk Varnedoe and Elizabeth Streicher, *Graphic Works of Max Klinger* (New York: Dover Publications, 1977).

**117.** Georg Voß, "Ausstellungen, Sammlungen," *Die Kunst für Alle* 3, no. 6 (Dec. 1887): 96–97.

**118.** See Renate Hartleb, "'Eve, sans trêve': Zur Frau im Werk von Max Klinger," in Gleisberg, *Max Klinger, 1857–1920*, 84–90, who points out that Klinger was one of the first German artists to deal with prostitution without condemning the woman. A contemporary view of these issues is Franz Hermann Meissner, *Max Klinger* (Berlin: Schuster & Loeffler, 1899), 69–77, an expanded version of his essay originally published in *Westermann's Illustrierte Deutsche Monatshefte* 71, no. 421 (Oct. 1891): 112–29, and then reproduced in *Die Kunst unserer Zeit* 6, 1st half-vol. (1894): 1–20, with superb plates of his major works. Julius Vogel, a friend of Klinger's and future director of the Leipzig Museum of Art, pointed out in 1897 that Meissner's writing about Klinger was not reliable and was filled with inflated critical nonsense ("Altes and Neues von Max Klinger," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 32, n.s. 8 [1896–97]: 165–66). See also Cornelius Gurlitt, "Max Klinger," *Die Kunst für Alle* 10, no. 5 (Dec. 1894): 66–73; Käthe Kollwitz, "Ansprache zur Beisetzung von Max Klinger," 8 July 1920, quoted in *Max Klinger: Wege zum Gesamtkunstwerk*, by Roemer-und Pelizaeus Museum, exh. cat. (Mainz: Verlag Philipp von Zabern, 1984), 131–32; and Streicher, "Max Klinger's Malerei und Zeichnung," 244.

**119.** Herman Eichfeld, "Die dritte Münchener Jahressausstellung," *Der Kunstwart* 4, no. 21 (Aug. 1891): 328; Hans W. Singer, "Max Klinger's Gemälde," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 29, n.s. 5 (1893–94): 49; Pecht, *Die Kunst für Alle* 6, no. 13 (Apr. 1891): 207. See also Pecht's appraisals in *ibid.* 5, no. 4 (Nov. 1889): 53, where he refers to a graphic series of "unseres Höllenbreughels, Max Klinger, . . . dieses merkwürdig dämonischen Künstlers," and *ibid.* 11, no. 15 (May 1896): 236. On Avenarius's promotion of Klinger's graphics, see "Griffelkunst," *Der Kunstwart* 5, no. 2 (Oct. 1891): 17–20; and Avenarius, "Max Klinger Zyklus, 'Vom Tode,'" *ibid.* 8, no. 4 (Nov. 1894): 60, reprinted from Ferdinand Avenarius, *Max Klinger's Griffelkunst: Ein Begleiter durch ihre Phantasiewelt* (Berlin: Amsler & Ruthardt, 1895).

**120.** On the reception in Berlin, see George Voß, "Die Berliner Kunstausstellung," *Die Kunst für Alle* 2, no. 24 (Sept. 1887): 358; referring to Klinger as the "most reck-

less representative" of the modern realists, Voss was mildly critical of the work with its grotesque faces. Nevertheless, he judged the light-filled painting to be extraordinarily beautiful. On Leipzig, see Vogel, "Altes und Neues von Max Klinger"; Vogel included himself among those whose response to the painting was not positive. For Vogel's later account, see Julius Vogel, *Max Klinger und seine Vaterstadt Leipzig: Ein Kapitel aus dem Kunstleben einer deutschen Stadt* (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1923), 8–9. On the Bavarian parliament, see Ludwig, *Kunst, Geld und Politik*, 32. Jäger's attack on the nudes in Klinger's painting was part of the same speech on immorality in which he condemned Uhde for his portrayal of Christ as a common criminal.

**121.** The quotation is from Cornelius Gurlitt, "Max Klinger," *Die Kunst für Alle* 10, no. 5 (Dec. 1894): 66–69. Gurlitt later recounted in more detail the public ridicule of the painting at the Berlin Academy Exhibition and Klinger's aghast response in *Die deutsche Kunst des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts: Ihre Ziele und Thaten*, vol. 2 of *Das Neunzehnte Jahrhundert in Deutschlands Entwicklung*, ed. Paul Schlenther (Berlin: Georg Bondi, 1899), 611–14. See also Aemil Fendler, "Berlin Akademische Kunstausstellung," *Der Kunstwart* 1, no. 2 (Oct. 1887): 18; and Pecht, "Die Münchener Ausstellung von 1888: Die deutsche Historienmalerei," *Die Kunst für Alle* 3, no. 19 (July 1888): 292.

**122.** See Gisela Scheffler, "Max Klinger in München," in Danzker and Falk, *Max Klinger*, 9–10, for a careful examination of the archives and the daily press that revises the prevalent myth that the painting was viewed only by invitation for three days. Scheffler found no evidence in police or state records or in the daily press of a scandal or of police action against the exhibition. See also Maria Makela, "The Politics of Parody: Some Thoughts on the 'Modern' in Turn-of-the-Century Munich," in Forster-Hahn, *Imagining Modern German Culture*, 190–93, which treats the painting in the larger context of Catholic efforts to control and censor art in Munich; *Die Kunst unserer Zeit* 2, 1st half-vol. (Mar. 1891), unpaginated notes; Herman Helferich [Emil Heilbut], "Fünf Münchener Ausstellungen," *Die Kunst für Alle* 6, no. 14 (Apr. 1891): 214; and F[riedrich] Pecht, "München," *ibid.*, no. 13 (Apr. 1891): 207. Citations of the coverage through both announcements and reviews from the *Münchener Neuesten Nachrichten* and the *Münchener Allgemeinen Zeitung* and the report on the prince regent's visit are provided in Scheffler, "Max Klinger in München," 10 and 14 nn. 22–23. The article published six months later was Franz Hermann [Meissner], "Max Klinger, Maler-Radierer: Eine Studie," *Westermann's Illustrierte Deutsche Monatshefte* 71, no. 421 (Oct. 1891): 111–29, quoted phrases from 113.

**123.** Hans Singer, "Max Klinger's Gemälde," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, n.s. 5 (1893–94): 50. Gurlitt's account, published a year later in "Max Klinger," *Die Kunst für Alle* 10, no. 5 (Dec. 1894): 63, reported that the Munich police had prohibited the painting from being shown; however, after an order came from the culture ministry that the painting could be shown if it were partially covered, it was exhibited. In his 1899 biography Max Schmid referred briefly to *The Crucifixion's* not receiving good treatment at first and being curtained in Munich (see Max Schmid, *Klinger* [Bielefeld, Germany: Verlag von Velhagen & Klasing, 1899], 84–86).

Ludwig Leiss, in his study on censorship of the arts in Germany, *Kunst im Konflikt*, 101–2, states that there were no official records available in the archives to document the actions against the painting, other than the magistrate's order that the painting could be shown if it were partially covered. Citing a 1908 letter from Klinger to Alexander Hummel, Streicher, "Zwischen Klingers Ruhm und seiner Leistung," 49, refers to an outraged response to the painting on the part of the conservative Catholics in Munich that resulted in a police order to drape the figure during the first days of the exhibition. Scheffler, "Max Klinger in München," 10, 14 n. 20, cites the letter written by Klinger to his parents after he had left Munich over the excitement created by the painting and suggests that Klinger's quick compliance with the request from the cultural ministry prevented a scandal. See also Julius Vogel, *Max Klingers Kreuzigung Christi im Museum der bildenden Künste zu Leipzig* (Leipzig: E. A. Seemann, 1918), 13.

**124.** H[ermann] A[rthur] Lier, "Korrespondenz: Dresden, November 1893," *Kunstchronik*, n.s. 5 (Dec. 1893): col. 122. A brief announcement of the opening of the Lichtenberg exhibition appeared earlier, in "Dresden: Max Klinger," *ibid.* (Nov. 1893): col. 71. The reporter was Artur Seemann, "Klinger-Ausstellung in Leipzig," *ibid.* (Jan. 1894): cols. 203–6. Son of the founder and publisher of the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst*, Artur Seemann became the publisher of the journal in 1898. Vogel, *Max Klinger und seine Vaterstadt Leipzig*, 11–12, claimed that he had persuaded Klinger to overpaint in order to overcome the Leipzig Kunstverein's fear of offending the religious sensibilities of their members. Vogel characterized the reception of the painting at this 1894 exhibition as better than expected.

**125.** Karl Woermann, director of the Dresden museums, referring to Klinger as "der phantasiegewaltige Max Klinger," argued that if there was ever an art that was completely of its time, that served to develop strong personalities in art, and was above all in its deepest being German, it was the contemporary imaginative painting ("Was uns die Kunstgeschichte lehrt," *Der Kunstwart* 7, no. 15 [May 1894]: 228). For a further analysis of

Klinger's confrontation with the crises of his day, see Manfred Boetkes, "Wege zum Gesamtkunstwerk," in Roemer- und Pelizaeus Museum, *Max Klinger*, 1–12. Cornelius Gurlitt in 1894 recognized that ideas lay at the heart of Klinger's work: "Also Deutlichkeit des Ausdrucks und Einfachheit des rein malerisch zu erfassenden Gedankens: das ist wohl der Kern von Klingers Zielen. . . ein einfacher malerischer Gedanke" ("Max Klinger," *Die Kunst für Alle* 10, no. 6 [Dec. 1894]: 82). On Klinger's technical mastery, see *Der Kunstwart* 4, no. 13 (Apr. 1891): 201–2; *ibid.*, no. 21 (Aug. 1891): 328–29; and Herman Helferich [Emil Heilbut], "Etwas über die symbolistische Bewegung," *Die Kunst für Alle* 10, no. 3 (Nov. 1894): 34. See also the special issue of *Jugend* (12 Sept. 1910) devoted to Schopenhauer on the fiftieth anniversary of his death, in which Klinger's print *Der befreite Prometheus* was given a double-page spread on 890–91.

**126.** For a provocative analysis of the subversive nature of David Friedrich Strauß's distinction between the Jesus of history and the Christ of faith, see Marilyn Chapin Massey, *Christ Unmasked: The Meaning of "The Life of Jesus" in German Politics* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1983).

**127.** I am indebted here to a systematic analysis of this painting by Friedrich Gross, "Vom Alltagsgetriebe fern: Der Große Einzelne in Klingers *Kreuzigung Christi* und *Christus im Olymp*," in Gleisberg, *Max Klinger, 1857–1920*, 72–75. The legacy of the golden-haired Christ portrayed in both of these paintings was unfortunate for Klinger's reputation. Winkler, *Max Klinger*, 39–47, relates that in 1937 the Leipzig Art Society mounted a large Klinger retrospective that was intended to mask the confiscation by the National Socialists of modern art from the Leipzig museums and, more profoundly, to appropriate the tall, red-haired Klinger—seventeen years after his death—as an exponent of the ideal blond racial type and an advocate of the Germanic Christ of National Socialism. Winkler also traces the shifting attitudes toward Klinger's work in the successive postwar decades in the German Democratic Republic.

**128.** Vogel, *Max Klingers Kreuzigung*, 11.

**129.** After viewing the painting in Klinger's studio, Richard Dehmel wrote an ecstatic poem, titled "Jesus und Psyche: Phantasie bei Klinger" (1902), connecting the painting to Klinger's monumental statue of Beethoven and interpreting both as presaging a new era of sensual joy (Gross, "Vom Alltagsgetriebe fern," 76).

**130.** Alexander Dückers, *Max Klinger* (Berlin: Rembrandt Verlag, 1976), cogently demonstrates the pervasive influence of Schopenhauer's philosophy both in Klinger's

graphic cycles and in his monumental paintings of Christ, who for Schopenhauer was the symbol of suffering and of the negation of the will to live. On Nietzsche's influence upon Klinger's work, see Hans-Dieter Erbsmehl, "Kulturkritik und Gegenästhetik: Zur Bedeutung Friedrich Nietzsches für die bildende Kunst in Deutschland, 1892–1918" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 1993), chap. 3. Gleisberg, who argues convincingly for the essential subjectivity of Klinger's work, applies a variation of Cartesian logic to Klinger: "Ich zeichne mich, also bin ich" (Gleisberg, "Ich muß mir stets . . .," in Gleisberg, *Max Klinger, 1857–1920*, 24).

**131.** It is worth noting that of the articles that were devoted entirely to a single contemporary artist in the *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* from 1890 to 1918 the largest number by far—16—were about Klinger and his work (1894, 1895, 1897, 1898, 1900, 1902 [whole issue], 1905, 1909 [2], 1911, 1915, 1916, 1917 [2], 1918). About Liebermann there were 6 articles (1893, 1901, 1907, 1913, 1916, 1917); about Menzel, 5 (1886, 1896, 1903, 1905, 1915); about Lenbach, 3 (1904, 1905, 1906); about Hermann Prell, 3 (1885, 1896, 1904); and about Kollwitz, 2 (1905, 1909). Böcklin and Stuck each merited only a single article, as did other contemporary artists.

**132.** Franz Hermann [Meissner], "Hans Thoma," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 27, n.s. 3 (1891–92): 225, linked Thoma and Stuck to Klinger as pathbreaking artists. The quotation on artistic revolution was made by Max Georg Zimmermann in "Kritische Gänge," *Die Kunst für Alle* 8, no. 24 (Sept. 1893): 375, an article that was not enthusiastic about the new art; indeed, it was quite critical of various aspects of the modern world, especially socialism (see \*, "Dresden," *ibid.* 9, no. 2 [Oct. 1893]: 29).

**133.** Friedrich Haack, "Böcklin und Klinger," *Die Kunst für Alle* 11, no. 1 (Oct. 1895): 2.; Dr. Relling [Jaro Springer], "Die Ausstellung der XI," *ibid.* 9, no. 13 (1 Apr. 1894): 200. Springer, son of an eminent professor of art history, worked from 1882 to 1915 as a directorial assistant and curator of the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett (Print Collection) and married the daughter of August von Heyden, a professor of history painting at the Institute for Fine Art, Berlin. A strong supporter of new art forms whose judgment was reinforced by his art historical work, Springer reported regularly for *Die Kunst für Alle*. On Springer, see Schultze-Naumburg, "Deutsche Kunstkritiker," *ibid.* 10, no. 12 (Mar. 1895): 178. The further statements on Klinger were from Dr. Relling [Springer], "Die Berliner Künstaustellung," *ibid.* 8, no. 19 (July 1893): 291; and Helferich [Heilbut], "Fünf Münchener Ausstellungen," *ibid.* 6, no. 14 (Apr. 1891): 215.

**134.** Vogel, *Max Klingers Kreuzigung*, 17–20; *idem*, *Max Klinger und seine Vaterstadt Leipzig*, 35–39; Gleisberg, *Max Klinger, 1857–1920*, 341; Carl Schuchhardt, "Max Klinger's 'Kreuzigung' in Hannover: Vortrag im Hannoverschen Kunstlerverein am 24 April 1899" (Hannover: Commissionsverlag von Schmorl & von Seefeld Nachf., 1899), 23. Before he became director of the Kestner Museum (1887–1907), Schuchhardt was an archaeologist at the Pergamum dig and worked on the Pergamum altar after its transfer to Berlin.

**135.** Vogel, *Max Klingers Kreuzigung*, 16–17, and *idem*, *Max Klinger und seine Vaterstadt Leipzig*, 19, 33, recount the events in Leipzig. Avenarius discussed Klinger's paintings at length in his review of the exhibition, "Leipziger Bericht: Die Sächsisch-Thüringische Gewerbeausstellung," *Der Kunstwart* 10, no. 20 (July 1897): 315–16. A longer account of Pastor Hölscher's attack upon the "sacrilegious caricature" was published by Cornelius Gurlitt, *Die deutsche Kunst des neunzehnten Jahrhunderts*, 614–16. He reported on Georg Treu's response to Hölscher, which discussed Klinger's painting in the context of the new Protestant religious art in Germany. The full citations for these fifteen-page pamphlets are [H. Sellnick], *Kling! Klang! Klung! Betrachtungen über das Klingersche Bild "Christus im Olymp": Von ein Kunstverständigen* (Leipzig: Brückner & Niemann, 1897); and C. Gattermann, *Der Olympier Kritik des Klingerschen Bildes "Christus im Olymp"* (Leipzig: Brückner & Niemann, 1897). Reviews of the Klinger rooms in the Saxon-Thuringian Industrial Exhibition are in "Aus der Kunsthalle der sächsisch-thüringischen Ausstellung in Leipzig," *Die Kunst für Alle* 12, no. 23 (Sept. 1897): 380–82. Richard Graul, "Aus Leipzig," *Pan* 3, no. 2 (1897–98): 108–10, pointed out that Klinger's paintings formed the monumental centerpiece of the exhibition. For further information about the efforts to place Klinger's three large paintings together into a museum, see Max Lehrs, "Alexander Hummel und Max Klinger," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 50, n.s. 26 (1914–15): 29–52.

**136.** Hans Singer, "Max Klinger's Gemälde," *ibid.* 29, n.s. 5 (1893–94): 50.

**137.** Schuchhardt, *Max Klinger's "Kreuzigung,"* 16–22.

**138.** The laudatory stanza appeared in Gurlitt, "Max Klinger," *Die Kunst für Alle* 10, no. 5 (Dec. 1894): 69; the reference to "Crucify him," in Schmid, *Klinger*, 86.

**139.** Max Lehrs, in "Max Klinger's 'Brahms-Phantasie,'" *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 30, n.s. 6 (1894–95): 113, quoted this statement taken from Lichtwark's pamphlet *Wege und Ziele des Dilettantismus* (Munich: Verlags-

anstalt für Kunst und Wissenschaft, 1894) in a discussion of Klinger's suffering at the hands of the uncomprehending public.

## Part I, Chapter 2

### Carrying Art to the Public

1. Georg Voß, "Die Eröffnung der Berliner Jubiläums-Ausstellung," *Die Kunst für Alle* 1, no. 18 (June 1886): 247–49. This narrative of the opening ceremony and quotations are all drawn from Voss's account. A map of the exhibition park, a floor plan of the exhibition, and a listing of the works with selective illustrations is available in *Jubiläums-Ausstellung der Kgl. Akademie der Künste im Landes-Ausstellungsgebäude zu Berlin von Mai bis October 1886: Illustrierte Katalog*, exh. cat. (Berlin: 1886). For more detail on the Kaisersaal and decorations of the domed entry hall, see Adolf Rosenberg, "Die Jubiläumskunstaussstellung in Berlin, II," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 21 (1885–86): 247–56; and Anton von Werner, *Erlebnisse und Eindrücke, 1870–1890* (Berlin: Ernst Siegfried Mittler und Sohn, 1913), 464. Extensive coverage of the organization of the exhibition park, the building, and architectural details, including maps and floor plans as well as a verbatim report on the opening speeches, was provided throughout the summer of 1886 in the *Centralblatt der Bauverwaltung* 6 (May–Sept. 1886): 177–79, 186–88, 210–11, 222–23, 296–98, 314–15, 335–36, 377–78, 387–88.

2. The impressive contingent of paintings from England was a result, according to Werner, of negotiations by Crown Princess Victoria, the eldest daughter of England's Queen Victoria. Rosenberg drew a different conclusion from France's absence. Since the French had refused to participate in this Jubilee Exhibition, he wrote in his report, "Die Jubiläumskunstaussstellung in Berlin, I," *Zeitschrift für bildende Kunst* 21 (1885–86): 205, Berlin probably would not send a German exhibition to the Paris Universal Exposition of 1889. Germany, in fact, did have an unofficial exhibition in Paris in 1878 that was arranged by Werner with the explicit permission of Bismarck. For details on this episode and a careful examination of political aspects of the Franco-German relationship in the international exhibitions, see Françoise Forster-Hahn, "'La Confraternité de l'art': Deutsch-französische Ausstellungspolitik von 1871 bis 1914," *Zeitschrift für Kunstgeschichte* 48, no. 1 (1985): 506–37.

3. Rosenberg, "Die Jubiläumskunstaussstellung in Berlin, I," 207–14, has a lively contemporary description of these temples, dioramas, and panoramas; and Stephan Oettermann, *Das Panorama: Die Geschichte eines Massenmediums* (Frankfurt am Main: Syndikat, 1980), 202, provides further details. A thorough discussion of the cultural and political aspects of the German archaeological excavations in Pergamum and Olympia is presented by Suzanne

L. Marchand, *Down from Olympus: Archaeology and Philhellenism in Germany, 1750–1970* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 75–103.

4. Georg Voß, "Das griechische Fest in Berliner Ausstellungspark," *Die Kunst für Alle* 1, no. 20 (July 1886): 287–90; Werner, *Erlebnisse*, 466. Marchand, *Down from Olympus*, 95, suggests that the artists' festival, although cloaked in classical costumes, would have been perceived as a celebration of the German victory over the French because of Attalus's victory in 184 B.C. over the Galatians, who were actually Celts. Paul Lindenberg, "Die Osteria auf der Berliner Jubiläums-Ausstellung," *Die Kunst für Alle* 2, no. 3 (Nov. 1886): 44–47, described an Italianate building with a garden café created in the park by the Verein Berliner Künstler as a place for artists to relax. It was also opened for public use at stated times. The financial results were reported in #, "Verein Berliner Künstler," *ibid.* 1, no. 21 (1 Aug. 1886): 309–10.

5. \*\*, "Berlin: Der Schluss der Jubiläums Ausstellung," *Die Kunst für Alle* 2, no. 4 (Nov. 1886): 63–64, and Werner, *Erlebnisse*, 467, supply details of the closing ceremony. Final reports containing lengthy statistics were published a year later in "Ein Rückblick auf die Jubiläums-Kunstaussstellung in Berlin," *Die Kunst für Alle* 2, no. 24 (Sept. 1887): 377.

6. Friedrich Pecht, "Die Berliner Jubiläums-Ausstellung," *Die Kunst für Alle* 1, no. 18 (June 1886): 250. For a repetition of this litany, see Pecht's thoughts before the opening of the Third Munich International in Friedrich Pecht, "Die Münchener Ausstellungen von 1888: Einleitung," *ibid.* 3, no. 17 (June 1888): 261–63. For a brief summary of Berlin as an art center in the latter half of the century, see Robin Lenman, *Artists and Society in Germany, 1850–1914* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1997), 113–16; and for further detail, Nicolaas Teeuwisse, *Vom Salon zur Secession: Berliner Kunstleben zwischen Tradition und Aufbruch zur Moderne, 1871–1900* (Berlin: Deutscher Verlag für Kunstwissenschaft, 1986).

7. Liebermann, who had returned to Berlin from Munich in 1884, showed *Amsterdamer Waisenmädchen im Garten* (1885), *Das Tischgebet* (1886), and *Alt Männerhaus* (1880–81) in the 1886 Berlin Jubilee Exhibition. Uhde showed *Komm Herr Jesu* (1885, also titled *Das Tischgebet*). See Pecht's review of the English painters in *Die Kunst für Alle* 1, no. 24 (Sept. 1886): 345–49. In addition to articles already cited, extensive coverage of the exhibition appeared in the following issues of *Die Kunst für Alle*: 1, nos. 18–24 (June–Sept. 1886): 250–58, 263–71, 279–87, 295–304, 311–21, 330–35, 343–51; 2, nos. 1–3 (Oct.–Nov. 1886): 1–8, 17–26, 33–43. Adolf Rosenberg published articles in the *Zeitschrift für bildende*