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I have always been drawn to artists whose work is powerful and direct. You feel this in the art of Pablo Picasso, of Egon Schiele, of Ernst Ludwig Kirchner. And you definitely feel this in the art of Edvard Munch.

In whatever medium he worked—painting, drawing, or printmaking—the art of Munch is like a punch to the stomach. His images relate to primal emotions shared by all human beings: loneliness, anxiety, jealousy. But they are rendered in such a way that we also feel the beauty of existence, the pleasures of color and form. Simply put, Munch is a master.

In 2006, during my time as President of the Board of Trustees at The Museum of Modern Art, that museum put on a stunning exhibition devoted to Munch, one that surveyed his career in its entirety. Organized by Kynaston McShine, it spanned the years 1880 to 1944, showing the full range and richness of the artist’s achievement.

Now, a decade later, we have “Munch and Expressionism” at the Neue Galerie. I was pleased to see this exhibition take shape for several reasons. One is that it reunites the talents of curator Jill Lloyd and designer Peter de Kimpe, who first worked together on the similarly themed “Van Gogh and Expressionism.” I knew the results would be magical.

Another is that seeing the art of Edvard Munch in the context of the German Expressionists is a kind of revelation. There is intense interplay in the work of these artists, and it is tremendously exciting to see them feeding off each other to create new, more profound visions of the modern experience.

What we find in exhibitions like “Munch and Expressionism” and its predecessor “Van Gogh and Expressionism” is that the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century German art that is central to the Neue Galerie mission did not grow in isolation. There was a great deal of mutual influence among European artists, which resulted in an enriched outlook on both sides. This sort of trans-national artistic fermentation has continued, and represents the best hope for different cultures learning from and living with one another.

Finally, in staging this exhibition at the Neue Galerie, I simply wanted to have another chance to look at a large selection of superior pieces by Munch. This exhibition has provided the opportunity, and it is very gratifying. In Munch, we see an artist who transcends his own time, and speaks eloquently to our own.

The lenders to this exhibition have been most generous in parting with these spectacular works for the duration of our show. Those in Oslo and in New York in particular have given us a great gift in allowing us to share Munch with our visitors. The result is truly dazzling.

My love for Expressionist art dates back to my teenage years, and it remains as strong as ever. To see this work paired with the far-reaching art of the greatest of all Norwegian painters is something very special. I trust you will enjoy it as much as I do.

RONALD S. LAUDER
President, Neue Galerie New York
Edvard Munch is a seminal figure in the history of modern art. His paintings and drawings have a unique ability to explore the mysterious depths of the human psyche. Best known for his iconic work *The Scream* (1893), Munch had a successful and prolific career, enjoying great acclaim within his lifetime as Norway’s foremost artist. Yet the shadow of his early psychological torments and nervous breakdown inform all his work, and lend it a quality that make it unforgettable to experience.

Munch was greatly influenced by a number of artists over the course of his career, including Vincent van Gogh, Henri Toulouse-Lautrec, and Paul Gaugin. But his deepest affinity lay with the German Expressionist artists, many of whom subscribed to his view that “I do not believe in the art which is not the compulsive result of humanity’s urge to open its heart.”

With this exhibition, we explore the interplay between the work of Munch and his German and Austrian peers, including Erich Heckel, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, Emil Nolde, Egon Schiele, Karl Schmidt-Rottluff, and others. Unlike the superb retrospective mounted by The Museum of Modern Art in 2006, “Edvard Munch: The Modern Life of the Soul,” ours is a smaller show that highlights this mutual affinity and influence between Munch and his German Expressionist compatriots. It is an intimate exhibition for an artist whose paintings, drawings, and prints always speak to the private emotional life of the individual.

The curator of this superb exhibition is Dr. Jill Lloyd, who has organized so many memorable shows for the Neue Galerie, including “Christian Schad and the Neue Sachlichkeit” (2003), “Van Gogh and Expressionism” (2007), and “Vasily Kandinsky: From the Blaue Reiter to the Bauhaus, 1910–1925” (2014). She was aided by the esteemed Munch scholar Dr. Reinhold Heller, the co-editor of this catalogue and himself the organizer of “Brücke: The Birth of Expressionism in Dresden and Berlin, 1905–1913” (2009). Together, they have assembled an exhibition that is both rigorous and extraordinarily beautiful. Their contributions to this catalogue, along with those by Patricia G. Berman, Nelson Blitz, Jr., Jay A. Clarke, Nils Ohlsen, and Øystein Ustvedt, have resulted in a groundbreaking scholarly work.

Many lenders provided essential works, and I wish to thank all the museums and private collectors whose generosity has made this exhibition possible. These include the Munch Museum, led by Stein Olav Henrichsen, and the National Museum of Art, Architecture and Design, led by Audan Eckhoff, which generously allowed many great treasures to travel from Oslo to New York, as well as The Museum of Modern Art and its director, Glenn Lowry. We owe them a debt of gratitude. Our deepest thanks are also due to collectors Leon and Debra Black, Nelson Blitz and Catherine Woodard, Pål Gundersen, and Dag Rustad for providing outstanding loans to the exhibition. A special acknowledgement is due to Patrik Steorn at Thielska Galleriet and to the Swedish Cultural Ministry for making the arrangement that allows Munch’s great painting *The Book Family* to travel outside Scandinavia for the first time.
The installation designer Peter de Kimpe has again created a successful collaboration with our curator, filling the exhibition spaces with breathtaking color that frames this work in magnificent fashion. I would like to give special thanks to Scott Gutterman, Deputy Director and Chief Operating Officer; Janis Staggs, Associate Director, Curatorial and Publications; Phyllis La Riccia, Director, Membership and Development; Allison Needle, Chief Registrar and Director of Exhibitions; Michael Voss, Head Preparator; and Liesbet van Leemput, Graphics Manager, for their efforts on behalf of this superb exhibition. Finally, my deepest thanks to our President and Co-Founder, Ronald S. Lauder, for his abiding faith in our work.

RENÉE PRICE
Director, Neue Galerie New York
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The radical qualities of Edvard Munch’s work—his extreme originality and inventiveness—have frequently led to him being linked to the art of the future. As early as 1902 Max Linde gave his book *Edvard Munch and The Art of the Future* (*Edvard Munch und die Kunst der Zukunft*) this very title, underlining Munch’s prescient, inspirational role at the dawn of the twentieth century. The Blaue Reiter artist August Macke affirmed Munch’s importance for his generation in an admiring letter sent after the 1912 Sonderbund exhibition in Cologne, where Munch showed alongside the German and Austrian Expressionists: “We young ones,” Macke wrote, “have inscribed your name on our shield.” Meanwhile Munch, who considered that the Sonderbund’s presentation of “the wildest of everything now being painted” would “shake Cologne Cathedral to its core,” acknowledged his role as the “snow plough” that had “cleared a path for the coming generation.”

But whereas Van Gogh, who was likewise celebrated at the Sonderbund exhibition, is justly deemed a precursor or “father” of Expressionism, Munch, by contrast, both inspired and participated in the movement. Van Gogh had been dead for over twenty years by 1912, but Munch was very much alive. Indeed, he was to live on until 1944, five years after the Brücke artist, Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, committed suicide. During the years 1905–18, when Expressionism was in its heyday, Munch, who had already achieved notoriety in the last decade of the nineteenth century with his haunting Symbolist work, was reinventing and modernizing his art for the new century. There is no doubt that the Expressionists were stimulated by Munch’s innovations; but he also responded to their daring new style and drew on some of the same sources of inspiration that guided them. Alongside questions of direct influence (which obsess art historians but which artists frequently deny), we must be aware of parallel concerns with the preoccupations of the age, not to mention issues of affinity in areas such as temperament and attitudes to art and life that Munch and the Expressionists shared.

For all these reasons, the present exhibition is concerned not simply with influence from one generation to another, but rather with a dialogue between Munch and the Expressionists. As Reinhold Heller and I collaborated on the exhibition, we agreed that we too would conduct a dialogue in this catalogue: I should look at the subject from the Expressionists’ point of view, and he should represent Munch’s position. Inevitably the two sides of the coin are hard to split, but whereas Reinhold Heller will deal primarily with Munch’s involvement with Expressionism, I will set out to explore the Expressionists’ attitude to Munch. Why did they seek out Munch in the first...
place? What aspects of the older artist’s work did they admire? And how did they incorporate and transform the inspiration they drew from Munch in their own work?

The simplest explanation for the Expressionists’ strong attraction to Munch was his notoriety. After the succès de scandale of 1892, when Munch’s exhibition at the Verein Berliner Künstler (Association of Berlin Artists) in Berlin was deemed “a mockery of art” and prematurely closed, Munch became overnight “the most famous man in Germany.” Munch described this event as “the best advertisement I could have hoped for.” He quickly built on his sudden fame by organizing numerous strategic exhibitions in Germany, where his reputation went from strength to strength. He enlisted a circle of German patrons and supporters, the most important for our purposes being the Hamburg county judge and print expert, Gustav Schiefler, who became a non-active member of Brücke in 1906, and the main point of contact between Munch and the Expressionists.

Munch thus embodied a heady mix of rebellion and success—exactly what the Expressionists themselves were striving for. As a representative of “Nordic art,” Munch featured alongside Van Gogh and Gauguin in Julius Meier-Graefe’s Modern Art (Entwicklungsgeschichte der modernen Kunst), 1904, which served as a key source for the Expressionists’ knowledge of the latest artistic trends. The “shock of the new” in their art, and their bohemian, sexually liberated lifestyle were both validated by Munch, who was deeply involved in the artistic countercultures of his times: first as a member of the Norwegian Kristiania Bohème in the eighteen-eighties, and subsequently in the group of artists and writers around August Strindberg, who gathered in the Black Piglet bar (Zum Schwarzen Ferkel) in Berlin, and included, alongside Munch, the Polish writer Stanislaw Przybyszewski, the German poet Richard Dehmel, and the art critic Meier-Graefe. Ernst Ludwig Kirchner’s earliest portfolio of prints, Two People, 1905–06 [Fig. 2], illustrates Dehmel’s verse.
novel of the same title (which also inspired Arnold Schönberg’s *Transfigured Night* (*Verklärte Nacht*, 1899). Dehmel, who embraced Strindberg’s new emphasis on the inner life of his characters, their subjective instincts and emotions, recounts a powerfully erotic love story that alienates a pair of lovers from society and eventually destroys them—a typically Munchian theme.

In later years, Kirchner strongly opposed any association with Munch that might compromise recognition of his own originality. But Max Pechstein clearly stated in a letter of 1919 that the Brücke artists “recognized our similar yearning, our similar enthusiasm for the Van Goghs and Munchs which we had seen. For the latter, Kirchner was most enthusiastic.” There is plenty of evidence that the Brücke artists sought out Munch, inviting him, for example, to send work to their group exhibitions in 1906, 1908 and 1909, although Munch carefully sidestepped these overtures. Emil Nolde was the first Expressionist to come into Munch’s direct orbit in May 1906 when the Galerie Commeter in Hamburg, which represented Munch’s paintings, recognized in Nolde a kindred spirit and presented him to the Munch enthusiast, Gustav Schiefler. Nolde was deeply impressed by the works of Munch and Van Gogh that he saw in Schiefler’s collection. In December 1907 a personal encounter between the two artists ensued in the Café Bauer in Berlin, where Schiefler and Nolde met a clearly inebriated Munch, who gave them a tour of his recently completed Reinhardt Frieze, commissioned for the Kammerspiele theatre. The next day—with Munch still drunk—Schiefler and Nolde were invited to visit the artist’s Berlin studio, where they saw his latest version of *The Death of Marat*, 1907 [Fig. 3], which Munch presented

---

the following year at the Salon des Indépendants in Paris as a paradigm of his new, twentieth-century style. Nolde failed to persuade Munch to join the “new secession” of artists he was planning at the time, and later recorded that their meeting “was not particularly happy, or even interesting,” although he respected “Munch’s most wonderful graphic creations.”

Nolde and the Brücke artists apparently confronted a brick wall when they tried to enlist Munch to their cause, despite his stated admiration for their work. A variety of explanations for Munch’s reticence have been mooted, perhaps the most convincing being Arne Eggum’s suggestion that the strategic older artist was far more interested in launching his new style in Paris than exhibiting with a group of youngsters in the comparative backwater of Dresden. By the summer of 1908, when Karl Schmidt-Rottluff reminded Munch that it was the last moment he could send paintings to the Brücke exhibition that year, Munch was on the verge of the nervous collapse fuelled by alcoholism that led to his hospitalization in Dr. Jacobsen’s nerve clinic in Copenhagen. A year later, when Schmidt-Rottluff made a last attempt to secure Munch’s participation in a Brücke exhibition via Schiefler’s intervention, Munch had cut his ties with Germany and relocated to his native Norway. Schmidt-Rottluff wrote to Schiefler: “It is a great pity that once again we will have to give up on Munch. But the Brücke artists and I thank you sincerely for your efforts on our behalf.” It was not until 1912 when the Sonderbund exhibition presented its major survey of modern European art that Munch and the Expressionists exhibited side by side.

Graphic Art

Both the woodcuts and the lithographs have left a strong impression on me, unlike the works of Liebermann, as fine as they are. But the Munchs, the Munchs, they were really powerful. (Karl Schmidt-Rottluff, 1907)

Karl Schmidt-Rottluff’s strong admiration for Munch’s prints, which he saw in Gustav Schiefler’s home in 1907, reflects the Expressionists’ high general esteem for Munch’s graphic art. Indeed, it was through Munch’s prints that they came to know many of his famous motifs, and the revolutionary techniques of his woodcuts had an immense impact on their emerging graphic style. Although Munch’s first etchings, woodcuts and lithographs date from the mid-1890s, the public appreciation of this aspect of his work took off at the beginning of the new century, coinciding with the birth of Expressionism. Large exhibitions of Munch’s graphics were held in Hamburg, Leipzig and Dresden, and in 1904 Munch signed a contract with Bruno Cassirer in Berlin for the exclusive rights to sell his graphics for three years. Print collectors in Germany began to seek out Munch’s prints, including Max Linde and Gustav Schiefler, who published the first catalogue raisonné of Munch’s graphic work in 1907 [Fig. 4]. Emil Nolde, Erich Heckel and Karl Schmidt-Rottluff all saw Munch’s prints in Schiefler’s collection during their formative years: the opportunity to discuss the Norwegian artist’s techniques and his experimental approach to print-making with an expert of Schiefler’s standing was undoubtedly of great importance to them.
Brücke graphics initially took the decorative, flat, planar style associated with Jugendstil illustration as a point of departure. The encounter with Munch, most especially with his woodcuts, encouraged the Expressionists to develop a new feeling for the expressive potential of roughly carved wood. In the present exhibition, Nolde’s *Knight*, 1906 (Cat. No. 73), demonstrates the artist’s use of gouge and chisel to achieve a raw immediacy similar to the effect of rough-hewn wood in Munch’s *Old Fisherman*, 1897 (Cat. No. 75). What apparently appealed to the Expressionists in Munch’s method was the direct trace of the artist’s hand, with the result that the final print is no longer perfectly and conventionally finished but rather a manifestation of ‘process’ or how it is made. Munch’s experimental approach to the wooden block extended to leaving the wooden grain visible in the final composition. Two versions of Munch’s *The Kiss III*, 1898 (Cat. Nos. 64 & 65; Figs. 4 & 5), use exactly the same woodblock with identical knots and grain patterns, but whereas one is printed vertically the other, unique impression is printed horizontally. By changing the direction of the grain Munch creates different expressive and atmospheric effects: the vertical grain reinforces the phallic verticality of the merged figures, while the horizontal grain underlines the fragile, ephemeral nature of their embrace. The Brücke artists frequently exploited the wooden grain to create expressive effects, for example in Nolde’s *Fishing Steamer*, 1910 (Cat. No. 67), where the visible horizontal grain at the center of the composition mediates between sky and sea and holds the elements in powerful equilibrium.

Before he formulated his new twentieth-century painting style, Munch experimented in the 1890s with rough carving that brought the surface of his prints to life, rendering them particularly appealing to the Expressionists. Beyond issues of direct influence however, both Munch and Nolde felt that their work would be more expressive, more vital and alive, if it incorporated the chance processes of nature—be it the patterns of wood grain in their prints, or the more extreme

---

4 Cover of Gustav Schiefler’s, *Verzeichnis des graphischen Werks Edvard Munchs bis 1906*, Berlin, 1907. Photo courtesy The Manhattan Rare Book Company


effects that could be achieved by leaving their works exposed to the elements. Munch’s “kill or cure” treatment whereby his works were subjected to leaks and accidents in the studio or executed outside in the winter months [Fig. 7], corresponds to Nolde deliberately leaving his watercolors outside when he was working in Cospeda in 1908, although he almost certainly knew nothing of Munch’s methods [Fig. 8]. Nolde recalled this episode in his memoirs: “Half-finished and finished pictures were scattered around, covered in snow, so that I had to look for them, and I was astounded at how the texture of the colours had altered in a dreamlike way under the snow. Sometimes I also painted on ice-cold evenings and I enjoyed seeing the colours freeze into crystal stars and rays. I loved this collaboration with nature, in which painter, reality and painting seemed to fuse into one entity.”

Issues of influence and affinity also occur in the colored prints. Heckel, for example, adopted Munch’s characteristic method of cutting his wooden blocks with a fretsaw into sections so that he could apply different colors and reassemble the block for printing. The strong outlining and stencil-like appearance of Fränzi Reclining, 1910 [Cat. No. 18, Fig. 9], results from this technique; although in comparison to woodcuts such as Munch’s Encounter in Space, 1898–99 [Fig. 10] the color planes in Heckel’s print are more radically abstracted and the motif is transposed from a symbolic realm to the unambiguous here and now. On a formal level, Heckel exaggerates the monumental, reductive features of Munch’s style to concentrate on the essence of his subject and intensify its impact. But at the same time he introduces a psychological immediacy, a direct encounter with the angular, pubescent model, who is undeniably an individual rather than a type.

The process of abstraction and reduction to essentials also features in Expressionist landscape paintings that relate closely to Munch, such as Schmidt-Rottluff's *Footpath*, 1911 [Fig.11], painted on his return from a summer trip to Norway, and Gabriele Münter's *The Blue Gable* [Cat. No. 11], executed the same year. It is hard to know whether the formal reduction and patterning results from direct contact with Munch or from the lessons that the Expressionist artists learnt in their printmaking concerning simplification and planar abstraction feeding back into their paintings. Indeed, this raises an important issue of affinity between Munch and the Expressionists. The open-ended approach they shared, their emphasis on the process of art making rather than a definitive end product, led to a free interchange between painting, drawing and print-making, and the dissolution of boundaries between the different media. Munch thus explored motifs like *Madonna* and *Evening. Melancholy I* in both prints and paintings [Cat. Nos. 49–51; 52–55]. He described how he continued to experiment with given motifs in his prints and “often use(d) prints as a means of drawing and handcoloring.”

Spectacular handcolored prints such as *Ashes I*, 1896 [Cat. No. 81], *Old Fisherman*, 1897 [Cat. No. 76], *Madonna*, 1897 [Cat. Nos. 49–50], *Angst*, 1896 [Cat. No. 32], and *The Scream*, 1895 [Fig. 12, Cat. No. 27], signal the porous boundary between painting and print-making in Munch's oeuvre. The Expressionist artist who comes closest to this approach is Ernst Ludwig Kirchner, who freely moves between painting, print-making, drawing and sculpture, creating thrilling sequences of work around a particular motif, such as the street or the artist's studio.
In *Towards the Forest*, 1897/1913–1915 (Cat. Nos. 56–59), Munch likewise creates in a single print sequence variation after variation, no two of which are precisely the same. This “one-off” approach to printmaking also attracted the Expressionists, who often favoured small, hand-printed editions that had the authenticity of unique works of art. Nolde adopted a similar approach when he experimented with color lithography in 1913, in print sequences such as *Young Danish Woman, Dancer* and *Young Couple*. Like Munch, Nolde uses overlapping, transparent layers of ink to create new colors with powerful expressive effects; many of these prints also have touches of handcoloring. The dramatic combination of black, orange, blue and red in the Museum of Fine Arts Boston’s version of Nolde’s *Young Danish Woman* (Cat. No. 63), for example, contrasts with the radiant blue and yellow luminosity of the impression from the Los Angeles County Museum of Art (Fig. 13, Cat. No. 60). These prints illustrate the artist’s central belief that “feeling through hues, be it joy, exultation, grief, reverie or other emotions, can be expressed through color.”

Although Nolde was undoubtedly inspired by Munch’s inventive color woodcuts and lithographs, Munch’s highly experimental variations of *Towards the Forest* from 1913–15, when he used two key blocks to create new symphonies of color, may be a response to Nolde’s lithographs. Be this as it may, the two artists share an underlying affinity of purpose and a common approach to expressive color variation.