



Plate III. Max Liebermann, *Women Plucking Geese*, 1872, Oil on Canvas, 118 x 172 cm. Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Alte Nationalgalerie.

Weimar Beginnings

Liebermann and Munkácsy

HENDRIK ZIEGLER

Scholarship has hitherto paid insufficient attention to Max Liebermann's years of study in Weimar between 1868 and 1873. This raises two central questions. First, why did the twenty-year-old, talented, financially independent art student from a wealthy family of Berlin entrepreneurs pursue his academic art training at the Grand Ducal Art School of Saxony, an unusual choice since it had been in existence only since 1860 and was located in the small Thuringian town of Weimar? Second, to what extent did the art of the Hungarian Mihály Munkácsy shape Liebermann's development toward the end of his years in Weimar? Liebermann's first large-format paintings, among them *Women Plucking Geese* (Plate III), which was finished in Weimar in 1871–72, can be compared to the paintings of the Hungarian artist in terms of the choice of subject matter, composition, and painterly realization.

In what follows I suggest that it was primarily the liberal teaching style consistently pursued at the Weimar Art School since its inception that prompted the young Liebermann to choose this institution quite deliberately over the older and more tradition-steeped academies in Düsseldorf, Munich, Berlin, and Karlsruhe. In addition, I shall attempt to place the influence of Munkácsy's art for Liebermann's early work into its proper perspective. As an art student, Liebermann studied the paintings *The Last Day of a Condemned Man* (1869) (Figure 2.1) and *Lint Makers* (1871) (Figure 2.2), the Hungarian art-

ist's first two international exhibition successes. He examined these paintings carefully and fully admired their subject matter, pictorial composition, arrangement and interweaving of figures, choice of color, and pronounced light-dark contrasts. Yet for all the noticeable borrowings, Liebermann simultaneously distanced himself in crucial—especially topical—aspects from his friend's paintings. While Munkácsy sought to arouse the beholder's sympathy for the Hungarians' patriotic feelings and desire for independence by means of a richly anecdotal, internal narrative that employed clearly articulated and obvious dramaturgical high points, Liebermann shifted the statement of his paintings into the sociopolitical realm. For example, his painting *Women Plucking Geese*, by employing a radical, paratactic composition devoid of a substantive center and dispensing largely with any sentimental appeal to the viewer, conveys a sober, objective vision of daily peasant life in the young German Empire. The rough daily labor is conceived and depicted as an act that oppresses and to some extent dulls human beings, yet invests them with dignity and honor and is—in religious terms—redemptive. As I will show, Munkácsy's art had merely a catalytic effect on Liebermann: it reinforced his decision to likewise make a political statement in his works from the very beginning, though one that was general and supranational in nature, far from the feverish patriotic elation in his own country following Germany's 1871 victory in the war against France. Most of all, however, the virtuosic compositional method of his Hungarian friend,



Figure 2.1. Mihály Munkácsy, *The Last Day of a Condemned Man*, first version, 1869, Oil on Wood, 137 x 195 cm. Formerly in the W. P. Wiltach Collection, Philadelphia Museum of Art. Current whereabouts unknown.

which was intent on infusing the pictorial subject with an emotional charge, drove Liebermann to counter such showy effects with a lapidary style that isolated and monumentalized the pictorial figures.

The Choice of Weimar as a Place of Study

It is generally assumed that the decision to study in Weimar came in part from Max Liebermann's strict and thrifty father. The latter, rather skeptical of the artistic impulses of his second-oldest son, supposedly insisted on training in a city that was not far from home, was little suited to a dissolute lifestyle, and had a low cost of living.¹ In addition, Max Liebermann supposedly decided on Weimar as a place to study in the spring of 1868—having completed a first year of apprenticeship in 1866–67 in the private studio of the Berlin animal and portrait painter Carl Steffeck—because he was attracted to the Belgian history painter Ferdinand Pauwels, who taught there.²

Indeed, Ferdinand Pauwels, active at the Weimar Art School between 1862 and 1872 as a professor of history painting, was Liebermann's primary teacher in Weimar. Occasionally the auxiliary teachers Paul Thumann and the Belgian

Charles Verlat filled in for Pauwels; they, too, were involved in young Max's training.³ As it was, the German public that was interested in art equated the Weimar Art School largely with Ferdinand Pauwels at the end of the 1860s: going to Weimar meant being trained by Pauwels, especially from the perspective of Berlin. The still-young Weimar institution had made a name for itself largely at the biennial exhibitions held by the Berlin Academy of Art. Participation in the Berlin exhibition by Ferdinand Pauwels and Stanislaus von Kalckreuth, as the director of the school and a landscape painter, had played a crucial role in spreading Weimar's reputation as a place for art education: in 1864, Pauwels had won the small gold medal in Berlin for his painting *The Return of The Exiles of Duke Alba* and the large gold medal in 1868 for his *Persecution of Protestants in the Netherlands*; moreover, that same year he and Kalckreuth had been elected full corresponding members of the Prussian Academy of Arts.⁴ Pauwels was admired not only for his razor-sharp, richly detailed realism with its precise reconstruction of the historical ambience, but also for his contrast-filled colorization that simultaneously worked with a smooth application of paint. His choice of themes, which were decidedly opposed to the Catholic Church and the Pope just prior to the intense political struggle that Chan-

cellor Otto von Bismarck waged after 1871 against the social influence of the Catholic Church (the so-called *Kulturkampf*), won him general recognition in the Protestant regions of Germany, and especially in Prussia.

However, Liebermann's decision on where to study was probably not made solely on the basis of Ferdinand Pauwels's fame or because of certain familial considerations: the schools in Düsseldorf or Karlsruhe would have been equally suited to providing training as a history painter in a city with a modest cost of living. Rather, the decisive factor that prompted Liebermann to continue his art training in the Thuringian residence town was probably the liberal, unorthodox structure of the curriculum at the Weimar Art School. It is also likely that Carl Steffek specifically advised Liebermann to go to the school in Weimar: Steffek was an artist who appreciated creative freedom and the individual promotion of talent, and who maintained, parallel to his academic teaching, a private studio in which he instructed art students at every

skill level and sometimes involved them in the completion of his own works.⁵

The Graduated Course of Training at German Art Academies

As I will show in detail in a separate section below, the teaching method that was practiced in Weimar was characterized by the rapid introduction of students to oil painting, avoiding excessive drawing studies on the basis of engravings and plaster casts of ancient works. The class structure was largely abolished and replaced by the individual supervision of the art students, and the nature and scope of the assignments were determined by the professor chosen by the student at the beginning of his studies and were not uniform for all students in a class.

The typical course of training an art student had to go through at a German university in the 1860s can be ascer-



Figure 2.2. Mihály Munkácsy, *Lint Makers*, 1871, Oil on Wood, 141.3 x 196 cm. Budapest, Hungarian National Gallery.

tained, for example, from the statutes that had been in force at the Royal Art Academy of the Prussian Rhine Provinces in Düsseldorf since 1831.⁶ It should be noted that the training at the other German art schools was organized in much the same way. The art school that was established in Karlsruhe in 1854 essentially adopted the Düsseldorf regulations.⁷ The Berlin Art Academy—which, after the death of its long-time director Johann Gottfried Schadow in 1850, went through a phase of stagnation in terms of its structure and personnel until a thorough reorganization was undertaken in 1875—also envisioned a training of art students that was graduated and organized into classes much as it was in Düsseldorf.⁸ Finally, the structure of the course of study was not much different at the art academies that had existed in Munich since 1808.⁹

The Düsseldorf Art Academy, founded in 1773 and under Prussian control only since 1819, envisaged in its statutes from the early 1830s a three-tiered course of study for its students, broken down into an elementary class, a preparatory class, and a subsequent master class. These three classes had to be passed through by all entering art students or *Eleven*. First, all artists-in-training had to attend the elementary class for up to two years, depending on their specific prior knowledge and skills. Having successfully passed a test of aptitude for the artist's profession, a student could enroll in the first academic stage of training, the preparatory class.

The real basic training of the student took place in the preparatory class in two stages over a period of four years. First, under the supervision of specially assigned teachers, the basic skills of drawing were acquired over two years by copying works of antiquity and learning from a live model. Next, the art student advanced to the so-called painting school (*Malschule*), where he was admitted into one of the specialized classes for history, genre, portrait, or landscape painting. It was only now, under the direction of a single professor, that students were introduced to oil painting and the composition of complex paintings. Finally, after the training in the painting school was completed as the final stage of the preparatory class, the student could advance to the master class or "class of the practicing *Eleven*," where he was allowed to work another five years in the academy in his own studio under the casual supervision of his teacher.

Friedrich Kallmorgen, who later founded the Grötzingen Artist Colony near Karlsruhe, gave an indication in his memoirs of the extent to which the long years of training in drawing in the elementary and preparatory class could impede an artist's self-development. Kallmorgen had begun in art training at the Düsseldorf Academy in 1875 at the age of nineteen:

I entered the elementary class of Professor Andreas Müller, a short, old, grumpy painter of saints. His brother Karl, also a painter of saints, ran the class in the Hall of Antiquity. The class was really very full, I barely found a seat and started copying again. Heads, hands, feet, nudes, and then figures after Andrea del Sarto, Holbein, Dürer—day after day the same copying, which I had learned long ago. There were students in the class who had been doing the same thing for 2–3 years. That was not stimulating. We were strictly warned against oil painting, nobody should venture to try it at home . . . I wanted to become a landscapist, what did I need antiquity for in the first place? Well, there is no other way, everything must take its regular course [it was said by the Academy].¹⁰

The rules of the Weimar Art School sought to distance themselves from these customary educational practices, which, though seen as tried and tested, featured the shortcomings Friedrich Kallmorgen described so incisively.

The Liberal Statutes of the Weimar Art School

The official statutes of the new Weimar Art School were adopted on 1 October 1860.¹¹ They were supplemented by decisions made at a conference of professors at the end of November and recorded in the first quarterly report of the school secretary.¹²

The most important and innovative achievement of the Weimar system lay in the almost complete abolition of the graduated, class-based basic training of the art students. Every professor was to follow his students from the beginning to the end of their training and be allowed to determine their course of study. In contrast to the Düsseldorf Academy, "Hall of Antiquity" and "Painting School" no longer referred to stages, but only practice rooms that could be used by every student on instructions from and under the supervision of his professor, individually and regardless of his semester. Only

beginners should be supervised during nude drawing, by a teacher hired for that specific purpose. Students were allowed to freely choose their teacher upon entering the academy. This is how it was put in the quarterly report of the school secretary: it was agreed

that every teacher at the art school can accept students admitted to the institution through a decision by the committee, and should then independently guide these students from the beginning to the end of their training. Thus, the Hall of Antiquity and the Painting School should be open to all teachers for their individual students, and only nude drawing is to be supervised by the painter [Johannes] Nießen, since he has been hired specifically for that purpose. It was also decided that it will be left to each individual student to choose his teacher.¹³

One must not underestimate the significance of this Weimar system. For the first time at a German art school, instruction in plaster, nude, and painting classes was not seen as a rigid curriculum that every art student had to pass through in a particular time frame; instead, the classes were merely considered aids that should be used by the students in accordance with their individual needs. Thus the student in Weimar usually made it through the plaster class much more quickly than his counterpart in Düsseldorf, for example, and was acquainted with oil painting already in the nude class. In this way, the structure of teaching at the Weimar Art School favored a conception of art that was committed less to drawing than to direct painterly realization, which was especially beneficial to genre and landscape painters, who could do without a lengthy study of antiquity and nudes.¹⁴

The educational practice at the Weimar Art School had a decisive influence on Liebermann's early turn to genre and landscape, as well as on his first approaches to a thick painting style. Moreover, the pedagogical principle in Weimar, namely to respond in a high degree to the individual needs of each art student, no doubt favored the talented, rapidly progressing Max Liebermann. To return to the starting point of my argument, Ferdinand Pauwels, who was popular with the students, would have guided Liebermann's training as envisaged by the Weimar statutes; however, his painting left no traces in Liebermann's early work in terms of painting style and choice of subject matter.¹⁵ With regard to the latter, the art of another

painter—that of the Hungarian Mihály Munkácsy—was far more significant for Max Liebermann's path to artistic independence.

Max Liebermann's Encounter with Mihály Munkácsy

Scholarship has been correct in repeatedly highlighting—even if for the most part in only cursory fashion—how important the art of Mihály Munkácsy was to the young Max Liebermann.¹⁶ Before we can look at the biographical and artistic points of intersection between the two artists, we must review Munkácsy's spectacular career.

Mihály Lieb was born in 1844 in the small Hungarian town of Munkács (today in Ukraine); beginning in 1848, the family, with official permission, called itself 'Munkácsy' after its place of residence.¹⁷ Born into modest circumstances and originally trained as a journeymen carpenter, Mihály received his first art training from the itinerant painter Elek Szamosy before moving on to the Budapest Academy in 1863 at his recommendation. A first modest commercial success allowed Munkácsy to spend six months at the Vienna Academy in 1865; in 1866 the young artist transferred to the academy in Munich. During a stay in Paris in October 1867, Munkácsy discovered the paintings of the Barbizon School and of Gustave Courbet. Back in Munich, Munkácsy, not least because of his experiences in Paris, fell briefly under the spell of Wilhelm Leibl. In October 1868, finally, Munkácsy resettled in Düsseldorf, where he would work above all under the supervision of the genre painter Ludwig Knaus, whom he admired. It was here that he created two paintings that brought him, after many years of hardship, his first international successes and made him famous overnight. In 1869, he received a gold medal at the Paris Salon for *The Last Day of a Condemned Man* (see Figure 2.1); he had already been able to sell the painting to an American millionaire even before the exhibit had opened.¹⁸ In 1871 he finished *Lint Makers* (see Figure 2.2), which he exhibited successfully at the Paris Salon in 1873, even if critics did not receive it with as much enthusiasm as they had *The Last Day of a Condemned Man*.¹⁹ It was also during his time in Düsseldorf that Munkácsy came to know Max Liebermann.

At the beginning of 1872, Munkácsy moved to Paris so that he could spend time working in Barbizon. But he increasingly incorporated into his repertoire scenes of high-society Paris, as well as religious subjects later. His marriage to the wealthy, widowed Baroness de Marches in August 1874 furthered his social advancement, enabling him to maintain his status as one of the celebrated Salon painters of Paris until the 1890s. He died in 1900 in the insane asylum of Bonn-Endenich.

The question that remains is how the first contacts between Munkácsy, who was living in Düsseldorf, and Liebermann, who was studying in Weimar, came about. In the spring of 1871, Stanislaus von Kalckreuth, the director of the Weimar Art School, took the initiative to appoint the Hungarian artist, whose success at the Paris Salon had made him known overnight. Kalckreuth saw Munkácsy as a successor to Ferdinand Pauwels, who was retiring from the faculty. Kalckreuth, who had good contacts at the Düsseldorf Academy since he had been trained there, travelled to the Rhenish city to conduct initial negotiations with Munkácsy.²⁰ He was accompanied by Theodor Hagen, who had come to Weimar from Düsseldorf only in January of the same year, and the student Max Liebermann. The young Liebermann probably traveled with the two professors at his own urging, most likely out of curiosity to meet the celebrated Hungarian artist, whose painting *Lint Makers* (see Figure 2.2) he was in fact able to study in Munkácsy's studio in Düsseldorf.²¹

The talks seem to have proceeded to the satisfaction of both sides, since Munkácsy came to Weimar as early as the fall of 1871 to have a look around and to pay an introductory visit to Grand Duke Carl Alexander. On this occasion Munkácsy also visited Liebermann: on 22 October, he congratulated him on his small painting *In the Studio*.²² The first meeting with Carl Alexander finally took place on 4 November on the Wartburg. In a diary entry, the grand duke recounted the positive impression that Munkácsy had immediately made on him.²³ In an entry dated 5 November, Carl Alexander noted that Munkácsy had given him his word of honor that he would move to Weimar in June 1872. But first wanting to finish a painting in Paris, he would not be able to come to Weimar for good, however, until January 1873.²⁴

Munkácsy did not keep his initial promise to join the Weimar Art School. He settled in Paris, probably as early as the end of 1871, definitively by the beginning of 1872.²⁵ Reminded once again of his agreement in the spring of 1872, probably by Theodor Hagen, who had traveled to Düsseldorf, Munkácsy conveyed his final decision verbally through Hagen and in writing to the grand duke that he would no longer be coming to Weimar.²⁶ The journal *Die Dioskuren* commented—not without glee—on Munkácsy's failed appointment and presented it as a failure of Stanislaus von Kalckreuth's personnel policy.²⁷ And Kalckreuth was in fact unable to fill the gap in the faculty left behind by Pauwels's move to Dresden. The art school in Weimar stumbled into a personnel crisis that eventually led to Kalckreuth's resignation from his post as director.²⁸ This unsatisfactory personnel situation is also likely to have been partly responsible for Liebermann's gradual withdrawal from Weimar in 1872–73.

Liebermann and Munkácsy had remained in touch after their brief meetings in Düsseldorf and Weimar. As will be discussed in greater detail below, in the late fall of 1871, Liebermann, immediately after his visit to Munkácsy's studio in Düsseldorf, had begun work on his first large-format painting, *Women Plucking Geese* (see Plate III).²⁹ The painting was finished in the spring of 1872, and at an exhibit in Hamburg in May Liebermann was able to sell it to an art dealer in that city for 1,000 talers. He used the proceeds of the sale to travel to Paris for fourteen days to examine paintings by Millet, Courbet, and Ribot at the Salon. In Paris he also met Munkácsy again.³⁰

Liebermann resettled in Paris for good at the end of November 1873. In an autobiographical account that he penned much later (9 June 1911) for Gustav Pauli, the director of Bremen's Kunsthalle, Liebermann wrote about the motives that prompted him to leave for Paris: "In the winter, at the end of November 1873 I went from Weimar to settle permanently in Paris, where I remained until 1878 . . . Munkácsy attracted me immensely, but even more so Troyon, Daubigny, Corot, and most of all, Millet."³¹ This retrospective statement by Liebermann about the importance of the art of Munkácsy and that of the school of Barbizon for his own artistic development seems to accurately capture the relationship between these two poles of influence: it was not the painting of Munkácsy in

particular, but above all the shared enthusiasm for the ideals of the artist colony in Barbizon—the study and representation of unspoiled nature and of the rural population living in and from it—that seems to have united the two artists once more for a while before their paths diverged for good.

The scholarship on the relationship between Munkácsy and Liebermann in the early 1870s has always been somewhat contradictory and inconsistent. Was Munkácsy Liebermann's teacher? Did the two go so far as to work on the same paintings? Or did Liebermann, three years younger, merely derive occasional pleasure and inspiration from the compositions of his older colleague and otherwise go his own way? I shall argue here that Munkácsy's painting was an important source of inspiration (alongside many others) for Liebermann between 1871 and 1874, in the sense, however, that in works in which Liebermann clearly engaged compositions by Munkácsy, he simultaneously distanced himself from them. Munkácsy's paintings were only aids for a better formulation and differentiation of his own compositional means and substantive accents. I will analyze three paintings of Liebermann from the first half of the 1870s to illustrate in greater detail Liebermann's peculiar dialectic relationship to the art of Munkácsy.

Liebermann's Relationship to the Art of Mihály Munkácsy: Appropriation and Distancing

At the beginning of Liebermann's artistic engagement with the art of Munkácsy stands his painting *Women Plucking Geese*, which he began in his Weimar studio in the fall of 1871 and finished in the spring of 1872 (Plate III). The painting can be seen as a reaction to Munkácsy's painting *Lint Makers* (see Figure 2.2), which Liebermann had been able to study during his visit to the Hungarian artist's Düsseldorf studio during Pentecost in 1871. Munkácsy had created his large-format, rectangular painting in Düsseldorf in 1870–71 under the impact of the Franco-Prussian War; however, Munkácsy explained in a letter that his intent had been to capture an episode from the Hungarian war of liberation that had occurred in his early childhood in 1848.³²

Inside a peasant's dwelling, at the head of a long table, sits an injured independence fighter who has returned home

and is recounting his experiences at the front lines, while women, children, and veterans who are preparing bandages for the Honvéd army listen with varying degrees of interest. Munkácsy has given his composition of rows of figures a visual as well as emotional center with a somewhat better-dressed young woman sitting in the front and slightly to the left of the middle of the painting. At the same time, she is designed as a counterpart to the injured fighter at the left edge of the scene, who forms the head of the sequence of figures. With folded arms and downcast eyes, the young woman has turned toward the returnee, who is lending emphasis to his account with an outstretched left arm. The real theme of the painting, its dramaturgical highpoint obvious to any beholder, is the emotional relationship that is unfolding between these two protagonists against the backdrop of the political events and leaves room for further interpretation. The other persons in the painting seems to have merely the function of spelling out in detail to the beholder the possible emotional states of the young woman in response to the account of her counterpart.³³

What aspects of Munkácsy's composition did Liebermann allow to flow into his painting *Women Plucking Geese*? What in the work of his older colleague inspired him, and what did he cast aside or seek to outdo? It must be noted that the motif itself was not Liebermann's invention. It goes back to a—now lost—drawing by Liebermann's friend Thomas Herbst, who had studied women plucking geese in his northern German birthplace. When Liebermann asked for the sheet as a model for a larger composition, Herbst readily gave it to him.³⁴ Liebermann thus by no means shied away from an eclectic manner of working, which began by drawing on various sources of inspiration to arrive at a pictorial solution all its own.

In a dark shed we see, spatially staggered, numerous elderly women sitting together at work: they are plucking the breast feathers of geese, which are needed to make feather quilts. As in Munkácsy's painting, the figures are richly contrasted against the darker background. The most glaring similarity to Munkácsy's painting, however, is found in the strong row-like arrangement of the figures. It is striking, though, that Liebermann has left the center of his composition unemphasized: only the heads of various women and the white of a

goose can be discerned in the semidarkness of the painting's background.

The peasant women are performing their work as though turned inward, each on her own. A moment of human interaction has been inserted in the left half of the picture merely in the form of the old worker, who with one hand is handing to one of the women a goose to be plucked. With the other hand he has grasped a bird that has just undergone the rude procedure to remove it. In the right half of the painting, a second, space-transcending relationship between some of the figures is suggested by a woman with a white kerchief who is turning toward her fellow workers further back in the room. Originally, Liebermann had even placed a young child in the picture's foreground, probably comparable to the one in Munkácsy's painting next to the basket with the bandage lint; in the end, however, Liebermann decided to over paint it.³⁵ This deletion is significant for Liebermann's distancing from the model he admired: everything that distracted from the depiction of work processes that were always the same and should be performed without sentimentality was to be avoided. The principle of strict row-like arrangement from Munkácsy's large composition, radicalized through a center that was kept substantively unemphasized, is one to which Liebermann remained loyal. One notes this conception in the canvases of rural workers that Liebermann painted immediately following *Women Plucking Geese*, for example in his two versions of *Women Cleaning Vegetables*.³⁶

With this objective, sober way of grasping the everyday working world of the simple rural population, Liebermann's painting clearly set itself apart from that of Munkácsy, whose approach was based entirely on the beholder's identification and empathy with the persons depicted. The means that Liebermann employed to arrive at such a radical simplification was clearly identified in a letter to his brother on 2 February 1872 that referred to *Women Plucking Geese*: the choice of a subject that was "mentally zero (*gedanklich gleich null ist*)."³⁷ It is obvious what Liebermann was trying to express proudly with this statement. While he claimed for his painting—which had already transcended the conventional format of a genre painting—the rank of a history painting, he desired that his *Women Plucking Geese* break through the canon of pictorial

subject matter that was usually chosen for history paintings: the model should not be subject matter—religiously, morally, or patriotically elevating—drawn from the sacred history of redemption, mythology, or immediate or recent contemporary history. Rather, the subject matter should be drawn from the reality of daily life that was neither unique nor especially remarkable or fascinating. This restraint and soberness in terms of content constitutes the essential difference from the art of Munkácsy. And yet both artists were intent on making a political statement. Munkácsy was explicitly recalling the bloody nineteenth-century Hungarian emancipation movement, a revolution that led to the partial sovereignty of his homeland within the imperial-royal dual monarchy existing since 1867. By contrast, Liebermann attempted to evoke a general reality of proto-industrial peasant life, which, though characterized by largely monotonous and heavy physical labor, did allow for an existence that was not yet deracinated and alienated. Perhaps the background of the Franco-Prussian War of 1870–71 reinforced Liebermann's determination to avoid any form of national-political statement, while similar military events prompted his Hungarian colleague to choose a patriotic subject matter.

Both artists employed a pronounced light-dark contrast in the two paintings in question. However, bringing out figures from a dark background achieved by an undercoat of asphalt-black was a phenomenon typical of the time and one that can be observed in numerous other artists of the same generation, from Franz von Lenbach and Hans Makart to Hans von Marées. The application of this painting technique offered the possibility of dramatizing what was depicted in the picture, especially when it came to acts that were inherently banal; most of all, however, it suggested a skill resembling that of the old masters, which could elevate the painting to the rank of a venerable history painting already sanctioned by the past. Both aspects were familiar to Munkácsy and Liebermann.³⁸

It appeared that after this first intensive and clarifying engagement with Munkácsy's important early compositions, Liebermann did not return to the art of his Hungarian friend until his first years in Paris. Above all, both artists intensively studied the rural life surrounding the artist village of Barbizon located at the edge of the Fontainebleau Forest, and

their shared enthusiasm for the art of Jean-François Millet could form a starting point for a renewed exchange. Just how intently the two men engaged the art of the school of Barbizon—each in his own way—may be seen, on the one hand, in Munkácsy's intimate forest interior *Women Carrying Brushwood* (1873) (Figure 2.3),³⁹ and, on the other hand, in Liebermann's 1874 painting *Peasant Woman Harvesting Potatoes* (Figure 2.4).⁴⁰ While the former was more strongly about the intimate, almost melancholic mood of the forest interior, the latter was orientated more clearly toward Millet's monumental figural style, which he sought to transfigure to the point of being heroic.

That there may have existed a particular closeness between the art of Liebermann and that of Munkácsy during this crea-



Figure 2.3. Mihály Munkácsy, *Women Carrying Brushwood*, 1873, Oil on Wood, 99.7 x 80.3 cm. Budapest, Hungarian National Gallery.



Figure 2.4. Max Liebermann, *Peasant Woman Harvesting Potatoes*, 1874, Oil on Canvas, 89.5 x 116.5 cm. Klassik Stiftung Weimar, Kunstsammlungen.

tive phase is suggested by a medium-sized landscape painting *Forest Interior with Woman Gathering Brushwood* (Figure 2.5). The Hungarian Lajos Végvári, an expert on Munkácsy and author of his oeuvre catalogue, assumes that in this painting the landscape was painted by Munkácsy, while Liebermann painted the woman carrying brushwood in the middle ground.⁴¹ In the first oeuvre catalog of Liebermann, written by Erich Hancke in 1914 (1923), the painting was accordingly assigned to both artists. Hancke even surmised that the Hamburg painting was created by then still young Hungarian László Paál, who was also working in Barbizon, and that his countryman Munkácsy signed it to make it more marketable. Finally, Liebermann may have inserted the small figure of the woman.⁴²

Hancke characterizes the relationship between Munkácsy and Liebermann during these years as that between teacher and student: "I was not able to arrive at a completely clear concept of his relationship to Munkácsy from the artist's often contradictory statements. It was probably for a time something like that of student and teacher."⁴³ However, the more recent scholarship on Liebermann has questioned this notion. In the 1979 *Max Liebermann in seiner Zeit* exhibition catalogue, Eberle assessed the relationship between the two artists as more likely loose and friendly; with respect to the Hamburg painting, he points out that Liebermann in his early period never painted "such a close combination of untouched nature and man."⁴⁴ And neither Boskamp nor Eberle included the painting in question in their 1994 and 1995 inventory catalogues of Liebermann's painterly oeuvre.⁴⁵



Figure 2.5. Mihály Munkácsy and Max Liebermann?, *Forest Interior With Woman Gathering Brushwood*, n.d., Oil on Canvas, 78 x 56 cm. Hamburg, Hamburger Kunsthalle.

However, Eberle does observe that several of Liebermann's paintings during these years could have been created only in dialogue with the works of his Hungarian friend, employing the latter's painterly and compositional style.⁴⁶ A pronounced patchy painting style, a color palette reduced largely to subdued tones of brown, green, and gray, and the concentration in terms of content on individual figures that are shown in a close emotional relationship to each other, were for Munkácsy typical means of depiction during these years. Liebermann could profit from them, even if he himself employed a painting style that placed more emphasis on the brushstroke, and continued to tend toward greater emotional soberness in the depiction of groups of people.

The combination of closeness and distance from Munkácsy's art during the early years in Paris can be read in Lieber-

mann's 1874 painting *Vegetable Vendor—Market Scene* (Figure 2.6).⁴⁷ The work shows a vegetable seller in conversation with an older woman facing her in front of the entrance to a wine shop. The anecdotal moment is strongly scaled back: one can hardly make out the topic of the conversation, whether it is merely about the goods on offer or some other, weightier theme. Eberle believes that the motif goes back to Munkácsy's painting *Farewell*, which is nearly equal in size and was created in Paris a little earlier (Figure 2.7).⁴⁸ The work by the Hungarian shows two middle-aged peasant women in front of the stove of a sparsely furnished kitchen: they have



Figure 2.6. Max Liebermann, *Vegetable Vendor—Market Scene*, 1874, Oil on Canvas, 84 x 59 cm. Cologne, Wallraf-Richarz Museum.

clasped each other's hands and are saying farewell. Although Munkácsy does suggest, by the position of the two women facing each other and their serious facial expressions, that this is probably a longer and possible painful farewell, he does not provide any other details in terms of content about the reasons for the imminent separation. It is precisely this emotional openness—which leaves room for speculation—that makes this painting so touching. This ambiguous narrative also constitutes the essential point of similarity with Liebermann's painting. However, the women lack all emotional expression. And it is this emotional restraint that clearly sets Liebermann apart from Munkácsy.

Comparing these two works, if they should indeed be seen as creatively connected, reveals once more that Munkácsy's works had merely a catalytic effect on Liebermann: the study of the art of his Hungarian friend made him realize more clearly his own ideas in terms of content that he wished to follow: a style of painting that was sociopolitically relevant but avoided any emotion and sentimentality. This very distance from the work of Munkácsy also reveals just how much the German artist had learned from his Hungarian artist friend: the courage to portray simple social milieus in richly contrasted light-and-dark painting.

During his Weimar years Max Liebermann had profited from the open structure of teaching at the art school that had been in existence since 1860. The institution did not stamp its imprint upon Liebermann; instead, it gave him the possibility to develop on his own and, among other things, to seek out contact with an artist who stood outside the academy, even if he was for a while talked about as a successor to one of the art professors: Mihály Munkácsy. The Weimar beginnings of Max Liebermann are thus characterized by the substantial absence of an engagement with what existed at his place of study itself. However, the city on the Ilm—and this speaks for the liberal atmosphere of study that existed there—offered the platform for his style of working, which was beginning to emerge: international in orientation and paying little heed to national affiliations.

Translated from the German by Thomas Dunlap.



Figure 2.7. Mihály Munkácsy, *Farewell*, 1872/73, Oil on Wood, 83 x 69.5 cm. Budapest, Hungarian National Gallery.

NOTES

1. Matthias Eberle, "Max Liebermann zwischen Tradition und Opposition," in Sigrid Achenbach and Matthias Eberle, eds., *Max Liebermann in seiner Zeit*, exhibition catalogue, Nationalgalerie Berlin, Haus der Kunst Munich, 1979–80 (Berlin, 1979), 11–40, here 16.
2. Walther Scheidig, *Die Weimarer Malerschule 1860–1900*, ed. Renate Müller-Krumbach (Leipzig, 1991), 91f.
3. Ibid., 238. In the "Index of teachers and students," Scheidig indicates that Liebermann was also enrolled with the Belgian Charles Verlat, who had been teaching at the school since 1869. Matthias Eberle, *Max Liebermann: Werkverzeichnis der Gemälde und Ölstudien*, 2 vols., I: 1865–1899 (Munich, 1995), 11, lists, alongside Pauwels and Verlat, also Paul Thumann as one of Liebermann's teachers in Weimar. Thumann—initially himself a student of Pauwels's—taught at the school from 1866 to 1870, mostly beginners; Verlat taught Liebermann only as a substitute for Pauwel.

4. Hendrik Ziegler, *Die Kunst der Weimarer Malerschule: Von der Pleinairmalerei zum Impressionismus* (Cologne, Weimar, and Vienna, 2001), 124.
5. On Carl Steffek: Irmgard Wirth, *Berliner Malerei im 19. Jahrhundert: Von der Zeit Friedrichs des Großen bis zum Ersten Weltkrieg* (Berlin, 1990), 416–418.
6. “Die Statuten der Düsseldorfer Kunstakademie: Zweck, Einrichtung und Lehrplan der Akademie,” in Rudolf Wiegmann, *Die königliche Kunst-Akademie zu Düsseldorf: Ihre Geschichte, Einrichtung und Wirksamkeit* (Düsseldorf, 1856); reprinted in Wend von Kalnein, ed., *Die Düsseldorfer Malerschule*, exhibition catalogue, Kunstmuseum Düsseldorf, Mathildenhöhe Darmstadt, 1979 (Düsseldorf, 1979), 209–214. See also Dieter Westecker, “Die Düsseldorfer Kunstakademie im 19. Jahrhundert,” in Heinz Althöfer, ed., *Das 19. Jahrhundert und die Restaurierung: Beiträge zur Malerei, Maltechnik und Konservierung* (Munich, 1987), 36–39.
7. Adolf von Oechelhaeuser, *Geschichte der Großherzoglich Badischen Akademie der bildenden Künste: Festschrift zum 50jährigen Stiftungsfest* (Karlsruhe, 1904), 6ff.; Ekkehard Mai, “Die Kunstakademie Karlsruhe und die deutsche Künstlerausbildung im 19. Jahrhundert,” in Sigmar Holsten, ed., *Kunst in der Residenz: Karlsruhe zwischen Rokoko und Moderne*, exhibition catalogue, Staatliche Kunsthalle Karlsruhe, 1990 (Heidelberg, 1990), 38–53.
8. *Zur Jubelfeier 1696–1896* (Berlin, 1896), esp. xxvii–xxxviii; Ludwig Pallat, Richard Schöne, *Generaldirektor der Königlichen Museen zu Berlin: Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der preußischen Kunstverwaltung 1872–1905* (Berlin, 1959), 53–57; Nicolaas Teeuwisse, *Vom Salon zur Secession: Berliner Kunstleben zwischen Tradition und Aufbruch zur Moderne 1871–1900* (Berlin, 1986), 29–37.
9. “Revidierte Verfassung der Akademie vom 14. August 1846,” in Eugen von Stieler, *Die königliche Akademie der Bildenden Künste zu München: Festschrift zur Hundertjahrfeier* (Munich, 1909), 108–114; excerpts also in Heidi C. Ebertshäuser, ed., *Kunsturteile des 19. Jahrhundert Zeugnisse: Manifeste, Kritiken zur Münchner Malerei* (Munich, 1983), 100–103. For a general discussion of the Munich academy see Thomas Zacharias, ed., *Münchener Akademie: Tradition und Widerspruch. 175 Jahre Kunstakademie München* (Munich, 1985).
10. Friedrich Kallmorgen, “Leben und Streben: Lebenserinnerungen von Friedrich Kallmorgen 1856–1924,” ed. and slightly rev. Hans Knab and Gisela Nehring, unpublished typescript, Karlsruhe 1985–86, 29; quoted in Irene Eder, “Die Zeichnungen von Friedrich Kallmorgen,” in Helga Walter Dressler and Sylvia Bieber, eds., *Mit Kallmorgen unterwegs: Zeichnungen und Gemälde von 1880 bis 1920*, exhibition catalogue, Städtische Galerie im Prinz Max Palais Karlsruhe, 1991–92 (Karlsruhe, 1992), 17–23, here 17, note 3.
11. They did not appear in printed form until 1862: Otto von Schorn, *Über die Einrichtung und den Stand der Sächsischen Kunstschule zu Weimar* (Weimar, 1862); excerpts also in Achim Preiß and Klaus-Jürgen Winkler, *Weimar Konzepte: Die Kunst- und Bauhochschule 1860–1995* (Weimar, 1996), 63f., document 5; see Ziegler, *Die Kunst der Weimarer Malerschule*, 33, note 101.
12. Preiß and Winkler, *Weimar Konzepte*, 62f., document 4; see Ziegler, *Die Kunst der Weimarer Malerschule*, 34, note 105.
13. Preiß and Winkler, *Weimar Konzepte*, 62.
14. Ziegler, *Die Kunst der Weimarer Malerschule*, 34f. and 58–64.
15. On Pauwels’s popularity among the art students see Scheidig, *Die Weimarer Malerschule*, 77.
16. Lajos Végvári, “Munkácsy’s Gemälde *Die Scharpiezupferinnen*,” *Acta historiae artium Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 2 (1955): 271–298, here 272; Lajos Végvári, ed., *Katalog der Gemälde und Zeichnungen Mihály Munkácsy’s*, trans. Tilda Alpari (Budapest, 1959), 9; Eberle, “Max Liebermann zwischen Tradition und Opposition,” 26; Anna Szinyei Merse, “Neue Bestrebungen: Realismus, Naturalismus und Freilichtmalerei bei den Ungarn in München,” in *Ungarn und die Münchner Schule. Spitzenwerke aus der Ungarischen Nationalgalerie 1860 bis 1900*, exhibition catalogue, Bayerische Vereinsbank Munich, 1995–96 (Munich, 1995), 11–47, here 29; Eberle, I, 42.
17. On the following see Zsuzsanna Bakó, “An Irregular Biography,” in *Munkácsy: A Nagyvilágban in the World*, exhibition catalogue, Magyar Nemzeti Galériabau Budapest, 2005 (Budapest, 2005), 13–30; Imre Czeglédi, *Munkácsy ösei és rokonsága* [The Ancestors and Relatives of Mihály Munkácsy] (Békéscsaba, 2001) (=A Békés Megyei múzeumok közleményei, vol. 22); *Munkácsy et le Grand-Duché de Luxembourg*, exhibition catalogue, Musée national d’histoire et d’art Luxembourg, 1996 (Luxembourg, 1996), 29–35 (detailed but not always reliable timeline by Joseph Kohnen); *Budapest 1869–1914: Modernité hongroise et peinture européenne*, exhibition catalogue, Musée des Beaux-Arts Dijon, 1995 (Paris, 1995), 110; *Ungarn und die Münchner Schule*, exhibition catalogue (Munich 1995/96), 130; Géza Perneczky, *Munkácsy* (Budapest, 1970); Lajos Végvári, *Mihály Munkácsy élete és művei* [Mihály Munkácsy: Life and Works] (Budapest, 1958).
18. Mihály Munkácsy, *The Last Day of the Condemned Man*, first version, 1869, oil on wood, 137 x 195 cm, formerly Philadelphia, Museum of Art, present whereabouts unknown; see Végvári, *Katalog der Gemälde*, 45, No. 104, and Plate XXXV; on model studies, in part with the use of photographs, see exhibition catalogue *Budapest 1869–1914*, 111, Nos. 26a and b. A first replica—today no longer extant—was made in 1870 for the English collector Forbes; see vgl. Végvári, *Katalog der Gemälde*, 45, No. 106. In 1878, Munkácsy, with the collaboration of his students, used a photograph of the first version that was sold to the United States to create a second version, which is today in Budapest (oil on canvas, 119.3 x 170.5 cm, Budapest, Hungarian National Gallery, Inv. No.: NG 1509; Végvári, *Katalog der Gemälde*, 53, No. 283). The two versions differ only in minor details: for example, the figures entering on the left background of the original seem to have been left out in the second version. Another version, this one limited to the figure of the condemned and a guard, is today also in the museum in Budapest; see Végvári, “Munkácsy’s Gemälde *Die Scharpiezupferinnen*,” 272. On the inventory of the National Gallery in Budapest see most recently Zsuzsanna Bakó, *Munkácsy Mihály és Pál László: Vezető a Magyar Nemzeti Galéria állandó kiállításához* [Mihály Munkácsy and László Pál: Guide Through the Permanent Collection of the Hungarian National Gallery] (Budapest, 1992).
19. Mihály Munkácsy, *Lint Makers*, 1871, oil on wood, 141.3 x 196 cm, Budapest, Hungarian National Gallery; see Végvári, “Munkácsy’s Gemälde *Die Scharpiezupferinnen*”; Végvári, *Katalog der Gemälde*, 46, No. 131, and plate XLI; Perneczky, *Munkácsy*, No. VII; on two model studies, in part based on photographs, see exhibition catalogue *Budapest 1869–1914*, 112, Nos. 27 and 28.
20. Scheidig, *Die Weimarer Malerschule*, 78; Eberle, I, 14.
21. Eberle, I, 14.
22. Eberle, I, 14; on Liebermann’s painting, see Eberle, I, 40, No. 1871/6.
23. Thüringisches Hauptstaatsarchiv Weimar, HA A XXVI, No. 1968, Diary Carl Alexander, entry of 4 November 1871: “Kalkreuth alors se rendit à Düsseldorf où le talent de Munkácsy le frappa. Je ne le connais moi que par une photographie de l’un de ses tableaux, des gens faisant de la charpie et écoutant des récits d’un blessé les uns avec grande émotion, les autres avec doutes, d’autres avec indifférence. L’artiste même me plu par un air bon rappelant Harrach. Son type est slave, il ne parle l’allemand qu’avec une certaine difficulté. Après le dîner on se réunit de nouveau dans la chambre de St. Elisabeth et l’on resta longtemps à causer autour de la tasse de thé.” See Ziegler, *Die Kunst der Weimarer Malerschule*, 49, note 170.
24. Thüringisches Hauptstaatsarchiv Weimar, HA A XXVI, No. 1968, diary of Carl Alexander, entry of 5 November 1871: “[J]e fis appeler Munkácsy. Le résultat de

- notre conversation fut sa parole d'honneur qu'il viendra à Weimar en Juin prochain si Dieu permet et je vis en voulant (?) terminer un tableau à Paris avant de transporter ses pénates complètement à Weimar, ce qu'il croit ne pouvoir effectuer définitivement qu'en Janvier dans un an si Dieu permet et si je vis." See Ziegler, *Die Kunst der Weimarer Malerschule*, 50, 172.
25. *Ungarn und die Münchner Schule*, exhibition catalogue, Munich 1995/96, 130; Bakó, "An Irregular Biography," 20, note 29; Farkas Zoltan and Végvári Lajos, eds., *Munkácsy Mihály válogatott levelei* [Selected Letters of Mihály Munkácsy] (Budapest, 1952), letter 52.
 26. Bakó, "An Irregular Biography," 21, note 31; Farkas Zoltan and Végvári Lajos, eds., *Munkácsy Mihály válogatott levelei*, letter 55. An excerpt from this letter in German translation is found in F. Walther Ilges, *M. von Munkacsy* (Bielefeld and Leipzig, 1899) (=Velhagen & Klasing Künstler-Nomographien, Vol. 40), 48: letter of Munkácsy to Baroness de Marches, [Paris, May 1872?]: "Jetzt ist wiederum ein anderer Freund von mir hier, der in Weimar Professor ist. Also mit ihm und durch einen vernünftigen Brief habe ich mich von Weimar vollständig und glücklich losgemacht; es ist aber auch nötig gewesen, weil es unmöglich gewesen wäre, hinzugehen." ("Another friend of mine is now here, who is professor in Weimar. And so with him and by means of a sensible letter I have completed and happily dissociated myself from Weimar; it was necessary, however, because it would have been impossible to go there.")
 27. Criticism of the failure to appoint Munkácsy: *Die Dioskuren* 17, no. 29 (21 June 1872): 230f.; see Scheidig, *Die Weimarer Malerschule*, 78, note 118; Ziegler, *Die Kunst der Weimarer Malerschule*, 51, note 183.
 28. Ziegler, *Die Kunst der Weimarer Malerschule*, 48–58.
 29. Max Liebermann, *Women Plucking Geese*, 1872, oil on canvas, 118 x 172 cm, Berlin, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, Preußischer Kulturbesitz, Alte Nationalgalerie, Inv.-No.: 668; Katrin Boskamp, *Studien zum Frühwerk von Max Liebermann: Mit einem Katalog der Gemälde und Ölstudien von 1866–1889* (Hildesheim and Zurich, 1994) (=Studien zur Kunstgeschichte, Vol. 88), 12, 37, 120ff., Cat. 15, ill. 6; Eberle, I, 41–44, No. 1872/2.
 30. Eberle, I, 14.
 31. Autobiographical account to Gustav Pauli, 9 June 1911, Kunsthalle Bremen, Archiv; here quoted from Eberle, I, 14. Eberle, "Max Liebermann zwischen Tradition und Opposition," 29, note 51, gives the text with a slightly different wording; he is quoting from Max Liebermann, *Die Phantasie in der Malerei: Schriften und Reden*, edited with an introduction by Günter Busch (Frankfurt a. M., 1978), 30: "Munkácsy zog mich mächtig an, aber mehr noch taten es die Troyon, Daubigny, Corot, vor allem Millet, und der Schärmerei für letzteren, den ich für den epochemachendsten der Maler halte, bin ich bis heute treu geblieben." ("Munkácsy attracted me tremendously, but even more so Troyon, Daubigny, Corot, especially Millet, and to this day I have remained loyal to my enthusiasm for the latter, whom I consider the most epochal painter.")
 32. "[T]he subject goes back to the Hungarian revolution of 1848. The title will read: *Those Who Remained at Home*, that is women, children, the injured, and so on, who are making bandages for the injured, and a wounded soldier who is recounted his experiences during the campaign." See J. Kapo I, "Düsseldorfi levelek Munkácsytól – Munkácsyról" [letters from Düsseldorf from and about Munkácsy], in *Művészettörténeti Évkönyv* (Budapest, 1952), 158, quoted here from Végvári "Munkácsys Gemälde *Die Scharpiezupferinnen*," 287, note 53; see also Végvári *Katalog der Gemälde*, 9 and Bakó, "An Irregular Biography," 20.
 33. Végvári did not shy away from characterizing the painting as the communist national icon of Hungary (Végvári, "Munkácsys Gemälde *Die Scharpiezupferinnen*," 288, 289, and 292). (For example, we read on page 292: "The painting is a thoroughly democratic composition, one that illustrates the unity of the revolutionary nation, its true state and the varying degrees of its consciousness, without 'heroes', without broad and pathos-filled gestures, while at the same time forging it into an inseparable unity through the identity of feeling.")
 34. Scheidig, *Die Weimarer Malerschule*, 92; Eberle, I, 42.
 35. Eberle, I, 42.
 36. Max Liebermann, *Women Cleaning Vegetables (Women Canning)*, first version, 1872–73, oil on wood, 45 x 60 cm, private collection, Winterthur; Boskamp, *Studien zum Frühwerk*, 125ff., Cat. 36, ill. 50 (Boskamp confuses the first with the second version); Eberle, I, 51f., No. 1872/10. Since the painting was accidentally sold twice at the Antwerp Salon, Liebermann had to repeat the painting the following year to satisfy the second buyer; see Eberle, I, 64f., No. 1873/15.
 37. Eberle, I, 51f., No. 1872/10.
 38. On asphalt painting in Munkácsy see Zsuzsa Wittmann, "Bitumen: Munkácsy's Dark Priming Substance. Material examination Results," in exhibition catalogue *Munkácsy: A Nagyvilágban in the World*, 149–151.
 39. Mihály Munkácsy, *Woman Carrying Brushwood*, 1873, oil on wood, 99.7 x 80.3 cm, Budapest, Hungarian National Gallery, Inv.-No.: NG 4647; Végvári, *Katalog der Gemälde*, 48, No. 183; Max Liebermann in *seiner Zeit*, exhibition catalogue (Berlin/Munich, 1979/80), 380, No. 136.
 40. Max Liebermann, *Potato Harvest*, 1874, oil on canvas, 89.5 x 116.5 cm, Weimar, Klassik Stiftung Weimar, Kunstsammlungen; Boskamp, *Studien zum Frühwerk*, Cat. 50; Eberle, I, 77, No. 1874/11.
 41. Mihály Munkácsy and Max Liebermann, *Forest Interior with Woman Gathering Brushwood* (landscape by Munkácsy, the woman by Liebermann?), oil on canvas, 78 x 56 cm, Hamburg, Kunsthalle, Inv.-No. 1330; see Végvári, *Katalog der Gemälde*, 52, No. 278, and Plate CII; exhibition catalogue (Berlin/Munich, 1979/80), 382, No. 137; Scheidig, *Die Weimarer Malerschule*, ill. 103. The catalogue of the collection of the Hamburg Kunsthalle of 1969 still put forth the opinion that the woman was painted by Liebermann; in the more recent catalogue of 1993, the painting appears only as a work by Munkácsy; see Eva Maria Krafft and Karl-Wolfgang Schümann, eds., *Katalog der Meister des 19. Jahrhunderts in der Hamburger Kunsthalle* (Hamburg, 1969), 234, No. 1330; Jenns Eric Howoldt and Andreas Baur, eds., *Die Gemälde des 19. Jahrhunderts in der Hamburger Kunsthalle* (Hamburg, 1993), 146.
 42. Erich Hancke, *Max Liebermann: Sein Leben und seine Werke* (Berlin, 1914; 2nd ed. 1923), 84.
 43. Ibid.
 44. *Max Liebermann in seiner Zeit*, exhibition catalogue (Berlin/Munich, 1979/80), 382, No. 137.
 45. See Boskamp, *Studien zum Frühwerk*, and Eberle, *Max Liebermann*, vol. 1.
 46. Eberle, I, 70, No. 1874/2, and 73, No. 1874/4.
 47. Max Liebermann, *Vegetable Vendor – Market Scene*, 1874, oil on canvas, 84 x 59 cm, Cologne, Wallraf-Richartz-Museum, Inv.-No.: WRM 2341; Boskamp, *Studien zum Frühwerk*, Cat. 43, Ill. 66; Eberle, I, 70, No. 1874/2 (Illustration 71 is mirror-reversed).
 48. Mihály Munkácsy, *Farewell*, 1872–73, oil on wood, 83 x 69.5 cm, Budapest, Hungarian National Gallery, Inv.-No.: NG 1873/191; Végvári, *Katalog der Gemälde*, 47, No. 156 and Plate LII.