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Abstract of Dissertation
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This dissertation studies the reception of Nordic painting in nineteenth-century France. I argue that the notion of so-called Scandinavian Art in nineteenth-century French literature, commonly referred to as *l’art scandinave, l’école scandinave, or les écoles scandinaves*, and encompassing artists coming from the countries that in the present day are known as Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland, developed during the second half of the nineteenth century, and solidified in usage and meaning at the end of the 1880s. The following study presents a chronological account of how French writings on Nordic painting changed during this period, beginning with an introductory survey of eighteenth and early nineteenth-century writings on Nordic art and literature, and ending with the Universal Exposition of 1889.
I dedicate this dissertation to my parents,
Kent and Susan Parkinson,
for their endless love and support.
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Maurice Hamel's and Charles Ponsonailhe's descriptions of the Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, and Finnish artists at the Universal Exposition of 1889 aptly summarize the common tendencies used by French art critics and historians used to describe painting coming from the Nordic countries at the end of the nineteenth century. Nordic artists, as Hamel evokes, were frequently perceived as students of nature. Born in the wilderness of the North, and to a certain degree isolated from the rest of European civilization, these artists practiced a manner of naïve art, largely untouched by the legacy of the grandes écoles and their grands maîtres. By consequence, as Hamel suggests, painting in the Nordic countries tends to be lacking in finesse, even crude, but nonetheless sincere, observant, and by consequence, poetic. For many critics writing in the latter half of the nineteenth century, the demonstration of an artist’s independence from tradition – Classical or otherwise – was

---

2 Ponsonailhe, “L’Art étranger à l’Exposition Universelle,” first article, 91
largely seen in a positive light. Twenty years earlier, the naturalist critic Émile Zola had defended the young Edouard Manet in similar terms of honesty and nativity, writing “While others rack their brains to invent a new Death of Caesar or Socrates Drinking the Hemlock, he quietly arranges a few objects and a few people in the corner of his studio and begins to paint, analyzing the whole with care. I repeat, he is a simple analyst.”

Hamel, himself a defender of Manet’s legacy after the artist’s recent death, describes Nordic artists using similar terms of praise, emphasizing their lack of pretension, their rootedness in their immediate surroundings, though the environment they inhabit might be a bit more exotic than the Paris faubourgs.

Seemingly in contrast to Hamel’s quote, Ponsonailhe does not praise Nordic artists for their impendence, but rather for being “filles de l’art français.” Naiveté might be an inborn quality, but it could also be taught, as the spread of Manet, Gustave Courbet, and Jule Bastien-Lepage throughout Europe – the latter artistic being particularly influential to Nordic artists – had demonstrated. Plein-air painting, like the scientific method, spread not by brute force but by the compulsion of truth. Many French critics admired Nordic artists because they were, with regards to artistic education, blank slates ready to receive the benefits of the French education. Therefore, as Ponsonailhe suggests, to praise Nordic art was to praise France as well.

Finally, the artists of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland were described as part of a common group, Scandinavia, exhibiting similar artistic tendencies, including those described above. Beginning in the late nineteenth century and through the early twentieth

---

century, it became commonplace – an institutional fact – to label the artistic styles of these four countries as codependents. The 1924 catalogue for the Musée du Luxembourg, Paris’ museum of contemporary artists, lists artists including the Dane Peder-Severin Krøyer, the Finn Albert Edelfelt, the Swede Bruno Liljefors, and the Norwegian Frits Thualow, under the section label “Les Écoles Scanidnaves,” while André Michel’s *Histoire de l’Art* – one of the first modern art historical survey texts – entwines the history of the four aforementioned Nordic countries together under the title, “L’Art dans les Pays Scandinaves.”

Of course, despite commonalities in language and history between the countries, there was no a necessary force that necessitated that the artists of these four countries should be grouped together, working in a style of the same ilk called *l’art scandinave*. In terms of geopolitics, Scandinavia did not exist, as the Nordic countries had not been a unified since the time of the Kalmar Union arose in the fourteenth century, and until 1917 Finland was a duchy ruled by Russia. In terms of language, throughout much of the nineteenth century, the terms *les école scandinave* or *l’art scandinave* were not utilized by French writers, who instead grouped all of Northern Europe together with the term *les écoles du Nord*, or attached the Nordic countries to the better-known traditions of Rembrandt or Dürer, thereby ascribing these artists to *l’école hollandaise* or *l’école allemande*.

The purpose of this dissertation is to study the reception of Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, and Finnish art in France through the lens of French writing to explain how it came to be known as Scandinavian, including the core traits described above summarized

as sincerity, mysteriousness, and as an ally of France. First and foremost, then, I do not aim to create a historical study of Nordic artists working in France, but rather analyze the history of French texts on Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian painting, with a focus on tracing changes in terminology used to describe and categorize these artists according to aesthetic, political, or racial groups. Of course, in studying the writings of French critics and historians engaged with Nordic artists, this dissertation does concern itself with surveying the activities of Nordic artists in France, but always with the aim of understanding how their works related to their French audiences, including what artworks could have been seen, in what context they were presented, and how their value was signified by French institutions such as through exhibition awards, state acquisitions, and journalistic or historical attention. Of central concern is to understand how internal influences effected writings on Nordic artists. Such internal influences include, for example, the influence of art critics and writers on one another to create movements, such as Romanticism or Naturalism; changes within modes of curation and viewership in art, such as seen within the grouping of artists together by nation rather than simply by name at the Universal Expositions; and the effects of France's political relationship with other European countries, such as Germany and Denmark, and the sometimes powerful ways in which geopolitical conflicts would reverberate through the world of art.

**Methodology**

The scope of this dissertation configures to the years between 1855 and 1889. Although not a strict study of the internal structure of the Universal Expositions in Paris, my study argues that the Universal Expositions both had a strong influence on asserting the
language and ideology of nationalism onto art criticism, and that study and comparison of responses to the Universal Expositions is a practical means of understanding major shifts in the reception of Nordic art during the nineteenth century. 1855 marks the occasion of the first Universal Exposition in Paris, serving as a benchmark that art critics frequently reference as well as one of the first major exhibitions of Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists on French soil. The Universal Expositions of 1867 and 1878 mark the final exposition of the Second Empire and the first exposition of the Third Republic. The Franco-Prussian War and Siege of Paris in 1870-71, which brought an end to the Second Empire and resulted in the loss of Alsace and Lorraine, would have a powerful effect on how writers looked at France’s place within Europe, the changes of which can be seen in the reviews of Nordic artists at the Universal Expositions of 1867 and 1878. Finally, the Universal Exposition of 1889 marks not only the first national organization of a Finnish exhibition of painting in France, thereby marking the inclusion of Finland among les écoles scandinaves, but would also host a centennial exhibition of French art spanning from David to Manet, helping solidify a narrative of the history of art in France and its influence on Europe.

Most of my research material stems from art critical reviews of these four expositions, of which four to six reviews of the Danish, Swedish, Norwegian – and when appropriate, Finnish – exhibitions from major Parisian newspapers such as Gazette des Beaux-Arts and Le Temps are analyzed and compared. Focus is frequently given to the Nordic artists who received medals the exposition juries or whose artworks were purchased by the French state after the event given the tendency for critical evaluations to align with – and perhaps even elucidate – the evaluations of the juries. As such, Salon
awards, state acquisitions, and private gallery exhibitions are traced between the expositions both as a means of studying the reception and travel of Nordic artworks in France but also as a means of tracking down reviews. Although this dissertation does not aim to study the reception of Nordic art across Europe, and therefore excludes analysis of exhibitions outside of France, exceptions are made for the Vienna International Exposition of 1873 and the Copenhagen Exhibitions of Nordic and French Art in 1888 given their extensive analysis by French critics.

The French critics and authors I focus on in my research are chosen in accordance to their continued interest in Nordic art across time or due to their involvement within French institutions, thereby building linear and lateral context. Although many of the writers studied are less well-known, including Jules Claretie, Auguste Geffroy, and Paul Mantz, the study of their writings on Nordic art, culture, and politics, across time sheds light on the way in which issues internal to French art history and criticism shaped the reception of Nordic painting in France.

Finally, in addition to surveying French journals and books, correspondence between Nordic artists and their French counterparts have been analyzed for the sake of building case studies. Much of this research has been done through comparative archival research over the course of two years at libraries and institutes including the Archives Nationales in Saint-Denis, France, the National Library and National Gallery of Norway, the National Library of Sweden, and the Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek in Copenhagen, Denmark. This research has given me broad insight into both the interrelationship between Nordic and French artists, writers, and institutional actors across the nineteenth century, much of which falls outside the scope of this current dissertation, and has provided me with a clear
understanding of the historical materials available for engaging in a transnational reception history of Nordic art.

Review of Recent Literature

In the early twentieth century, scholarship on the history of Nordic art was largely confined to the art historians writing in Sweden and Norway, including Jens Thiis and Georg Nordensvan. In 1880s and 1890s, a small number of American art historians, including Kirk Varnedoe and his students Michelle Facos and Patricia Berman, have brought renewed interest in the work of Nordic avant-garde painters of the mid-to-late-nineteenth century. The impetus for current scholarship on Nordic art can be traced back to the Brooklyn Museum’s highly successful exhibition, *Northern Light* (1982), which first brought Nordic artists in the nineteenth century to the public’s attention through its presentation of National Romantic paintings. The ensuing scholarship on Nordic art was largely revisionist in its thinking, attempting to shed light on the neglected artistic and social histories of Norway, Denmark, Sweden, and Finland, while putting forward an alternative to traditionally francocentric accounts of modernism via historical models that were both decentering and pan-European.
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My own research follows in the wake of the historiographical concerns of earlier scholars but takes on as its focus of study the critical reception and visual presentation of Nordic artists in France rather than in their own native countries, and in doing so seeks to analyze how dominant cultural attitudes toward Northern Europe helped solidify interpretations of Nordic art as peripheral, exotic, or derivative. The first major attempt in the United States to pose the question of Nordic artists’ reception in France took place within the *Northern Light* exhibition catalogue through Emily Braun’s, “Scandinavian Artists and the French Critics.” In this article, Braun surveys critics’ responses to Nordic painters during the Universal Expositions of 1878 and 1889 to demonstrate two major points: first, that French attitudes toward Nordic painting shifted during end of the nineteenth century, changing from dismissal to praise; second, that this change in attitude was as much a reflection of a French self-image as it was of the national identities of Nordic painters. 

According to Braun, although French critics praised the expression of national character in Nordic artworks, they located the artist’s means of expression – technically pleinairist, which critics asserted the artists had learned the ateliers of French artists – as firm evidence that the French modern school of painting reigned supreme in Europe.

Since Braun’s article, little scholarly effort in the United States has been directed toward further studying the history of Nordic artists in France. However, several recent
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12 There are two notable exceptions to this: Siulolovao Challons-Lipton’s book on Scandinavian artists training under French academic artist Léon Bonnat, and an article by Michelle Facos, Thor Mednick, and Janet Rauscher comparing coverage of the 1889 Paris Universal Exposition in French, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, and Finnish newspapers. See: Siulolovao Challons-Lipton’s, *The Scandinavian Pupils of the Atelier Bonnat* (Lewiston:
efforts by French scholars have paved the pathway for future research. Annie Scottez-De Wambrechies and Franck Claustrat’s exhibition, *Echappées nordiques: Les maîtres scandinaves et finlandais en France - 1870 / 1914* (Palais des Beaux-Arts, Lille, 2008 - 2009) presented the first major public presentation and examination of the biographies and social histories of Nordic artists living and exhibiting in France. In tangent with this exhibition, Claustrat has produced several essays tracing the canonization of Nordic art as a distinct national school of painting by French art critics. The most recent and comprehensive publication on this topic is Vibeke Röstorp *Le Mythe du Retour: Les Artistes Scandinaves en France de 1899 à 1908* (2013), notable for its exhaustive documentation of the exhibition patterns of Swedish and Norwegian expatriate artists in France. A unifying feature found in the writings of both Röstorp and Claustrat is a desire to shine a critical light on contemporary portrayals of nineteenth-century Nordic art by examining their roots within writings around the turn of the century in France and the Nordic countries. According to Claustrat, the common trend found in contemporary literature on nineteenth-century art to associate Nordic and Baltic painting with the themes of light and mystery – visible in the similitude of book and exhibition titles such as *Northern Light, The Mystic North, Lumières du Nord*, and *Nordiskt Sekelskifte: The Light of the North* – can be traced back to the fin-de-
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siècle writings of Maurice Gandolphe and Charles Ponsonailhe. Röstorp, on the other hand, sheds light on the processes of historical revisionism, examining the way in which Swedish and Norwegian historians have selectively bracketed nineteenth-century Swedish and Norwegian art in order to fit it within nationalist narratives of artistic germination. As the title of her book suggests, *Le Mythe du Retour: Les Artistes Scandinaves en France de 1899 à 1908*, Röstorp describes the commonly accepted account that Swedish and Norwegian artists ‘returned home’ from abroad in the 1890s to develop a national style of art as a historical construction, dismantling this claim by quantitatively demonstrating the continued importance of France and its salons for the careers of Scandinavian expatriate artists as well as the plurality of non-nationalistic themes favored by artists.

In the writings of Braun, Röstorp, and Claustrat, the relationship between art and national identity has been demonstrated to be not only a recurrent issue for critics and historians since the beginnings of modern Nordic painting, but that definitions of Nordic identity have been dependent upon time, location, and politics. The purpose of my current research is to expand the still-limited understanding of the history of Nordic artists in France through an approach that utilizes both historiographical and sociological methods of research. On the one hand, my research expands the research of Braun and Claustrat by studying the responses of French art critics to Nordic artists across the Universal Expositions, examining what meanings were assigned to Nordic art, tracing how meanings persisted or fluctuated across time, and interpreting them within the context of the history of French ideas concerning internationalism, geopolitics, and aesthetics. My research

---

16 Röstorp, ill. 96, p. 200
contributes to these discussions by offering a more substantial survey of critical responses to Nordic artists beginning with the first major exhibition of foreign artworks at the Universal Exposition of 1855 and tracing a lineage of responses up to the turn of the century.

On the other hand, my research expands upon the methodological approach of Röstorp by broadly surveying the careers of Scandinavian painters in France, including academic painters, bourgeois naturalists, and many other otherwise popular artists who have now generally “fallen out” of art history. While Röstorp focuses on documenting the presence of Nordic artists at the Parisian salons and exhibition societies, my project’s methodology places emphasis on analyzing the relationship between Nordic artists and the French gallery system as a means of marketing their art to a French audience. By examining Nordic art from the standpoint of its historical reception, including when and which artists were popular in France and what meanings were attached to them, not only do we gain a better understanding of the history of French taste regarding foreign artists, but in doing so we have the chance to place contemporary canons of Nordic art in a critical light.

**Summary of Claims**

My dissertation claims that notion of Scandinavian Art in nineteenth-century French literature, alternatively referred to as *l’art scandinave, l’école scandinave, or les écoles scandinaves*, and encompassing artists coming from the countries that in the present day are known as Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland, developed across the second half of the nineteenth century, and solidified in usage and meaning at the end of the 1880s. Through my research, I point to three main developments within French society that
motivate this change. First, around the start of the Second Empire, comes the reorganization of the study of painting within France around the concept of the nation. This is seen visually and conceptually through the Universal Expositions, which organized the display art according to an artist’s place of birth, as well as in the rise of naturalist art theory, which sought not only to critique, but to explain art through social or biological models. For the first time, the French public was presented a work of art as Danish, Norwegian, or Swedish, which not only reinforced nationalist modes of thinking, but also tended present Denmark, Sweden, and Norway as part of an interrelated group. Second is the legacy of Preromantic and Romantic literature from the turn of the eighteenth century, which introduced French audiences to Norse Mythology as well as to a more limited degree contemporary literature and poetry, and often so with a folkish or nationalist mode of interpretation. Comparative studies of literature according to nation developed earlier than comparative studies of art, the latter retaining strong ties to Classical Universalist ideals even through the mid-nineteenth-century.

Third, although both the visual reorganization of art around the notion of nationality and the lateral influence of the idea of national literature were influential in shifting critics towards nationalized and racialized manners of writing about artists from the Nordic countries, neither of these directly led to the rise of the terms *l’art* or *l’école scandinave*. Instead, for the idea of Scandinavian Art to arise within French writing, it had to be presented as a counterpoint to Germany. In other words, usage of *l’école scandinave* has roots in political Scandinavism, which attempted to create a unified Nordic front against the perceived power of the German Confederation led by Austria and Prussia. The first references to *l’école scandinave* occur in the 1860s as a critique of German Unification,
and particularly the Denmark’s wars with Prussia and Austria in 1848 and 1864 over Denmark’s ethnically Germano-Danish duchies bordering Prussia. References to \textit{l'école scandinave} and \textit{l'art scandinave} begin to flourish after the Franco-Prussian War, in which France would lose Alsace and Lorraine to the now-unified German Empire, and are frequently intertwined with criticisms of Germany. The idea of the good Scandinavian race and culture became a counterpoint to the vilified German race and culture, and French writers frequently sought to align the values of Scandinavia with those of France. The rise of a colony of young Nordic landscape and genre painters to France in the early 1870s to study plein-air painting techniques provided a major impetus for the usage of the terms \textit{l'école} and \textit{l'art scandinave} to flourish, whose artists embodied the idea of both pan-Scandinavian unity along with Franco-Scandinavian amity.
Chapter I: A Short History of Ideas about the North Before 1850
Introduction

La France ne se doutait pas, avant 1855, qu'il existait une école scandinave, et elle ne fut pas peu surprise en 1867 d'apprendre que le roi de Suède était lui-même un peintre de paysage. Cette école, née d'hier, subit naturellement un peu les influences étrangères, et on y trouve deux courants très marqués : l'un a pour point de départ Dusseldorf, où beaucoup d'artistes suédois ont fait leurs études et où quelques-uns sont même domiciliés, l'autre prend son mot d'ordre à Paris. En 1855, les peintres suédois semblaient former à peu d'exceptions près une simple annexe de l'école Allemande, mais en 1867 l'influence contraire commençait à prévaloir, et nous avons pu voir, à l'exposition de Vienne en 1873, que la facture épinglée de Dusseldorf était à peu près abandonnée en Suède, où les artistes ont adopté une touche plus grasse, plus nourrie, et en rapport avec leurs efforts du côté de la couleur et de l'effet.\footnote{René Menard, \textit{Le Monde Vu Par Les Artistes: géographie artistique}, (Paris: Librairie Ch. Delagrave, 1881), 779}

René Ménard, 1878

René Ménard’s statement in 1878 that France had no idea that an \textit{école scandinave} existed before 1855 is in many ways typical of French criticism of Nordic art during the second half of the nineteenth century. Paintings by Nordic artists were approached with an air of novelty, even exoticism, by French critics, who oftentimes expressed surprise that any artists existed at all in the far northern countries of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway.

In contrast to Ménard's statement, not only had schools of art existed for over one hundred years in Sweden and Denmark, but there had been a many fruitful exchanges between French and Nordic artists throughout the eighteenth century. Both the Royal Swedish Drawing Academy (founded in 1735) and the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts (founded in 1754) were modeled upon the École des Beaux-Arts in France. Though French artists had been working in the Nordic countries since the seventeenth-century, both the Danish and Swedish Academies also became
important intercessors for propagating Franco-Nordic artistic exchanges. In addition to mirroring the hierarchical structure and classicizing aesthetic philosophy of the French Academic system, both academies also welcomed French artists into their ranks as professors. Arguably the most influential is the French painter Guillaume Taraval who, after first establishing his École de dessin in Stockholm, would become an important figure in the establishment of the city's Royal Academy. In Denmark, the French sculptor Jacques-François-Joseph Saly, who had had executed an equestrian portrait of king Frederik V, was one of the Copenhagen Academy's first professors, and soon afterwards became the school's director.

It might be argued that one of the reasons for certain French critics’ ignorance of Nordic art prior to 1855 is that national identities played only a minor role in critical evaluations before this period. The Universal Exposition of 1855 was the first major exhibition in France to arrange artists according to their place of birth, and it was only three years prior, in 1852, that organizers of the annual Salon began to record the nationalities of participating artists in the exhibition catalogues. Thus, before the 1850s, there were little means for knowing what exactly what an artist’s place of origin without already having prior knowledge on the subject. In fact, few publications existed on the history of Swedish, Danish, or Norwegian artists
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available in French before the mid-nineteenth-century. The one notable exception to this dearth of literature is *Notices sur la littérature et les beaux-arts en Suède*, by the Swedish author Marianne Ehrenström. Recounting the history of Swedish art and architecture back to the eleventh century, along with numerous pages dedicated to the history of Swedish poetry and literature, insofar as the book was remarkable for its time, it was also an anomaly.20

Thus, given the lack of recorded information on Nordic artists in France, one might attribute Ménard’s statement that few people in France had ever heard of so-called Scandinavian art before 1855 to simple ignorance. Nonetheless, Ménard’s ignorance is in part willful. Interest in Nordic culture and literature – and above all poetry – had proliferated in France throughout the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, particularly through the publications of francophone Swiss writers Paul Henri Mallet and Germaine De Staël. Appearing at the same time as France’s vogue for Ossian, Mallet’s translations of the Eddas – epic poems and narratives compiled in medieval Iceland recounting the battles of Nordic gods and heroes – sparked a vogue for the mysterious ancient gods of the North. Several decades later, Romantic interest in Eddic literature would further stimulated by De Staël’s accounts of the melancholy landscapes of Scandinavia alongside her accounts of contemporary National Romantic Danish poetry in her book, *De l’Allemagne* (1813). In other words, throughout nineteenth-century, one of the common tropes
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in French literature on the Nordic countries, is that the Nordic countries are in themselves unknowable. The Romantic aura of mystery would continue to play an important role in the French reception of Nordic art until the end of the decade, even after substantial artist colonies had established themselves in Paris and its environs in the 1870s.

This chapter broadly outlines the history of French interest in Nordic art and literature during the Enlightenment and through Romanticism to elucidate how this history would influence the reception of Nordic art during the Second Empire and Third Republic. The chapter begins by demonstrating that Nordic—specifically Swedish—artists a long history of contact with France, and that the final decades of the Ancien Régime saw the development of substantial foreign colonies of artists working in France, including Alexander Roslin, Adolf Wertmüller, and Peter Adolf Hall. During this period, universalist interpretations of art within French art criticism reigned. The execution of the Beautiful Ideal remained the primary goal of the artist, and the expression of nationality was understood as contrary to the universal ideal, and in fact, a sign of an artist’s ignorance.

Enlightenment political theorist Montesquieu’s writings on the influence of climates on diversity of European cultures and forms of government would produce a major change on how Nordic artists were perceived, aligning cold climate with the spirit of independence. Pre-Romantic and Romantic fascination in Northern European writings – including British, Scandinavian, and Scottish literature and poetry – would spark a radical revaluation of the role of nationality in artistic expression, realigning national expression with artistic authenticity. As the ideology
of Romanticism flourished in France throughout the early nineteenth-century, the interest in the folkish, foreign, and exotic would merge with a new generation of Nordic artists working in France, including Johan Gørbtiz and Per Wlckenberg, who began to shift towards National Romantic landscape imagery in their own artworks. Although many of the artists of this earlier generation would later be forgotten about by French writers later in the nineteenth century, many of the characteristics associated with Nordic art during this time – including poeticism, mysteriousness, and independence – would have long-lasting effects on critics’ writings of Nordic art throughout the nineteenth century.

A Brief History of Scandinavian Artists in France in the Eighteenth Century

The eighteenth century was an important époque for establishing social and institutional connections between French and Nordic artists. Of the groups of Nordic artists living or working in France during the eighteenth-century, Swedish artists would be the largest and would have the most enduring reputations. Two of the first and most important Swedish artists to achieve success in France would be the enameller Charles Boit (1622-1727) and the pastel portraitist Gustav Lundberg (1695-1786). Perhaps the most significant aspect of their careers would be that both would be elected as members of France’s Royal Academy of Fine Arts, beginning with Boit in 1717 and followed Lundberg in 1741, who painted a portrait of Boucher for his reception piece [Fig. 1.1]. That two Protestant artists could be elected to a Royal institute at a time when Catholic France had officially rescinded religious toleration was significant, and in the case of Boit’s election to the Academy,
a letter of permission was issued directly from the Regent.\(^{21}\) While religious status may have largely presented more of a formal rather than a practical obstacle for Scandinavians working in France,\(^{22}\) Boit’s and Lundberg’s ascent to official recognition at the Academy set a major precedent for the oncoming generation of Swedish artists working in France, allowing them to join the Academy, receive commissions from the Royal family, and even receive government salaries.\(^{23}\)

Two younger Swedish artists who would directly benefit from the Academic privileges granted to their predecessors would be Alexander Roslin (1718-1793), and Adolf Wertmüller (1751-1811). Citing the prior exceptions had been made for Boit and Lundberg, the Royal Academy admitted both artists as well, beginning with Roslin in 1753 and Wertmüller in 1784.\(^{24}\) Arguably the most significant Swedish artists working in France during the eighteenth-century, both artists were given the unique privilege of paintings portraits of the royal family, including for example Wertmüller’s portrait of Queen Marie Antoinette [Fig. 1.2]. Roslin enjoyed great success as one of the most highly regarded portraitists residing in France, painting numerous foreign dignitaries and French aristocrats. Though Roslin would make

---


\(^{24}\) Magnus Olausson, “Alexander Roslin: An Artist’s Career,” 34
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France his adoptive homeland, settling there permanently until his death, so sought after were his portraits that he also made trips outside of France to paint for royal courts, such as his two year-long sojourn in Russia, where he painted the portrait of the Maldavian Princess Zoie Ghika [Fig. 1.3].

Several other Swedish painters from the same era would also be admitted to the Royal Academy: the miniaturist Peter Adolf Hall (1739-1793), the history painter Jonas Hoffman, and the classical sculptor Johan Tobias Sergel. Neither Hoffman nor Sergel, however, achieved the full title of académicien, instead only being granted the intermediary title of agréé, and left France shortly afterwards. The Royal Academy, however, was not the sole route for Swedish artists pursuing careers in France, and many other Swedish artists achieved considerable success through various means. Along with Hall, two other largely forgotten miniaturists, Carl Gustaf Klingstedt (1657-1734) and Niclas Lafrensen (1737-1807, who took the name Lavreince while living in France), were quite popular with French collectors in their own time as well as later during the nineteenth century, who filled their
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25 Magnus Olausson, “Alexander Roslin: An Artist’s Career,” 40
26 Sources do not provide a clear picture of whether Hall made it beyond the stage of agréé or not, though if he did not, it did not dissuade him from remaining in France. Marianne Ehrenström writes that Sergel was not admitted as a full member due to the medium of his reception piece, Othryades the Spartan, Dying (c. 1779). The work, presently at the Louvre, is in terracotta, when only marble was considered acceptable as a reception piece. Philippe de Chennevières remarks, however, that in 1803 Sergel was recognized as an associé étranger by the Institut National de France, which had absorbed the Academy during the First Republic. Marianne Ehrenström, Beaux-Arts, vol. 3 of Notices sur la littérature et les beaux-arts en Suède (Stockholm: Imprimerie Eckstein, 1826), p. 47. Chennevières, “Les artistes étrangers en France, I, Sergell,” 124. Réau, Histoire de l’Expansion de l’Art Français, vol III, 89. Frédéric Villot, Hall: Celebre Miniaturiste du XVIII Siècle: Sa Vie, Ses oeuvres, Sa Correspondance (Paris: Librairie Française et Etrangère, 1867), 10-11
curiosity cabinets with these artists’ small, fashionable works [Fig. 1.4].27 Finally, Paris was not the only place where a foreign artist could establish a career in France. Wertmüller, for example, made took shorter residences in Bordeaux and Lyon while the portraitist Per Eberhard Cogell (1734-1812), settled in Lyon permanently as the director of the city’s Academy of Fine Arts.28

Several Danish and Norwegian artists also traveled to Paris during the eighteenth century. Included in this group were number of significant Danish and Germano-Danish engravers, notably Johan Frederik Clemens, Georg Haas, and Johan Georg Preisler.29 Haas and Preisler, both born to established families of engravers, would be admitted into the Royal Academy in the years 1782 and 1787, respectively. Much like their Swedish counterparts, Danish artists would also have to seek Royal permission to enter the Academy on account of their status as Protestants. Yet by the 1780s the reception of non-Catholics into the Academy had already become a common practice, and as the correspondence of the Director General of the King’s Buildings, Comte d’Angeviller, concerning the status of these artists make clear, the primary concern of the Academy was the artist’s adherence to aesthetic standards and the rules of reception set up by the organization. Religion

was an afterthought.\textsuperscript{30} Though a foreigner might come to fear the bureaucracy of the Academy, its Catholicity was of little concern.

Other noteworthy Nordic artists working in France during the Ancien Régime include the medal artist Michael Bøg – one of the few Norwegians working in France – the miniaturist Cornelius Høyer (1741-1804), the sculptors Johannes Wiedwelt (1731-1802) and Andreas Weidenhaupt (1738-1805), and the painters Jens Petersen Lund (1731-1794) and Jens Juel (1745-1802). Some Danish artists, like Juel, followed a path akin to Roslin’s, coming to Paris to study portraiture, and painting both French and Danish sitters in the fashionable style of the time, as seen in his portrait of the provincial aristocrat Jeanne Myèvre [Fig. 1.5]\textsuperscript{31} Many of these artists, however, including Juel resided in France for rather brief durations before traveling to other countries such as Denmark, England or to Italy. As a consequence, in both the literature of the nineteenth-century and today, there has been a tendency to either downplay their relationship to France, or, given their itinerant careers, omit them from historical accounts altogether. In either case, the desire to compartmentalize painters according to national histories tends to lead to the erasure of institutional and informal social networks that provided links between artists working across cities such as Rome, Copenhagen, and Paris. Moreover, such networks also facilitated what knowledge critics and writers had of artists beyond their own borders; for the one Danish artist who undoubtedly had the most


enduring legacy in France was also one who never worked or trained in France: Bertel Thorvaldsen.

Coming from a younger generation of classicizing artists, the sculptor Bertel Thorvaldsen’s work rose to prominence in France during the time of the First Empire rather than the Ancien Régime. Thorvaldsen’s work was highly regarded by Napoleon I, who commissioned the artist to sculpt such highly propagandistic pieces such as the *Alexander Frieze* (1813) for the Palazzo del Quirinale, the vacated papal palace intended by Napoleon to be his family’s residence during the Imperial rule of Rome. Thorvaldsen also executed a number of much more intimate works for Napoleon’s family, including the death mask of Letizia Bonaparte, who was living in Rome. A further sign of the artist’s deep regard within France would be the number of official honors bestowed upon him even after the fall of the First Empire, which includes being elected a foreign member of the Academy of Fine Arts in Paris in 1823 being given title of Officer in the Legion of Honor in 1831.

Formal reception by the Academy was thus a significant goal for many Scandinavian artists desiring successful careers in France; and while several of these Scandinavian *académiciens* subsequently partook in long or even permanent residencies in France, the common notion that a Scandinavian artists has “gone
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33 Jørnæs, 76
34 Quatremère de Quincy to Bertel Thorvaldsen, 21 February, 1823, m29A, nr. 14; Le Grand Chancelier de l’ordre de la Légion d’honneur, [Étienne] MacDonald to Bertel Thorvaldsen, 31 May, 1831, m29 II, nr. 53; The Thorvaldsens Museum Archives, Copenhagen, Denmark. arkivet.thorvaldsensmuseum.dk. Accessed 3/21/2016
native” in attaching herself to an institution outside of her country of birth, is to a large degree a myth since it was not uncommon for artists to be members of two or even more European Academies. The most important reason for becoming an académicien in France was that it brought to the artist a series of benefits an artist would otherwise not have access to, including the ability to exhibit work at the annual Salon, the chance for a government stipend and commissions, and, perhaps most significantly, it placed artists with a firmly established circle of fellow artists. Within and outside of the Academy, one of the common features seen in Scandinavian artists working in France is the reliance upon social networks that facilitated their international and oftentimes itinerant careers. Professional circles formed around established artists such as Alexander Roslin, the French painter Jospeh-Marie Vien (1716-1809), and the German engraver Johann Georg Wille (1715-1808), who listed themselves as protectors of both Danish and Swedish artists entering training through the Academy. Outside the Academy, international masonic societies in Paris such as the Réunion des Étrangers and Amis Réunis, also played an important role in facilitating the careers of Scandinavians in Paris by acting as gathering grounds for city’s cosmopolitan elites, including diplomats,

35 For example, Hall was a member of the Academies in Paris and Stockholm, and Roslin was a member of the Academies in Florence, Stockholm, and Paris, while Sergel, according to Philippe de Chennevières, was a member of the Academies in Rome, Vienna Berlin, Copenhagen, Munich. Magnus Olausson, “Alexander Roslin: An Artist’s Career,” 23; Vienne, “Nicolas Lafrensen, Peintre à la Gouache,” 282; Ph. de Chennevières, “Les artistes étrangers en France, I, Sergell” Revue Universelle des Arts, tome 3 (Bruxelles: A. Labroue et Ci, Imp, 1856), 124
merchants, and artists including Presiler and Hall. Personal relationships also formed an essential part of an artist’s network of support. Roslin married the French pastel painter and fellow *académicien* Marie-Suzanne Giroust. Hall, who also married into a French family, counted amongst his circle of friends Swedish ambassador (and husband of Germaine De Staël) Erik Magnus Staël von Holstein, painter Hubert Robert, fellow miniaturist Lafrensen, and Vigée Le Brun. Likewise, Thorvaldsen became close friends with Horace Vernet while working in Rome, each of whom commemorated the other through portraits in their respective artistic media [Fig. 1.6 & 1.7].

Such international networks were extremely important for artists, especially for those working abroad, since they were relied upon for various forms of professional and financial support. For us, they shed further light on the way the pursuit of cosmopolitanism, rather than the expression of national ideals, served as a major ideal for both Scandinavian artists working in France during the eighteenth-century and the patrons and institutions that supported them. The styles in which they worked as well, from Roslin’s classically infused Rococo portraits to
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38 Villot, *Hall*, 13
39 Villot, in his biography of Hall, in particular stressed the importance of protectors for foreign artists. Such persons, oftentimes independently wealthy aristocrats or persons of high rank, would facilitate the care of the artist during his or her life, and even after his or her death. According to Villot, for example, upon the demise of Hall, the Ambassador Staël purchased a large number of paintings and drawings from the artist’s collection. This would have undoubtedly been as means for providing aid to his the artist’s widow and children, as the sale of artworks to provide support for a deceased artist’s family was a common practice in both the eighteenth and nineteenth century. Villot, *Hall*, 20
Lafrensen’s titillating miniature *galantes*, are expressive of a desire to assimilate to public taste and in which questions of origin or identity remain largely outside factors of aesthetic evaluation.

At the same time, art criticism, which was also developing in the eighteenth century, tended to be dismissive toward the value of national character in the arts. Diderot’s comments on Roslin’s paintings at the Salon of 1865 offer a striking example of how an artist’s national origins could be seen as having a detrimental effect on his artistic aptitude.

Diderot’s chauvinism towards Roslin stems from a disdain for provincialism, which was akin to ignorance. For the chief organizer of the *Encyclopédie*, any genuine form of knowledge would have to be universal, not local in origin, though at the heart of
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this universe sat Rome and Athens. Thus, an artist had to venture either to the
wellspring of Antique knowledge or travel to a grand metropolis such as Paris,
where the accumulation and competition of great thinkers provided ample fodder
for the refinement of taste and the erasure of regional ignorance. 41

Nordic Art after the Fall of the Ancien Régime

As for the community of Scandinavian miniaturists, engravers, and portrait
painters who had accumulated in France throughout the century, their legacy would
be subject to the vicissitudes of taste and politics. At the start of the Revolution,
many of the artists who had established careers in France, including Hall, Lafrensen,
and Wertmüller, and Cogell would flee France. The artists, many of who were
supported by and helped indulge the vanities of the now defunct Ancien Régime
feared the increasing suspicion of the National Convention towards those
potentially harboring Royalist sentiments.42 Roslin was one of the few who stayed in
France, but lacking patrons, his career came almost completely to a halt before he
passed away in 1893.43 As for the others, Lafrensen returned to Gothenburg, Hall
died in exile in Liège, and Wertmüller fled to Madrid before immigrating to the
United States.44 Having initially sought refuge in Switzerland, only Cogell returned
to his adopted city of Lyon, where he continued to teach drawing until the end of his
life.45

41 Diderot, “Salon de 1765,” 319
43 Magnus Olausson, “Roslin’s Europe,” 20-21
44 Lundberg, Lavreince : Nicolas Lafrensen, peintre suédois, 1737-1807, x.
45 Bonnamen, “Pierre Cogell: Un Roslin Provincial” 220
For numerous decades there was little written about the Scandinavian artists active in France during the eighteenth century; yet there would be revitalization in many of the eighteenth-century Swedish artists as both the Rococo Revival came under way in France and as a historical interest in foreign schools of artist began to grow around the mid nineteenth-century. The vogue for miniatures and conversation pieces crafted by the *petits-maîtres* of the prior century in particular led to a major demand for works by Lafrensen and Hall, some of whose works could sell for more than 50,000 francs. At the same time, a number of publications authored by French writers concerning eighteenth-century Swedish artists also appeared, including Charles-Philippe de Chennèvieres multi-article series on Roslin, Wertmüller, and Sergel written for the *Revue Universelle des Arts* in 1856 and 1857. Chennèvieres, at that time an administrator at the Louvre, would go on to be the Conservateur Adjoint and later Curator of the Musée du Luxembourg, where he would be an influential force in promoting the internationalization of the museum’s collection.

---

46 One of the few, but important, examples includes Marianne Ehrenström, *Notices sur la littérature et les beaux arts en Suède* in 1826, a French-language book written by a Swedish author.


proclaimed, is not only to assert their own value as artists, but in doing so, to simultaneously recognize France’s long held status as a place of universal assembly for artists and a testament to the “national genius” of the country.50

Yet it was precisely the increasingly popular notion that each nation possessed a particular character expressed through art, in combination with the belief that the genius of France was to be essentially syncretic, which left the situation of this group of expatriate artists in an ambivalent position; for if imitation flattered French art history, it was nonetheless detrimental to the development of a national ethos. Towards the century’s end, Henry de Chennevières (1858-1946), Philippe de Chennevières’ son, would also write a historical account on France’s eighteenth-century Swedish immigrants artists. Yet the younger Chennevières, reflecting the century’s changing artistic ideals, would end his article with a lament for the negative impact French influence would have upon Sweden:

Ainsi, l’École suédoise fut au ton de Paris pendant tout le siècle. Avec un peu de malice on pourrait peut-être reprocher à Tessin de n’être pas resté dans le vrai du caractère national en forçant les esprits calmes de son pays à une éducation française par trop extérieure et spirituelle, mais si l’on prend garde au nombre d’élèves étrangers inscrits à l’Académie du Louvre, et ce nombre était d’un dixième on aurait mauvaise grâce à ne pas lui passer sa belle ardeur française si bien mise en pratique, même au détriment de l’art du Nord. Il y a, en effet, chez les natures scandinaves, un besoin du style reposé, fort inconnu de l’idéal du Paris d’alors, et les deux seuls vrais artistes de la Suède et du Danemarck, Sergell et Thorvaldsen, durent se grandir à Rome pour devenir eux-mêmes.51
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Though flattering to France’s own history, what Chennevières and other critics after 1855 increasing sought was a genuinely national character in art – a kind of art that could only be produced through the education and indeed natural environment of the artist’s own land of origin. A decade later, the young writer Maurice Gandolphe (1874-1947) would echo these ideals in writing his (possibly the first in France) historical account of art in Sweden. Scandinavian art would not begin until artists like Hockert, Gandolphe argues, freed themselves from foreign influence and painted their own land, their own people, and in their own style. In Gandolphe’s understanding of the history of art as in essence process of national-self realization, Roslin and Hall were then aesthetically French and historically pre-Scandinavian. It was, at least on the face of it, a reversal of the values of Enlightenment values Diderot had expressed more than a century earlier. Gandolphe, like Chennevières, believed only in art’s local or provincial character, which was exactly the fault he found in Roslin: “on cherche des Goths, on trouve des Parisiens toujours.”

Reviving the Goths: Imaginative Geographies of the North and Debates around the Diversity of Tastes

The introduction of la Scandinavie to eighteenth-century French audiences as distinct geographical region with its own unique culture and literature – indeed, one worthy of academic study – would to a large degree come through the writings of Swiss author Paul-Henri Mallet. Mallet made significant contributions to the proliferation of ideas about Scandinavia through two widely-read volumes of on Scandinavian history,

Introduction à L’histoire du Danemarch où l’on traite de la religion, des moeurs, des lois, et des usages des anciens Danois (1755), and Monuments de la mythologie et de la poésie des Celtes, et particulièrement des anciens Scandinaves (1756). With regards to the reception history of Scandinavian art and literature within the rest of Europe, Mallet’s most important contribution was to translate the Eddas in French – the first translation of the Eddas into another language other than Latin – which would then spread to a wide European audience through printing of his books in France, England Italy, and Russia.  

Mallet had been invited to Copenhagen in 1752 to serve as a professor of French literature at the Collège royal de langue et belles-lettres françaises, inaugurated just one year earlier. There in Denmark, Mallet worked under the guidance and protection of two Danish counts born in northern Germany, Lord Chamberlain Andreas Gottlieb Moltke and Foreign Minister J.H.E Bernstorff. Both Moltke and Bernstorff had strong personal inclinations toward French culture, decorating their estates in works by contemporary French artists, and would help in the establishment of the Royal Academy just two years later. The Danish court’s interest in Mallet, however, extended beyond their desire to import knowledge of fashionable French aesthetics into Copenhagen. Denmark’s reputation amongst the Enlightenment intelligentsia of Europe had suffered greatly in the eighteenth century due to its autocratic system of government. Particularly damaging in this regard had been the wide publication – and translation into French – of Robert Molesworth’s An Account of Denmark (1693), in which the English author leveled a volatile critique of the
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Danish government. The pomp of the Danish court, Molesworth contended, was a slavish impression of French absolutism, whereas England – which had just overthrown King James II in 1688 during the Glorious Revolution – was the only free country of Europe.55

Soon after his arrival, Mallet’s role would shift from literary professor to foreign propagandist. In 1753, Moltke requested Mallet to devote his time to writing a book – in French, and therefore intended for French audiences – rectifying the country’s image. The book was to be completed just a two years later, in time for King Frederick V’s birthday in 1755.56 Mallet, however, did not set out to write a direct defense of contemporary politics in Denmark; rather, he sought to demonstrate the indefatigable genius of Denmark by compiling a history of its earliest inhabitants.57 As one of the means of countering the now prevalent equation between despotism and Denmark, Mallet sought to reverse the common ideological division between Mediterranean Civilization and Northern Barbarism via a historiographical reading of the fall of the Roman Empire.58 According to Mallet, modern democratic principles had been born in the North. Northern European tribes had liberated Continental Europe from a decadent Roman Empire, replacing despotism with the values of equality and order.59
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Revisionist readings of Classical authors such as Plato, Tacitus, and Jordanes had been a popular means of advancing nationalist histories amongst European scholars, and in particular with regard to the national origin of the Gothic and German tribes of Antiquity. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Swedish Gothicists such as Olaus Rudbeck and brothers Johannes and Olaus Magnus had argued that the Gothic tribes who defeated the Romans were in fact Swedish, making a connection between the term Goth and the Swedish region of Gotland. These authors thereby sought to elevate the historical importance of Scandinavia to the same level as Rome. While disagreeing with many of the extravagant claims of these Gothicist authors, such as Rudbeck’s desire to locate Atlantis in Sweden, Mallet took their identification of the invading tribes who conquered Rome with the Scandinavian people and situated it within a context more pertinent to contemporary Enlightenment audiences: the origins of laws and governments in Europe. Anti-absolutists in France looked to accounts of the social organization of the Goths and Germans within Tacitus’ Germania and Jordanes’ Getica as examples of early forms of liberal government in Europe – and moreover, models of just governance that had triumphed over a morally bankrupt and despotic Rome. By asserting a direct ancestry with these early barbarian tribes, French and German Enlightenment thinkers promoted a
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national heritage of liberal values, thereby critiquing the legitimacy of contemporary forms of government. By ascribing the origins of European liberty to the Barbarian Invasions, by identifying these invaders with Scandinavians, and by promoting an image of Scandinavians as possessing an inherently fierce, robust, and enduring character, Mallet would thereby be a crucial catalyst in fermenting an image of Scandinavia with contemporary – as well as future – French audiences.

In the spirit of Enlightenment thought, Mallet sought to explicate the specificities of Scandinavian character via their physical environment. The reason for the Scandinavian’s instinct for independence, according to Mallet, was due to their deep and immediate connection to nature. They were people who lived in the wilderness of the forests and the mountains. The cold climate and close contact to nature conditioned their bodies to be strong and hardy, insensitive to fatigue: “Une grande abondance de sang & d’humeurs, des fibres fortes & peu mobiles, une vigueur inépuisable constituoient le tempérament des Scandinaves & des Germains, comme celui de tous les peuples sauvages qui vivent sous un semblable climat.” Climate, according to Mallet, determined not only on a people’s physiological constitution, but their moral constitution as well. Though warlike, Germans’ and Scandinavians’ ignorance of materialism and hatred of oppression, cultivated by their primitive and nomadic lifestyle, made them a naturally honest and fair people: Thus, Mallet sought to base his argument for the moral superiority of Scandinavians within the context of an unbiased argument rooted in physiological and environmental data. It was

65 Mallet, Histoire de Dannemarc, 28.
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via a pure and linear causality, running from physical bodies to social bodies, that Scandinavians achieved their exemplary position within Europe, the root source of which was climate.

Mallet was by no means the first scholar to try to trace differences in culture through differences in environment. Political thinkers in the eighteenth century were pressed to recognize and explain the diversity of human cultures in the face of the classically held belief in a universal humanity. Many, including Montesquieu, sought to thereby explain the diversity of human cultures – an affirmation of relativism that in many ways challenged the classically held belief in a universal humanity – by appealing to nature.68 Being Europe’s most respected social and political philosophers of the mid-eighteenth century, it was above all in the writings of Montesquieu that Mallet based this theory of climates.69 His most influential text, The Spirit of Laws, is dually descriptive and prescriptive at heart, seeking to provide rational explanation for the disparity between human societies in order to then advise on the most suitable manner for governing them. The laws of a society should act as a balance to the conditions that form the basis of a people’s character, which themselves are the product of moral as well as physical causes.70

A particularly powerful thesis within The Spirit of the Laws – both with regards to its prevalence within the text as well as its influence on later writers – is that climate could be understood as a fundamental force in shaping societies. Inhabitants of warmer climates, including those within Asia and in Southern Europe, tended to be ruled by despotic
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governments. The unusually harsh government of these regions, according to Montesquieu, occurred because of the heat and plentitude of natural resources naturally predisposed them to both physical and moral weakness. By contrast, inhabitants of cold climates, such as those residing in Northern Europe, continually resisted the yolk of tyranny throughout history. This defiant demeanor as well as physical hardiness was due to the cold climate, which naturally predisposed people toward the sense of fairness and equality needed for the existence of electoral forms of government.

Montesquieu thereby broadly divided Europe according to northern and southern cultures, summarized through the distinction between Germanic and Latin spheres of influence. At the same time, the macro-effect of climate on social bodies could be explained through the minute actions of hot and cold on the individual human corpus and how this affected individual temperaments. Montesquieu's account of the differences between northerners and southerners can be broadly understood through the binary actions of retention and expulsion, set in motion through the effect of climate on nerves and tissues. Heat relaxes the nerves, expanding them on the skin's surface, thus increasing their susceptibility to stimulation, but also making them more susceptible to exhaustion. On the contrary, the cold contracts the nerves, their extremities receding from the skin's surface, and thereby decreasing sensitivity, but also preserving the vigor and integrity of the nervous fibers. As Montesquieu writes: “The nerves that terminate from all parts in the cutis form each a nervous bundle; generally speaking, the whole nerve is not moved, but a very minute part. In warm climates, where the cutis is relaxed, the ends of the nerves are expanded and laid open to the weakest action of the smallest objects. In cold countries, the cutis is constricted and the papillae compressed: the miliary glands are in some measure
paralytic; and the sensation does not reach the brain, except when it is very strong and proceeds from the whole nerve at once.”71 From his theory that the cold restrained bodily tissue's reactivity, Montesquieu would come to the idea Northern Europeans as less subject to emotional impulse, less receptive to bodily fatigue, and more generally, colder in temperament.

Neither Montesquieu nor Mallet, however, had any direct agenda in advancing any notion of Northern artistic genius. To the contrary, both Montesquieu and Mallet, the logical consequence of the compression of the nerves due to the cold climate was a dulled imagination; 72 and while neither author took great interest in the study of aesthetics,73 similar stipulations of the negative relationship between cold climates and aesthetic sensibilities tended to have a negative impact on how French writers judged the artistic capabilities of Northern Europeans during the eighteenth century.74 Consequently, rather than associating Scandinavian artists with the plaintive, poetic, many eighteenth-century theorists and aestheticians were more likely to associate Northern European culture with an unreflective philistinism, more attracted by violence and drunkenness than poetry on account of their harsh environment. For example, according to Cartaud de La Vilate in Essai

72 According to Montesquieu, the cold makes the nerves less reactive, and therefore people of northern nations suffer in imagination, taste, and fondness for pleasure. The author also remarks that arts in the North tend to be “cold and phlegmatic.” Charles de Secondat, Baron de Montesquieu, The Spirit of Laws, vol. 1, trans. Thomas Nugent (New York: The Colonial Press, 1899 [1748], p. 222-223; Mallet, Histoire de Dannemarc, 65.
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74 For a detailed discussion of the theory of climates and the development of comparative literature in eighteenth century France, see Roger Mercier’s two-part article, 'La théorie des climats des "Réflexions critiques" a "L'Esprit des Lois"," Revue d'Histoire littéraire de la France 53, nos. 1-2 (1953)
*historique et philosophique sur le gout* [1736], the icy hearts of Northerners are made them incapable of experiencing the sentimentality needed for the appreciation of the arts. Rather than taking leisure in literature, they preferred instead the excitement of bacchanalian combat.75 Even more critical of the artistic capacities of Northerners would be Jean-Baptiste Dubos. In *Critical Reflections on Poetry and Painting*, Dubos argues that arts cannot flourish above the fifty-second North parallel nor closer to the equator than twenty-five degrees. “It would be needless to use many arguments to prove, that there are countries, which never produced any eminent painters or poets,” Dubos argues. “Everybody knows, for instance, that we have never had from the extremities of the North but wild poets, coarse versifiers, and frigid colorists. Painting and poetry have never approached the pole nearer than the latitude of Holland; and even in this province we have seen only a poor starved kind of painting.”76 Dubos, like many eighteenth-century writers, held onto a universalist notion of art. The only true expression of beauty was to be found within the Classical tradition. Any deviation from the Greco-Italian tradition – or its Mediterranean climate, as Dubos argues – merely leads to degradation.

As prejudicial as Cartaud or Dubos’ writings were against aesthetic capabilities of Northern Europe’s inhabitants, however, theories about the effects of climate and its relationship to the diversity of human taste would ultimately lead writers to challenge Classicism’s hegemony within aesthetics, leading authors to speculate on alternative forms of beauty, and eventually to the admission of different national traditions of art and
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It was the eighteenth-century’s burgeoning taste for the sublime, savage, and passionate, in direct contrast to harmonious, cultured, and eternal Beauty that led to an interest in non-Classical traditions of Europe. This vogue for rough-hewn aesthetics and foreign traditions materialized most evidently in the sentimental travel literature, with its descriptions of folk traditions and picturesque scenery from the distant peripheries of Europe, as well as in an interest in medieval poetry and literature. When Mallet provided the first French translation of selections from the medieval Icelandic Eddas in his *Monuments de la mythologie et de la poésie des Celtes, et particulièrement des anciens Scandinaves*, he sparked a renewed interest in Old Norse poetry – including, quite popularly, the mythological figure of Odin – that would resonate in French, English, as well as Scandinavian art and literature throughout the next century.

While the popularity of Mallet’s translations of Old Norse mythology and late-eighteenth-century interest in the medieval sublime would lead to later characterizations of Scandinavian artists as brooding poets, inhabitants of a crepuscular and mysterious land, the spark that led to this powerful impression of the North within the French imagination was more directly a consequence of events unintended by the Swiss scholar. In his writings on Denmark, Mallet mislabeled the origins of the Scandinavian people as Celtic – a mistake clearly evident even within the title of his 1756 book, *Monuments de la mythologie et de la poésie des Celtes, et particulièrement des anciens Scandinaves*. Less than a decade later
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after Mallet’s *Monuments*, James Macpherson published the long-lost epic poetry of Scottish bard Ossian, which Macpherson claimed to have translated from Gaelic, and which was then translated into French in 1777. Macpherson’s mournful poems are awash with allusions to moonlight nights, teary-eyed lovers, and vengeful warrior as cold as the rocks they rest upon. Although scholars would later dispute the legitimacy of Macpherson’s discovery as well as Mallet’s ethnological conjectures, the association between Nordic mythology and Celtic epic poetry – and with both, the powerful image of the misty and mysterious North – within the French popular imagination was inevitable.

**De Staël, Romanticism, and the Germanic Spirit**

Though born in the preromantic climate of late-eighteenth-century Europe, the characterization of Scandinavians as gloomy, mystical, and naturally inclined to poetic feeling – in short, Ossianic – would take on full momentum within the Romantic generation of the early nineteenth-century, the most significant of whom would be Germaine De Staël. While both Mallet and Montesquieu had both highlighted Scandinavian society as an exemplary model in the history of European liberalism and as a counterpoint to despotism, De Staël would popularize interest in Northern Europe’s artistic heritage within France. After De Staël introduced Germanic literature to the French public through her book *De l’Allemagne* (1813), Germany would become entwined with the idea of Romanticism. De Staël also included important contemporary Danish playwrights and
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poets within her text such as Adam Oehlenschläger. Like Montesquieu, De Staël held up Germany as a means of critiquing French politics and society. Romanticism would become the counterpoint to Classicism, and Germanic culture was highlighted as a challenge to the hegemony of the French Empire. As the geographical and cultural division between Europe’s North and South would become increasingly accentuated, Germanic Europe’s northernmost region, Scandinavia, would find itself increasingly scrutinized by French authors – as well as associated with Germany.

De Staël’s interest in Germany derived from a mixture of her cosmopolitan upbringing and disdain for Napoleon. Born Anne Louise Germaine Necker, De Staël came from a family of Prussian Calvinists who had emigrated to Geneva in 1724. In 1786, she married the Swedish ambassador Baron Erik Magnus de Staël Holstein. Throughout her life, and in particular due to her popular literary salon in Paris, she maintained a multinational group of affiliations and friends – a group which included the senior Paul-Henri Mallet, a childhood friend of her father’s. The political liberalism of De Staël and her associates led to her exile by Napoleon from Paris on October 15th, 1803. It was during this period of exile that she visited Germany, inspiring her to write De l’Allemagne.

A life-long admirer of Montesquieu, De Staël begins her book with a reiteration of the eighteenth-century trope of Europe’s division in accordance with Roman or Barbarian heritage. In Europe’s South, the Italians, French, Spanish, and Portuguese are all unified by
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the legacy of Ancient Rome, including their Latin language and culture as well as their pagan origins. In the North, the Germans, English, Swedes, Danes, and Dutch, share a common Teutonic heritage. Though the civilization of the North is younger than that of the South, largely born of the Christian Middle Ages, as De Staël contends, these nations have been long unified by their continued resistance to the “Roman yoke.” Along with these historical causes, De Staël similarly affirms the role of climate for having shaped the differences of culture and forms of government between the Germanic North and the Latin South. The evocation of climate’s relationship to culture (and, by consequence, the ensuing form of government) is a clear homage to the influence of Montesquieu, but the aims and means by which De Staël interprets the influence of environment differs from those of the Enlightenment thinker.

De Staël attributes two characteristics that unite all the Germanic peoples since their beginnings: a spirit of independence and loyalty. While the two traits clearly derive from models of Northern European society as the origins of European liberalism popular within Enlightenment historiography and political theory, De Staël adds that from these social traits Germanic literature develops its particular literary character: a feeling for melancholy. For De Staël, the Germanic manner of living is that of seclusion, palpable
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within their spirit of independence and their cloistered environment within the forests of Northern Europe. At the same time, the Christian origins of Germanic culture – a religion that is, in contrast to Latin paganism, inherently spiritualist rather than materialist – leads to a reflective way of thinking. In a highly Ossianic description, De Staël remarks of the Germanic people: “leur imagination se plaît dans les vieille tours, dans les créneaux, au milieu des guerriers, des sorcières et des revenants ; et les mystères d’une nature rêveuse et solitaire forment le principal charme de leur poésies.”\(^{91}\) De Staël’s addition of spiritual and psychological traits to the Northern character established by Montesquieu and Mallet, her inclusion of the Christian Middle Ages into their historiography of the barbarian tribes, and her interest in Northern European artistic legacies, marks an ultimately deeply influential development in how Northern Europeans would be characterized in nineteenth-century French literature. While earlier developed notions of the course, uncultured, and even bellicose nature of Northern Europeans would persist, assumptions of Northern philistinism and even stupidity would begin to die out as the nineteenth-century progressed. Along with these changes would develop a Romantic reformulation of the Enlightenment theory of climates, adding a spiritualist note to its otherwise thoroughly materialist underpinnings. Though the cold might dampen the nerves, it also invigorated the soul.

Given De Staël’s attempt to elevate the cultural status of Northern Europe via climatological arguments, the art and literature of Scandinavia would be shown in a new light within France. According to De Staël’s logic, artistic aptitude increased relative to latitude. It is only as one ventures toward the north of Europe, approaching the Baltic with
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its cities of Konigsberg and Copenhagen, in which one finds true artists. The fogs and frosts of the North quite naturally foster a life of poetic contemplation and self-reflection.

When De Staël comes to her analysis of Danish theater, her examples do not go beyond Adam Oehlenschläger and Jens Baggesen. Her analysis of these playwrights’ styles is similarly limited, mentioning simply that Danish theater’s success must be due to its ability to appeal to both French traditions and German sensibilities; yet when De Staël commences to describe the climate and natural surroundings of Denmark, her words suddenly become more poetic:

Nous ne connaissons à peine le Nord, qui touche aux confins de la terre vivante; les longues nuits des contrées septentrionales pendant lesquelles le reflet de la neige sert seul de lumière à la terre; ces ténèbres qui bordent l’horizon dans le lointain, lors même que la voûte des cieux est éclairée par les étoiles, tout semble donner l’idée d’un espace inconnu, d’un univers nocturne dont notre monde est environné. Cet air si froid qu’il congèle le souffle de la respiration, fait rentrer la chaleur dans l’âme; et la nature, dans ces climats, ne paraît faite que pour repousser l’homme en lui-même.

Coming at an important transition between Enlightenment and Romantic thought, De Staël does not so much turn her predecessor’s theory of climates on its head, but rather steers it toward an alternative conclusion. The choleric temperament and physicality of Scandinavians are reaffirmed within De Staël’s writings; but rather than following a linear logic, the effects of climate result in a duality of natural temperaments. For De Staël, the physical assertiveness of Scandinavians is complimented by an equally powerful gloominess.
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In addition to De Staël description of the powerful effect of Scandinavia’s mystical nature, she also emphasized the influence of Scandinavia’s Eddic history on contemporary Danish authors. It is through the unique tradition of Nordic mythology, De Staël, claimed, that Scandinavian literature could one day achieve comparable fame to Germany.95 Here, the Ossianic fascination with Old Norse poetry carried from Mallet to De Staël meets the beginnings of Scandinavian National Romanticism. One of the first Scandinavian figures to embrace Scandinavia’s mythological heritage, derived from the Eddas, as an alternative to the Classical model, Adam Oehlenschläger would be a pivotal force in perpetuating National Romanticism in Denmark.96 Within dramatic works such as Vaulundurs Saga (1805) and Balder the Good (1807), Oehlenschläger presented a romanticized image of Scandinavia’s pre-Christian past.97 In part through Oehlenschläger’s argument that Norse mythology expressed a distinct poetic and dramatic style that Romantic movement would spread throughout Sweden as well during the beginning of the century.98 Though often overshadowed by her analysis of German literature, De Staël’s analysis of Danish drama proved to be prescient, demonstrating not only the profound influence that specifically Nordic themes would have on the Scandinavian states, but also the increasing popularity the subject would encounter within France as well.

Ut Pictura Poesis: From the Ossianic to the Pitcturesque North
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Within France, the poeticization of Scandinavia under De Staël would have a major impact on both French Romantic literature as well as painting. Throughout the early nineteenth century, the image of Scandinavians as innately mysterious being, either as brooding poets, or as violent warlocks, in addition to descriptions of their sublime and exotic surroundings would continually emerge in novels such as Victor Hugo's *Hans of Iceland* (1823), Honoré de Balzac's *Séraphîta* (1834), and scandinavophile writer Pierre Victor Lerebours' Edda-inspired play *Harald, ou Les Scandinaves*, which premiered in France in 1824. In painting, the *Primitifs* of Jacques Louis David’s atelier looked not only Greek but also Ossianic stories in their search for purer, pre-Roman motifs. De Staël herself would be rendered in Ossianic fashion in *Corinne au cap Misène* (1819), in which François Gérard depicts the author holding a lyre within a wild, ruinesque setting [Fig. 1.8].

Most evident of Mallet’s continuing influence is Anne-Louis Girodet’s *The Spirits of French Heroes Welcomed by Ossian into Odin's Paradise* (1801), which, along with Gérard’s *Ossian*, was commissioned for Joséphine Bonaparte’s Château de Malmaison [Fig. 1.9]. Most prominently stands Ossian, flanked by Celtic warriors, reaching forward to embrace two of Napoleon’s favorite generals, Louis Desaix and Jean Baptiste Kléber, both of whom had recently been killed. To add to this complex mixture of historical, mythological, and political references, Girodet sets the location as Odin’s paradise for slain warriors, Valhalla. Here we see most significantly the way in which Mallet’s “Celtic error” transfixed itself to
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French culture, melding within official iconography of the French Empire. This was undoubtedly a direct product of Imperial propaganda, as Napoleon sought to associate Celtic identity with France via its historical connection with Brittany, even establishing a Celtic Academy in 1805 with a team of scholars to historically validate France’s claim to Celtic heritage and invalidate England’s own.103

While the mixture of archaism and classicism that constituted the style of the Primitifs would eventually fall out of favor, the Romantic association of Scandinavian culture and geography with primitivism would continue to have a lasting impact in France. One of the main routes by which French interest in Scandinavian art would be transformed and revitalized would be through picturesque travel imagery. The influence of popular travel prints and the rising dominance of landscape over history painting in nineteenth-century France has been discussed by several art historians, including most prominently Nicholas Green. Green has pointed to the decades aligning with the Restoration (1814-1830) and July Monarchy (1830-1848) governments as the approximate moment of time in which this aesthetic shift occurred. The rising demand during the 1820s and 1830s for artists to provide illustrations for picturesque travel literature subsequently led to an influx of artists practiced in landscape entering their works into the Salon and art market.104 Critics quickly linked depictions of the French landscape to expressions of national identity, which had been deeply shaken following the defeat of Napoleon’s Empire. Whether
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one’s politics were Republican, Legitimist, or Bonapartist, the picturesque rendering of France’s topographically and culturally diverse regions was an ode to the singular unity of the French nation.\textsuperscript{105}

Picturesque and sublime depictions of the Nordic countries – particularly centered on the farthest arctic regions of the peninsula and outlying islands – follow a pattern of reception in France similar to the historical model outlined by Green, emerging in the late 1820s and largely rising to institutional acceptance by the early 1840s. There are two main occurrences that can be linked to this shift in taste. The first and one of the best-documented and culturally significant explorations of the arctic echelons of Northern Europe was that of the ship \textit{La Recherche}. Led by medical doctor and scientific explorer Paul Gaimard, the vessel made a series of voyages in the later 1830s, first to Iceland and Greenland from 1835 to 1836, then to Spitsbergen from 1838 to 1840. In addition to the team of scientists recording geological, astronomical and zoological information, several visual artists and writers also accompanied the journey, including Auguste Biard and Auguste Mayer. They provided not only visual and literary documentation of the voyage, but also enrich it through historical and anecdotal reflections on life in Scandinavia.\textsuperscript{106} Many of these persons would come to have a significant impact on French culture through the publication of their works. The fluid transition between printed illustration to Salon painting within Biard’s artworks illustrate the blurring boundaries between empirical description and fine art aesthetics inherent within the rise of landscape

\textsuperscript{105} Green, \textit{The Spectacle of Nature}, 101-02
painting. At the same moment in time, a rise in the number of Scandinavian landscape artists exhibiting and receiving critical praise at the Salon also occurs. This group includes artists such as Johan Gørbitz, a Norwegian portraitist living in France influenced by national romantic imagery emanating from Norway, and Per Wickenberg, a Swedish painter who rose to immense popularity in France through his winter scenery.

According to Greg M. Thomas, early nineteenth-century travel books tended to gravitate towards three main European localities: Italy, England, and Switzerland. These three geographical spheres corresponded, respectively, to the major aesthetic categories of the Beautiful, the Picturesque, and the Sublime. During this same period, and particularly around the first half of the nineteenth century, a large number of voyager accounts of Scandinavia would also appear in France. The imagery that accompanied these books strongly parallel those coming from voyager accounts of Switzerland, repeating similar sublime motifs such as mountain peaks, waterfalls, solar effects, and accentuated cloud formations, occasionally softened by the appearance of rustic wood cabins and staffage [Figs 1.10 & 1.11]. The main thematic tendency that distinguished accounts of Scandinavia from Switzerland was the ubiquitous inclusion of winter imagery from northern Scandinavia and up towards the North Pole [Fig. 1.12].

The writer Xavier Marmier, who accompanied *La Recherche*, would be an important force in the dissemination of interest in Scandinavia, providing detailed account of the culture and literary history of the Nordic countries in his books *Lettres sur le Nord* and *Relation du Voyage* – a topic that would influence him so greatly as a writer that he would later be a pivotal force in establishing the Bibliothèque Nordique, Paris’ largest collection of Scandinavian books, located within the Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève. Additionally, two volumes of illustrations containing 444 images by the artists aboard the ship, the *Atlas historique et pittoresque*, provided a uniquely rich visual description of the people, places, and landscapes of Scandinavia and Northern Europe. These prints were made after the sketches by several French landscape and seascape artists including Auguste Mayer, Barthélemy Lauvergne, Charles Giraud and François Auguste Biard.

Many of the lithographs in the *Atlas* make use of sublime imagery akin to that in early nineteenth-century illustrated voyager accounts. Aesthetically, however, they are closer to paintings, employing greater use of halftones to emphasize both figures and atmospheric effects, while also using more simplified, focused compositions. This resultant dramatic accent placed upon the scenery is particularly evident in the lithographs copied from the works by Auguste Mayer [Fig. 1.13], a marine painter known for his depictions of historical events and battles. In fact, both Mayer and Auguste Biard would exhibit paintings based on their sketches from *La Recherche*.

---

Recherche at the Salon in the late 1830s and early 1840s. In 1842, Auguste Biard exhibited four paintings derived from his voyage on La Recherche, including an outdoor Sami congregation, Le Pasteur Laestadius instruisant les Lapons, a scene of a walrus hunt, Vue de l'Océan glacial: pêche aux morses par des Groënlandais [Fig. 1.14] and a scene of the aurora borealis, Magdalena bay. Vue prise de la presqu'île des Tombeaux, au nord du Spitzberg, effet d'aurore boréale, with the latter two works being bought by the French state immediately afterwards.

Biard was a well-regarded albeit unorthodox Salon artist in the early to mid-nineteenth century. Considered an eccentric by some critics, he specialized in depicting a broad range of exotic locales, inspired by his numerous voyages and occasionally lengthy residencies abroad.110 He was popular with contemporary audiences in France, including of King Louis-Philippe. Upon seeing Biard's painting, Combat contre des ours blancs, at the Salon of 1839, the king was so thoroughly impressed by the painting that he recommended that the artist accompany the research team on board La Recherche during their next departure.111 Although Biard’s status on board the ship was unofficial and unpaid, he nonetheless received support from the king himself through the commission of two paintings.112

111 Biard was accompanied by his fiancé, Léonie d’Aunet, who would later publish an account of her travels in Voyage d’une femme au Spitzberg (Paris: Hachette, 1854). Aaserud, “Le peintre de cour et le prédicateur,” 146
112 Aaserud, “Le peintre de cour et le prédicateur,” 146
The paintings Biard was commissioned to execute, *Le duc d’Orléans recevant l’hospitalité sous une tente de Lapons – août 1795*, and *Le duc d’Orléans descendant la grande cascade de Eyanpaikka sur le fleuve Muomo (Laponie) – septembre 1795* [Fig. 1.15], depict Louis-Philippe as a young man during his exile to Scandinavia. Desiring to escape the same fate of his father, Louis-Philippe-Joseph d’Orléans [Philippe Égalité], who was guillotined in 1793, the young Duke travelled through Scandinavia to evade detection. Though Louis-Philippe also resided in more prominent Scandinavian cities including Christiania during his exile, Biard’s commissioned works center on the future king’s travels to Finnmark in the autumn of 1795, aided by a hospitable group of Sami. Biard’s completed canvases are a highly unusual blend of royal portraiture together with historical genre, travel illustration, and romantic landscape, based a number of topographic and ethnographic studies the artist made during his travels aboard *La Recherche*, and combined with the a sensibility for dramatic composition visible in *Vue de l’Océan glacial* and *Combat contre des ours blancs*.

The superficial explanation behind Louis-Philippe’s commission of these paintings lies in part with both his sentimental affection for Norway as well as the relevance of historical landscape for this era, which rose and fell from popularity during the course of the early nineteenth century. Yet a deeper political message runs through these images as well. By evoking a parallel between *La Recherche’s*...
scientific explorations of the North to his own expedition-in-exile more than forty
years earlier, Louis-Philippe evokes a prophetic narrative tying together his early
life and eventual rule over France, albeit one placed within a largely secularized
image. The propaganda of the July Monarchy centered upon an image of the Citizen
King as a champion of progress and bourgeois values. Although Biard's
compositional emphasis on peripheral characters and natural surroundings almost
threatens to overpower the figure Louis Philippe, it also functions both to heighten
the illusion of empirical veracity as well as to reinforce Louis Philippe's image as a
ruler aligned with the course of modern progress. The sublime topography of
northern Scandinavia thereby implicitly functions as an antidote to the allegorical
classicism traditionally associated the Legitimist politics, revitalized under the
Bourbon Restoration, nonetheless while functioning to aggrandize the narrative of
Louis Philippe's reign.

Thus, through the July Monarchy, the Scandinavian landscape became
incorporated into the iconography of French nationalism. Just as topographical
diversity became an important theme in imprinting the French picturesque
landscape with a sense of national identity, the representation of exotic ecologies,
from Algeria, to Martinique, to Scandinavia, can be similarly read as forming
iconographies of French global power. A further illustration of the use of
topographical imagery as a tool for propaganda can be seen with Auguste Mayer's
historical landscape commemoration France’s battle with England over Martinique,
*Prise du Rocher "le Diamant", Près de la Martinique, 2 Juin 1805* (1837),
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commissioned by Louis Philippe in 1836 [Fig. 1.16]. Even though the islands of the Article Circle were never subjected to French colonialism, Scandinavia represented the northern periphery of Europe, making French exploration of Scandinavia and Svalbard a symbol of French power.

After fall of the July Monarchy and the death of Louis-Philippe, Biard’s work remained a powerful illustration of France’s growing fascination with cataloguing varieties of foreign geographies and cultures during the nineteenth-century. Between 1851 and 1864, Biard was commissioned to paint Panorama of Magdalena Bay for the Galerie de Minéralogie of the Muséum National d’Histoire Naturelle in Paris. Composed using a conglomeration of motifs taken from his travel sketches and subsequent paintings the panorama offers visitors an immersive look into La Recherche’s voyage to Spitsbergen, including scenes of a polar bear hunt, the scientific collection of flora and minerals, and of course the sublime frozen topography of Spitsbergen.116

**Johan Gørbitz, a Norwegian National Romantic in Paris**

According to the twentieth-century historian Louis Réau, the time between the First Empire and Second Empires would be a “passing eclipse” in which neither French artists
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115 *Galeries historiques du Palais de Versailles*, tome IV (Paris: Imprimerie Royale, 1840), 247-48

116 For discussions what Biard likely invented within his works, including several errors in the depiction of Sami life, and possible inspirations from earlier travel pictures, see: Barbara C. Matilsky, “Francois-Auguste Biard, Artist-Naturalist-Explorer,” Gazette des Beaux Arts, vol. CV (February 1985); Anne Aaserud, “Le peintre de cour et le prédicateur,” 148,
traveled to Scandinavian nor Scandinavian artists traveled to France. Contrary to Réau’s statement, however, during the July Monarchy, while Biard and Mayer were exhibiting their paintings of Lapland and Svalbard, several landscape paintings by Nordic artists would begin appearing at the Salon. Though many of these artists depicted scenery from Italy and Holland, others would begin to exhibit motifs from Norway and Sweden as well. This would include names more closely associated with the National Romantic landscape tradition, including Thomas Fearnley and Fredrik Sødring, but also several lesser-known painters as well. Amongst these artists, the Norwegian portrait painter and miniaturist Johan Gørbitz (1782-1853) would have one of the longest lasting careers in France, as well as one of the most telling.

Though almost completely forgotten by French historians, Gørbitz worked as an artist in France for twenty-seven years. He began his artistic training at the Danish Academy of Fine Arts in Copenhagen, where he likely worked with Cornelius Høyer, Denmark’s leading miniaturist and secretary of the Academy. The possible influence of Høyer, who had trained in Paris under fellow miniaturist Jean-Baptiste Massé, would also explain why Gørbitz then moved to Paris in 1809. In Paris, Gørbitz received additional training with Antoine-Jean Gros. By 1812, Gørbitz was already exhibiting several portraits at the Salon. He was an active presence at the Paris Salon for the rest of his life while making a living off his skills as a portrait
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118 Bodil Sørensen, “Johan Gørbitz: Norges første internasjonale maler,” Landet der Sitroner Gror (Tromsø: Nordnorsk Kunstmuseum, 2005), 31
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painter. Even after returning to Norway in 1836, where he continued to send works to the Salon, and had gained an admirable reputation amongst French critics.

Within Norwegian art historical texts, Gørbitz is remembered almost exclusively for his later career in Norway, where he became a leading portraitist of Christiania’s social and literary elite, including the author Camilla Collett [Fig. 1.17]. Though relatively little is known about Gørbitz’s work in Paris, on the surface his career seems to follow a similar formula to that of other Scandinavian petits-maîtres in France such as the eighteenth-century Swedish miniaturists Peter Adolf Hall and Niclas Lafrensen or the Dano-Swedish contemporary, Carl Fredrik Kiorbøe, well regarded for his equestrian and dog paintings during the July Monarchy and Second Empire. All resided in France over a long period of time, working in artistic media meant for private consumption, and were dependent on selling their works to a bourgeois or upper class clientele.

Despite his reputation as a portraitist, Gørbitz evidently cared little for the genre. Insofar as portraiture was a source of income for the artist, by the same means Gørbitz found it to be a restraint on his personal draw toward landscape painting. Landscape and genre painting were gaining steady popularity at the Paris Salon, thereby providing Gørbitz with an outlet through which he could submit
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his works. Though he continued to occasionally submit portraits, from 1827 onward many of the works he submitted to the Salon were landscape and genre scenes.

Some of these paintings, especially towards the beginning, take motifs from the environs of Paris, such as the forests of Fontainebleau, or from southern Italy, to which he traveled in the early 1830s. In the ensuing decade, however, Gørbitz’s oeuvre as began to incorporate motifs beyond Italy, Fontainebleau, and other scenery popular with French artists at the time. By 1840, though Gørbitz had returned to Christiania several years earlier, the artist would continue to exhibit at the Salon, where he would now exhibit almost exclusively Norwegian landscapes. As a landscape painter, Gørbitz proved himself just as apt in his abilities as a portraitist, if not even more so. Works such as Torrent à Ullensvang (1840 Salon) and Vue pris à Hardanger (1843 Salon) were given ample praise by French critics. Critics frequently singled out both the picturesque quality of the scenery as well as the veracity of Gørbitz’s works, noting the painstaking facility through which the artist rendered Norway’s natural surroundings.125

Though the current whereabouts of these works exhibited at the Salon are largely unknown, the descriptive titles by which his Salon works are listed indicate that that Gørbitz gravitated towards scenery from Norway’s mountainous interior and western fjords, the latter of which were favored by the then-flourishing Norwegian National Romantic School. The district of Hardanger plays an important role in the iconography of the National Romantics, showing up in contemporaneous
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paintings by Hans Gude [Fig. 1.18], Adolphe Tidemand, and the Dane Johannes Flintoe. Norway's vast mountain ranges had to a large degree remained unexplored up until a few decades earlier. The early nineteenth-century became a period when artists, geographers, and botanists – oftentimes as part of the same group – would systematically document Norway's topography and ecology for the purpose of advancing understanding of the country's own makeup and surroundings.\(^{126}\) Flintoe in particular would play a prominent role in this feat, making a series of group expeditions through the western counties such as Sogn og Fjordane, Telemark, and Hordaland [Fig. 1.19] to depict its mountains and glaciers from 1819 through the 1820s, and was often accompanied by a small team of officials including Gerhard Munthe, a drawing instructor at the Military Academy and one of Norway's most important cartographers.\(^{127}\) In Flintoe's wake, a number of other Norwegian artists working in Germany such as Johan Christian Dahl, Thomas Fearnley, and Joachim Frich turned their attention back to capturing the unique scenery of Norway in a manner that simultaneously emphasized both romantic sentimentalism but also empirical accuracy.\(^{128}\)

Gørbitz's oil sketches, such as of the village of Faving in the Gudbrand Valley in central Norway [Fig. 1.20], provide further visual evidence that the artist was following a similar path of inspiration as his Norwegian colleagues. The medium suggests that they were painted on the spot, and as noted by commentators on his


\(^{127}\) Messel, “Discovering the Mountains,” 104, 124.

\(^{128}\) Messel, “Discovering the Mountains,” 132
Salon submissions in France, Gørbitz’s works exude both picturesque sensibility and precision. Even more telling of Gørbitz’s connection to National Romanticism is character is the lithograph, *Ullensvang i Hardanger* [Fig. 1.21], printed in Peter Christen Asbjørnsen’s *Norge fremstillet i Tegninger* (1848).¹²⁹ The prominence of the river in the scene suggests that the lithograph is likely a reproduction of the same work the artist exhibited at the Salon of 1843, *Torrent à Ullenswang*. Perhaps most telling of the historical context in which Gørbitz’s work is situated, however, are the other illustrations that appear alongside the artist’s own landscape. Featuring landscapes by Norway’s leading artists including Fearnley, Dahl, and Frich himself, *Norge fremstillet i Tegninger* is, in the words of Nils Messel, “a summarizing synthesis of the discovery of Norway as artistic subject matter in the first half of the 19th century.”¹³⁰ The book was organized through the guidance of Frich himself, who therefore must have not only known of Gørbitz’s landscapes, but evidently held them in a similar regard to the other leading National Romantics of the era.

Many of Gørbitz’s actions beyond the Salon demonstrate that he was in dialogue with the National Romantics, but that he was in communication with these artists well before his departure home in 1836, and furthermore played an important role as an intermediary between the artists of France and Norway. One of the persons that Gørbitz certainly had contact with is the cartographer Gerhard Munthe, who had accompanied Flintoe’s travels in the early 1820s. Around 1825,
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Gørbitz worked with Munthe to produce maps of the Norwegian counties of Smålenene, Akershus, and Hedermarken, acting as an intercessor between the Norwegian cartographer and the French engravers, Malo ainé and Pellier.\textsuperscript{131}

It might be guessed that Gørbitz’s work with Munthe may have inspired his transition to a landscape painter, for the artist submits – though they were rejected by the jury – his first Norwegian landscape paintings to the Salon in 1827.\textsuperscript{132} Regardless of the artist’s inspiration, the Gørbitz would continue to work as an important intermediary between France and Norway in the years to come. Around 1840, he introduced an important publication by Johan Christian Dahl on Norway’s medieval wood structures to his French colleagues at the Société Libre des Beaux-Arts titled, \textit{Denkmale einer sehr ausgebildeten Holzbaukunst aus den frühesten Jahrhunderten in den innern Landschaften Norwegens}.\textsuperscript{133} Published in 1837 in Dresden, where Dahl resided, but with the inclusion of French subtitles, the book consisted of a series of detailed architectural illustrations of the stave churches of Borgund, Urnes, and Hitterdal (now called Heddal).

The illustrations meticulously render the churches’ exteriors, interiors, and schematic floor plans in detail, with emphasis given to tracing the elaborate
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ornamentation found accompanying the churches’ portals and columns [Fig. 1.22].

According to Dahl’s own account, he had first seen these churches in 1826.\textsuperscript{134} Dahl started his trek through the Norwegian countryside in July of that year, having consulted Flintoe on what the best places to travel were;\textsuperscript{135} and though Dahl is primarily known for his landscapes, like Flintoe and his other contemporaries, he was interested in representing wider aspects of Norwegian culture, carefully sketching local costumes and ancient monuments such as the Balder’s Rock megalith along his way. Thus, the study of topography, anthropology, and medieval history were all intertwined tasks for many landscape painters of the National Romantic generation as a means of carving out a uniquely Norwegian identity and iconography. Dahl then returned to Norway in 1834 for the purpose of depicting Norway’s distinct wooden churches – built before Norway’s unification with Denmark – as a means of preserving the original design of these monuments before any further reconfigurations of their structures could take place.\textsuperscript{136}

Pierre-Victor, mentioned earlier, wrote a lengthy review of Dahls’s book in \textit{Annales de la Société Libre des Beaux-Art}, citing Gørbitz as the person who had led him to the book.\textsuperscript{137} The writer, who had debuted his Edda-influenced play \textit{Harald, ou les Scandinaves} to the French public in 1824, also had a major historical interest in Scandinavian antiquities, having published several articles on the subject for \textit{La
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France littéraire in 1840, which were subsequently unified for the book, Coup d’œil sur les Antiquités Skandinaves. Several plates from Dahl’s book were reproduced within Pierre-Victor’s article, including floor plans of the Urnes and Hitterdal churches, and a detailed illustration of the decorative motifs from one of the Borgund church’s portals. Pierre-Victor praised vigorously praised Dahl’s works, for not only did they introduce French audiences to a subject many still possessed little knowledge of, but they also gave further irrefutable evidence of a unique Scandinavian culture and aesthetic, already tangible within literature and poetry, and now visible within architecture.138

But Dahl’s drawings and observations were relevant not only to the national history of Norway, Pierre-Victor argued, but could also be a powerful source of inspiration for France’s own artists.139 Certain Norwegian motifs such as the dragon, and above all their interlacing ornaments, were visible within the medieval architecture around Europe, including Germany, England, and above all northwestern France. Wherever the seafaring people of the North travelled, they brought their art and their architecture with them.140 Therefore, Pierre-Victor remarks, though Dahl’s illustrations would undoubtedly seem quite foreign to many
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contemporary French readers, they nonetheless stemmed from “des peuples dont l’histoire n’est pas étrangère à la nôtre.”

The notion that the Nordic and French people had a special connection, despite a large geographical division, would play a crucial role in the reception history of Nordic art late in the nineteenth century, and Gørbitz’s role not only as a painter, but as a cultural ambassador, demonstrates the importance artists would play in furthering the Franco-Nordic connection. Pierre-Victor concluded his article with a call for further investigations into the origins and aesthetics of Scandinavian art; but the author’s claim that Dahl’s prints might serve as a source of influence for contemporary artists proved even more immediately prescient. Auguste Mayer would reproduce illustrations of both the floor plan and the portals of the Borgund church for the *Atlas pittoresque et historique* [Fig. 1.23]. Though Mayer adds a few architectural details to his lithograph, such as a section of lintel beam above the door, his lithographs are otherwise exact copies of the ones found in Dahl’s book. Undoubtedly, accuracy was more important than originality for a publication with dually scientific and aesthetic motivations such as *Atlas pittoresque and historique*, nor would it have been uncommon for book publishers to borrow prints from other sources. The demonstration that both French and Norwegian artists were simultaneously exploring Scandinavia through similar lenses, drawing from similar motifs, is pertinent, however, for the communication of images travelled simultaneously north and south. In *Norge fremstillet i Tegninger*, amongst the
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landscapes and peasant images by Tidemand, Fearnley, and other National Romantics, several of Mayer’s lithographs of northern Norway also appear [Fig. 1.24].

The Rise of the Northern Landscape: Shifting Taste in France

However significant Gørbitz’s influence may have been in introducing National Romantic imagery into France, a number of Nordic-themed landscape paintings began to appear at the Salon around the same time Gørbitz himself was working in that genre. In 1836, Thomas Fearnley had four paintings accepted at the Salon featuring National Romantic themes such as Sognefjord as well as the artist’s most iconic motif, Grindewald Glacier. Other paintings showcasing distinctly Scandinavian imagery would also show up at the Salon, exhibited by artists including the Swedes Josef Stäck and Per Wickenberg and the Danes Fredrik Sødring and Anton Melbye. Outside of landscape, other artists specialized in genre motifs such as still life and animal hunts, including Carl Kiörboe, Christine Löomann, Frants Bøe. Like landscape, these were traditionally Dutch genres of painting, which critics and collectors would have quickly recognized and associated with the artists’ Northern European origins. While there were few other, if any, artists outside of Gørbitz exhibiting during the Restoration, the Salon was witnessing a greater representation of Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists throughout July Monarchy, and they were gradually making their mark on French audiences.

The most successful Scandinavian artist in France in the pre-1850s period would be the Swedish landscape painter Per Wickenberg. The artist first exhibited at the Salon of 1838 with two works, *Des vaches; étude* (cat. 1796) and *Un Hiver* (cat. 795), winning a gold medal, third class, for the latter.\(^{143}\) He received emphatic praise from critics for his ability to capture the effects of ice and snow in subsequent paintings exhibited at the Salon such as *Pêche en hiver*, which is described in glowing terms by the critic Alex Barbier:

> Qu’est-ce que son tableau en définitive ? — Rien qu’un canal gelé, une glace tout unie, avec un ciel brumeux et deux ou trois figures qui ont le bout du nez rouge et l’ongulée aux doigts ; mais comme la poésie de la chose y est bien ! que cette glace est vraie ! que cette brume est froide et pénétrante ! et qu’il fait bon ici mettre son manteau ! quelle finesse de rendu ! quelle conscience dans l’exécution ! Quelle magie dans l’effet ! Ce tableau donne sa température, on sent l’hiver en le voyant.\(^{144}\)

In 1841, Wickenberg won another medal for his painting, *Effet d’hiver* [Fig. 1.25], and the following year, the artist was admitted to the Légion d’honneur.\(^{145}\) *Effet d’hiver* entered into the Louvre immediately after the Salon of 1841, while another painting, *Souvenir de Suède* entered into the collection of François Delessert, a prominent collector of French and Dutch artists.\(^{146}\) After the collector’s death in 1869, *Souvenir de Suède* continued to be a valued painting, fetching 12,000 francs at
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the Delessert auction – a price comparable to paintings by artists such as Gericault and Rosa Bonheur.\textsuperscript{147}

One of the reasons that critics would have been attracted to Wickenberg’s paintings was the sense of ecological veracity and exoticism lent by his tendency to focus almost exclusively on Northern European hibernal motifs. That critics expected Nordic landscape scenery to be laden with winter motifs is particularly evident in A.E. Delaunay’s review of Gørbitz’s \textit{Vue pris à Ullenswang} exhibited at the 1843 Salon: “En Norwège, il a cherché un des sites champêtres comme nous en voyons tant dans les pays un peu accidentés, et il l’a représenté à une époque où la végétation a chassé les neiges des coteaux et est venue reverdir cette nature glacée. On se croyrait dans quelque vallée fertile de la France, et non dans un pays où les frimas règnent pendant les trois quarts de l’année.”\textsuperscript{148} That Delaunay’s exaggerated description of the Norwegian climate is in closer alignment with that of Svalbard than Western Norway is undoubtedly in part a consequence of the popular interest in the arctic voyages of \textit{La Recherche} just a few years earlier. The simultaneous presence of landscapes by Gørbitz, Wickenberg, Biard, and Mayer at the Salon in the early 1840 allowed critics to make explicit associations between their works,\textsuperscript{149} and undoubtedly reinforced longstanding tendencies to associate the Nordic countries with geographical and climatological extremes.

\textsuperscript{149} Camille Berru & H. B., “Salon de 1841. 16e article,” \textit{L’Indépendant} (1841/05/23) : 2 ; Alphonse Karr, \textit{Les Guêpes} (Avril 1842) : 20
Nonetheless, early nineteenth-century conceptions of art were far from being organized according to nationality. In his 1806 publication *Dictionnaire des Beaux-Arts*, the antiquarian and historian Aubin-Louis Millin de Grandmaison defines école as a succession of artists of the same place of origin whose works are a similar character or who have studied under the same master.\(^\text{150}\) Millin lists eight main écoles, comprised of the Florentine, Roman, Venetian, Lombard, Flemish, Dutch, German, and French schools, along with the new school of England. To each school, Millin attributes a progression of masters, beginning with artists such as Dürer in Germany, Cimabue in Florence, and the foundation of the Academy of London for England in 1766. Beyond dictating where an artist trained, an artist’s national origins thus had little influence on his or her style. Indeed, as Millin describes, the écoles manifested themselves across national and geographical borders, such as the Flemish school, which the author describes as dictating the style of artists from Belgium, Spain, and Austria.\(^\text{151}\)

The early-nineteenth century notion of a school of art was thus not strictly national, and instead based on the perception of the influence of a set of stylistic hierarchies, influential masters, and practical pedagogy in the form of organized institutions for artistic instruction. Accordingly, the paintings of Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian artists were commonly seen as derivative of the Dutch tradition, to whom their naturalistic style was accredited, or seen as part of the more

contemporary schools of France and Germany, where a number of Nordic artists received their artistic education. Wickenberg, for example, was oftentimes compared to the seventeenth-century Dutch landscape painter Isaac van Ostade.152 Though some of the titles of Wickenberg’s paintings explicitly connote Dutch settings, even when they did not, the Dutch label still stuck. When the artist exhibited Souvenir de Suède in 1842, it was nonetheless praised as a strong example of the “école hollandaise.”153 Given the Romantic vogue for German art and culture toward the beginning of the century, critics also occasionally described Nordic artists as derivative of the German style. This was the case for Gørbitz, who was variously described as belonging to the German school, the French school, or more generally, the “école du Nord.”154 Yet hardly any critic would have thought to ascribe his artworks to a particular école norvégienne.

Not all critics appreciated the increasing number of Northern landscapes being exhibited at the Salon. A not-uncommon sentiment to be heard within the writings of both art critics and voyagers from France in the early-to-mid nineteenth-century is that northern Nordic landscape is inherently ugly.155 Théophile Gautier’s

152 “Salon de 1838” 6e article, Journal des Artistes, XII Année, 1er Volume, No. 14 (8 Avril 1838), 182
155 Nils M. Knutsen, “From Primitive to Picturesque. Some remarks on Peder Balke and the Discovery of the Scenery of Northern Norway,” A Norwegian Painter in the Louvre. Peder Balke (1804-1887) and his Times, eds. Magne Malmanger & Per Kvaerne (Oslo: Novus, 2006), 165
evaluation of Biard’s paintings exhibited at the 1841 Salon illustrates this belief in the anti-aesthetic quality of northern topographies.

M. Biard, revenu d’un long voyage au pôle du nord, de ces fabuleuses régions du Spitzberg et du Groënland, où le reflet des aurores boréales illumine des amoncèlemens [sic] de glaces bleuâtre ou d’interminables nappes de neige livide, nous fait voir des échantillons de Lapons, de Groënlandais, et autres populations arctiques, peints avec talent et sincérité, qui nous donnent pas la moindre envie d’aller passer nos vacances au pôle. Il est difficile de rêver quelque chose de plus ratatiné, de plus chassieux et de plus atrocement laid ; et puis, tous ces tableaux de natures-extrêmes et phénoménales n’intéressent que médiocrement les peuples des pays tempérés.156

Gautier’s dismissive comments come as somewhat of a surprise from the Romantic author who favored eccentricity over conformity, chastised travelers for imposing their own beliefs on other cultures, and considered the French to be of the North.157 Yet Gautier would articulate similarly ambivalent remarks while reviewing Scandinavian artists fourteen years later at the Universal Exposition of 1855, expressing the belief that the cold was a hindrance to aesthetic taste.158 Art may be relative in Gautier’s philosophy of l’art pour l’art, but the beautiful nonetheless remains a precious resource and does not manifest itself equally amongst all peoples or amongst all places.

In truth, the longstanding critique of the Northern philistine more inclined toward inebriation than aesthetic enjoyment, coupled with the tendency to dismiss Northern topography as ugly, would continue to surface throughout the nineteenth century.

century. Louis Edmond Duranty, for example, despite his well-known liberal attitudes toward Realism and Impressionism, evidently seemed to have little admiration for the practice of naturalism in art outside of Continental Europe. The Scandinavian artists exhibiting at the Exposition Universelle of 1878 had had little appeal to him on account of their northern latitude, of which the author remarks:

Dans ces régions du Nord, nous nous trouvons en face des phénomènes de la nature. La peinture y est tant soit peu météorologique. Des montagnes rouges, des cascades vertes, des rochers bleus, des soleils noirs, en un mot, toutes sortes de dérangements, de renversement et de bouleversements des choses y constituent un genre antipictural, antiharmonieux, qui trouble beaucoup les yeux et l'esprit, quoiqu'il puisse enrichir de faits curieux un traité d'optique. Les phénomènes physiques et géologiques ne sont pas propices à l'art, et, au lieu de vouloir étonner et humilier les peintres des pays méridionaux par l'étalage de ces phénomènes don't nous sommes heureusement privés, il vaudrait mieux faire comme certains bons peintres suédois et norvègiens : venir en France ou en Allemagne, et y étudier une lumière moins tourmentée dont les accents pleins et larges sont faits pour le pinceau.¹⁵⁹

Nonetheless, attitudes towards Nordic artists were changing in France, and the first half of the nineteenth-century was period of competing ideas and fluctuating boundaries within artistic practices. The increasing visibility of Scandinavian imagery within French visual culture, along with the mounting number of Scandinavian artists being represented at the Salon, clearly demonstrate a developing taste for this new manner of landscape emanating from the sublime and picturesque traditions in art. Scandinavian artists such as Gørbitz and Wickenberg, along with French artists such as Biard and Mayer, might be seen as paving the way for artists who would gain greater popular and historical recognition in France following the 1855 Exposition Universelle, including Adolf Tidemand. Far from

being an eclipse in the history Franco-Scandinavian artistic exchanges, the first half of the nineteenth century was a period of significant artistic development and intercultural dialogue, led by artists whose careers have been largely forgotten.
Chapter II: Nationalism, Naturalism, and the Second Empire
Introduction

It might be argued that the Second Empire marks the arrival of Nordic art in nineteenth-century France. This is not to say that Danish, Norwegian, and Swedish artists were not visible in France beforehand; nor is this to argue that the paintings exhibited by Nordic artists in France were not engaged in nationalist-driven motifs. As outlined in chapter I, there had been an established community of Nordic artists – mostly Swedish, though with some Danes – working in France since during the mid-eighteenth century, including Adolf Hall and Alexander Roslin, who had come to France to learn from its Rococo portraitists and miniaturists. These artists were followed in the early nineteenth-century by Johan Gørbitz, who began his career as a portraitist and miniaturist before switching to landscape painting – a genre that earned a very powerful reputation in France during the 1830s and 40s.

Rather, to say that Nordic art arrived in France during the Second Empire is to say that during this time that the field of art was subjected to a process of modernization in which defining an artist according to his or her place of birth became a common practice. The Universal Exposition of 1855 stands out as the most prominent expression of this process of nationalization would influence how art was viewed. As Patricia Mainardi argues, the Universal Exposition was the first major exhibition of foreign artists to organize its exhibition space according to nationality, allowing a comparison of works that stimulated discussions of national character.\(^{160}\) Suddenly, nationality was presented as an important factor in understanding art, and what was previously a competition between

individual artists became a competition of nations.

Important shifts in instructional practice were occurring in art around the time of the Universal Exposition. At the start of the Second Republic in 1848, the head of the Musées Nationaux, Philippe-Auguste Jeanron introduced a new system for classifying artworks at the Louvre, including the dates of the artist’s life, the artwork’s provenance, measurements, general description, and, amongst numerous other details to be catalogued, the école to which the artist should be assigned. Whereas methods of classifying works in a museum’s collection had been haphazard and based on conjecture, the Louvre introduced an institutional standard that would be imitated by other museums throughout France.¹⁶¹

The systematic system classification of works within museum collections would soon be applied to contemporary exhibitions as well. As Sara Tas has noted, in 1852, with the first Salon of the Second Empire Salon catalogues began noting the nationality of the exhibiting artists alongside their names and titles of works.¹⁶² The inclusion of artists’ nationalities in Salon exhibition catalogues appeared as one several new submission requirements requiring artists to indicate, amongst several other details, their place of birth.¹⁶³ These new regulations were printed under the signature of the Directeur général des musées, the Comte de Nieuwerkerke. One of the leading figures of Second Empire’s art new administration, Nieuwerkerke had been appointed Directeur

¹⁶³ See Article 6 in Règlement: Chapitre 1er, du dépôt des ouvrages, Salon de 1852 (Paris: Vinchon, 1852), 12
The idea to include artists’ place of birth, however, came from the suggestion of Nieuwerkerke’s newly appointed protégé, Philippe de Chennevières. In his position as Inspecteur des musées de province, to which he was appointed by Nieuwerkerke in 1852, Chennevières had considerable influence over the Salon and was in charge of its organization, including the design of its exhibition catalogues. It was one of several efforts throughout Chennevières’ career, which lasted into the Third Republic, in which he used his influence to help internationalize France’s art institutions, including the organization of the exhibitions of fine arts at the Universal Expositions of 1855, 1867, and 1878.

“Élargissez Dieu, disait Diderot; élargissez la patrie, crie la grande voix de l’esprit moderne,” the critic Paul Mantz would declare at the second Universal Exposition in 1867. The Classical Universalist ideals held by Enlightenment writers such as Diderot, who had decried an artist’s “empreinte nationale” as a sign of his ignorance, would be start to become outmoded in the 1850s and 60s. In their place, a bottom-up theory that sought the roots of artistic influence from folk culture, ecology, and above all national origin would become a powerful force in art critical and art historical writing.

---
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influential art historians to help develop this new mode—broadly defined as naturalist—analyzing art was Hippolyte Taine. Taine advocated a positivist model for studying art, where the historian studied the physical conditions in which an artwork was produced, including the race of the artist, the environmental and cultural milieu in which was created, and the moment in time it was produced as being, as a means of understanding the causes of an artwork’s form. Hippolyte Taine’s appointment as a professor of aesthetics and art history at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris in 1864\(^{170}\) helped solidify his status in France, and allowed his ideas about the relative nature of art to spread throughout the 1860s.

The top-down or hierarchical system of explaining the history of art according to the passage of knowledge from master to student and based upon a select set of traditional schools—namely Italian, Dutch, and Flemish—would start to become outmoded in the 1850s and 60s. In its place, a bottom-up theory that sought the roots of artistic influence from folk culture, ecology, and above all national origin would become a powerful force in art critical and art historical writings. Eric Michaud contends that driving force behind the emergence of national models of art in the nineteenth century is the practice of “racial attributionism” as the main, wherein “styles were determined by peoples or nations, and nations by their racial components.”\(^{171}\) It was a model of conceptualizing art’s history akin to eighteenth-century’s historiographical literature on Rome, where a unified people topple a decadent foreign oppressor. Again, the enemy would be Italy, reiterated in the form of the Classical ideals of the Renaissance— the oppressor of the local medieval traditions—and


reiterated in the Academic system that swept Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. Under this model of national self-realization, French art historians frequently sought to pinpoint which artists or epochs signaled the birth of each national school in the same way that Giotto’s paintings had been pointed to as marking the onset of the Italian Renaissance. According to the art historian and critic Ernest Chesneau, William Hogarth marks of the birth of a truly English style. Writing at the end of the century, the journalist Marius Gandolphe, the Swedish school of painting would begin with the Norse mythology-inspired sculptures of Bengt Fogelberg and the Sami genre scenes of Johan Höckert, the latter of whom was about to experience great success at the Universal Exposition in 1855.

**Empire and Internationalism: A Pretext to the First Universal Exposition**

At the heart of the Second Empire was the ideology of progress. Initially elected president of the Second Republic before staging a coup in 1851, Napoleon III’s popularity throughout the rule of both the French Republic and Empire was indebted to nostalgic longing for the First Empire ruled by Napoleon I. Following the lead of his famous uncle, Napoleon III sought to reassert France as a leading European power by modernizing Paris in highly visible ways. Most famous in this regard is Georges-Eugène Haussmann’s dramatic renovation of Paris into a modern city beginning in 1853, which included such

---

changes as the expansion of gaslights and sewer systems as well as the construction of a
network of boulevards and avenues, giving the old medieval city an up-to-date, logical
allure. At the heart of the Universal Exposition of 1855 lay a similar desire to assert Paris as
the modern capital of Europe, providing France the opportunity to display its advanced
technological superiority to the rest of Europe.¹⁷⁵ The exhibition of artworks by living
artists would similarly play a role in furthering the Second Empire’s image of modernity
not only through the desire to demonstrate the facility of France’s artists, but by helping
restructure discourse on art via the structures of modern nationalism.

Rodney Bruce Hall refers to the composition of the Second Empire as possessing a
unique “hybrid character” in which it was at once founded on a more traditional “imperial,
or pseudo-monarchical” model of government as well as the more modern ideology of
“national collective identity.”¹⁷⁶ Yet it would be the nationalist character of the Second
Empire that would arguably be most important, serving as a means for Napoleon III to
define his role as the leader of France both internally and externally. The Emperor may
have been an autocrat like many of his European neighbors, but he did not come from royal
lineage. This lack of recourse to heredity as a source of legitimacy placed him in contrast to
Europe’s monarchs, and as Hall argues, left Napoleon III to seek recourse in the principle of
nationality – or the proclamation of the right to national self-determination – as a means
for legitimizing his rule over France, and in turn as a guiding principle behind his foreign
policy.¹⁷⁷ During his reign, Napoleon III bolstered his image as a defender of nationalism by

¹⁷⁵ Albert Boime, Art in the Age of Civil Struggle, 1848-1871 (Chicago: University of Chicago
Press, 2007), 594.
¹⁷⁶ Rodney Bruce Hall, National Collective Identity: Social Constructs and International
Systems (New York: Columbia University Press, 1999), 198
¹⁷⁷ Hall, National Collective Identity: Social Constructs and International Systems, 178
directly aiding Italy in its battle for independence from Austria in 1859 as well as by giving support to Poland’s quest for autonomy from Russia, its independence having previously been championed by Napoleon I.\textsuperscript{178} Napoleon III’s nationalist agenda abroad helped fuel nationalist sentiments at home, strengthening support for the Second Empire. Napoleon III’s popularity in France was in large part born out of sentimental longing for the First Empire of Napoleon I, which had long since developed into a sense of national pride within French society. That two of the principal antagonists of the First Empire – Russia and Austria – would suffer territorial losses in the Emperor’s defense the right to national self-determination no doubt helped consolidate the French public’s support for Italian and Polish independence, as well as, of course, Napoleon III’s government.\textsuperscript{179}

In addition to establishing an argument for the right to rule that would antagonize the dynastic legitimacy employed by many of Europe’s rulers, Hall argues that the principle of nationality was promoted by Napoleon III as “a progressive, organizing, and modernizing force of history”\textsuperscript{180} that placed France as a guiding beacon of light guiding the rest of the world away from an outdated monarchical system. The link between progress and nationalism would similarly be at the heart of the international display of works at the Universal Exposition. As Patricia Mainardi explains, in the stages of planning the Universal Exposition, the Imperial Commission had deciding against making the exhibition of artworks retrospective in nature, opting instead to mold the show around the display of living artists. Only the works of artists still living by the date of June 22, 1853, the day the

\textsuperscript{178} \textsuperscript{178} Hall, \textit{National Collective Identity: Social Constructs and International Systems}, 178, 280
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Imperial Commission had announced its verdict, would be exhibited.\textsuperscript{181} This controversial decision, which went in the face of the reverence accorded to tradition and hierarchy by the defenders of Classicism, seems to have been tempered by the special retrospective exhibitions given to a handful of France’s established masters, including most significantly Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres and Eugène Delacroix.\textsuperscript{182}

Thus, a fusion was sought between the new Imperial philosophy of progress and the longstanding Academic ideal of traditionalism illustrated by the remarks given by Prince Napoleon, the President of the Universal Exposition and cousin to the Emperor:

\begin{quote}
Painting and sculpture will give, so to speak, a revelation of their future though an exhibition of their past, and a master whose recent works would be sufficient to immortalize his name will only be well known when the complete history of his talent is shown by the Exposition of 1855. In the arts as in all manifestations of intelligence and progress, it is useful at certain times to retrace one’s steps, to measure the ground covered, to compare the present to the past, so that we can better understand where we have come from and where we are going and prepare more confidently the ground for the future.\textsuperscript{183}
\end{quote}

Beyond the Universal Exposition, signs of an increasingly nationalized vision of art would prevail elsewhere in Second Empire institutions, including the Salon. The Salon went through a tumultuous period of change beginning with the Second Republic and through the early Second Empire, including economic difficulties, delayed and canceled Salons, and repeated changes in venue;\textsuperscript{184} yet from this chaos would eventually emerge lasting several institutional restructurings of the Salon that would last throughout much

\textsuperscript{182} Mainardi, \textit{Art and Politics of the Second Empire}, 49.
\textsuperscript{184} Patricia Mainardi, \textit{The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 18-19, Table 1, 29-30.
of the nineteenth century, and which reflect the new modernist vision of the Second Empire. This includes moving the Salon from its traditional venue at the Louvre to the Palais de l'Industrie of the Universal Exposition in 1857 – a move that, according to Patricia Mainardi, demarcates a rupture with the Classical tradition.\(^{185}\)

**Looking at International Art at the Universal Exposition: Denmark, Sweden, and Norway**

The Palais des Beaux Arts was constructed on a longitudinal plan divided into a series of interconnecting galleries allowing a division of works, hung salon style, according to participating country. At the heart of the Palais were two large central galleries displaying French paintings, around which were situated the special exhibited spaces dedicated to works of the recognized masters of the French school of painting: Ingres, Vernet, Delacroix, and Decamps. Occupying the front half of the Palais were galleries dedicated to displaying the paintings of twenty-eight\(^{186}\) participating countries from Europe, the Americas, and the Middle East, including Mexico, Turkey, Portugal, and numerous pre-unification German and Italian states that would soon cease to exist like the Kingdom of Hanover and the Grand Duchy of Tuscany. The Second Empire officials responsible for organizing of the Exposition France were unabashed in asserting the priority of France's artists. Of the 3376 paintings exhibited, more than half (1872) were created by French artists. Behind France were Great Britain and Belgium, exhibiting 381 and 226 paintings, respectively. Nearly a third of the participating countries, including

\(^{186}\) This number includes several countries unified under one government, including Sweden-Norway.
Greece and Peru, exhibited less than ten paintings.

Denmark, Sweden, and Norway all exhibited at the Universal Exposition with their own separate displays of fine art. Denmark had the largest exhibition, displaying 47 paintings created by 29 artists. Sweden came next, exhibiting 28 paintings by 17 artists. Norway, though exhibiting as part of the Dual Monarchy, was nonetheless treated in the exhibition catalogue and in critics’ reviews as a distinct nationality, and exhibited next to Sweden 16 paintings by 12 artists.\(^{187}\) Significant to the reception history of Nordic art in France, neither Finland nor Iceland had official presence at the first Universal Exposition. Iceland was still under the rule of Denmark, and Finland was a Russian duchy, which also abstained from exhibiting in 1855 due to the recent Crimean War. By consequence of their lack of visibility at the Universal Expositions, and given their lack of a national status in politics, neither Finland nor Iceland were discussed by French critics throughout most of the nineteenth century. It is only later in the 1880s, when the Duchy of Finland was permitted to organize its own display of painting at the Universal Exposition of 1889, that French critics would begin to write about these artists in the context of being so-called Finnish artists.

If the organization of the Universal Exposition led to the omission of Iceland and Finland from French discourse on art, it also created conditions by which Denmark, Sweden, and Norway would be thought of as correlated. As visitors entered through one of the Palais’ seven massive portals off the main Avenue Montaigne entrance, they would have likely almost immediately encountered the exhibition spaces of Denmark and the United

\(^{187}\) Many government documents feature discrepancies with regard to exhibition statistics that contradict one another. These statistics are based off of the number of artists and artworks listed in the official catalogue.
Kingdoms of Sweden and Norway, occupying the central portion of the building’s vestibule, and in proximity to one another. Alongside, the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian exhibits, the vestibule housed a geographical hodgepodge of other participating countries including Peru, Turkey, and the Papal States. While many of these participating countries exhibited only a handful of paintings each, by contrast, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway each displayed a relatively large number of paintings.

The artists of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway therefore had the benefit of having a strong visual presence in the Palais des Beaux-Arts. Although the entryway to the Palais des Beaux-Arts was not perhaps in many ways an optimal space for artists to display their works – as one critic complained, the vestibule became too cold during the autumn, causing most visitors to hurry through\(^{188}\) – the synergy between the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian exhibitions helped their paintings stand out. The exhibitions of Nordic painting at the Universal Exposition – especially Sweden and Norway – greatly surprised French critics, who wrote largely positive reviews, and received several distinguished recognitions from the judges.

Honorable mentions were given to numerous painters, including the Swedish landscape painter Marcus Larson, the Danish genre and portrait painters Julius Exner and Johan Gertner, and the Norwegian still-life and landscape painters Frants Bøe and Morton Müller. Even more impressive were the second-class medals given to the Danish still-life painter Theude Grønland and the Norwegian landscape painter Hans Gude. Grønland was resident of Paris and Salon veteran, admired for his fruits and flower paintings for which he

had received a first-class medal in 1848. Gude was a famed professor at the Düsseldorf Academy, celebrated throughout Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden, and his home country. After the success of his painting Vue prise dans les hautes montagnes de la province de Bergen (Norvége) [Fig. 2.1] in 1855, Gude would become one of the most successful Norwegian painters in France, even gaining the admiration of Napoleon III.

Without doubt, two of the biggest stars of the Universal Exposition were the Swedish painter Johan Höckert and Norwegian painter Adolph Tidemand. Both artists received first-class medals at the exposition. Tidemand was also given the merit of being named a Chevalier in the Légion d’honneur - a rare distinction that his fellow compatriots were happy to point out.189 Tidemand exhibited one painting, Funérailles dans les campagnes de Norvége; costumes du siècle passé [Fig. 2.2], for which he received nearly unanimous praise. The painting depicts a Norwegian gravøl, or funerary toast. Grieving friends and relatives huddle together in the cramped interior, quietly listening as one member of the community utters a few final remarks over the deceased’s plain wooden casket, his beer tankard resting nearby.190 Höckert's painting, Prêche dans une chapelle de la Laponie Suédoise [Fig. 2.3], is similar to Tidemand's in its religious tone and folkish appeal. The painting was based on a series of sketches made by Höckert during a trip to Lapland in the summer of 1850, shortly before his first sojourn in Paris.191 A preacher stands high above his congregation in his pulpit, gesticulating towards an open Bible. The

189 Beretninger om Norges deltagelse i Verdensudstillingen i Paris 1889, (Christiania: Fabritius, 1891), XXVII
190 My gratitude is given to my colleague Øystein Sjåstad, professor of art history at the University of Oslo, for clarifying the context and iconography of this painting.
colorful garments of the congregation stand in bold contrast to the sparse wooden interior of the chapel, illuminated in a rich chiaroscuro produced by the room’s sole window.

As a further testament to the painting’s major success at the exposition, Höckert’s Prêche was purchased by the French State where it was then sent – like almost all non-French paintings purchased through the Universal Exposition or Salon before the 1880s – to a museum in one of France’s regional capitals, and in this case the northern city of Lille. Both Höckert’s and Tidemand’s would often be referenced by critics and historians throughout the following decades, becoming a benchmark for later Nordic artists exhibiting in France. For many critics, Tidemand’s and Höckert’s success at the Universal Exposition marked the beginning of Nordic art. Indeed, neither Tidemand nor Höckert were well-known in France at the time of their success at the Universal Exposition; and yet Nordic artists were by no means unknown before 1855. By contrast, the Universal Exposition featured the works of several recognized artists from Denmark, Sweden, and Norway.

Alongside his compatriot Grønland, the Danish marine painter Anton Melbye led a considerable career in Paris, where he lived and worked. Although now most well-remembered for his relationship with the future Impressionist leader Camille Pissarro, Melbye’s marine paintings were highly regarded during the Second Empire. During this time, two of Melbye’s works, Les Pêcheurs de la Manche, and the drawing Un coin du Bosphore, could be seen at the Musée de Bagnères-de-Bigorre. Another painting depicting an early French steam battleship, Le vaisseau le Napoléon, was acquired by the Emperor

---

himself, and earned the Melbye the recognition of being named a Chévalier in the Légion d’honneur in 1854.\(^\text{193}\)

Another renowned Scandinavian painter in France at the beginning of the Second Empire was the Dano-Swedish animal painter Carl Fredrik Kiörboe. A former cavalry officer, Kiörboe moved to France in 1840 to pursue a career as an artist, where he used his familiarity with horse anatomy to carve out a career as a painter of hunting and animal scenes.\(^\text{194}\) Kiörboe’s began exhibiting at the Salon in 1841 and quickly received official recognition, winning third and second-class medals in 1844 and 1846, respectively. His most famous work, *The Inundation*, is characteristic of the artist’s scenes, depicting in dramatic and sentimental fashion a howling Newfoundland dog trying in vain to save her puppies from rising floodwaters. According to Georg Nordensvan, not only was the painting purchased by the state in 1850, but was also widely reproduced in engraving and photographic prints.\(^\text{195}\) One of Kiörboe’s greatest honors, however, occurred the year of the Universal Exposition, when he was commissioned to paint a dynamic portrait of the Emperor charging on a horse in battle [Fig. 2.4] and two similar equestrian portraits of the Empress.\(^\text{196}\) Like many of his eighteenth-century predecessors, including Cogell and Hall, Kiörboe had succeeded in carving out a spot for himself as an expatriate artist in France,
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\(^{193}\) *Catalogue du Musée de Peinture et de Sculpture Donné par M. Achille Jubinal à la ville de Bagnères-de-Bigorre* (Bagnères-de-Bigorre: Librairie de Dossun, 1852-1864), 19


\(^{196}\) *Explication des ouvrages de peinture...* (1855), 215.
where he lived until his death in 1876,

When Kjörboe exhibited his fox hunting scene, *Course de trotteurs sur un lac, en Suède*, [Fig 2.5] at the Universal Exposition, critics were largely silent, much as they were with the two marine paintings exhibited by Melbye. Although both artists, like Grønland, led successful careers in the French Salon and art market, the curation of the Universal Exposition helped further establish a context for viewership centered on nationality, thereby helping usher in new system of aesthetic evaluation aiming to measure, critique, and compare so-called national styles. Like their eighteenth-century Swedish Rococo predecessors, Melbye, Grønland, and Kjörbøe largely painted in popular genre styles whose roots were in England and the Netherlands, and for which the idea of national expression largely lay outside of the considerations of both the artists and their audiences; yet at the Universal Exposition of 1855 the critic A. J. Du Pays would complain that Kjörboe’s *Course de trotteurs sur un lac* borrowed too heavily from English painters.\(^{197}\) Evidence of “empreinte nationale,”\(^ {198}\) which Diderot had complained diminished the works of Roslin, was now sought after as an important indicator of artistic merit. In contrast to Kjörboe, the paintings of Höckert ultimately seemed more national to French critics. Such debates about the role of nationality in art would factor heavily into art critics’ reviews Universal Exposition of 1855, featuring prominently in dialogue surrounding the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian exhibitions of painting.

---

\(^{197}\) Du Pays, “Exposition universelle des beaux-arts,” 373

Fluctuating Definitions of École: the debate surrounding Nordic art and nationality

Critics’ reviews of the foreign exhibitions of painting at the Universal Exposition of 1855 reveal a time of transition in art theory from its roots in classical universal to modern nationalism. The organization of artworks at the exposition according to the participating nation did not immediately cause critics to assume nationalist theories of artistic production. Instead, many critics continued to affirm the continued existence of the traditional écoles, including Spain, Germany, the Netherlands, and the Italian schools persisted; and yet in comparing the artworks produced by contemporary artists from these different regions, critics deemed the traditional hierarchy of schools suitable for a modern revision.

According to the Romantic critic Théophile Gautier there existed four major schools of art in 1855, England, Belgium, Germany, and France, each of which expressed the national characteristics of individuality, craft, idea, and eclecticism. Gautier framed his criticism according to a traditional hierarchy of schools, but updated to account for the political, industrial, as well as artistic prowess exhibited by Germany, England and France during the nineteenth century. Conspicuously absent from Gautier’s hierarchy of schools are Italy and Spain. According to Gautier’s understanding of the cyclical rise and fall of historical epochs, like infertile fields fallen into disuse, these civilizations no longer produced great artists, and were therefore no longer relevant to the people of...

contemporary Europe.²⁰⁰ The material forces of “time and circumstance,”²⁰¹ argues Gautier, had subjected the traditions of the past to change to the processes of revival – visible in the fruitful artistic productions of England, Belgium, Germany, and France – or, in the cases of Spain and Italy, decadence.

Some critics, however, saw not only evidence that the hierarchies of tradition had been reshuffled, but the creation of new traditions as well. Critics such as Maxime Du Camp, who tended to treat time as progressive rather than cyclical, tended to look at the exhibitions of painting in 1855 as situated within a flux of emerging and collapsing nations. Comparing the exhibitions of Sweden and Norway to those of Spain and the United States, Du Camp saw evidence of emerging national style in both Swedish and Norwegian art: “En matière artistique, les Etats-Unis d’Amérique n’existent pas encore et l’Espagne n’existe plus; nous n’aurons donc pas à en parler; en revanche nous signalerons les efforts, encore indécis mais courageux, que la Suède et la Norwège font pour prendre un rang honorable parmi les nations amies des beaux-arts.”²⁰² The notion that the arts of the Nordic countries had not reached the mature state of having a distinct national style would often be reiterated by critics at the Universal Exposition of 1855 and in its wake. Echoing Du Camp, although Ernest Gebaüer located a “certain national air”²⁰³ in these Northern artists, their artistic efforts were too tentative to be counted as constituting their own national écoles.²⁰⁴

²⁰⁴ In one passing instance, Delécluze refers to Danish art as an “école du Nord,” but seems to be using the term loosely to categorize Danish artists as instinctively genre painters. See
One of the common critiques of the Nordic painting exhibitions in 1855 which linked to critics’ hesitancy to describe them expressive of a national style was that many of the exhibiting artists trained and worked in either Paris or Düsseldorf, and thereby painted with a foreign accent. Indeed, many of the artists exhibiting in the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian exhibitions listed addresses in Germany or France. Of the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists who received recognition from the jury, only Exner had an address that matched with his country of birth. One peculiar but poignant example of the influence Düsseldorf and Paris played on Nordic – especially Swedish and Norwegian – artists can be seen in paintings of Norwegian marine artist Johan Bennetter. Like several other Norwegian painters of his generation, Bennetter had trained in France, having learned from the French marine painter Théodore Gudin, and continued to live in the country where he received his education. Unlike many of his colleagues, however, at the Universal Exposition of 1855 Benneter chose to hang his paintings in the Norwegian galleries, but rather in those of France.

Although Bennetter interpreted his national identity in terms of habitat rather than birthplace or bloodline, many French critics present at the Universal Exposition of 1855 sought to find through painting evidence of a link between a nation’s historical past and its contemporary culture. For A. J. Du Pays, the distant lands Denmark, Norway, and Sweden promised exotic spectacles of Valkyries and Vikings, and yet the critic would be

---


206 At the following Universal Exposition of 1867, Bennetter – though still living in France – would exhibit with Norway.
disappointed to find that many Nordic artists painted in the same manner as those of the rest of Europe:

A cette dernière extrémité de l’Europe . . . il semble que l’art va revêtir des formes inusitées et réveiller notre gout, suffisamment blasé, par un aspect étrange. Ces contrées appartenaient encore au paganisme au onzième siècle, et avaient des temples élevés aux dieux Thor et Odin. C’était la patrie des elfes et des valkyries, ces déesses de la guerre qui après la mort des héros leur versaient, dans le Walhalla, la bière et l’hydromel. Pourquoi cette poésie guerrière des Eddas, pourquoi cette sombre mythologie des races scandinaves, aux échos bien plus rapprochés que ne le sont pour les races latines ceux de la mythologie grecque dont elles n’ont pu épuiser les enchantements, n’est-elle pas restée pour les premières, une source ouverte d’inspiration ? Tous les peuples de l’Europe sont-ils donc destinés à avoir, dans les arts et dans la littérature, un seuil et même idéal, comme ils ont déjà presque partout un seul et même costume ?

Du Pays’ comments - especially his interest in Norse mythology, and his description of Nordic artists as warrior poets – illustrate the powerful influence that the historical reception of Nordic literature through Romantic writers such as Mallet and De Staël would continue to have throughout the nineteenth century. Many French critics came to the galleries of foreign painting at the Universal Exposition much like tourists, hoping to catch a glimpse foreign peoples whose customs were quite unlike their own.

Critic and judges therefore found praise for artists such as Exner and Larson because of the ethnographic, topographical, as well as romantic qualities of the works they displayed. Larson depicted dramatic scenery of the Swedish landscape, such as Torrent dans une vallée de Suède, while Exner was known his colorful renditions of the dress and customs of the farmers of Amager, like in Paysan de l’île d’Amack. The allure of exotic discovery was what else led to the great success of Höckert’s painting of the congregants of Swedish Lapland. Pious peasants were of course a staple of genre painting, but Höckert’s
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207 Du Pays, “Exposition universelle des beaux-arts,” 373
Prêche dans une chapelle de la Laponie Suédoise had a powerful effect on the critics of 1855 that pulled them beyond the anecdotal details. “Il fait rêver aux grandes solitudes blanchies par la neige . . .”, remarks Du Camp. No matter that not a trace of snow is visible in the scene! What Du Camp ascribes to Höckert’s Prêche is not simply the ability to describe the rural life and topography of northern Sweden, but the power to evoke its spirit.

For Étienne-Jean Delécluze, the mystique of Höckert’s painting is specifically linked to what the author perceives as the Nordic people’s penitent Protestant roots, producing a spiritual quality to Swedish and Norwegian painting that he, echoing De Staël and Du Pays, refers to as “Northern poetry.” “C’est la poésie du Nord qui en fait le charme,” remarks Delécluze on comparing the paintings of Tidemand and Höckert, “Le soleil est voilé, la campagne et les habitations sont tristes; les vêtements rigides et épais cachent les formes humaines et alourdissent tous les mouvements du corps; l’âme seule, grâce à sa nature subtile, se fait jour à travers tous ces obstacles matériels: aussi les poètes ainsi que les artistes du Nord s’attachent-ils plus à peindre les sentiments que les formes.”

Nowhere else are the ideas of Scandinavian poetry, sentimentalism, and nature mysticism better expressed than in Claudius Lavergne’s description of Adolph Tidemand’s Funérailles dans les campagnes de Norvége. A scene like Höckert’s in terms of subject matter and composition, Tidemand’s painting depicts a Norwegian funerary toast. Grieving friends and relatives huddle together in the cramped interior, quietly listening as one member of the community utters a few final remarks over the deceased’s plain wooden
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casket, his beer tankard resting nearby.\textsuperscript{210} Evoking lines from Scottish author Walter Scott’s \textit{The Antiquary} (1816), Lavergne reinforces the connection between Scandinavian art, elegiac poetry, and frigid Northern climates:

Les larmes de la jeunesse sont une tiède rosée; – de nos yeux affaiblis par l’âge, la douleur tombe en larmes froides comme la grêle du nord, et qui glace les sillons de nos joues flétries; elles sont froides comme nos espérances, douloureuses comme nos pensées. – Celles que versent les jeunes gens ne laissent pas de traces; - les nôtres retombent sur nos cœurs; elles s’y amassent et décolorent pour nous le spectacle du monde.”\textsuperscript{211}

For Lavergne, the comparison between Scott’s poem and Tidemand’s painting is pertinent not just in terms of their similarly mournful subject matter, but because both the Scotsman and the Norwegian express in common a particular type of sadness unique to the North, one anchored in the severe and contemplative manner of suffering in Protestantism;\textsuperscript{212} but just as Du Camp conjures up images of desolate snow-swept landscapes in front of Höckert’s painting, Lavergne’s lyrical evocation of frozen tears falling like hail through Tidemand reveals how greatly the power Nordic nature – or at least how French critics imagined it – factored as a common source of inspiration and causation for artists.

Yet if artists such as Höckert could be appreciated for rendering the unique poetry of the Nordic natural environment insofar as it was expressive of a foreign artistic tradition, the Northern environment could simultaneously be read as a hindrance. “La Suède et la Norwège, malgré leur latitude septentrionale et leur jour polaire, possèdent des

\textsuperscript{210} The original Norwegian title identifies the scene specifically as a funeral feast or toast (\textit{Gravøl}), rather than as a funeral as indicated by the French title under which the painting was exhibited in 1855 (\textit{Funérailles dans les campagnes de Norwége; costumes du siècle passé}).

\textsuperscript{211} Lavergne, \textit{Exposition Universelle de 1855}, 47. For original English, see Sir Walter Scott, \textit{The Antiquary} (London: Oxford University Press, 1912 [1816]), 345.

\textsuperscript{212} Lavergne, \textit{Exposition Universelle de 1855}, 46–47.
peintres remarquables,” writes Gautier; “l’art est une plante vivace et qui fleurit partout, là même où le renne ne trouve sous la neige que du lichen à brouter.”

Gautier echoes De Staël’s idea that the cold pushes action inward to create contemplative temperaments, but unlike his Romantic predecessor, the critic saw the Northern environment as an obstacle that must be transcended for art to flourish. More simply, Gautier had ambivalent feelings towards the sublime aesthetic that painters frequently emphasized in depicting northern climates. Examining Auguste Biard’s paintings of Svalbard in 1841, the critic proclaimed that the phenomenal effects and topographies of the extreme North were both ugly and uninteresting.

Grønland’s fruit and flower paintings did not inspire French critics to the same degree that Höckert’s and Tidemand’s genre paintings did. More broadly, the Danish exhibition of painting received conspicuously less discussion – as well as fewer recognitions from the jury – than those of Sweden and Norway. Others criticized the Danish exhibition outright. While praising the two paintings exhibited by Grønland with exoticizing language typical of critics’ reviews of the Nordic exhibitions in 1855, Edmond About simultaneously disparaged the rest of the Danish exhibition, writing, “Ces deux tableaux ont dû apparaître au milieu des brouillards du Danemark comme le songe d’une nuit d’été.”

About’s disinterest, and even distaste, in Danish painting marks a discernible pattern in the French reception of Nordic art during the nineteenth century. The Danish

---

exhibition featured several celebrated Golden Age painters including P. C. Skovgaard, Wilhelm Khyn, and director of the Copenhagen Academy Wilhelm Marstrand, who exhibited his painting, *Des habitants de la Dalécarlie, en Suède, traversent le lac de Siljan pour se rendre à l'église* [Fig. 2.6]. At first glance, Marstrand's visual description of the rituals of pious Nordic peasants seems to possess the same naturalistic qualities and ethnographic appeal that led French critics to celebrate Höckert and Tidemand. Moreover, in contrast to Sweden's and Norway's painters, who French critics complained all lived outside of Scandinavia, the majority Danish artists exhibiting in 1855 resided in Denmark. Throughout the nineteenth century, however, French critics would consistently reject the Danish Golden Age style, decrying its metallic skies, dull landscapes, and stiff characters. In other words, though French critics appealed to the importance of a nation's authenticity, painters like Marstrand tended to be too removed from the French style, and too foreign, while the Danes who would gain praise during the Second Empire, such as Elisabeth Jerichau-Baumann and Lorentz Frølich, knew how to assimilate French techniques within their own artworks.

What can be broadly noted within critics' reviews of Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists is their tendency to explain and evoke as much as they describe the works in the form of conjured imagery, comparisons to other European artistic traditions, or through the comparison of geographical and social distinctions such as climate and religion. The intention of the Universal Exposition to be an all-encompassing exhibition of contemporary paintings pushed critics to recognize a diversity of schools, types of beauty, as well as the temporal vicissitudes of art itself, and therefore necessitated new geographical, cultural, and historical systems of aesthetic interpretation that could make
sense of this highly diverse world of art.\textsuperscript{216} Many of the ideas referenced by critics, such the mystery of the North, the poetic sentiment of its artists, the domineering force of its cold climate, and even its kinship to Scotland reveal as much about French critics’ knowledge of the Nordic countries as they do their ignorance. From Lavergne’s evocations of Scottish poetry to Gautier’s derision of the northern latitudes from which the artists hailed, the judgments critics attached to Nordic artists at the Universal Exposition are pregnant with the cultural legacies of Montesquieu, Mallet, and De Staël. Indeed, the very idea of Scandinavia as a \textit{terra incognita}, in relation to both the \textit{vagina gentium} and Valhalla, would remain one of the longest standing associations in relation to Nordic art in France.

\textbf{Interpretations of Nordic art as German}

One of the most significant legacies stemming from the Romantic generation’s reception of Nordic literature would be the tendency for French critics writing during the mid-nineteenth-century to assimilate Nordic art under Germany. Although critics periodically alluded to Dutch painting or Scottish poetry when writing about Nordic art, comparisons to Germany were more frequent. One of the reasons for critics’ association between German and Nordic stems from De Staël’s division of the Teutonic and Latin peoples in \textit{De l’Allemagne}. De Staël’s characterized Germanic art as philosophical, elegiac, and inspired by Christian spiritualism, contrasting this with the Latin South’s sensuous and material nature.

Numerous examples occur during the mid-century in which critics writing on Nordic artists reference to the so-called German aesthetic. At the Salon d’Amiens in 1841,\textsuperscript{216} Mainardi, \textit{Art and Politics of the Second Empire}, 66.
for example, Gørbitz’s landscapes were described by one critic as exhibiting “la manière sévère de l’école allemande.” In a similar manner, in 1862 Gautier would praise the Danish illustrator Lorenz Frølich’s engravings for *Amour et Psyche* by declaring that they possessed a “grâce pompéienne . . . simplifié par la sincérité germanique.” In his review, Gautier reinforces the connection to German art by comparing Frølich to the Nazarene painter Peter von Cornelius. Undoubtedly, Gautier was thinking of Cornelius’ series of preparatory drawings for a fresco depicting the Apocalypse, which the artist had exhibited seven years earlier in the Prussian painting section at the Universal Exposition. Cornelius’ Apocalyptic scenes, along with the paintings of fellow Prussian artist Wilhelm von Kaulbach, had been a major success at the Universal Exposition. Both artists received first-class medals for their works, and helped solidify French critics’ belief that Germany was one of the leading contemporary national schools of art.

The simultaneous success of Höckert’s and Tidemand’s religious genre paintings at the Universal Exposition of 1855 helped elicit comparisons between German and Nordic painting. Both Lavergne and Délecluze described Prussian and Nordic art as fundamentally more concerned with the expression of ideas than forms, which the critics saw as having roots in Protestantism. This tendency to describe German art as Christian and philosophical in nature had been developing in French art criticism over the past several decades, during a time of intense interest in German art. As Regis Spiegel points out, the
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1830s and 40s marks an important period in the French reception of German painting. Many writers and artists including Alexandre Dumas, Victor Hugo, and Gustave Courbet, traveled to Germany around this period, bringing back with them their thoughts and impressions. Through increased contact with German art arose a series of studies on the subject, including Hippolyte Fortoul’s, *De l’art en Allemagne* (1841-42), Athanase Raczinski’s *Histoire de l’art en Allemagne* (1836-1842), and Félix Nève’s, *De la tendance nouvelle de l’art en Allemagne* (1845), thereby further familiarizing French audiences with historical and contemporary German traditions. Above all, the religious art of Johann Friedrich Overbeck and his fellow Nazarenes garnered the greatest interest, helping set the foundation for the association between German painting and philosophical or religious imagery.

Published one year after the Universal Exposition, Bathild Bouniol’s book *L’Art Chrétien et l’École Allemande* demonstrates the influence that French interpretations of German art had on the reception of Nordic art. Pointing to the successes garnered at the Universal Exposition, Bouniol paints a triumphant picture of *l’école allemande* and its Nazarene leaders. Bouniol looked to the exposition, like many critics, as a sign of the progress or decadence of different national schools, pointing to the decline of the traditional schools led by Italy alongside the rise of the new schools, which included France, Germany, and England. Unlike many other writers, however, Bouniol is more
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explicit in dividing the landscape of contemporary European art into according to a hierarchy of dominant and subservient nations:

L’Exposition universelle des Beaux-Arts a rendu cet important service qu’elle a permis d’apprécier les tendances de l’art, non plus sur un point isolé, mais dans l’Europe entière, et par l’état présent d’augurer de l’avenir. De cet examen, pour nous il ressort qu’il n’est guère que trois grandes Écoles actuellement en présence : l’École Française, dans laquelle se confond, par ses affinités en général malgré quelques divergences de détail, l’École Belge qui peut citer de beaux noms ; l’École Anglaise, pittoresque et originale, mais dans un cercle retrait ; l’École Allemand, plus noble dans ses aspirations, ayant un but tout autrement glorieux, presque exclusivement spiritualiste et promise, si elle acquiert ce qui lui manque, aux plus hautes destinées. A cette École se rattachent les quelques peintres de la presqu’île Scandinave, et en particulier le Norvégien Tidemant [sic], instruit à Dusseldorf où il réside encore.221

Buoniol’s description of Scandinavian art as a subspecies of the spiritual l’École allemande, alongside his references to Tidemand and his residency in Düsseldorf, demonstrate the impact that the exhibition of Swedish and Norwegian paintings in 1855 – with its strong contingency of Düsseldorf painters, and religious genre scenes – had on French perceptions of Nordic art. Though the Nordic exhibitions were successful in introducing contemporary Nordic painters to French critics, many critics and historians continued to categorize art according to a pre-nationalist hierarchy of grandes Écoles – a system inherited from the Academic tradition, but revised according to contemporary, Romantic tastes which favored the school of Overbeck over that of David.

Nonetheless, the gradual modernization of art historical discipline throughout the mid-nineteenth-century, in which the writer’s task would come to mimic the methodology of a biologist or anthropologist – tracing the evolution of nations, describing the impact of

221 Bathild Bouniol, L’Art chrétien et l’école allemande, avec une notice sur M. Overbeck (Paris: Ambroise Bray; Schulgen et Schwan, 1856), 15-16
ecology on art, and creating meticulous taxonomies of écoles d’art – was proving the difficulty of synthesizing traditional artistic hierarchies with increasingly broad and nationalized ways of looking at art. Other contemporary attempts within French texts to classify Nordic artists, including the daunting Dictionnaire historique des peintres de toutes les écoles depuis l’origine de la peinture jusqu’à nos jours, first published in 1844 by the Belgian writer Adolphe Siret, demonstrates the common tendency for writers to classify Nordic artists as German, while also the great confusion that occurred when attempting to do so. In the 1866 edition of Dictionnaire historique des peintres, Siret classified eight majore schools of art: l’école Allemande, l’école Anglaise, l’école Espagnole, l’école Flamande, l’école Française, l’école Hollandaise, l’école Italienne, and l’école Russe. Other than the inclusion of Russia, Siret’s dictionary upholds the traditional hierarchies of the artistic schools utilized by eighteenth-century writers. Yet in contrast to earlier writings such as Dictionnaire des arts de peinture, sculpture et gravure, which limited their writing on – and, furthermore, their definition of – schools of art to deceased famous masters and their notable students, Siret attempts to create an encyclopedic work analyzing both past and contemporary artists and categorizing them according to the eight grandes Écoles.

Siret included within his Dictionnaire historique des peintres numerous nineteenth-century Nordic artists, most of whom he subsumed under l’école Allemande. This includes, least unsurprisingly, Norwegian artists of the Düsseldorf School including Johan Christian Dahl and Hans Gude, but also Danish Golden Age such Christoffer Wilhelm Eckersberg. More curiously, several contemporary Danish artists who exhibited at the 1855 Universal
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222 Adolphe Siret, Dictionnaire historique des peintres de toutes les écoles depuis l’origine de la peinture jusqu’à nos jours, 2nd edition (Paris: Librairie Internationale, 1866)
Exposition such as Julius Exner, who lived and trained in Copenhagen under Eckersberg. Bizarrely, Siret also names the Swedish Rococo painter Gustaf Lundberg as member of l’école Allemande, while other members of the eighteenth-century colony of Swedish artists working in France, like Roslin, are classified under l’école Française. Although fewer in number than the Nordic artists placed under l’école Allemande, l’école Française also included several more recent artists who made their careers in France, like Gørbitz and Kjörboe.

At the very end of his list of écoles, Siret also includes the much shorter list of artists, titled simply Suédois. Within this group appears the names of Swedish artists Johan Höckert and Per Wickenberg – the two most famous Swedish artists in mid-century France – but also Adolph Tidemand. That Siret uses the title Suédois (Swedes) and not école Suédoise denotes the ambiguous and unofficial manner of this group – as if to say that these artists are of course Swedes, and their art is undoubtedly Swede-ish in character, but that there is no Swedish Art. Of course, Siret’s dictionary demonstrates the difficulty of define artists according to either Academic or nationalist categories; for while most Nordic artists are listed as part of the German School, Siret’s taxonomy starts to twist around itself when it comes to face someone like Roslin, a member of the French Academy and therefore traditionally considered part of the French School, or contemporaries like Höckert, exhibiting and receiving recognition as a Swedish at the Universal Exposition, or Tidemand, a Norwegian artist working in a Prussian city whose country was nominally ruled by a Swedish monarch.
Perhaps as an attempt to ameliorate this conundrum, in Siret's 1883 edition of his dictionary, he would eliminate the Suédois section, and placing a notice in the introduction stating that Swedish and Norwegian artists would hereafter be categorized as German:

Les peintres de Suède et de Norvége ont été rangé dans l’école allemande. Ceux de Suisse dans l’école française et allemande selon la frontière avoisinante. Ceux d’Amérique dans l’école anglaise. Le jour n’est pas éloigné où ces différentes écoles occuperont dans l’histoire leur place individuelle comme les autres. Le moment ne nous a pas semblé venu d’établir cette division nationale.  

Siret therefore largely falls back on tradition, relying on the Academic grandes Écoles and following the Romantic trend to subsume the Nordic countries under Germany. Nonetheless, the author’s recalibration of the terms and categories of European art in reflect the much more dramatic ways in which the map of Europe had been redrawn in the time preceding the publication of the 1883 edition of Siret’s dictionary. Wars of national unification and fissure, and most particularly Second Schleswig War and Franco-Prussian War, would have a transformative effect on how French critics looked at both German and Nordic art. Yet in contrast to Siret, who almost seems to accept German expansion as a natural effect in art as in politics, many art critics in France would take an oppositional stance to Germany by dividing up what had in past been considered the domain of l’école Allemande. Beginning in the 1860s, Nordic artists would slowly be subsumed into a new category of art, l’école scandinave. This term would reflect French critic's growing interest in Nordic artists, already visible at the first Universal Exposition, but perhaps more
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Nordic Art Past and Present

The years following the Universal Exposition would be marked by an increasingly prominent presence of Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists working in France. Indeed, just four years after the 1855 Universal Exposition, one critic remarked that Scandinavian artists had become a veritable colony within Paris. Many of these artists took lessons from the French artist Thomas Couture, who took under his tutelage around twenty Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists throughout the course of the 1850s – the second largest group of foreign artists in the Couture’s atelier behind the German artists. Amongst this group were artists who had or would enjoy relatively great success in France, including the Danes Lorenz Frølich and Anton Melbye, the Swedes, Ferdinand Fagerlin and Johan Höckert, and the Norwegian Adolph Tidemand. Though many Nordic artists studied only briefly with Couture beginning in 1855 either immediately before or after the Universal Exposition, Nordic artists were becoming an increasingly visible presence at the Salon, where they garnered further attention from French critics.

The success of contemporary Nordic artists in 1855 changed perceptions of Nordic art history as well. A decade later, after being appointed as the Conservateur-Adjoint des Musées impériaux in addition to continuing to organize the Salon,
Chennevières appealed to Nieuwerkerke to transform the states’ museum of contemporary French artists, the Luxembourg Museum, to include a separate gallery for artworks by foreign artists. Just as the Louvre housed an international collection of “écoles anciennes,” Chennevières envisioned a newly organized Luxembourg to display the “diverses écoles vivantes” of various nations.\textsuperscript{227} In his letter to Nieuwerkerke, publicly printed in the Luxembourg Museum catalogue, Chennevières cites the international character of the Academy and the Salon, both of which admitted foreign artists. Drawn by the nation’s liberal values and artistic prowess, France, Chennevières argued, attracted only the most skilled artists of all traditions from far and wide.\textsuperscript{228} To display France’s illustrious collection of foreign artworks was not only to give just dues to artists who created them, but to shine a patriotic light on France as the central hub of modern art.

The rich history of Swedish artist émigrés in France was to have a considerable influence on Chennevières’ internationalized vision of France. Traditionally, as Chennevières mentions in his appeal to transform the Luxembourg Museum, works by foreign artists were sent to France’s provincial museums.\textsuperscript{229} While working as the director of provincial museums, Chennevières became familiar with works by works by eighteenth-century Swedish artists working in France. Chennevières cites the history of Swedish artists working in France in his 1863 letter as evidence of France’s unique and longstanding status as the international hub of Europe’s finest artists. Seven years

\textsuperscript{228} Chennevières, “A Monsieur le Comte de Niewerkerke (1863),” 1868, VII-VIII.
\textsuperscript{229} Chennevières, “A Monsieur le Comte de Niewerkerke (1863),” 1868, VIII.
earlier, the administrator also published a six-part series of articles on the lives of Sergel, Roslin, and Wertmüller in the Revue Universelle des Arts – possibly the first historical treatise on the lives of Swedish artists in French since Marianne d’Ehrenström’s Notice sur la Litterature et les Beaux-Arts en Suede.  

Although Chennevières’ writings on the eighteenth-century Swedish artists in France counts as only one part of his decades-long pursuit of internationalizing France’s art institutions his decision to publish them beginning in 1856, the author admits, was motivated by a contemporary event – the success of Scandinavian artists including Adolph Tidemand and Johann Höckert at the Universal Exposition one year earlier. Nearly sixty painters from Denmark, Sweden, and Norway were represented in the Universal Exposition’s Palais des Beaux-Arts, together exhibiting close to a hundred works – a number far exceeding what artists from these countries had exhibited at earlier salons. Furthermore, he exhibition spaces of Denmark and the United Kingdoms of Sweden and Norway would be placed immediately next to one another, reinforcing the notion of a shared Scandinavian unity in the arts.

---

232 Following information gathered from the Database of Salon Artists, approximately only 18 Danish, Norwegian, or Swedish artists exhibited their works in France between 1827 and 1850. See: Harriet Griffiths and Alister Mill, Database of Salon Artists, http://humanities-research.exeter.ac.uk/salonartists/works
L’école scandinave and the Salon of 1861

The Salon of 1861 would mark an important point in the reception of Nordic art in France, both with regard to the official successes garnered by artists include Gude, Tidemand, and the Dane Elisabeth Jerichau-Baumann, as well as with regard to how these artists were written about by French critics. Tidemand was again a hit with French audiences through his painting, La toilette de la fiancée en Norvège, which was purchased by the French state for 12,000 francs after its exhibition. The painting was reproduced in both French and Norwegian publications, including in Norske Folkelivsbilleder [Fig. 2.7].

Both Du Camp and Gautier, having previously written lukewarm reviews of Scandinavian artists at the Universal Exposition, now praised Tidemand’s La toilette de la fiancée en Norvège by drawing connections to his works exhibited earlier in 1855. An apt follow-up to his earlier Funérailles dans les campagnes de Norwège, Tidemand’s La toilette de la fiancée en Norvège depicts a folk ritual in Norway – the donning of a bridal crown in advance of a marriage. Both paintings rely heavily on the symbolic power of cultural objects – from beer tankards to traditional bunad folk dress – to convey their messages about the continuity and community of Norwegian life through the repetition of tradition. In La toilette de la fiancée en Norvège, Tidemand places particular emphasis on the passage of wedding jewels from the elderly woman to the young bride-to-be – a symbolic gesture commented upon in an article on Norwegian wedding rituals for Le Magasin Pittoresque a year later, using Tidemand’s paintings as an illustration. French audiences were no doubt
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interested in learning about the unique customs, rites of passage, and colorful dress of their European neighbors. In accordance with this sentiment, *La toilette de la fiancée en Norvège* was purchased by the French state for 12,000 francs after its exhibition.235

Works by Nordic artists found further support from the Emperor and Empress of France. Napoleon III had already in 1855 commissioned an equestrian portrait from the Swedish animal painter Carl Fredrik Kiörboe, and in 1861, the Emperor purchased for 6000 francs *Montagnes de Norvège*, exhibited at the Salon that year by Hans Gude. Gude’s landscape was sent to the Emperor’s palace at Saint Cloud where it was hung up in the Salon des Dames, rendered visibly in Jean Baptiste Fortuné de Fournier’s painting of the palace salons [Fig. 2.8].236 Just one year earlier, in 1860, the Emperor had purchased the genre scene *La Lecture de la Bible* from Polish-born Danish artist Elisabeth Jerichau-Baumann.237 Though she had exhibited with Denmark at the Universal Exposition, it was only in the years immediately following that she gained her greatest success in France. At the Salon of 1861, she exhibited *La Lecture de la Bible* along with a dozen other paintings among which included *Les délices de la maternité*, also purchased by the French state immediately after the Salon for 4000 francs.238
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Some critics who reviewed the Salon of 1861, such as Gautier, continued with the same Romantic tendencies of analyzing Nordic artists in terms of climatology. Gautier singled out Jerichau-Baumann’s portrait of the Queen of Denmark for its life-like use of color, a remarkable feat to be witnessed in a “peintre septentrional” since “le nord, avec ses clartés étranges, autorise souvent les peintres a des effets qui nous paraissent invraisemblables et choquent nos yeux habitués à une lumière pleine et régulière.”

Although Gautier’s tangential remark about northern climates seems out of place in the context of the rather banal subject matter of royal portrait, Gautier was undoubtedly influenced by the other paintings that Jerichau-Baumann hung near her portrait. Jerichau-Baumann exhibited two mythological paintings at the Salon of 1861, *La sirène du Nord* and *Hallgerd, costume de fiancée à Rejckjawick (Island)*. The latter painting represents, Hallgerd, wife of Gunnar Hámundarson in the medieval Icelandic manuscript *Njáls saga*. In *La sirène du Nord*, Jerichau depicts a *havfrue*, otherwise known as a siren or mermaid, who lured Danish fishermen to their deaths at sea. Although the location of the painting exhibited in 1861 is unknown, she would return to the mythological subject more than once in her career, including again in 1873 [Fig. 2.9]. Jerichau-Bauman’s representations of traditional Nordic folklore, just like Tidemand’s depiction of Norwegian cultural rituals, provided Gautier distinct motifs that could readily be identified as distinctly Scandinavian. “Il y a dans tout cela quelque chose de perfide et de mystérieux,” proclaimed Gautier while regarding *La sirène du Nord*; “malheur à l’Ulysse scandinave dont la barque touchera le récif!”

---
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One of the main critiques of the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian sections at the Universal Exposition was not that these countries lacked praiseworthy artists, but rather that these artists lacked a cohesive set of artistic traits to distinguish them from those of more established national schools. Arguably the first French writer to claim that the artists of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway constituted their own school of art, l’école scandinave, was the journalist Auguste Geffroy. He was of France’s leading authorities on Scandinavian history and politics during the Second Empire. He authored numerous books and articles on Scandinavia, including Histoire Des États Scandinaives (1851), and had traveled to each of the Scandinavian countries beginning in 1852.241 Geffroy’s extensive knowledge of Scandinavia also led him into political journalism, covering, amongst other topics, the simmering feud between Prussia and Denmark over the duchies of Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenburg that would eventual culminated in the Second Schleswig War in 1864.

Having taken up the role art critic at the Salon of 1861, Geffroy argued that the artists of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway by this time had emerged as a distinct cultural group, identifiable by the themes and motifs visible within their artworks. According to Geffroy, the école scandinave had three core traits common to artists – and indeed, all the people – of the Scandinavian countries: Protestant morality and national mores, a yearning for the natural beauty of the North, and a shared knowledge of national mythology.242 Geffroy linked these three thematic categories to the genre paintings of Tidemand, the


landscapes of Gude, and the mythological paintings of Jerichau-Baumann, all visible at that year's Salon. Yet while particular artists could be pointed out as illustrations of the school's tendencies, he stressed that no single artist could define the group:

Que faut-il dans les arts pour constituer une école? Une communauté d'inspiration et de mérite qui peut être lue à l'exemple d'un ou deux maîtres de génie ou à de certaines Influences extérieures agissant de même façon sur un grand nombre de talens exercés. Même sans Rembrandt, qui l'a illustrée, l'école hollandaise se fondait, et l'on reconnaît aujourd'hui plus d'une école étrangère de peinture qui se distingue seulement par une manière particulière et uniforme, sans avoir produit des œuvres d'une incontestable supériorité. À ce dernier titre, beaucoup de conditions se réunissent pour faire du groupe des peintres scandinaves une école que les récentes expositions européennes, et particulièrement la grande exposition parisienne de 1855, ont mise en lumière.243

Geffroy's definition of art as an inherently social phenomenon was another blow to the Academic definition of école by the increasingly influential ideals of modernism. Rather than understanding artistic schools as the influence of masters on his contemporaries, Geffroy asserts that the master is a product of his society. Style emanated outwards not through the ateliers but through a national ethos. Therefore, it made little difference if French art critics could not link Scandinavia to a Raphael, a Rembrandt, or some other great historical figure, since the Scandinavian artists of present adequately expressed their heritage and community in a distinctive manner.

Geffroy's argument for l'école scandinave weaves together contemporary French and Danish art theory, and more particularly the writings of Théophile Thoré and Niels Laurits Høyen. Of the most obvious influence on Geffroy are the Scandinavist ideas of the Høyen, a Danish art historian, who had advocated for en skandinavisk Nationalkunst in his 1844 lecture “On the conditions for the development of a Scandinavian National Art.” Høyen

encouraged artists to cultivate a “folkish mindset” by drawing from the land, folk life, and history of Scandinavia, which included motifs such as traditional costumes, the Sagas and Old Norse Literature, the plains and islands of Denmark, and the mountains of Sweden and Norway. Høyen’s Scandinavist ideals were put to practice through the organization Selskabet for Nordisk Konst. The organization, whose membership included prominent persons such as the founder of Carlsberg brewery, J. C. Jacobsen, the sculptor and spouse of painter Elisabeth Jerichau-Baumann, Emil Jerichau, and of course Høyen himself, encouraged Danish artists to depict “Nordic history, landscape, and folk life” through the purchase of works that embodied these themes, including Exner’s Amager’s peasant genre painting, *Visiting Grandfather* (1853) [Fig. 2.10].

Geffroy’s predilection for culturally instructional genre paintings such as Tidemand *La Toilette de la Mariée* and Jerichau’s *La Lecture de la Bible* mirror works supported by the Selskabet for Nordisk Konst like Exner’s *Visiting Grandfather*, while the author’s emphasis on protestant morality and national mores, a yearning for the natural beauty of the North, and a shared knowledge of national mythology keenly mirrors Høyen’s own definition of Scandinavian art espoused less than twenty years earlier. Geffroy takes Høyen’s pan-Scandinavian nationalism and folkish aesthetics and argues for their validity by placing them within the theoretical framework of Thoré, whose writings on Dutch art would have been familiar to many contemporary French readers. Thoré’s *Amsterdam et La Haye. Études sur l’école hollandeaise* (1858) vitalized French interest in the Dutch school of art as

---


an alternative to the Classical tradition. Significantly, Thoré argued that the emergence of the Dutch school in the seventeenth century to be not simply the product of individual geniuses such as Rembrandt, but as reflected within its naturalist tendencies, as a product of Holland’s social and political conditions of the time as well. Geffroy’s comparison of Scandinavian to Dutch art is therefore undoubtedly a reference to *Amsterdam et La Haye*, which had been published just three years prior to Geffroy’s article.

As Lyne Therrien argues, the emerging model of artistic analysis, where art was studied not through the lens of taste, but as a means of understanding the society that produced it, would help legitimize the study of previously ignored artistic traditions. Being both Northern European and relatively unknown or ignored by French critics before the 1855 Universal Exposition seems to have placed Scandinavian art in the right place and the right time to be appreciated by French artists, lending their so-called provincial artlessness an increasingly attractive air of authenticity in the oncoming decade. Nonetheless, Geffroy’s motivation for arguing for the existence of l’école scandinave was not derived from a desire to critique the discipline of art history in France, but rather an extension of his political writings on Scandinavism.

Scandinavism was first and foremost at the time of Geffroy’s article a political ideology that, as Uffe Østergaard remarks, should be read in parallel to other nineteenth-century unification movements in Italy and Germany. Although Scandinavism sought to

---
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emphasize the shared cultural, historical, political, and linguistic unity of Denmark, Norway, and Sweden, solidarity between the Scandinavian kingdoms was also seen as a useful tool to counter the growing threat posed by German nationalism. The revolutions of 1848 had inspired nationalist revolts amongst the German-speaking populaces of Denmark’s southern Duchies of Schleswig and Holstein, resulting in joint Danish-Swedish efforts to quell the uprisings, followed by a counter-response in support of the rebellion from Prussia. Even after the end of the First Schleswig War three years later, tensions continued to simmer between the German Confederation and Denmark over the official status of the Duchies and their relationship to Denmark.

Geffroy would cover and contribute to debates the Schleswig-Holstein Question throughout the late 1850s and early 1860s in which the journalist positioned himself as supporter of Denmark and a proponent of Scandinavism. In 1857, Geffroy wrote an extensive article outlining the history of Scandinavism and its consequences for contemporary politics titled “Le Scandinavisme et le Danemark.” Geffroy, above all, advocated for what he called a practical Scandinavism rooted not in race – an idea that he opposed – but in common interest, writing:

Le scandinavisme répond à un sentiment vrai des périls et des ressources que les pays du Nord rencontrent autour d’eux et au milieu d’eux. C’est assez dire que sa place est marquée parmi les idées sérieuses qui doivent préoccuper aujourd’hui l’Europe. . . . Les peuples dont cette nation, dans son péril extrême, invoque la fraternité et l’alliance sont prêts à s’unir à elle ; les anciennes haines ont été oubliées, les dissentiments se sont aplanis ; la Norvège ne craint pas que l’union nuise en rien au solide édifice de la liberté ; la Suède a tout à gagner et suit son étoile.249

The “péril extrême” that put the Scandinavian kingdoms at risk, of course, was Germany. Geffroy’s advocacy for Scandinavism was first and foremost a practical means of establishing a collective buffer against German territorial expansion. Rejecting Romantic ideals of a natural unity between the Scandinavian people, Geffroy accepted the reality that centuries of conflict and differing needs had often placed the three kingdoms at odds with one another. Despite this past, Geffroy implores the Scandinavians to place their differences aside as a necessary means of not creating a nation state, but providing a united front against Germany.

It is in light of Geffroy’s use of Scandinavism as a means of politically opposing Germany that the author’s use of term l’école scandinave at the Salon of 1861 must be given further interpretation, namely as cultural counter to l’école allemande. In an era when many French critics still looked at German art as one of the leading European écoles and subsumed Nordic artists under Germany, Geffroy by contrast asserts that the Nordic artists working in Düsseldorf such as Tidemand and Gude were not Germanic in style, but form their own school, l’école scandinave – one that is superior to l’école allemande:

Les artistes du Nord on forme une école vraiment originale qui a triomphé auprès certaines écoles étrangères. On l’a bien vu à Dusseldorf. On sait qu’il y a dans cette ville une académie de peinture, fondée depuis 1767, et qui attire des artistes des differens [sic] de l’Europe. Cependant Dusseldorf, après la retraite de Cornélius en 1824, languissait ; l’école allemande qui y subsistait se laissait aller à un mysticisme sans élan et sans vigueur, qui a fait incliner sa peinture vers le genre incomplet et impuissant de l’imagerie religieuse. Tidemand et Gude ont seuls rappelé la vie par leur originalité.250

Just two months before his review of the Salon of 1861, in an article entitled “L’Agitation Allemande et le Danemark,” Geffroy complained about Germany’s “soif d’unité,” spearheaded by Prussia. Geffroy saw Germany’s role in the field of contemporary art as an act of violence against the Nordic countries, and an extension of German territorial expansion in hopes of forming an ethno-nation state. The idea of an école scandinave was therefore in large part a tool to check what Geffroy perceived as German aggression, in the same way that Geffroy viewed political Scandinavism not as a racial or national necessity, but as a practical means of combatting pan-Germanism.

Few French writers during the Second Empire would join Geffroy’s in proclaiming the birth of l’école scandinave, or for his advocacy for political Scandinavism. Denmark would soon face defeat in 1864 during the Second Schleswig War, resulting in Denmark’s loss of the Duchies of Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenburg. The Scandinavian countries failed to provide a unified front against invading Prussian and Austrian forces, that would help ensure to the creation of both the modern unified German state and the modern diminutive Danish state. Nonetheless, though the dreams of political Scandinavism were short lived, as a cultural ideal it enjoyed greater longevity and success. In a similar many of the ideological structures that motivated Geffroy’s l’école scandinave would be strongly resonate in art criticism during the Third Republic, in the wake of France’s own losses of
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Alsace and Lorraine to the newly unified German Empire. Throughout the nineteenth-century, French usage of the terms *école scandinave* or a national *art scandinave* would almost always be highly politically charged, as a means of implicitly critiquing Germanism.

**The Rise of Naturalist Art Theory at the Universal Exposition of 1867**

The Second Empire was a time of transition with regard to modern practices of writing about art. Critics struggled to juggle both traditional ideas and emerging concepts together, melding both Academic and nationalist systems of organizing écoles d’art while affirming that beauty was both eternal and also relative to time and culture. In the 1860s, however, naturalism within the practice of painting, mirrored by historicism within writing, were both on their way to becoming institutional standards. Perhaps the most famous indication of a major shift in aesthetic ideologies was Hippolyte Taine’s appointment as a professor of aesthetics and art history at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris in 1864. Taine viewed art in broader terms as a form of cultural production, formed not primarily by genius, but rather through the tripartite forces of race, milieu, and moment; and though undoubtedly one of the most dogmatic proponents of a positivist approach to art in France, he was certainly not the only writer to profess such a worldview. The biological reductionism of Taine and the social theories of Thoré would be merged and transformed in the writings of a new generation of art critics coming to maturity in the progress-driven ideology of the Second Empire, and for whom the Universal Exposition of 1867 served as a proof that art had entered a new and modern era.

---

The layout of the Universal Exposition was a visual expression that France led the way in modern progress. On the grounds of the Champs Élysées in 1855, there had been a strict division between exhibitions of industry, housed in the Palais de l’Industrie and the Galerie des Machines, and exhibitions of art, housed in the Palais des Beaux-Arts. These cathedral-like structures dedicated to art and industry would be replaced in 1867 with one massive, centralized structure situated on the Champ-de-Mars. In a manner mirroring the modernizations the city of Paris had recently undergone under Baron de Haussmann, the Palais du Champ-de-Mars was organized according to a logical division of concentric circles and avenues to help facilitate movement. Industry occupied the outermost rings of the structure, while the fine arts occupied the smaller, innermost rings stretching around the central garden. A series of radiating avenues divided the circular structure according to nation, as one reporter observed, in a manner reminiscent of the folds of a fan.

Despite the rational design of a circular grid, not all nations were accorded equal measure. The palace was rather a cosmic vision of the modern world in which Napoleon III’s Second Empire was Europe’s shining star. France took up nearly one half of the palace. The German countries, divided by independent states placed close to one another, and Great Britain and Ireland took up around one quarter of the palace, while Belgium and Holland were given smaller, but relatively ample accommodations. Occupying around one-sixth of the space, and situated farthest away from France, was the rest of the world. Here, the gallery spaces including Greece, Italy, Russia, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. As in 1855, the exhibition spaces of Denmark and Sweden-Norway were once again situated next to one another 1867, sandwiched between Russia and Greece, with Russia flanking Sweden-Norway, and Greece flanking Denmark. The exhibition also featured many non-
European nations grouped together by region, including East Asian nations of China, Siam, and Japan, the Middle Eastern countries of Turkey, Egypt, and Persia, and finally, a gallery for the continent of Africa.

The visual display of national dominance in a supposedly cooperative international event did not go unnoticed within reviews of the exposition of fine arts. A commissioner from the United States, Frank Leslie, complained that the display of fine arts “could hardly be considered a competition,” given the sizable influence the French organizers had allowed themselves: “She had all the advantages of proximity, all the stimulus of glory and gain, and if these were insufficient to call out and display her treasures in art, there existed behind an authority capable of achieving things much more difficult.”255 The unequal division of space was enough of a problem that Belgium, Bavaria, Switzerland, and Holland had to have their own special annexes constructed, which only added confusion to the exhibitions of painting.

That France was the leader of the arts was treated as fact in the writings of French critics. Nonetheless, the threat posed by international competition was an issue of concern. Citing the sizable increase in foreign artworks and artists since in comparison to the first Universal Exposition, Marius Chaumelin issued a word of caution those who believe France’s supremacy in art to be unshakable.256 Indeed, France’s art world had been shaken to the core with the deaths of Horace Vernet, Alexandre-Gabriel Decamps, Eugène Delacroix, and Auguste-Dominique Ingres over the past seven years, all of whom had been

counted as France’s leading artists in 1855. To many critics, their deaths – especially those of Delacroix and Ingres – appeared to signal the end of an era and the dawn of a new and uncertain one, the air of which was palpable at Champs-de-Mars. The old quarrel over line and color, as Hippolyte Gautier observed, had now fallen silent in the galleries.257 Echoing Gautier, for Paul Mantz, the Universal Exposition seemed to affirm that the old masters had not only vanished, but that the entire system of aesthetic hierarchies had effectively crumbled. Critics, Mantz pondered, now found themselves occupied with the analysis of an amalgamation of schools and minor masters.258

The body of critics who wrote responses to the Universal Exposition of 1867 consisted of an important array of proponents – many of them roughly the same age as Taine – of the historicist approach to art. Two such critics, Paul Mantz and Marius Chaumelin, were contributors to Blanc’s Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles. In his 1861 publication, La Peinture française au XIXe siècle: Les chefs d’école, Chesneau emphasized that in judging art, one must “reconstruct” the environment in which a work of art was created, and in doing so, approach the work of art from an air of impartiality to evaluate it.259 Chaumelin would reiterate the role of the critic as a detached observer again in his review of the Universal Exposition, when he encouraged his readers to approach art from a standpoint of cultural relativism, directing those visiting the galleries to examine the works with a sense of removal: “Examinons donc, avec l’attention qu’elles réclament, les
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productions des artistes étrangers, en cherchant à nous transporter autant que possible dans le milieu où elles sont nées ; car il en est des œuvres de l’art, comme de toutes les autres créations de l’esprit humain : on ne les comprend bien que si l’on tient compte des influences de climat, de mœurs, de société, qui les ont fait éclore"  

As more than one critic had observed, the effect of cosmopolitanism ushered in by the Universal Exposition on the arts was to dismantle the art critic’s old system of measure, which tended to look back to longstanding traditions, such as Classicism, or even more recent masters, such as Delacroix. Rather than looking to the past, critics increasingly looked to the Universal Exposition as a barometer for the future of l’art moderne. As Albert Boime has argued, the notion of human progress had always been a core principle behind the Second Empire’s founding of the Universal Expositions, with their displays of technological advancement and its explicit analysis of the evolution of cultures. The emphasis given to tradition at the Palais des Beaux-Arts in 1855 via the special exhibitions given to Ingres and Delacroix can be seen as a conservative anomaly that ran in the opposite direction of the Universal Exposition’s ideology of modern progress. Philosophically, art and industry made strange bedfellows; and though by 1867 aesthetic ideologies were beginning to shift, the old paradigm of tradition was strongly rooted enough within painting that Ernest Chesneau, the official art critic at the Universal Exposition, specifically addressed this in a portion of his review titled, “Quelle influence les expositions internationals exerceront-elles sur l’avenir de l’art?” Human society, Chesneau
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confirmed, continues to advance by the means of technology, and the Universal Exposition was an important opportunity for lesser-evolved nations to learn from France's example. Art, he observed, was no longer a trade guarded in a lineage from master to apprentice but was subject to international trade and intermingling. Nevertheless, Chesneau insists, every age and every country will have its masters, since genius is spontaneous and cannot be determined by external causes.\textsuperscript{263}

Throughout the nineteenth century, many critics besides Chesneau would pay lip service to traditional ideals of genius and beauty. Nonetheless, art criticism at the Universal Exposition of 1867 would strongly lean towards naturalist and nationalist modes of interpretation, and which would have an important impact on the reception of Nordic painting. While the Romantic legacy of De Staël would continue to influence critics' interpretations of Nordic painting, a rising tendency amongst critics to look at art and its relationship to ecology would shift critics' interest largely towards landscape painting and away from religious genre painting.

\textbf{Critical Evaluations of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway in 1867}

The relationship between the Nordic exhibitions of painting and drawing at the Universal Exposition of 1867 would have a dynamic similar to what had been seen in 1855. The Sweden once again held the largest show, exhibiting 56 paintings and drawings by 31 artists, followed by Norway, exhibiting 47 works by 26 artists. In comparison to 1855, both Norway and Sweden had approximately doubled the number of works shown. Denmark, by

contrast, had a somewhat smaller presence than from the prior Universal Exposition, exhibiting only 40 paintings and drawings paintings and drawings by 23 artists.

Like France, Denmark, Sweden, and Norway had also experienced major losses since 1855 that would have important impacts on the Universal Exposition of 1867. Sweden's star artist at the last Universal Exposition, Johan Höckert, had died suddenly in September 1866. Much like Sweden’s last international luminary painter, Per Wickenberg, Höckert died young and at the height of his popularity in France, thus cutting short a potentially long and potentially influential career abroad. Denmark, on the other hand, had suffered a humiliating defeat at the hands of the Prussian army during the Second Schleswig War in 1864, resulting in the loss of the duchies of Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenburg.

The Second Schleswig War became a visible motif in several paintings at the Universal Exposition, including Niels Simonsen's Danois combattant pour le Sleswig (1861), Jerichau-Baumann's Le soldat blessé [Fig. 2.11, and Carl Dahl’s, La bataille navale d'Helgoland (9 mai 1864) depicting the destruction of the Austrian ship Schwarzenberg by three Danish ships. If Denmark had sought to exact revenge on Prussia and Austria through its exhibition of paintings, it nonetheless resulted in, much like the war, an utter failure, as French critics openly expressed disappointment with Denmark's exhibition. By contrast, Sweden and Norway, despite the former's loss of Höckert, would once again achieve the praise of French critics, in part through larger and stronger repertoire of landscape paintings visible in both countries’ exhibitions. Both Sweden and Norway had
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discovered a successful formula for success, meeting critics’ desire for the expression of unique national character through the display of the Scandinavian Peninsula’s picturesque valley and mountain scenery. Denmark would have to modernize its tastes to catch up, as its own attempts at rendering national motifs fell flat.

Denmark’s exhibition of paintings in 1867 was similar in makeup to what was presented at the first Universal Exposition. Several of the school medal winners from prior 1855 and prior Salons were present, including Theude Grønland, Julius Exner and Johan Gertner. A photograph of the Danish exhibition shows the prevalence of marine, peasant genre, still life paintings, including Exner’s Colin-Maillard, Dahl’s, La bataille navale d’Helgoland (9 mai 1864), along with Carl Bloch’s biblical painting, Samson [Fig. 2.12].

Popular newcomer Elisabeth Jerichau-Baumann, who had achieved considerable success in the Salons of the 1860s, stood out as Denmark’s greatest chance for international success, taking the lead with a large exhibition of eight paintings and one drawing. Once again, French critics defined Danish artists by their collective skill as colorists and genre painters. Exner was again singled out for his genre paintings, receiving praise from both Marius Chaumelin and Hippolyte Gautier for his selection of jovial domestic scenes, including Colin-Maillard [Fig. 2.13]. Here, Exner depicts a group of young Danish children play a game of blind man’s buff. The children’s gestures and faces are expressively animated as they tease the blindfolded boy. A duck scurries away from the commotion, and two seated adults look on in amusement off to the side, pipes and beer tankards in hand.

---
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The remnants of a meal to the right of the canvas, complete with snaps glasses, now emptied, add to the expression of bounty and merriment which had appealed to the French critics. Like Tidemand’s Norwegian scenes, Exner’s interiors put local Danish culture on display while using universal genre themes that would have been easily understood by French audiences, all while rendered with the colorful chiaroscuro and attentive detail one came to expect from the Northern schools.

Other than Exner however, few other Danish artists passed the scrutiny of French critics. In general, relatively few words were given to the Danish exhibition, but many of which were indifferent or critical. Paul Mantz attacked Denmark’s famed portraitist, Johan Gertner, with the charge that his paintings lacked modeling. Even Jerichau-Baumann received mixed and mediocre reviews. Few critics took interest in her depictions of Danish costumes, her domestic interiors, or her depiction of the heroin Gudrun from the Icelandic Laxdæla saga. “Disons-le franchement,” Mantz summarized tersely, “nous ne sommes pas contents de nos amis les Danois.” The greatest insult towards Denmark, however, came from the Universal Exposition’s official critic, Ernest Chesneau. Chesneau, like Mantz, did not care for the Danish exhibition, but found particularly egregious faults in its battle paintings, singling out a grisaille by Simonsen titled Danois combattant pour le Sleswig (1861). Marget Mogensen identifies this painting as Episode af træfningen ved Sankelmark 6 februar 1864 [Fig. 2.14] in which Simonsen depicts a surrounded group of

---

soldiers fending off Austrian forces with their bayonets during the battle of Sankelmark.\textsuperscript{271}

Writing in his aptly named review, \textit{Les Nations Rivales dans les Arts}, Chesneau noted that both Denmark and Prussia had brought their political battles into the arena of art, with either country exhibiting several paintings of the Second Schleswig War. Comparing the Dane Simonsen’s paintings to Prussian painter Emil Hünten’s paintings of the battle of Dybbøl, Chesneau concludes that, at least from an artistic point of view, one must side with Prussia.\textsuperscript{272}

Simonsen’s bulky, heroic figures vastly differ from the naturalist style of battle painters such as Horace Vernet and Ernest Meissonier – who won the Medaille d’Honneur in 1867 for his battle paintings – and which was typically utilized within Hünten’s paintings, including \textit{Gefecht bei Thorstedt bei Horsens, 22. April 1864} [Fig. 2.15]. Chesneau’s politically charged jab therefore underscores one of the reasons for Denmark’s general failure to capture the praise of France’s critics. Denmark’s taste in paintings demonstrated little change since the prior Universal Exposition. Its Biedermeier aesthetic, solid brushwork, and penchant for illustrating historical and mythological narratives paintings exuded a mid-century Golden Age quality pioneered by artists including C. W. Eckersberg at the beginning of the century. At a time when a young generation of French naturalist critics rallied around the slogan of progress, and Maxime du Camp gleefully proclaimed that the French school had decapitated its old masters,\textsuperscript{273} Denmark’s exhibition would have seemed
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old fashioned even if Danish painters embraced the modern ethos of national expression.

As Marius Chaumelin remarks, though the Danish artist Simonsen could be praised for his patriotism, he erred in attempting to render a historical scene, a genre generally unsuitable for Scandinavian artists. Given their Protestant origin, Chaumelin’s explanation was that Scandinavian artists tended not to excel in historical, mythological, religious works, but were naturally gifted in “la représentation des mœurs et des passions de leurs contemporains, c’est la reproduction consciencieuse et naïve des scènes familières, des intérieurs enfumés et des sites agrestes de leurs pays bien-aimé.”274

Chaumelin’s critique possessed some apt foresight. The Norse mythology paintings of the mid nineteenth century, as Knut Ljøgodt remarks, were the last vestige of a Romantic tradition that had struggled against the homogeneity of Classicism decades earlier. By the early 1870s, Norse mythology had fallen out of favor amongst Danish critics, who had at this point turned their attention towards Realism.275 Already in the 1860s, French tastes had shifted towards genre and landscape painting, such that at the Universal Exposition of 1867 first class medals were given to artists including Jules Breton, Jean-François Millet, Charles-François Daubigny, and a Medal of Honor was given to the Barbizon master Théodore Rousseau.276 The outmoded nature of Denmark’s exhibition was therefore palpable to a number of French critics including Paul Mantz, who noted Denmark’s failure to cultivate its landscape painters, at the cost of falling behind all the other écoles modernes.277
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In contrast to Denmark’s disappointing reception, French critics largely greeted both Norway and Sweden’s selections of artworks with praise, which notably were dominated by landscape and genre pictures. Like Jerichau-Baumann’s portrait of Gudrun, the portraits of mythological heroines by the Norwegian Peter Nicolai Arbo (depicting Ingeborg from Frithiof’s Saga) or the Swede Mårten Eskil Winge (depicting Kráka from the Poetic Edda, amongst other texts); yet few if any critics, took any interest in these national romantic motifs. If one man acted as a symbolic figurehead for defining Swedish and Norwegian art within the realms of genre and landscape painting it was Charles XV, the king of both Sweden and Norway, who astonished critics by exhibiting his own paintings at the 1867 Universal Exposition. As a gesture to his role as a dual monarch, Charles XV exhibited separate works in both the Norwegian and Swedish sections—a Norwegian landscapes in the Norwegian section, and two Swedish landscapes with his Swedish artist brethren. One of the Swedish landscapes, Paysage d’hiver [Fig. 2.16] was presented to Napoleon III and the Empress Eugenie as gift, who hung it in Élysée Palace. Though a level critique of Charles XV’s submissions was out of the question for French critics, the King’s predilection for landscape painting cemented the notion, already in germination, that landscape painting was the natural to the aptitudes of Swedish and Norwegian painters.

The critical association between Scandinavia and landscape painting was strongest with Norway. No doubt, this judgment was in part due to the large number of landscapes exhibited in the Norway’s painting section, which made up roughly half of the country’s
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exhibition. While a handful of these paintings depicted scenes from foreign countries, the vast majority of titles specify Norwegian locales, including scenes of the fjords of Hardanger by Georg Anton Rasmussen and Morten Müller and mountainous scenes of Romsdahlshorn and Jotunheimen by Johan Fredrik Eckersberg. Adding to Norway’s already-augmented exhibition of paintings were several works by marine painter Johan Jacob Bennetter. Bennetter, who had exhibited at the prior Universal Exposition with France – his longtime place of residence – now sided with his country of origin with the submission of three marine paintings. In addition to two Norwegian port scenes, Bennetter also exhibited a historical marine painting illustrating the military campaigns of William the Conqueror, one of France’s most famous Norman Dukes and a direct descendent of the Viking king Rollo, departing from Saint-Valery in 1066 to capture the English crown – a tip of the hat to the artist’s Norwegian origin and French residence.

Above all, it was the sublime landscape scenery of Eckersberg and Gude that received the greatest attention. Both had exhibited Norwegian mountains scenes at the prior Universal Exposition in 1855, though either artist displayed only one work apiece. Though Eckersberg received little attention in 1855, Gude had already stood out, receiving a first-class medal for his depiction of Bergen’s mountainous landscape. Benefiting from Norway’s heightened presence in 1867, within which landscape painting readily stood out as the dominant motif, both artists received near-unanimous praise from France’s critics. Gude exhibited four paintings, including *Cortège funèbre traversant un fjord de Norvège*, one of the artist’s numerous dramatic funeral scenes, showing a coffin and villagers traversing Sogne Fjord in their boats. Praising the artist’s colorism and keen attention to detail –
especially in rendering the varying transparencies of both air and water - Chaumelin proclaimed Gude to be as good as any French painter.\textsuperscript{280}

It was the same predilection towards sublime imagery rendered in heightened detail that drew critics towards the two paintings exhibited by Eckersberg, especially \textit{Vue du haut plateau de la Norwege} – an immense panorama of the Jotunheimen Mountains that is most likely the artist’s \textit{Fra Jotunheimen} [Fig. 2.17]. Eckersberg landscape was singled out for its simultaneous novelty and veracity, bringing French viewers face to face with impressive topographies that had hitherto been unknown to them.\textsuperscript{281} “Cette nature et cet effet, étranges, exceptionnelles,” Chaumelin contemplated, “ont quelque chose de saisissant.”\textsuperscript{282} Eckersberg’s paintings delivered the mystique that French critics had come to associate with Norwegian painting since the prior Universal Exposition; yet in contrast to the poetic musings which French critics used to describe images of the Norwegian outdoors in 1855, critics in 1867 now judged Norwegian landscape for its seeming acute veracity. Mantz described Eckersberg painting of the Jutenheim Mountains as a “révélation topographique d’une nature que nous ignorons,” before praising it as “aussi vrai qu’il est original.”\textsuperscript{283}

The success of Eckersberg’s paintings amongst French art critics, with their lack of anecdote and topographical exactitude, was a further sign of the increasing influence of naturalism over romanticism. Eckersberg’s paintings almost overshadowed the genre
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paintings of Tidemand, who had taken center stage in 1855 with his *Funérailles dans les campagnes de Norvége*. As in the past, Tidemand’s works focused on describing the events and rituals stemming from Norway’s traditional folk culture, including a scene of a Lutheran priest distributing communion to the sick and elderly; yet critics largely passed this painting over and instead focused their eyes on Tidemand’s historical genre scene, *Combat singulier de l’ancien temps (Norvége)*. The scene depicts the outcome of a duel between two men armed with axes inside a tavern, one of the men having been mortally wounded. Tidemand’s secure reputation in France through his successes at the 1855 Universal Exposition and subsequent salon ensured that French critics would once again pay attention to his works; but this year, Tidemand would receive no medals. Instead, Gude was the sole Norwegian artist to receive official recognition from the French juries, winning a second-class medal for his landscapes.  

Landscape would also stand out at the Swedish exhibition, though in a manner less definitive than at the Norwegian exhibition. A few landscape painters stood out, including of course King Charles XV, whose two landscapes at the Swedish exhibition were praised by Chaumelin for their truthful expression of “la nature froide et sauvage de la Scandinavie.” The Swedish landscape painter who stood out most prominently, however, was Edward Bergh. Like many Swedish and Norwegian artists, Bergh had trained in Düsseldorf, where he had studied under Gude. Like his master, Bergh painted in a
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manner that bridged Romanticism and Realism, depicting dramatic views of Swedish mountains, forests, and waterfalls rendered in evocative, moody palettes. Such works, including *Chute d’eau* (*motif de la province de Bohus, en Suède*) - one of three landscapes exhibited by the artist in 1867 – provide attractive to critics as well as to judges, earning Bergh a third-class medal at the Universal Exposition.287

Despite the strong presence of Charles XV and Bergh, it was Sweden’s genre, painting that gained the greatest notice of French critics. In contrast to Norway, whose exhibition was dominated by landscape, Sweden’s exhibition was mostly comprised of genre paintings by artists. Amongst the genre painters, Bengt Nordenberg, August Jernberg, and Ferdinand Fagerlin received positive praise from France’s critics. Like their Danish counterpart, Exner, these artists specialized in sentimental anecdotes of Swedish folk life, from marriage proposals to tending to farm animals. “Charmant” is one word that came to critics’ minds in describing these artists’ works, along with praises for their adept use of color, their renderings of national costumes and traditions, and the faithful expression of daily life.288 Gautier declared Fagerlin to be Sweden’s best artist, and the jury agreed, awarding him a third-class medal for his paintings.289

Notably, all three of these genre painters had received ample training abroad in Düsseldorf as well as in Paris, where they had been students of Thomas Couture.290 Despite

these painters’ cosmopolitan artistic upbringing and evidence of stylistic borrowings from Couture, French critics insisted on ascribing their talents as genre painters to their Swedish origins, and particularly to the determination of environment. Both Gautier and Chaumelin agreed that it was the effect of geography and climate that preordained the Swedish artist’s natural predilection towards genre painting. As Gautier comments, it is the cold of the Swedish outdoors that leads them these artists to their love of interiors.291 Likewise, Chesneau reasons that the crushing weight of the Swedish environment, “la sublimité des spectacles naturels, des effets de lumière imprévus, dans ce voisinage du pole,” that drives artists excel at genre painting above landscape.292 Chesneau’s statement clearly reiterates the longstanding prejudice held by French art critics, observable in 1840s and 1850s, that Northern landscape is inherently ugly. By and large, however, Sweden, like Norway, had succeeded in building a reputation for itself in the wake of the success of the first Universal Exposition, and critics’ proclamation of their artist’s adeptness at genre painting functioned as a legitimation of Swedish art in the increasingly pan-European canon of contemporary schools. “La Suède ne déchoit pas,” Du Camp remarks, “et l’impression excellent qu’elle avait produite en 1855 ne s’est pas affaiblie.”293 If by 1867 Sweden was now being regarded by a number of French critics as succinct group with readily identifiable skills and traits, then Johan Höckert was viewed as the school’s leader.

Having died only the year prior to the Universal Exposition, Höckert’s submissions to the exhibition were posthumously exhibited. Three works in total were shown by the artists, including the history painting Incendie dans le palais royal de Stockholm, 1er mai
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1697, and two genre paintings, *Intérieur d'une tente laponne*, and *Retour de la noce, en Laponie* [Fig. 2.18]. French critics immediately grasped onto and praised Höckert’s two Lapland paintings, especially *Intérieur d'une tente laponne*, which conjured up fond memories of the artist’s exhibition of works from 1855. Rendered in deep chiaroscuro, Höckert’s depiction of a Sami couple tending to their infant possessed the same formula of colorism, the hushed intimism, and sense of otherworldliness that attracted French critics to *Prêche en Laponie* twelve years earlier. *Retour de la noce, en Laponie*, on the other hand, with its jovial marital theme and clearer palette, provided a clear visual connection to the paintings of Nordenberg, Jernberg, and Fagerlin, who also received the praise of critics.

*Incendie dans le palais royal de Stockholm, 1er mai 1697*, [Fig. 2.19] however, fared much differently in the eyes of critics. Unlike the ethnographic genre painting for which he was known in France, Höckert’s painting depicts a fire that had swept through Stockholm’s royal palace nearly two hundred years earlier, with the royal family fleeing from the premises. The painting had previously been exhibited at the 1866 Scandinavian Art and Industry Exhibition in Stockholm, where it was well received by Höckert’s countrymen. By contrast, the French critics Mantz, Chesneau, Du Camp, and Chaumelin unanimously panned the work as being technically facile, overwrought, and moreover unsuitable to the Swedish style. For Chaumelin, that an otherwise remarkably talented artist could fail at such a work only proved that history painting was outside the natural domain of Scandinavian artists, just as Danish artists had floundered with their battle scenes.
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Chaumelin’s judgment was echoed by Du Camp, who advised the Swedish artist to concentrate his efforts on those scenes natural to his aptitude – intimist scenes and interiors from the far regions of the North.296

**National and Scandinavian Identities**

Critics’ responses in 1867 had significantly shifted since 1855 towards an increasingly decentralized, nationalized theory of art. It was a change in ideology of which critics themselves were aware. “Élargissez Dieu, disait Diderot; élargissez la patrie, crie la grande voix de l’esprit moderne,” declared Mantz.297 This nationalized view of art is evidenced by the manner in which French critics increasingly sought out cultural, racial, and geographical motivations amongst the different countries of exhibiting artists they saw. Chesneau thus praised Swedish artists for their ability to depict their ethnographic abilities, rendering the unique physiognomies of their local populations visible with their pale blond air and light blue eyes.298 Similarly, just as Chesneau judged Sweden and Norway to possess a natural aptitude toward genre painting given their predisposition towards simple domestic joys, Chaumelin sought explanation for Swedish and Norwegian artists’ seemingly natural predilection towards painting mountainous landscapes through the wide prevalence of the suffix *berg* amongst the names of the exhibitors, including Eckersberg, Wahlberg, and Rydberg.299 Although Denmark received relatively little analysis from critics given their poor reception at the Universal Exposition, its political and artistic
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defeats nonetheless helped define Danish art in a negative sense, namely not German, and poor at history painting.

Although critics were quick to point out similarities between Swedish and Norwegian painting styles, few described the Nordic countries as a unified group, concerning themselves instead with articulating the unique national styles of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. The absence of solidarity between Denmark and the United Kingdoms of Sweden and Norway expressed in 1864 was perhaps echoed in the disunity between Denmark’s exhibition of painting and Sweden and Norway’s exhibitions of painting in 1867, appearing to bring an end to Geffroy’s vision of a united école scandinave as a counterpoint German nationalism. Despite the rising power of Prussia, and with this the defeat of Scandinavism, however, Chaumelin was one of the few, if not the only critic to carry forward the idea of a Scandinavian school of art.

“L’unité Scandinave “declared Marius Chaumelin,” n’est pas encore faite en politique, mais, au point de vue de l’art, elle est beaucoup plus avancée que l’unité allemande. Les peintres des trois royaumes ont un point où ils se ressemblent, un sentiment commun : ils aiment avec passion leur pays natal, et c’est à peindre ses aspects sauvages, ses coutumes naïves, ses mœurs patriarchales qu’ils se consacrent à peu près exclusivement.” Chaumelin’s definition of the unifying characteristics of Scandinavian art strongly resemble those Geffroy had described six years earlier, which included protestant morality and national mores, a yearning for the natural beauty of the North, and a shared knowledge of national mythology. Chaumelin and Geffroy both emphasize a shared love
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of painting the outdoors by emphasizing a unique Scandinavian environment dissimilar from that of the rest of Europe. Along with the fatalistic force of sublime and uncultivated nature, the determination of culture and history also figure prominently in both critics’ analysis of the Scandinavian school, emphasizing the unique traditions and costumes shared by Scandinavians, as well as their common Protestant religion. Chaumelin’s differs from Geffroy’s definition of Scandinavian art differs only in their judgments of the suitability of the depiction of national myth in painting. Though Chaumelin acknowledges the uniqueness and poetry of Scandinavia’s mythology, he contends that it is not germane to Scandinavian artists to depict scenes from religious images given their Protestant heritage, and that their religion has therefore equipped them to depict the natural world with greater adeptness.302

“Tout dans sa peinture,” remarks Chaumelin on the nature of the Scandinavian artist, “se ressent de cette franchise, de cette bonhomie, de cette absence de convention, qui contrastent si fort avec l’élégance apprêtée, la coquetterie mignarde, le pédantisme archéologique et les libertinages d’imagination de nos peintres à la mode.”303 Between the first two Universal Expositions, “Northern poetry” transformed into Scandinavian sobriety. In contemplating the works of Tidemand and Höckert, Delécluze had declared in 1855 that Northern artists endeavored to paint feeling rather than form.304 By contrast, in 1867,
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304 “... c’est la poésie du Nord qui en fait le charme. Le soleil est voilé, la campagne et les habitations sont tristes; les vêtements rigides et épaiss cachent les formes humaines et alourdissent tous les mouvements du corps; l’âme seule, grâce à sa nature subtile, se fait jour à travers tous ces obstacles matériels: aussi les poètes ainsi que les artistes du Nord s’attachent-ils plus à peindre les sentiments que les formes.” Delécluze, Les Beaux-Arts dans les Deux Mondes, 184.
Mantz praised Eckersberg for his ability to create a painting “aussi vrai qu’il est original,” proclaiming the artist’s functioned as much as a documentarian than as a poet.

Of greatest significance in Chaumelin’s definition of Scandinavian art, however, is the critic’s affirmation of Scandinavia as a means of critiquing Germany. Chaumelin introduces his definition of Scandinavian art by remarking that the Scandinavian art is “plus avancée que l’unité allemande.” Chaumelin’s remark echoes a fear of Prussia’s bellicose actions in asserting control over northern Europe. Immediately prior the Universal Exposition in 1866, Prussia had defeated its former ally Austria in the Seven Week’s War to assert itself as the dominant power within the German Confederation, now renamed the North German, forcibly annexing several German states into the confederation in doing so. Chaumelin had similarly warned of Germany’s “soif d’unité” in March of 1861, just two months before his article on l’école scandinave at the Salon of 1861.

For at least some art critics writing during the Second Empire then, the praise of a specifically Scandinavian art was a means of opposing German politics. This was due not only to the Schleswig Wars, which resulted in Danish territorial losses to the German unification effort, but also given the long history of associating the Nordic countries with Germany in the arts. Echoing Geffroy again, Chaumelin denied that Nordic artists could be subsumed under a foreign school such as Germany, arguing that although Scandinavian artists may have learned their “ficelles du métier” abroad, they have always preserved “les sentiments de leur race; ils restent scandinaves en dépit de toute influence.”
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there is little evidence to suggest that Geffroy’s and Chaumelin’s Scandinavian ideas were widespread in French journalism during the 1860s or that their writings would directly influence other critics, both writers introduce a pattern of thought that would proliferate in the wake of France’s loss of Alsace and Lorraine to the German Empire in 1871. To write about *l’école scandinave* or *l’art scandinave* was to place oneself in political opposition to Germany, and praise for Scandinavian art would frequently be paired with criticism of German culture or politics. In other words, Scandinavism maintained its roots as a political ideal, even when commandeered by French journalists and art historians. However, in the process of being taken up and affirmed by French writers, Scandinavism would not only be used to express the unity of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway to one another, but also to France.
Chapter III: Revanchism and Scandinavism
Introduction: A New Generation of Artists

The years leading up to the 1878 Universal Exposition would bear witness to an increasing popular and art historical interest in Nordic artists in France. The general success of the Nordic countries at the Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867 – despite some harsh criticisms of the Danish exposition in 1867 – helped solidify the celebrity of a select few artists such as Hans Gude, Adolph Tidemand, Johan Friedrich Höckert, Lorenz Frølich, and Elisabeth Jerichau-Baumann, garnering positive reviews amongst critics, Salon medals, as well as several notable acquisitions for French museums and the private collections of Napoleon III.

This generation of artists who had largely found success in France around the time of the Second Empire, and who had been mainly responsible for galvanizing French critics’ interest in Nordic art, would mostly sink away in the 1870s. Jerichau-Baumann would abandon her patriotic images of Norse mythological heroines and reinvent herself as an Orientalist painter in the 1870s, at which point she would become less interested in showing at the Paris Salon. The famed illustrator Lorenz Frølich would return to his native Denmark in 1875 after spending nearly twenty years in Paris. Anton Melbye and Theude Grønland, who already began to earn success in the 1840s, passed away in 1875 and 1876, respectively. The popular animal painter Carl Frederik Kørboe, who had painted Napoleon’s portrait around 1855, passed away in Dijon in 1876.

Perhaps the greatest blow came from the death of the Norwegian painter Adolph Tidemand in 1876. Tidemand’s paintings illustrating Norwegian folk life had played an
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important role in garnering critics’ interest in Nordic art and culture. At the same time, the
great success of Tidemand and his Düsseldorf colleagues at the Universal Expositions,
including Hans Gude, Edward Bergh, and Ferdinand, oftentimes reaffirmed critics’
tendencies to see the Nordic countries as an extension of Germany, even as the bloody
resolution to the ethno-territorial disputes of Schleswig-Holstein Question in 1864 inserted
a firm wedge between Germany and Denmark.

A new generation of artists would begin to appear in the late 1860s and 1870s
whose presence in France would radically alter how critics understood the relationship
between Germany, France, and the Nordic countries. Like many of the Nordic artists who
went to France at the start of the Second Empire and studied with Thomas Couture, the
new generation would seek training in private French ateliers. Many, like the Swedish
painter Nils Forsberg and Gustaf Cederström, learned from the hispagnoliste style of Léon
Bonnat, while others, such as Albert Edelfelt, trained with the popular historical genre
painter Jean Léon-Gérôme. Beyond the studios, artist colonies in the French countryside,
such as Grez-sur-Loing, were another important source of education for artists including
Alfred Wahlberg [Fig. 3.1] and Hugo Salmson wishing to paint directly outdoors sur le motif.
As many of these artists established their careers in France, the gallery Goupil & Cie
provided a new means for both financial support as well as widespread visual exposure,
reproducing artists’ works through the dealer’s newly perfected photogravure process.

The generation of artists who established careers in France beginning in the 1870s
and extending into the 1880s – and above all the pleinairist Swedes, led by Wahlberg – are
largely regarded by contemporary art historians as the forerunners of modernist painting
practices in Scandinavia. Several of the painters attracted to France drew a strong contrast between the practices of the Düsseldorf Academy that had heavily influenced Nordic artistic practice in the 1850s and 1860s and the naturalist, anti-Academic styles of Gustave Courbet, Edouard Manet, the Impressionists, and later Jules Bastien-Lepage. According to Torsten Gunnarsson, after being exposed to French plein-air painting, the Swedish Grez-sur-Loing painter Carl Frederik Hill would reject the Düsseldorf style outright as unnatural, “declaring that the difference between Edvard Bergh’s and Wahlberg’s landscapes was like the difference between a green plank and God’s own nature.” Yet the question of what manner of painting was best suited to capturing the so-called truth of nature was subject to fierce debate. Gude, writing to former pupil at Karlsruhe, Hans Thoma, admonished the German artist for his newfound interest in Courbet, encouraging Thoma to instead, to “Use God’s nature as your first teacher.” For Gude, Courbet’s so-called anti-idealist approach to nature was akin to falsity rather than truth.

There was a strong political component to the debates about French versus German aesthetics amongst Nordic artists as well. For Danish artists, the loss of the duchies of Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenburg to Prussia and Austria had already led to a rejection of

---

German art in the 1860s, bringing in a period of artistic isolationism. However, the Franco-Prussian War would further complicate Nordic artists’ relationship with German art. The defeat of France during the Franco-Prussian War (1870-71), remarks Nicolai Strøm Olsen, greatly divided Norwegian painters. Much of Norway's cultural elite had already been opposed to Prussia since the Schleswig-Holstein War of 1864. Nonetheless, the ties between German and Norwegian art were strong, leaving some painters including Adolph Tidemand and Otto Sinding – who would find considerable success in France in the 1880s – to with Prussia in 1870. Frederik Collett, on the other hand, sided with France, creating a rift between himself and his friend Tidemand. Amongst Sweden's artists, many sided with France, some fiercely so. Bonnat’s student, Forsberg, remained in France during the war to serve as a volunteer army medic. Although Charles XV decided to keep Sweden politically neutral during the war, the painter-king was disheartened by France’s defeat.

Of course, the defeat of France the hands of Prussia in 1870 would have far its greatest consequences at home, leading to the collapse of the Second Empire, a months-long siege of Paris, and a bloody civil war arising from the Communard insurrection. The most devastating outcome of the Franco-Prussian War, however, would be France’s loss of the Alsace and Lorraine. These French regions on the border of Germany were annexed by to the newly unified German Empire, formed in the immediate aftermath of the war. The Principle of Nationality, which had been a guiding principle of the Second Empire and its institutions, including the Universal Exposition, had backfired on Napoleon III as Germany
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proclaimed its right to a unified state, which would include German-speaking territories of France. All the while the German Empire’s political influence accelerated, France would find itself politically isolated from the rest of Europe, including countries who rulers and populaces from otherwise sympathetic to France’s plight such as Sweden.\textsuperscript{317} King Charles XV died in 1872, shortly after the Franco-Prussian War, and was succeeded by his brother, Oscar II. Whereas Charles XV had developed an amicable relationship with Napoleon III, even gifting the French emperor two of his landscape paintings, Oscar II took a more pragmatic approach to international politics. Recognizing that any sort of close political relationship with the now-impotent France would likely bring little benefit to Sweden, Oscar II considering it more advantageous to shift alliances to the victorious German Empire.\textsuperscript{318}

This concoction of shifting generations, ideological rifts, political crises, and the reorganization of national borders created a unique set of circumstances that radically reshaped how French artists looked at Nordic art. After physical bloodshed ended in 1871, France would continue to wage war against Germany on the cultural field. German art, frequently praised for its spiritual ideals up until the war, would now frequently be derided as provincial, derivative, and a produce of a bellicose nation more interested in territorial expansion than artistic ingenuity. In the process of defaming \textit{l’art allemande}, critics found a new ideal in the artistic products of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, which they titled \textit{l’art} or \textit{l’école scandinave}. The combination of what would be an increasingly sizable and

successful cohort of Nordic artists residing in France, along with a shared narrative of national mutilation at the hands of Prussia linking the histories of France and Denmark, created a unique set of circumstances in which Scandinavism would find itself at the heart of French patriotism – and anti-Germanism.

The decision of many Nordic artists to move away from Düsseldorf and embrace the naturalist techniques they picked up in Paris affirmed for critics that German power was a façade, that France continued to be the center of European life, and with la Scandinavie as France’s ally and witness. Nonetheless, the acceptance of l’art scandinave in French literature would not be immediate. Given the longstanding ties of Nordic artists to Germany, and in the context of widespread post-war xenophobia, many critics looked at Nordic art with suspicion in the 1870s. Other critics derided the decision of many Nordic artists to pick up plein-air techniques as slavish imitation.

While chapter two argued that French critics drew a strong connection between German and Nordic art during the Second Empire, this chapter argues that the Romantic Germanist interpretation of Nordic art largely halted with the onset of the Franco-Prussian War. Instead, the idea of a pan-national Scandinavian art – called l’art scandinave, l’école scandinave, or les écoles scandinaves – spread within French literature during the 1870s as a response to both anti-Germanism along with growing Nordic artistic interest in French naturalist painting techniques. Focus will be placed on the emergence of the new generation of Nordic artists working in France, examining in what manner they picked up French painting techniques – above all pleinairism – and how these artists found a new means of support and visual exposure through the gallery Goupil & Cie. Throughout this chapter, it will be demonstrated that discussions of l’art scandinave in 1870s French
criticism almost exclusively arise alongside derisions of Germany. Alongside revanchism, it will be argued that historical revisionism also played an important role in defining l’art scandinave, whereby which both journalists and historians frequently referenced histories of Franco-Nordic cultural exchanges as a means of bolstering contemporary efforts to align the practices of Nordic artists with those of France.

Anti-Germanism and its Consequences on the Reception of Nordic Painting

Ruminations over French identity as well as what place it would have in the future of Europe had a major impact on discourse within 1870s politics, art, and literature. Rachel Esner has argued that within art criticism, the desire to launch a cultural counterattack against Germany found expression through two differing ideological camps: one liberal and international, the other conservative and isolationist. The liberal camp advocated a program of cultural imperialism, arguing that the French nation was at heart international and paternalistic. To counter the political isolation in which France had been plunged after the war, the French nation could only remedy itself by serving as a guiding light for the rest of Europe, which for the arts translated into a call to embrace the foreigner artist colonies in France.

A largely similar ideology had prevailed under the Second Empire, during which critics advocated the philosophies of eclecticism and progress. The power of French art,
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according to the ideology of eclecticism, was its ability to borrow and adapt from multiple European traditions.\textsuperscript{322} The Universal Exposition confirmed for critics that while the once-viral arts of Italy and Greece grew stale, French art flourished in the modern age. The philosophy of French artistic eclecticism merged with Napoleon III’s program of making France Europe’s center of progress and modernity. According to the official critic of the Universal Exposition of 1867, Ernest Chesneau, human society was advancing, and just as the Universal Exposition gave evidence to the forward momentum of science and industry, so too art must progress forward through the international exchange of ideas – with France’s duty to lead the way.\textsuperscript{323}

After the Franco-Prussian War, however, a reactionary camp of critics arose, arguing that the liberal ideology of cosmopolitanism had led France into moral and political decay.\textsuperscript{324} Amongst those intellectuals influenced by this ideology in the 1870s can be included René Ménard, an art critic and pioneer of the modern art historical discipline. In addition to teaching art history classes at the École nationale des Arts Décoratifs de Paris in the early 1880s, in 1875 Ménard authored one of the first illustrated art history survey texts in France, \textit{Histoire des Beaux-Arts illustrée}, which covers Antiquity to the art of Ingres and Delacroix.\textsuperscript{325} Ménard believed adamantly that art was a product of society and that its proliferation or diminution was tied directly to a civilization’s progression or decadence. In
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contrast to the political conservativism – and ecological reductionism – of Taine, who
argued that the decline of France stemmed from the Republican ideals of the Revolution.\textsuperscript{326}
Ménard tied artistic progress with the growth of \emph{l'esprit public} and \emph{l'esprit de famille}.\textsuperscript{327}
Decadence stemmed from the loss of social cohesion, including the loss of republicanism,
the rise of despotism, but also – as was the case with the Roman adoption of oriental gods,
Ménard argues – the incursion of foreign influences.\textsuperscript{328}

Reviewing the Vienna International Exposition of 1873 – the first international
exposition to take place in Europe since the war – René Ménard’s illustration of a
worldview of that saw the Second Empire’s programs of international artistic exchange as
having led not to progress, but to decadence. Ménard argues that whereas the works
shown at the first Paris Universal Exposition of 1855 had appeared fresh and original, less
than two decades later at the Vienna International Exposition the works appeared little
different from what could be seen at home at the Paris salon.\textsuperscript{329} Universal expositions,
according to Ménard, had the tendency to “niveler et à faire disparaître le génie particulier
des races et les tendances spéciales des écoles.”\textsuperscript{330} Internationalism had thus, according to
Ménard, brought about a period of artistic mediocrity due to the mixing of different
schools. Although the question of preserving national identity in an age of internationalism
the had frequently arisen as a concern for critics during the Second Empire, Chesneau had

\textsuperscript{326} Esner, “Art Knows No Fatherland: The Reception of German Art in France, 1878-1900,”
18; Therrien, \textit{L’histoire de l’art en France}, 108
\textsuperscript{327} René Ménard, \textit{Histoire des Beaux-Arts illustrée} (Paris: Imprimerie Générale & L’Écho de
la Sorbonne, 1875), 122
\textsuperscript{328} Ménard, \textit{Histoire des Beaux-Arts illustrée}, 122-23
\textsuperscript{329} René Menard, “Exposition de Vienne,” second article, \textit{Gazette des Beaux-Arts}, ser. 2, VIII
(1 Octobre 1873): 354
\textsuperscript{330} Menard, “Exposition de Vienne” 354
argued that the strength of national genius and originality would inevitably lead to culture’s preservation. In the wake of 1870, however, the hope of progress had shifted to fears of artistic decline coupled with a mistrust for foreign invasions, whether they be military or cultural.

Ménard’s belief in the decadence of arts due to internationalism would similarly color the critic’s review of Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists at the exposition. For example, Ménard argues that whereas Sweden once had original and praiseworthy national artists such as Höckert, they were now either dead or had been subsumed under foreign influence. The great majority of Nordic artists at the exposition, however, Ménard perceived as falling under the influence of Düsseldorf, including Tidemand’s *Bridal Procession through the Forest* [Fig. 3.2]. Though Ménard notes that Denmark, Sweden, and Norway all occupied their own separate space, he argues that they were nonetheless indistinguishable from the German section: “La Suède, la Norvège et le Danemark occupent ensemble une des salles de l’exposition, et si le nom de chaque nationalité n’était pas inscrit au-dessus des portes, on serait tenté de croire que cette salle est une annexe de l’Allemagne.” Ménard’s comparison between the art of the Nordic countries and that of Germany was not meant to be taken as neutral observation, and certainly not as praise, as had occasionally been the case in prior decades amongst germanophile critics wishing to subsume artists of the Scandinavian peninsula under *l’école allemande*. Ménard’s review of the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian galleries at the Vienna International Exposition was, with few exceptions, almost completely negative, standing in bold contrast to what seemed
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to be an increasingly positive perception of Nordic artists - especially Swedish and Norwegian – since the opening of the first Universal Exposition nearly twenty years earlier.

The accusation that Nordic artists leaned too heavily on either French or German styles and offered little originality to painting had frequently been raised at the Universal Expositions of the Second Empire. Ménard’s reiteration of this common critique, however, rises distinctly out of the climate of anti-Germanism that pervaded throughout the early Third Republic, during which time, journalists frequently posed their critiques in terms of a cultural struggle between France and Germany. Although the critic reserved moderate praise for those artists who swayed towards France, which according to Ménard included the landscape painters Ludvig Munthe, Alfred Wahlberg, and – somewhat paradoxically – the former Düsseldorf teacher Hans Gude, Ménard disdained those who came under the influence of Düsseldorf, whose artists he likened to “[les] élégants de province qui se pavent dans des modes surannées.”

Ménard ends his review of the Vienna International Exposition by concluding that there were few lessons to be learned from art outside of France. “En quittant l’étranger pour visiter la section française, “writes Ménard,” il semble qu’on entre dans une capitale après en avoir parcouru les faubourgs. C’est là que chacun vient prendre son mot d’ordre, et Paris est aujourd’hui le centre de la vie et de l’activité dans les arts.” French chauvinism therefore weighed more heavily in Ménard’s criticism of Nordic art than the desire to see national expression in the arts. While artists who showed signs of French influence were praised – even if only moderately so – those who did not were seen as inherently inferior.
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The broad xenophobic tenor of Ménard’s review, and his pronounced disdain held for the Düsseldorf painters, stemmed from the critic’s fear of a far-reaching German ploy to extend its influence in Europe not only politically, but in art and culture as well. According to Ménard, German influence in the arts was on the rise, visible not only in the Nordic countries, but in Central European countries such as in Poland and Hungary, and even on France’s own doorstep.\textsuperscript{335} This mounting cultural influence of Germany, however, not the result of the progression of German society, but the willful historical deceit of German scholars. Writing several years later in response to the Universal Exposition of 1878, Ménard would argue that German art had originated in France, and could be proven historically. From the Classical painting style of Cornelius to Gothic architecture, all the major artistic achievements claimed by Germany to be part of their national character could in fact be traced back France.\textsuperscript{336}

The narrative of German thievery of French culture is a core theme within Ménard’s vision of art history, and was pronounced by the art historian early on in the Third Republic within both his \textit{Histoire des Beaux-Arts illustrée} as well as his review of the Vienna International Exposition.\textsuperscript{337} Writing at the 1873 exposition, Ménard remarks that it has been a longstanding tendency for Germans to steal from the cultural creativity of the Latin races, writing:

\begin{quote}
L’activité artistique de l’Allemagne s’est toujours développée parmi les contrées que leur situation géographique met en contact journalier avec les races latines et où presque toutes les villes sont de fondation romaine. Cette observation peut ne présenter au point de vue de l’art qu’un intérêt secondaire mais en Allemagne, où les études ethnographiques sont fort en honneur, elle
\end{quote}
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peut répondre au dédain que nos voisins affichent pour tout ce qui tient aux races latines.338

Ménard’s comment is more than just an attack on at the inauthenticity of the newly-unified German Empire – a nation he would describe as having artificial borders – and more than an expression of contempt towards Germany for the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. Rather, in the eyes of the French critic and historian, it was a warning that the continual encroachment of Germany on the culture and territory of France was part of a greater existential battle between the German and Latin peoples, in which all the great cultural products of Latin Europe would go under a process of Germanization through forcible annexation and historical revisionism.339

In the immediate aftermath of the Franco-Prussian War, international exhibitions changed from yardsticks for measuring national progress to a mortal struggle for the future – as well as the history – of European culture. For French critics, the means of evaluating foreign artists shifted from questioning their originality to questioning whose side they were on: Paris of Düsseldorf. Artists such as Tidemand were clearly suspect as potential enemies of France. Throughout the 1870s and into the 1880s, French critics would frequently reject those Nordic artists that continued to work in Düsseldorf, Berlin, or any other Prussian city. The historical arc of the reception of Nordic in France, however, would shift towards a narrative of comradeship rather than hostility. Artists such Wahlberg, who largely abandoned their Düsseldorf training and embraced French naturalism, were deemed potential allies. Not only did the success of these ex-Düsseldorf artists give evidence to France’s continuing cultural relevance in Europe, but also suggested that
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Germany was losing the cultural battle. This ideological battle for the identity of Nordic art would take place throughout the 1870s. After the Universal Exposition of 1878, many French critics, including Ménard himself, would no longer regard Nordic artists as allied with the practices of Germany, but rather those of France. As the visibility of Nordic artists working in France using a pleinairist style proliferated, so did the belief in a unique alliance that bound France and the Nordic countries together.

**The New Scandinavian Allies**

The defensive wall erected up by scholars such as Ménard seeking protect the culture and history of France from thieving outsiders that gripped critics such as Ménard in the early years of the Third Republic was countered by the call for France to extend its reach, internationalize, and colonize. The initial impetus to expand French colonialism from a sporadic affair to an organized movement, argues C. M. Andrew, was to reassert "French prestige" after the losses of Alsace and Lorraine to the German Empire. In the European scramble to conquer and divide Africa at the end of the nineteenth century, France’s widespread colonization of North, West, and Central Africa was a means of affirming France’s power against its own European neighbors as well as stoking national pride within its own borders.

Military and economic domination of Africa and Asia was supplemented a much more widespread policy of cultural colonialism in wake of the Franco-Prussian War. In
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1883, just two years after the conquest of Tunisia, the Alliance Française was founded as a means spreading the French language, first within the French Maghreb, but soon throughout much of the rest of the world. Within the first few years of the foundation’s existence, committees of the Alliance Française were set up in cities worldwide including Melbourne, Shanghai, London, and Copenhagen. Alongside the language, art – particularly painting – would also be used as a tool for asserting French influence beyond its own borders. Although critics had already noted the appeal of French art across Europe during the Universal Expositions of the Second Empire, it was during the Third Republic that writers would fully engage fine arts on the cultural battlefield.

In 1873, French artist Jules Delaunay and critic Jules Claretie - a burgeoning scandinavophile, who would later at the turn of the century write numerous articles concerning the influence of Scandinavian literature on France, and particularly Ibsen, published a booklet on contemporary Nordic artists titled *Les Artistes Scandinaves*. The
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booklet was supposed to be part of a subscription series on art with a new edition sent every month. The booklet details the careers of four painters, the Dane Lorenz Frølich, the Swedes Kristine von Post (usually referred to as Christine de Post in France) and Amalia Lindegren, and Charles XV, King of Sweden and Norway [Fig. 3.3]. Von Post, Lindegren, and Frølich had all come to France during the 1850s, studying in the ateliers of French artists and exhibiting in the annual Salon, where they found success. Though trained as a painter, Frølich found his greatest success as an illustrator for French books. Christine von Post had a great success when her biblical painting, *The Mother of Moses Exposing her Son on the Nile*, at the Universal Exposition of 1867, then gifted to the Chateau Gontier Museum in western France. At the same Exposition, Charles XV, who had died just one year before the publication, surprised French critics when he exhibited several paintings in both the Swedish and Norwegian sections. The paintings were a gift to the French Emperor Napoleon III - for the Swedish king was of French descent, grandson of Marshall Jean-Bernadotte, who had served under Napoleon III's uncle, Napoleon I, before being offered the Swedish crown as a successor to the heirless Charles XIII.

These artists represented what the authors saw as an alliance between France and Scandinavia in the face of German expansion. Although Sweden remained politically neutral during the Franco-Prussian war, Charles XV along with a good portion of the Swedish populace remained sympathetic to France. Given Charles XV’s political and cultural affinity to France, the authors of *Les Artistes Scandinaives* give ample praise to the artists of

Sweden, who they saw as being led to a new artistic renaissance by their wise Francophile king. As Delaunay writes:

Sous le règne heureux de Charles XV, roi artiste, l’art suédois a pris un si rapide essor et se développe d’une manière tellement prodigieuse que ; si une renaissance, comme tout le fait présager pour l’art de la peinture, est proche dans le monde, comme celle que virent éclore les XVe, XVIe et XVIIe siècles par en Italie et en Hollande, les artistes suédois alors marcheront de pari avec les français.345

The authors’ assurance that France marches along with Sweden in its path towards artistic greatness was intended as vindication of France’s own importance as an artistic leader in Europe. Throughout the Second Empire, and particularly in discourse concerning the Universal Expositions, critics frequently associated France with the ideal of progress.

Swedish art under the reign of Charles XV had certainly made an impact on French audiences, but the implication of Delaunay’s statement is that France helped guide Sweden in the right direction.

It was not Sweden alone that had achieved greatness through France’s help, but rather as the title of the booklet implies, all three of the Scandinavian countries. In the booklet’s introduction, Claretie emphasizes both the unity of Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists, as well as the distinction of Scandinavian art from the rest of Europe: “. . . ces peuples du Nord, dont nous aimons l’honnêteté, la raison calme, la fidélité et l’humour profonde ont, eux aussi, un art véritable, un art spécial qu’on pourrait appeler l’art scandinave.”346 Claretie’s emphasis on the term scandinave emphasizes the novelty of the

idea of a Scandinavian style of painting within French literature. It will be recalled that the historian and journalist August Geffroy had argued during the Salon of 1861 that an école scandinave existed, unified by a common Scandinavian culture and history, despite the tendency for these artists to study in Düsseldorf; however, the notion of Scandinavian art found few reiterations in French literature during the Second Empire. The uncertainty of France’s future in the immediate wake of the Franco-Prussian War provided an impetus for French writers to reconsider cultural Scandinavism, not only as a means for salvaging Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian culture from the politically volatile idea of greater Germania, but as a politically advantageous means of countering Germanism.

Unlike Geffroy’s notion of l’école scandinave, which sought only to define the shared qualities of Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian art, Claretie’s idea of l’art scandinave argued in favor of an alliance between Scandinavia and France. At the very end of his preface, Claretie declared the motto of the booklet to be: “La France aux pays du Nord!”347 It was a call to further pursue French cultural influence in the Nordic countries given the recent tendency of Nordic artists to pursue artistic education in France, but moreover suggested France’s self-identified role as a national liberator. The idea that France, by inviting foreigners to its exhibitions venues and bestowing on them the finest painting practices, had guided Europe – and especially the Nordic countries – towards the development of an independent national style would continue to be reiterated by critics throughout the rest of the century.

A decade earlier, Philippe de Chennevières, now head of the Musée du Luxembourg, France’s museum of contemporary art, had already proclaimed that it was of national
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interest to showcase the nation’s benevolence towards foreign artists. However, the reason that critics took such a strong interest in proclaiming a fraternal bond with the Nordic countries is rooted in France’s renegotiation of its cultural and geopolitical place in Europe.

The political isolation of France after the Franco-Prussian War and the continual threat of another military conflict with Germany led writers across the cultural and political fields to search for new alliances in Europe. Journalists almost immediately made a connection between the shared circumstances of both France and Denmark. Within the course of less than a decade, both had gone to war with Prussia and lost substantial geographical territories in the process of German unification. While Napoleon III had given little resistance to the Prussian and Austrian annexation of the duchies of Schleswig, Holstein and Lauenburg after the war with Denmark in 1864, a narrative of mutual victimization at the hands of a common foe now emerged after 1870. Reflecting back on his first trip to Denmark in 1867, the author Victor Fournel would write that after the Franco-Prussian War, his subsequent travels through Denmark would be laden with a newfound sympathy for the otherwise little-remarked upon country:

J’étais parti d’abord sans presque rien savoir, comme la plupart de mes compatriotes, de cette petite nation qui a une grande histoire, et n’éprouvant guère que la curiosité banale de touriste pour un pays assez peu connu; j’y suis retourné avec un intérêt et une sympathie qui ne pouvaient que s’accroître à un examen nouveau et que je voudrais faire partager au lecteur.

Within French literature, the Wars of German Unification transformed the image of Denmark into a sympathetic ally. Fournel, like many critics, had found that both France and
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“nos amis danois”\textsuperscript{350} shared a common enemy in Prussia, whom the author accuses – in a reference to both Denmark’s and France’s territorial losses – of having “fait tache d’huile sur la carte.”\textsuperscript{351}

The burgeoning notion that Denmark had long been “le vieil ami de France,”\textsuperscript{352} as art critic Dubosc de Pesquidoux would remark at the Universal Exposition of 1878, demonstrates the important place of art historical revisionism in France after the Franco-Prussian War. Just as Ménard sought to challenge the legitimacy of the German nation-state by arguing that German art and architecture could be traced back to France, unscrupulously stolen by Germany just like Alsace and Lorraine, French writers would revisit the shared histories of both France and Denmark to rationalize the need for a modern alliance. One of the most striking examples of this revisionist tactic is in L’Alliance Franco-Danois au Moyen Age published in 1871 by Alexandre Germain, Vice President of the Archeological Society of Montpellier and dean of the faculty of letters.\textsuperscript{353} In the booklet, Germain retraces the affinities between France and Denmark since medieval times:

Le Danemark, alors chrétien, ne menaçait plus l’Europe des ravages de ses pirates ; il cherchait, au contraire, à se mêler, dans un but manifeste du progrès social, aux peuples civilisés. La France attirait particulièrement ses regards. Les Danois avaient appris à la connaître, à la faveur des croisades, auxquelles ils prirent, avec les autres populations scandinaves, une partie si active, et ils s’habituaient à venir demander, soit à ses écoles, soit à ses monastères, les moyens de s’instrouite et de donner cours à leurs goûts de néophytes. Sans renoncer à leurs anciennes inclinations pour la vie d’aventures, ils s’étaient
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disciplinés, et songeaient à s’enrichir par de profitables relations plutôt que par le pillage.\textsuperscript{354}

Following a formula like Delaunay and Claretie’s \textit{Les Artistes Scandinaves}, Germain’s \textit{L’Alliance Franco-Danois au Moyen Age} develops a narrative of Franco-Nordic kinship in which France plays the role of the enlightened, benevolent teacher while Denmark plays the role of the young student attracted by the intellectual splendor of France. Furthermore, Germain’s portrayal of the Danes as a peaceful people who had long ago given up their arms to pursue cultural aims instead.

Lastly, and perhaps most importantly, Germain’s historical treatise was written in direct reaction to France’s contemporary political conflict with Prussia, urging an alliance between France and not only Denmark, but all the Scandinavian countries:

\begin{quote}
La France et les États scandinaves ont presque toujours eu les mêmes intérêts, malgré la diversité des époques et des circonstances. Cette communauté de fortune ne saurait que grandir aujourd’hui, en face de l’excessif développement de la Prusse.\textsuperscript{355}
\end{quote}

By establishing a common and much reviled enemy in Prussia and imagining an idealized past, Germain sought to stoke nationalist sentiments amongst both French and Nordic readers in pursuit of a cultural – if not political – battle against Germany.

The sudden insistence of the ethnic unity of Scandinavia and their historical and cultural alliance with France, seen in both \textit{L’Alliance Franco-Danois au Moyen Age} and \textit{Les Artistes Scandinaves}, is part of a broader attempt by French scholars to use revisionist scholarship to reimagine European identity and history as a counter to the German
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Empire’s vast restructuring of the map of Europe. Although political Scandinavism had died well before the Franco-Prussian War, the idea of a unified pan-Scandinavian identity distinct from – and largely hostile to – Germany provided a counterbalance to realization of a unified German nation-state. In other words, French authors hoped to posit Scandinavia as a genuine nation in contrast to the contrivance of the German Empire. Just as Ménard described Germany as nation with artificial borders, with an art and architecture plagiarized from France, in 1871 the biologist and ethnologist Jean Louis Armand de Quatrefages would argue in *La Race Prussienne* that the German race was a construction as well. According to de Quatrefages, the Prussians are neither Germanic nor Slavic, but rather are racially Finnish.\(^{356}\)

The tendency to link anti-Germanism – and particularly anti-Prussianism – with pro-Scandinavism is particularly evident in Claretie’s publications. Just one year before *Les Artistes Scandinaves*, Claretie had published a particularly acerbic book on German culture titled *Les Prussiens Chez Eux*. “La grande nation française était l’héroïsme;” writes Claretie, “la grande nation allemande, ou plutôt la grosse nation – car *grand* là-bas se traduit par *gros* – ne sera jamais que l’égoïsme.”\(^{357}\) As noted by Rachel Esner, the Franco-Prussian war would bring about a sudden transformation of France’s image of Germany from “faithful, hard-working, and honest” to “narrow-minded and despotic.”\(^{358}\) Within the establishment of this cultural dichotomy between honest, heroic France and lazy, despotic Germany,
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critics would add in the Nordic countries as an ally, ascribing to them the same positive
characters attached to France, and contrasting them with those of Germany.

In Les Artistes Scandinaves, Delaunay contrasts the bellicose and culturally obsolete
Germans with the peaceful, progressive Scandinavians, writing:

“Malheureusement les Allemands ont de beaucoup retardé le moment où l'on
ne pourrait plus demander à une nation pour lui assigner son rang: « Combien
avez-vous de soldats? – Mais : Que comptez-vous de savants, d'artistes, de
poètes ?. . . » La Suède, la Norwège et le Danemark qui n'ont rien à envier
comme gloires militaires, brillent d'un vif éclat dans le mouvement progressif.
Peuples libres, Scandinaves sont en train d'édifier le monument de leur
grandeur artistique, scientifique et littéraire.”

Paired with Claretie's introduction, Delaunay's description of the Scandinavian
people follows a strikingly similar model as Germain's historical narrative about the
Vikings. Both L'Alliance Franco-Danois au Moyen Age and Les Artistes Scandinaves
describe a people who have given up military conquest for scholarly pursuits,
contrasting the peaceful Scandinavian culture with the pugnacious Germans. Just as
important as this contrast to Germany, however, is the way these authors use
Scandinavia as a mirror to France's own self-image. In both texts, France plays the
role of Scandinavia's educator and ally – the same role in which France would see
itself on a global level in the burgeoning years of the Third Republic.

Esner also observes that French art critics helped shape a self-image of
cultural progress in contrast to the perceived bellicose nature of Germany.

Reviewing the Universal Exposition in 1878, one anonymous writer for the Revue
Bleu would articulate this cosmopolitan self-image precisely, writing: “It is no longer
the prestige of our armies [which will make France great], but the sweet light,
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peaceful and all-powerful, of a rich, serene, and happy France, astounding and instructing the world with its marvels of work and intellect.”

Without mentioning the country by name, the author’s allusion to the irrelevance of armies to the modern world was a direct critique of Germany and an attempt to sublimate the shame of France’s defeat. The image of the generous, peaceful and progressive France was erected in contrast to Germany’s expanding military prowess – an attempt to relabel the losers as the victors, and victors as the losers.

Emily Braun has suggested Scandinavian art likely gained in popularity after the Franco-Prussian war quite as a sort of politically safe alternative for enjoying much of what had previously been admired of German art and culture. Many of the characteristics used to describe Scandinavians, such as a love of freedom and poetry, had been used by De Staël had used to describe Germans in On Germany, and yet were now seen as characteristics only to be associated with Scandinavians in opposition to the violent, dense Germans. Since 1848, the old Germania of the early nineteenth-century had been going through a process of being cut up, divided, and reformed in not only politics but also literature. Out of this period of turmoil l’art scandinave arose forcefully in French literature, both a product of real and imagined forces linking France and the Nordic countries together.

---


The Impact on Scandinavian Art of the New Market for Reproductions

As during the Third Republic, the pursuit of both private and state patronage were important goals of Nordic artists working in France. During the tumultuous early period of the Third Republic, only one painting by a Nordic artist was purchased at the Salon by the French state. The painting purchased was Wilhelmina “Mimmi” Zetterström's *Intérieur Laponais* [Fig. 3.4], acquired in 1875 after its exhibition that year. Zetterström (1843-1885) moved to Paris in 1872, shortly after the completion of her artistic training at the Academy Sweden, where she began exhibiting at the Salon.³⁶² Depicting the interior of a Sami tent with a mother rocking her infant, *Intérieur Laponais* bears a strong resemblance to the paintings of Höckert, whose works she had studied as a student.³⁶³ The young Zetterstöm’s emulation of the recently-deceased Höckert, still revered in France, was a surefire way to gain the attention of critics, who appreciated it’s ethnographic voyeurism along with the artist’s relaxed painting style.³⁶⁴ It was through the help of an influential friend, however, that Zetterstöm succeeded in having her painting purchased by the French state. France’s Ministre des Affaires Étrangères, Louis Decazes, wrote to the Directeur des Beaux-Arts, Philippe de Chennevières, in May 1875, encouraging him to purchase her painting.

Chennevières evidently agreed, as one month later, *Intérieur Laponais* was purchased for two-thousand francs and deposited at a museum in the Bretagne city of Saint Malo.365

Persistence and having the support of a French intermediary were important assets to have for Nordic artists looking to sell their works in France. Another crucial facet of this business acumen also included knowing how to adapt to the taste of one’s audience. Zetterstöm achieved a minor success four years later at the Salon of 1879 with her painting *Charlotte Corday devant le Tribunal Révolutionnaire* [Fig. 3.5]. Radically different in subject matter her earlier *Intérieur Laponais*, this painting is a heroic portrayal of Charlotte Corday, the infamous assassin of Jacobin journalist Jean-Paul Marat, standing defiantly before a Revolutionary court in 1793. The painting was selected by the gallery Goupil & Cie to be part of its yearly album, *Reproductions des Principaux Ouvrages*.366 This double-volume set comprised of one hundred high-quality photographic reproductions of choice paintings and sculptures selected from each year’s Salon. The set of photographs was then sold through Goupil’s biannual catalogue, *Publications Nouvelles*, for a price of one hundred and fifty francs. The gallery’s decision to include *Charlotte Corday devant le Tribunal Révolutionnaire* within the photographic album is telling of the appeal of Zetterström’s artwork to contemporary French audiences. Through the affordability and reproducibility of his prints, Goupil targeted a broad sector of the European bourgeoisie, accordingly selecting

365 Zetterstöm may have received support not only personal help from Decazes himself, but from state institutions as well itself. Decazes mentions in his letter that Zetterström had come under the patronage of his department, though he does not elaborate by what means. Mme. Zetterström, “Intérieur Laponais,” Archives Nationales, Cote F/21/261. For information on the painting’s attribution to Saint Malo, see the online resource: *Intérieur Laponais*, by Zetterstrom (Mme) Cote F/21/261. Archives Nationales. Base Arcade. [www.culture.gouv.fr](http://www.culture.gouv.fr). Accessed 2/2/2017

his artworks to match these tastes. Goupil & Cie therefore provided a good means of advertising for an artist by spreading their artwork widely, including through newspapers. Goupil’s photographs could be used as practical guide for their own illustrations, as is evidenced by the appearance of Zetterström’s painting in *l'Univers Illustré* in January 1880.

The contrast between Zetterstrom’s *Intérieur Laponais* and *Charlotte Corday devant le Tribunal Révolutionnaire* is telling regarding changes in French tastes and changes in Nordic exhibition strategies during the 1870s. *Intérieur Laponais* followed a formula of ethnographic realism through which Nordic artists such as Höckert, Wickenberg, and Tidemand had found success in France throughout the midcentury. Their works were Nordic peasant genre scenes, describing the traditional costumes, ancient social customs, and wild natural environments of geographically isolated peoples, often in precise detail and great exoticizing effect. Such works corresponded with the shifting aesthetic criteria of the time, in which French critics began to extoll the virtues of painting one’s own time and place over Classical erudition.

Zetterström’s include *Charlotte Corday devant le Tribunal Révolutionnaire*, by contrast, provides none of the of the local Nordic iconography present in *Intérieur Laponais*. Instead, the painting might be said to speak a language that is purely French, referencing acutely historical figures and events of the Revolution in such a manner that would have spoken to contemporary French sentiments. While it is without doubt certain that Nordic artists hoping to make a career within the Second Empire – above all Lorenz
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Frølich and Elisabeth Jerichau-Baumann – strategically adopted both fashionable French styles and motifs to appeal to patrons, this tendency becomes a more pronounced feature of Nordic painting in France at the start of the Third Republic. Whereas exoticizing ethnographic paintings painted with a distinctly Northern European style including Höckert’s *Prèche dans une chapelle de la Laponie Suédoise* and Tidemand’s *La toilette de la fiancée en Norvège* defined French taste in Nordic art during the Second Empire, both critics’ and judges preferences would shift during the late 1870s towards artists working en plein air, depicting the rural French landscape and people, including, along with Zetterström, Hugo Salmson, Alfred Wahlberg, and August Hagborg.

As this young generation of Nordic – mostly Swedish and Norwegian – artists who assimilated to French practices began to receive recognition from the Salon juries, the gallery and publisher Goupil & Cie would become an important source of patronage and visual exposure. A very limited number of paintings by some of the Second Empire’s most luminary Nordic artists had passed through the hands of the gallery from the early 1850s through the mid 1860s. These early purchases consist of two flower paintings by Grönland, two hunting scenes by Kiörböe, a marine painting by Anton Melbye, a landscape by Gude, a landscape by Swedish painter Michael Dahl, and a couple genre paintings by Danish artist Julius Friedländer.\(^{368}\) In the 1870s, however, Goupil began to regularly purchase and sell

paintings by Swedish and Norwegian artists, and above all Alfred Wahlberg. In 1868, Goupil bought their first painting by Alfred Wahlberg, titled Clair de lune in 1868, for the price of 2000 francs. From this moment onward, Wahlberg would become one of Goupil’s most successful Nordic artists. Over the next two decades, Goupil & Cie would purchase more than fifty of Wahlberg’s landscapes, many of which were then sold to an international array of collectors and dealers from Paris, Moscow, England, and New York.369

In the early 1870s, Wahlberg was joined by two of his Swedish compatriots, the genre painter Hugo Salmson and the landscape painter Wilhelm von Gegerfelt, both of whom sold a considerable number of paintings to the gallery. Other artists who would sell a significant number of works through Goupil & Cie beginning in the 1870s include the Danish marine painter Wilhelm Xylander, and to a lesser degree Norwegians Ludwig and Gerhard Munthe. Apart from Xylander, who spent in career in Denmark and Germany,370 each of these artists had placed considerable investment in France for their careers, either residing in France in the 1870s or receiving major recognition at the Salon and Universal Exposition.

The reproduction of artworks by Goupil & Cie’s publishing wing provided another important means of exposure for Nordic artists, allowing the circulation of their works to a mass audience through inexpensive prints. Salmson had several his works sold as prints.

through Goupil & Cie’s catalogue.\textsuperscript{371} In addition to being printed in several different sizes and formats, paintings reproduced as prints by Goupil & Cie were often leased by the gallery for use in illustrated French journals as well, including Le Journal Illustré and l’Univers Illustré, thus adding to the visual proliferation of an artist’s work throughout France. For example, Salmson’s painting 
\textit{Dans le serre}, shown at the Salon of 1876, appears in several different forms in the French media. First lampooned May of that year in Le Journal Amusant [Fig. 3.6], later in October a photographic reproduction of 
\textit{Dans le serre} was sold in an album of prints through Goupil’s \textit{Publications Nouvelles}.\textsuperscript{372} Goupil’s photograph of Salmson’s \textit{Dans le serre} was then copied by an artist working for Le Journal Illustré and leased for reproduction in the journal, appearing the next year in an April 1877 issue [Fig. 3.7].

Given the great reliance of Nordic artists placed on showing at and receiving awards from the Salon for establishing their careers abroad, Goupil’s publishing wing thus would have been an important tool for helping establish the reputations of younger artists arriving in France in the early 1870s. Prints allowed Nordic artists the opportunity to disseminate images of the paintings they chose to exhibit at the Salon widely throughout France, and to be seen in a great variety of contexts. Two of the earliest examples of Salmson’s paintings reproduced by Goupil include \textit{Petite Suédoise} and \textit{Pierrot au Violon}. Salmson had exhibited both paintings at the Salon of 1875. The gallery had bought only one

\textsuperscript{371} Works by Hugo Salmson reproduced in Goupil’s \textit{Publications Nouvelles} series in the 1870s include \textit{Petite Suédoise} (October 1875), \textit{Pierrot au violon} (October 1875), \textit{Dans la Serre} (October 1876), \textit{Un marché à Anvers} (April 1879), \textit{Une arrestation dans un village de Picardie} (October 1879), and \textit{Dans les champs} (October 1879).

of the two paintings, purchasing *Petite Suédoise* on March 27th, 1875, selling it the next year to an anonymous buyer via the Christie’s auction house in London. Although Goupil & Cie appears never to have purchased the original painting of *Pierrot au Violon*, the publishing house appears to have acquired reproduction rights for both of Salmson’s 1875 Salon paintings, appearing that year in the October edition of Goupil’s *Publications Nouvelles*.374

Salmson’s *Petite Suédoise* appeared in *Reproductions des Principaux Ouvrages*, a gigantic album of seventy photogravures of paintings and sculptures from the Salon of 1875 [Fig. 3.8]. The works included are of a conservative, Academic, but fashionable style, ranging from traditional religious paintings by Salon stalwarts like William-Adolphe Bouguereau, to themes more fashionable in the 1870s such as scenes from the Franco-Prussian War and historical genres from the French Directory.375 Many of the artists included in the volume are those who garnered the highest accolades of the 1875 Salon, such as Fernand Cormon, winner of the newly instituted Prix du Salon, which financed three years of study in Rome for a young artist in the hopes of combatting the increasing incursion of commercialism in the arts.376

---

375 Another Goupil artist who became famous for his scenes from the Directory around this time is Frederick Kaemmerer. McIntosh “Goupil’s Album: Marketing Salon Painting in the Late Nineteenth Century,” p. 80
These artists were, in other words, the cream of the crop of the annual Salon. *Reproductions des Principaux Ouvrages* had the contradictory aim of being both a luxury object sold by a leading commercial gallery as well as paying homage to the immaterial value of the artistic masterpiece. Selling for a sizable sum of 400 francs, this deluxe album was by far the most expensive product available in the publications catalogue. Each photogravure, printed on gilt-edged paper, was accompanied by an original sonnet penned by poet Adrien Dézamy. These ekphrastic poems served as emotive descriptions for the reader, setting the figures and events depicted by the artist to a narrative, as is seen in the case of Dézamy’s poem for *Petite Suédoise*:

La mère est aux champs ; le père, à la forge. / La fillette alors s’assied dans la cour / Parmi ses pigeons chéris, dont la gorge / De mille reflets s’irise au grand jour.

L’un veut becqueter ; l’autre se rengorge. / Quels roucoulements ! ... Chacun, à son tour, / Dès qu’il a reçu caresse et grains d’orge / S’envole joyeux vers son nid d’amour.

Dans ses petits bras, la jeune Suédoise / Tient son favori, que rien n’apprivoise / Et qui de s’enfuir cherche le moyen.

Comme elle est heureuse, et quel frais sourire ! / Son œil vous arrête et semble vous dire : / « Ce sont mes enfants : je les aime bien ! »

Dézamy’s poem carefully weaves through the image, describing the latent action of each of the static characters, imbuing them with sounds, intentions, and emotions, set against the background story of a working-class Swedish peasant girl playing with her pet pigeons while her parents are at work. The combination of image and poetry simultaneously seeks to root the photogravures in a conservative

---

377 *Salon de 1875, Reproductions des Principaux Ouvrages, Accompagnées de Sonnets par Adrien Dézamy* (Paris: Goupil & Cie, 1876), p. 54
interpretation of fine art that points back to the ideals of the Renaissance, evoking what Rennselaer Lee calls the “humanistic doctrine” of *ut pictura poesis* inherited by the founders of the French Academy.\footnote{Rennselaer W. Lee, “Ut Pictura Poesis: The Humanistic Theory of Painting,” *The Art Bulletin* 22, no. 4 (Dec. 1940), p. 211} At the same time, the poem’s accessible, visually instructive narrative – along with the luxurious formatting of the album – is indicative of the wealthy art amateurs to whom *Reproductions des Principaux Ouvrages* would have been marketed.

In comparison, Salmson’s other work chosen from the Salon of 1875, *Pierrot au Violon* was produced in multiple less expensive photographic formats. For six francs, consumers could purchase a twenty by twenty-six-centimeter photograph of *Pierrot au Violon* from Goupil’s *Galerie Photographique* series. Printed in a mid-sized format, these photographs were intended to be either framed and used as an interior decoration or kept within an album for private viewing. The least expensive version of *Pierrot au Violon* came in a small sixteen by eleven-centimeter cabinet card, purchasable for a mere one franc from the *Cartes-Album* series. These inexpensive photographs could also be used as guides for artists who copied works for illustrated journals such as *Le Journal illustré*, in which *Pierrot au Violon* would appear on the front page of the May of 1875 issue [Fig. 3.9], thus extending the visual proliferation of Goupil’s images. Finally, Salmson’s *Pierrot au Violon* was also reproduced in a more economical version of Goupil’s annual Salon album. For the more modest sum of 150 francs, Salon enthusiasts could also purchase *Reproductions des Principaux Ouvrages* in the form of a smaller-formatted double-album of one hundred works, unaccompanied by sonnets, and printed as photographs rather than
photogravures. Salmson’s *Petite Suédoise* was excluded from this economical version of the album, instead replaced with the less-valued *Pierrot au Violon*.

Thus, the differing values accorded by Goupil & Cie to Salmson’s *Petite Suédoise* and *Pierrot au Violon* are reflected in their means of reproduction. Though Goupil & Cie’s business model depended on the development of cheap and efficient means of reproducing images, the gallery nonetheless sought to retain the fine-arts language of craft and rarity – a trait visible in Goupil’s exclusion of *Petite Suédoise* from cheaper reproduction formats. The traditional techniques of engraving and etching generally sold at a higher cost than other forms of reproduction and were advertised on the first page of *Publications Nouvelles*. As a mechanically aided etching process, the photogravure process retained a direct line to the historical tradition of the fine reproduction. Photographs, by contrast, both relied on a purely mechanical means of reproduction, and as such were viewed as having little accordance with the tradition of engraving. As a painting owned by the gallery – and, critically moreover, as a work yet to be unsold as of the October edition of *Publications Nouvelles* – Salmson’s *Petite Suédoise* was in effect marketed as having more inherent value than *Pierrot au Violon*; and yet Goupil still found potential for great popular appeal in the artist’s *Pierrot au Violon*, selling it in multiple variations of the format of the more cost efficient photograph.

Like Salmson’s *Pierrot au Violon*, many of the artworks appearing in Goupil & Cie’s *Galerie Photographique* and *Cartes-Album* series were not owned by the gallery. Instead,
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379 It is this format that Zetterström’s *Charlotte Corday devant la Tribunale Révolutionnaire*, mentioned above, would appear after the Salon of 1879.
they were often selected from the annual Salon as notable artworks that would have appealed to the gallery’s bourgeois European clientele. These relatively inexpensive photographs provided an important opportunity for artists to advertise their artwork, and several other Nordic artists had reproductions of their works sold in these series. One important example is the young Finnish painter, Albert Edelfelt. One of the most famous Finnish National Romantic painters of the nineteenth century, Edelfelt would also be one of the most successful Nordic artists in France. The artist rose to the height of his fame in France during the 1880s, during which time he was largely known for his exhibitions with the dealer Georges Petit. However, like many of the artist who came to France in the 1870s, the launch of Edelfelt’s career would in part be aided by Goupil.

Edelfelt moved to Paris at a young age in 1874, studying with Jean-Léon Gérôme at the École des Beaux-Arts until 1878. Edelfelt’s first success in France would come while he was still a student, exhibiting his painting *Blanche de Namur et le prince Haquin*, shown at the Salon of 1877 [Fig. 3.10]. The work represents Bianca of Namur, Queen of Sweden and Norway, playing and singing to her son, the future King Haakon IV of Norway. The painting is in the popular style of historical genre painting for which his French teacher was well known, mixing historical pomp with informal genre intimacy; however, the image has a distinctly Nordic meaning. The painting alludes to the eventual unification of the three Scandinavian kingdoms – known as the Kalmar Union – via Haakon’s marriage to Queen Margaret of Denmark. *Blanche de Namur et le prince Haquin* was playfully

---

382 T. K. Derry, *A History of Scandinavia: Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, & Iceland* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1979), pp. 69-78
lampooned by the French press, who represented the young king Haakon in a jockey costume riding on the Queen's lap [Fig. 3.11]. The next year, Goupil & Cie began selling reproductions of the painting in the form of a cabinet card photograph, shortly before the painting went on exhibition in France again at the 1878 Universal Exhibition.\textsuperscript{383}

Goupil's print catalogues also reveal the important presence that female Nordic artists had in France during the Third Republic as well. Such names include now mostly forgotten artists including the Danish genre painter and portraitist Catherine Engelhart (also known as Cathinca Amyot). Like many Nordic artists of her generation, Engelhart began training in Düsseldorf in the 1860s before moving to Paris in the mid-1870s. Engelhart trained in the atelier of Bouguereau in 1876, an artist who would have taught her the techniques that would assure success at the Salon.\textsuperscript{384} At the Salon of 1878, Engelhart exhibited her painting \textit{Le retour de la fille repentante}, where the painting was warmly received by Charles Clement, a well-known critic writing for \textit{Journal des Débats}.\textsuperscript{385} One year later, \textit{Le retour de la fille repentante} [Fig. 3.12] was being reproduced and sold by Goupil in the form of a cabinet card, the same year that Zetterström's \textit{Charlotte Corday devant le Tribunal Révolutionnaire} appeared in the smaller, economical version of \textit{Reproductions des Principaux Ouvrages}.\textsuperscript{386}

\textsuperscript{385} Georges Clement, “Salon de 1878,” \textit{Journal des Débats Politiques et Littéraires} (28 June 1878)
\textsuperscript{386} \textit{Publications Nouvelles de la Maison Goupil et Cie: Imprimeurs et Éditeurs} (Asnières: Imprimerie Goupil et Cie, Octobre 1879), pp. 5-6
From Salmson’s depictions of Pierrot to Zetterstöm’s scene of a French Revolutionary trial, many, if not the majority, of paintings by Nordic artist émigrés that passed through Goupil & Cie’s gallery or publishing wing have a markedly pan-European rather than national character. The concern for authentic national expression, it might be surmised, was a theoretical debate quarreled over amongst art critics and historians, and counting little in either the valuation of Europe’s bourgeois art collectors or the artists who wished to profit from them. At the same time, the expression of cosmopolitanism is one of the tendencies seen in the generation of artists coming over to France around the time of the Franco-Prussian War. Arriving at a time of social instability and national soul-searching, Nordic artists like Nils Forsberg actively sought to assert their patriotism for their adoptive country. Others still were eager to cast off the Academic training of their youth to acquire new techniques from their teachers in Paris’ private ateliers or from one another in the artist colonies of France’s countryside.

Internationalism at the National Contemporary Art Museum: The First Nordic Paintings enter the Musée du Luxembourg

In 1879, immediately after the Third Republic’s first Universal Exposition, two more Nordic paintings would be purchased by the French state from that year’s Salon: Salmson’s *Une arrestation dans un village de Picardie* [Fig. 3.13] and Hagborg’s *Grande marée dans la Manche* [Fig. 3.14]. The Swedish artists proudly project their immersion in French life.
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387 H. Salmson, *Arrestation en Picardie*, Cote F/21/252, Archives Nationales, Saint Denis, France
388 A. Hagborg, *Grande marée dans la Manche*, Cote F/21/224, Archives Nationales, Saint Denis, France
and artistic practices through their works, adopting the plein-air styles of Jules Breton and Jules Bastien-Lepage, and making direct reference to the provinces in which they observed their subject in the titles. Both works would be sold as prints in Goupil’s *Reproductions Nouvelles* in October 1879. Salmson’s *Une arrestation dans un village de Picardie* stood out, appearing not only in *Principaux Ouvrages* albums of the annual Salon, but also in the catalogues selection of *Gravures*, where the print was sold as a single twenty-eight by forty-centimeter format photogravure.\(^{389}\)

Whereas every other state acquisition of a Nordic artwork had been placed in a regional museum outside of Paris, Salmson’s *Une arrestation dans un village de Picardie* and Hagborg’s *Grande marée dans la Manche* were purchased for Paris’ national museum of contemporary artists, the Musée du Luxembourg. As a national museum, the Musée du Luxembourg had traditionally been reserved as a collection of living French artists. The decision to include two Swedish artists in the Musée du Luxembourg collections created a new and prestigious opportunity for Nordic artists focusing their careers in France. Over the next two decades, other artists such as Frits Thaulow, Anders Zorn, and Peder Severin Krøyer would have their paintings shown in the museum as well. Moreover, opening the Luxembourg’s doors to non-French nationals should be read as a further codification of internationalism as an essential component of the national French character.

As mentioned earlier, since the early 1860s, Philippe de Chennevières had sought to include foreign artists in the Luxembourg’s collection. France, Chennevières argued, had always been a locus point for Europe’s artists to congregate, and to include non-French

\(^{389}\) *Publications Nouvelles de la Maison Goupil et Cie: Imprimeurs et Éditeurs* (Asnières: Imprimerie Goupil et Cie, Octobre 1879), p. 2
artists in the national collection was an important patriotic gesture. Chennevières cites several foreign artists working in France during the eighteenth century, including the Swedes Alexander Roslin and Gustaf Lundberg, as well as eight foreign-born artists in the Luxembourg’s national collection, including the Swiss artist Charles Gleyre and the German artist Henri Lehmann. Chennevières was appointed curator of the Luxembourg a decade later in 1873, resigning just six years later in 1879. While his leadership oversaw little change in the Luxembourg’s policy towards foreign artists, his international initiative would frequently be referenced by likeminded successors.390 In 1881, Salmson’s Une arrestation dans un village de Picardie and Hagborg’s Grande marée dans la Manche would first appear in the Luxembourg catalogue, along with an updated version of Chennevières’ original appeal towards internationalization is reprinted in the introductory text. Following the quote, the catalogue’s author and new curator of the museum, Étienne Arago, remarks with regret that the museum has not yet been able to designate a room to display works in the Luxembourg’s now-expanding collection of foreign artists.391

From Roslin to Salmson, Nordic painting helped affirm Chennevière’s patriotic vision of France’s universal influence in the arts. The Luxembourg’s acquisition of the two paintings by Salmson and Hagborg – artists from a distant country whose language was non-Latin – was evidence of the France’s liberal, cosmopolitan tolerance, but also its supremacy in the arts. Both visibly French and modern in style and subject, Salmson’s Une

390 Léonce Bénédite, Le Musée du Luxembourg: Écoles Étrangères (Paris; H. Laurens, 1924), 4-6
arrestation dans un village de Picardie and Hagborg’s Grande marée dans la Manche are displays of the reigning power of France in the arts.

The Universal Exposition of 1878

The Universal Exposition was first conceived in in 1855 as a means of demonstrating the Second Empire’s prosperity in the wake of the 1848 Revolution. In 1878 the fledgling Third Republic would again utilize the event of the Universal Exposition to showcase France’s indefatigable endurance and character in the wake of another national crisis – the Franco-Prussian War. With the memory the Second Empire’s defeat and the loss of Alsace and Lorraine to the newly formed German Empire still fresh in the minds of many, the desire for revenge was as strong as ever. Excluding Germany from participation in the Universal Exposition of 1878, however, would have only highlighted the France’s lasting humiliation at the hands of Germany rather than affirming the republic’s strength. As Rachel Esner has argued, by inviting its old foe to the Universal Exposition France could seek its revenge.392 By hosting an international convoy of scientists, industrialists, and artists from much of the globe, France would seek to affirm its identity as the leader of cultural progress in Europe.

Germany, however, felt little inclined to become embroiled in France’s cultural affairs and initially declined to participate in the Universal Exposition. After negotiations, Germany eventually accepted France’s invitation, but only on the

392 Esner, “Art Knows No Fatherland: The Reception of German Art in France, 1878-1900”, 18-20
condition that the German exhibition be shown *hors concours*. Furthermore, Germany demanded that both countries should exclude military paintings from the exhibition as well.\textsuperscript{393} Germany sought to avoid stoking the flames of French nationalism any further by evading the exposition jury and carefully avoiding any reference to German militarism.

Sensing the French public’s appetite to see the banned paintings, Goupil & Cie put on a private exhibition outside of the Universal Exposition feature military scenes by French painters.\textsuperscript{394}

Despite efforts by both French and German officials to avoid overt military references, one painting of the Franco-Prussian War made its way into the Universal Exposition. The painting, however, was not displayed in either the French or German exhibition spaces, but rather in Sweden’s. *Mauvaises Nouvelles* [Fig. 3.15] was created by Nils Forsberg, who, alongside Wahlberg, was one of the pioneering Francophile Swedish artists to come to France in the late 1860s. Forsberg’s *Mauvaises Nouvelles* is painted in the same hazy chiaroscuro and loose, but Academically sound finish of his teacher, Bonnat, and depicts an aging French veteran sitting alongside his granddaughter as she reads to him from *Le Petit Journal*. The veteran’s clenched fist and visibly suppressed anger leaves little doubt as to what the bad news might be. Forsberg had been deeply affected by the Franco-Prussian War, and understood quite well the still-fresh feelings of resentment of the citizens of his adopted country. While many other artists, both Swedish and French alike,

\[\text{\textsuperscript{393}}\text{ Esner, “Art Knows No Fatherland: The Reception of German Art in France, 1878-1900”, pp. 44-45 }\]
\[\text{\textsuperscript{394}}\text{ Esner, “Art Knows No Fatherland: The Reception of German Art in France, 1878-1900”, p. 45 fn. 33}\]
had fled the Franco-Prussian War and Siege of Paris, Forsberg volunteered as a combat medic, serving directly alongside French combat troops.395

Forsberg’s close proximity to the French military as well as his nuanced understanding of French national sentiments in the early Third Republic are clearly expressed in the details of his painting. The style of the uniform, and of course, the wooden crutch, identifies the man in the painting as a war veteran of the Imperial army [Fig. 3.16]. Forsberg accentuates the medals displayed on the soldier’s jacket, rendering them in finer detail against the loosely brushed composition. To the far left, with the red ribbon and star, we see that he has been named a knight of the legion of honor, a merit established under Napoleon I to award those who had contributed either civil or military service to the French nation.396 To the far right, half-hidden under the wooden crutch, and with a tricolor ribbon, is the July Medal, awarded in 1831 to those who participated in the Revolution of 1830 to depose Charles X, thereby toppling the last Bourbon monarch of France and leading to the establishment the constitutional monarchy of Louis-Philippe.397 Of greatest significance to Forsberg’s painting is the medal of Sainte-Helene, centered between the medals for the July Revolution and the Légion d’Honneur, featuring a green and red striped ribbon and an effigy of Napoleon I in the middle. The medal of Sainte-Helene was issued in

397 Fayolle, Supplément à la collection historique, 9
1857 by Napoleon III to veterans of all wars fought between 1792 and 1815, the time of the first French Republic and the First Empire.\textsuperscript{398}

The medals worn by the veteran and the victories they commemorate thereby establish a Bonapartist vision of modern French history - one that is liberal, egalitarian (though not Republican), and deeply nationalist – going back to the French Revolution through the Second Empire, now threatened to its very core by Germany. Despite the paintings unmistakable intent to evoke the sympathy, nostalgia, and anger of French visitors to the Swedish galleries, \textit{Mauvaises Nouvelles} received relatively little attention from French critics, and as Forsberg notes in his biography – undoubtedly with a more than a hint of disappointment – no medals.\textsuperscript{399} This lack of recognition due to the curious fact that \textit{Mauvaises Nouvelles} was omitted from the official catalogue, even though Forsberg's two other paintings exhibited – \textit{Portrait de Mlle. L. B.} and \textit{Les saltimbanques; avant la loi Tallon} – were listed. Nonetheless, Forsberg’s painting had the power to evoke strong opinions from the French critics who saw and wrote about it. One critic proclaimed that France should purchase the painting immediately and display it in the Musée du Luxembourg.\textsuperscript{400} Another critic expressed frustration that Forsberg’s painting had been overlooked in being left out of the catalogue.\textsuperscript{401}

The Swedish artist would have to wait another decade before receiving validation for his pro-French patriotism via another homage to the memory of the

\textsuperscript{398} Adolphe Wahlen, \textit{Ordres de chevalerie et marques d’honneur: décorations nouvelles et modifications apportées aux anciennes jusqu’en 1869} (Paris: Librairie Diplomatique d’Amyot, 1869), 27
\textsuperscript{399} Nils Forsberg, \textit{Mitt Liv} (Stockholm: Albert Bonniers Förlag, 1929), 299
\textsuperscript{401} \textit{Les Merveilles de l’Exposition de 1878} (Paris: La Librairie Contemporaine, 1879), 186
Franco-Prussian War, *Le Fin d’un Héros*. Set during the Siege of Paris, the painting of a mortally wounded soldier receiving his last rites, and would receive a first-class medal at the Salon of 1888. At the Universal Exposition of 1878, however, the legacy of the Franco-Prussian War and its effect on contemporary French politics would continue to have a marked effect on how critics evaluated the exhibitions of Nordic paintings. While critics holding anti-German sentiments would continue to see the Nordic countries as a new artistic ally to France, other critics attracted to the new naturalist tendencies arising in German art would continue to judge Nordic painters as old fashioned and derivative.

**Overview of the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian Exhibitions of Painting**

In contrast to the ordered, cosmic design of the 1867 Palais du Champ-de-Mars where each nation radiated out along the central plan, the new building erected on the Champ-de-Mars for the Universal Exposition of 1878 is marked by an eclectic appearance. A massive rectangular complex of interconnected buildings and corridors lie beyond a Beaux-Arts exterior, housing the industrial and contemporary fine arts exhibitions. One of the most remarkable features of the exhibition space was the so-called rue des nations – a continuous façade of different national architectures from the exhibiting countries, one spawning directly from the next. The rue des nations simulated the tourist’s stroll down the street of a European capital, condensed and multiplied into an artificial world tour.

Situated across from the Champ-de-Mars was a second and equally eccentric structure, the Palais du Trocadéro. Constructed in a mélange of Baroque and
Byzantine styles, with two pincer-like colonnades reaching out from a large central plan dome, the Palais du Trocadéro offered visitors a simulated voyage into Europe’s Classical past rather than its metropolitan present. The building was an homage to the arts of tradition in contrast to the future-oriented ideology of the Universal Exposition, housing a concert hall situated under the central dome along with an exhibition of Classical fine art sculptures.

Rather than being placed next to the historical exhibition of artworks at the Palais du Trocadéro, contemporary painting and sculpture were set in the same venue as the exhibitions of industry – the symbols of modern progress – at the heart of the Champ-de-Mars. In contrast to the Universal Expositions 1855 and 1867, in which the fine arts exhibition of Denmark was situated next to those of Sweden and Norway, in 1878 Scandinavia was divided along opposite ends of the Champ de Mars. The Danish exhibition was situated close to Belgium, Switzerland, and Portugal, while the Swedish and Norwegian exhibitions were near France, Italy, and the United States.

The Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian exhibitions of painting and drawing at the Universal Exposition of 1878 were also larger than in previous years. In both 1855 and 1867, the Swedish exhibition consisted of a little over 50 works of art. Sweden, as in the past, had the largest exhibition, but now in 1878 the size increased, with approximately 56 artists exhibiting 90 paintings and drawings. The Norwegian exhibition also steadily increased in size over the decades, exhibiting 16 works of art in 1855, and 45 works of art in 1867, and now, in 1878, 59 paintings and drawings by approximately 43 artists. By contrast, Denmark had shrunk at the
1867 exhibition, with a miniscule display of 29 artworks. Regarding both size and accolades, Denmark had been overshadowed by the exhibitions of Sweden and Norway in 1867, receiving scant attention from French critics. Now in 1878, the Danish exhibition doubled its size, with approximately 38 artists exhibiting 78 paintings and drawings.

One of the greatest changes in the Nordic exhibitions, however, came from the nature of the artworks being exhibited. In 1855 and 1867, French critics had tended to describe Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists as inherently painters of genre scenes, as was traditionally associated with the Northern schools. The judges at the expositions largely mirrored the beliefs and preferences of the critics. The only Nordic artists to receive first-class medals at the Universal Exposition were Höckert and Tidemand. French critics considered landscape painting to be another traditionally Northern and therefore essentially Nordic practice, but one of secondary importance, and accordingly landscape painters such as Edward Bergh, Hans Gude received second and third class medals. Historical and mythological scenes, French critics cautioned, were the realm of the Southern schools, and unsuitable to Northern latitudes, and therefore either ignored or criticized the works of this type within the Nordic exhibitions.

In 1878, landscape would make a great leap forward through the works of Norwegian artist Ludvig Munthe and Alfred Wahlberg. Both artists, already well admired in France, would both receive first class medals for their landscapes.402 Yet

---

the individual successes of Munthe and Wahlberg are girded by the wider prevalence of landscape painting at the Nordic exhibition spaces. In both the Danish and Swedish shows, landscape accounted for nearly half of all the paintings exhibited, while in Norwegian exhibition nearly two-thirds of all the paintings exhibited were landscape.403

Even more surprising than the success of Nordic landscape painting at the 1878 Universal Exposition would be the resurgence of historical and religious motifs. At the prior Universal Exposition, paintings depicting scenes from the national histories and mythologies of the Nordic countries had largely been either ignored by critics or treated with hostility. Such was the case for the Swedish painter Höckert – otherwise adored by French critics for his paintings of Lapland – with the exhibition of Incendie dans le palais royal de Stockholm, 1er mai 1697, which was panned by several critics otherwise favorable to Nordic artists, and for Marius Chaumelin, proof that Scandinavian art was naturally averse to historical motifs.404 Yet despite the continued general consensus that genre and landscape were the natural domain of Nordic artists, several biblical and national historical paintings would take the spotlight. Norwegian artist Hans Heyerdahl would receive praise for his painting Adam et Ève chassés du paradis [Fig. 3.17], while his compatriot Eilif Petersszen caught the eyes of critics with his representation of the kiss of Judas in

404 Marius Chaumelin, “Exposition Universelle de 1867”, L’Art Contemporain (Paris: Librairie Renouard, 1873), 38
Judas Ischariote, for which they respectively won second and third-class medals. Both artists trained in Munich and displayed similarly dramatic painting effects, with their rough brushwork and heavy tenebrism, coupled with naturalistic renderings of the human figure that French critics found alluring. It was an early success abroad for the two young artists, both of whom would become leading figures of the Nordic National Romantic movement of the 1880s and 1890s.

Of a more traditional nature were the national historical paintings of the Dane Carl Bloch and the Swede Gustaf Cederström, who stood out for their scenes from the life and death of Denmark’s and Sweden’s monarchs. Bloch’s works stood out within the Danish section through number alone, exhibiting eight different paintings ranging from genre, to religious scenes, to historical paintings. Amongst these works, though, critics tended to single out Roi captif - a work depicting sixteenth-century Danish king Christian II held captive in Sønderborg castle, deposed and imprisoned by his uncle, Frederick I – as Bloch’s most impressive work. Cederström exhibited an equally dramatic painting from the national history of Sweden with Le corps de Charles XII porté par ses officiers à travers la frontière norwégienne (1718) [Fig. 3.18] The painting represents the procession of Swedish King Charles XII’s body down a mountainside, killed during Sweden’s failed campaign to invade Norway in 1718. Both artists were awarded by the jury, with Cederström receiving a second-class medal and Bloch receiving a first-class medal.

---

407 Derry, History of Scandinavia: Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, and Iceland, 161-63
Although Bloch only received lukewarm praise for his paintings, which several critics tended to regard as impersonal and dryly academic, it was nonetheless the first time that a Danish painter won a first-class medal at a Universal Exposition, and therefore an overall success for Denmark in comparison to the prior exposition. Cederström’s paintings, on the other hand, were received warmly by French critics, and would capture the attention of the gallery Goupil & Cie as well. In 1881, the gallery would later reprint *Le corps de Charles XII porté par ses officiers à travers la frontière norvégienne (1718)* as a photogravure for the broad consumption by the French public, purchasable for 10 francs through its catalogues.\(^\text{408}\)

It was the academic quality of their works that made both Bloch and Cederström magnets for both praise and criticism. At the time, the most popular artists of France were Jean-Lean Gérôme, Alexandre Cabanel, and Ernest Meissonier. All three had won the Grand Prix at both the Universal Exposition of 1867 and again in 1878. These artists were adept at garnering the favor of both official and popular praise through their engaging narratives, eye-catching colors, and skillful finish. As argued by Patricia Mainardi, the rise of these three painters demonstrates the triumph of bourgeois influence in dictating contemporary taste beginning in the Second Empire.\(^\text{409}\) The works of Cederstöm – who would continue to sell works and reproductions via Goupil in the 1880s – can be understood as having a similar appeal to these three artists, and particularly Gérôme. Like Gérôme, who was one of

\(^{408}\) *Publications Nouvelles de la Maison Goupil et Cie: Imprimeurs et Éditeurs* (Asnières: Imprimerie Goupil et Cie, Avril 1881), 3

Goupil’s most famous artists, Cederström was adept at melding traditional historical narratives with more popular compositional devices derived from genre painting, most clearly seen in sentimental devices used in *Le corps de Charles XII*, such as the meagerly-dressed hunter and howling dog who mourn the body of the Swedish king. Yet, much in the same way that the paintings of Gérôme and Cabanel drew the ire of Naturalist critics such as Émile Zola, the spectacular stylings of both Cederstöm and Bloch were quick to attract simultaneously large amounts of praise and critique from French art critics.

It would indeed be a contentious year for Nordic art in France, given the lingering sentiments of animosity towards Germany. Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian art would be not only swept up in what several critics viewed as a mortal struggle between Latin and Germanic civilization, but a larger debate about the roll and purpose of nationality within the arts. The debate over whether artists from the Nordic countries should be defined as part of a German, French, or independently Scandinavian school would become even louder in 1878 than it had in prior years, but also more complex. With this debate came the usual critique levied against Nordic artists – many of whom continued to work abroad in Germany, France, and occasionally Italy – of practicing a derivative sort of art, and therefore lacking a genuine national character. On one side, critics including Charles Blanc and the historian Gabriel Monod harshly lambasted Nordic artists for leaning on the art of other nations, while critics such as the Catholic legitimist Dubosc de Pesquidoux argued that the artists of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, beyond all outside

---

410 Mainardi, *Art and Politics of the Second Empire*, 158, 162
influence, unequivocally remained national.411 Yet for other critics, such as Paul Mantz, aesthetic evaluations of a painter’s work could no longer be so easily drawn along national borders. Instead, Mantz’s evaluations of Nordic art were to be founded on to what degree they followed the progress of cosmopolitanism – that is to say, to what degree they emulated the artists of France.

In 1867 Mantz declared “Élargissez la patrie” to be the voice of the modern spirit.412 Little more than a decade later, his declaration would take on a subtle shift in meaning, as Mantz declared the esprit modern to be rooted in the increasing fluidity of borders and an exchange amongst neighbors.413 Despite both a geographical and political detachment between France and the Nordic countries, one of the most important developments in the critical reception of Nordic art was the desire to see Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists as allies of France in the forward advancement of modern art. In the wake of lingering resentments toward Germany, France would play the role of the benevolent patron and the seat of cultural knowledge, while Scandinavia would acquire the role of the aspiring young protégé.

The Debate About Landscape

411 Dubosc de Pesquidoux, L’art dans les deux mondes. Peinture et sculpture (1878), vol. 2, 278-79, 307
The strong presence of landscape painting in the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian exhibition sections shifted the genre into the spotlight in many French reviews. In France, the 1870s had become a pivotal decade for the popularization of landscape painting. Without doubt, the controversial rise of the Impressionists, who held their first exhibition in 1874, would help elevate the importance of the genre as a subject of serious critical debate, defended by major proponents of Naturalism including Edmond Duranty and Émile Zola. The reception of Nordic landscape painting at the Universal Exposition of 1878, however, cannot be easily delineated according to critics’ associations with either avant-gardist or conservative aesthetic philosophies. Indeed, Duranty would write one of the exposition’s most scathing rebukes of Nordic landscape, while the Catholic legitimist Léonce Dubosc de Pesquidoux would become one of its staunchest defenders.

Many of the critiques of the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian landscapes penned in 1878 would echo those of Théophile Gautier, who in the 1850s and 1860s, had largely found the environmental conditions of the Nordic countries to be inherently anti-pictorial in nature. This would be Duranty’s argument, who would open his review with a complaint about the ugliness of Northern landscape:

Dans ces régions du Nord, nous nous trouvons en face des phénomènes de la nature. La peinture y est tant soit peu météorologique. Des montagnes rouges, des cascades vertes, es rochers bleus, des soleils noirs, en un mot toutes sortes de dérangements, de renversements et de bouleversements des choses y constituent un genre antipicutral, antiharmonieux, qui trouble beaucoup les yeux et l’esprit, quoiqu’il puisse enrichir de faits curieux un traité d’optique. Les phénomènes physiques et géologiques ne sont pas propices à l’art…

414 See chapters 1 and 2
415 Duranty, “Exposition Universelle: Les Écoles Étrangères de Peinture (troisième et dernier article),” Gazette des Beaux-Arts (1er Septembre 1878), 156
Duranty’s complaint about the so-called meteorological character of Nordic landscape painting in part can be linked to some of the recurrent imagery visible across the different national exhibition spaces. Winter scenes, mountain views, and summer nights are some of the recurrent motifs that show up within both the titles of the works exhibited as well as within the descriptions of various art critics.416 One such example is Carl Rasmussen’s Soleil de minuit – a Greenlandic landscape that is likely the artist’s Midnatsstemning ved den grønlandske kyst (1872) [Fig. 3.19], purchased by the Danish state six years earlier. The scene’s prominent blue glaciers and summer midnight sun, bathing the distant mountains in a purple light, is an acute example of the sort of reversal of ordinary effects that Duranty found so off-putting. Although the midnight sun motif would become a staple of late-nineteenth-century Nordic painting, it was foreign to French critics, who found the meteorological effect bizarre.417

Duranty’s description of the Nordic countries as inherently backward evokes the climatological determinism of eighteenth-century writings on aesthetics, in which critics such as DuBos, Montesquieu, and Diderot described Northern Europe as incapable of producing artists. The anti-provincialism of these critics would be echoed be Duranty in his call for Nordic artists to venture to the more civilized climates of continental Europe to continue their artistic studies: “Venir en France ou en Allemagne,” Duranty writes, “et y étudier une lumière moins tourmentée dont les

417 Dubosc de Pesquidoux, L’art dans les deux mondes. Peinture et sculpture (1878), vol. 2, 338
accents pleins et larges sont faits pour le pinceau.”418 A similarly patronizing
critique would be levied against Nordic painting by Charles Blanc, who, like Duranty,
blamed the lack of good artworks on at the Nordic exhibition spaces on an
inhospitably cold climate. “Le génie de l’art est trop frileux pour se plaire dans ces
parages,”419 Blanc remarks. Though Duranty’s and Blanc’s derisive comments at
times appear motivated more by chauvinism than artistic analysis, part of their
dismissal of Nordic landscape painting can be linked to what some critics
considered to be an overwrought and outdated painting style. Though several
artists began to turn to French pleinairism during the 1870s, many artists, including
Rasmussen, continued to paint in a picturesque style by then considered outdated
by many French critics.420

Citing Danish Golden Age painters Wilhelm Khyn and Carl Frederik Sørensen
along Wahlberg – who, despite his embrace of Paris, retained strong elements of his
early Düsseldorf training – Duranty would describe Nordic landscapes as false,
opaque, and metallic.421 The historian Gabrielle Monod would levy a similar attack
against the falsity of the Nordic painting style and the ugliness of the Nordic
landscape. Although Monod would disavow the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian
exhibitions, his critique of Danish landscape resonates strongly with the words of
Duranty and Blanc:

418 Duranty, “Les Écoles Étrangères de Peinture,” 156
419 Charles Blanc, Les Beaux-Arts à l’Exposition Universelle de 1878 (Librairie Renouard,
1878), 341
420 Thanks to my advisor, James H. Rubin, for suggesting this point and noting the
relationship between Rasmussen and the picturesque tradition.
421 Duranty, “Les Écoles Étrangères de Peinture,” 159
Rien n'est plus étrange et plus pénible que leurs paysages d'un vert cruel, dessinés avec un soin et une patience dignes d'un meilleur résultat, mais qui ne rappellent en rien la nature. Ils n'ont pas d'idée du mouvement et de la souplesse de la vie ; tout est chez eux d'une immobilité et d'une froideur métallique et l'on y trouve aussi, il faut l'avouer, une désolante banalité.\footnote{Monod echoes Duranty in both his description of Danish painting as having a metallic tone, false character, and inspired by inherently ugly northern landscape; but while Duranty expresses repulsion towards the foreign and anti-aesthetic character of northern Scandinavian mountainous terrain, in reverse, it is the banality of Denmark's lowlands that becomes the subject of Monod's criticism.}

Several other art critics including Paul Mantz, Léonce Dubosc de Pesquidoux, and Louis Enault also noted the representation of natural phenomena within landscape paintings by Nordic artists; but in contrast to Blanc, Duranty, and Monod, these writers viewed such motifs in a positive light and praised the artists. Veteran critic Paul Mantz specifically admired the “sévérités septentrionales”\footnote{Mantz, “Exposition Universelle: Les Écoles Étrangères IX: Etats-Unis – Suisse – Danemark – Suède et Norvège,” 5} of the Norwegian painters Ludvig Munthe and Frithjof Smith-Hald. Though both worked in Düsseldorf at the time of the exposition, they would each garner important accolades in France at the time of the 1878 Exposition. Munthe would win a first-class medal for his landscapes at the Exposition while Smith-Hald would move to France immediately afterwards to become one of the best-known Nordic artists of the 1880s.\footnote{Likewise, both Dubosc de Pesquidoux and the poet and travel writer Gabriel Monod, Les Beaux-Arts À l’Exposition Universelle (1867-1878) (Paris: Librairie Sandoz et Fischbacher), 39-40.}
Louis Enault praised what they understood to be the almost supernatural effects of light of unique to the North, particularly evident within nocturnal scenery. Enault lauded Wahlberg for his ability to capture with superb accuracy “l’intimité de ces étincelantes nuits du Nord.” Dubosc de Pesquidoux also praised “les races septentrionales” – especially Wahlberg – for their ability to capture the spectacular luminescence of Northern nocturnes while commending Rasmussen for his ability to capture “les colorations magiques” of the midnight sun, unknown outside of the “pays hyperboréens.”

Both words of praise and disapproval were steeped in the rationale that the unique environment of the Nordic countries provided an impetus for their painters of. In part, they show the long-lasting influence of eighteenth-century aesthetic theory on French art criticism — particularly the works of Abbé DuBos. Those critical of the landscapes presented at the Nordic exhibitions were quick to cast blame on the geographical situation of these countries as inhospitable to art, arguing instead that only the temperate climate of countries such as France can foster good artists. At the same time, critics’ focus on ecology should be interpreted as a sign of the rising importance of landscape painting within French art. The visual prominence of landscape painting at the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian...
exhibitions of 1878 provided a stimulus for the climatological conjecture present in the writings of critics reviewing that year’s Universal Exposition. While the dominance of genre painting at the Nordic exhibitions in 1855 and 1867 pushed critics to consider Scandinavian art in terms of social and religious mores, the burgeoning practice of landscape painting would inevitably shift dialogue on national identity towards the effect of environment on art.

Ménard would remark three years later, with some degree of truth, that the Universal Exposition of 1878 was the final hurrah of the Nordic painters of the Düsseldorf School. The paintings by Norwegians Hans Gude and Ludvig Munthe – and to a lesser degree those of the Swede Edward Bergh – largely reigned unchallenged within the minds of art critics as the leading representatives of Scandinavian landscape painting. In 1878, though Munthe would win a first-class medal, Mantz began to suspect that Gude would soon be replaced by younger painters. The major success of Wahlberg and Gegerfelt in France throughout the 1870s in both the Salon and the Universal Exposition marks an important shift away from the dominance of Düsseldorf-trained Norwegian landscape painters and towards French-inspired Swedish landscape painters. Nonetheless, residual elements of Gude and the practices of the Düsseldorf school remained in style of many of the French-inspired landscape painters, and indeed, despite the admonishment of critics, would continue to be popular in France through the century, as evident by the success of Norwegian artists including Frithjof Smith-Hald

and Johannes Grimelund. While these artists adopted a brighter and more atmospheric palette thanks to their French studies, both would also retain the acute topographical precision of their earlier German training.

While Swedish and Norwegian landscape painting was contested amongst critics, Danish landscape painting was largely panned across the board. At the Universal Exposition of 1867, Paul Mantz had warned that Denmark’s failure to develop within the field of landscape painting would cause the country to fall behind the other écoles modernes.\textsuperscript{430} Mantz’s prediction was largely true. Though some critics reserved lukewarm praise for a few Danish artists such as Bloch, fewer critics had positive remarks towards the country’s selection of landscape painters. Even Dubosc de Pesquidoux, one of the few critics to by and large praise the Danish exhibition, would nonetheless describe Danish landscape painting as mediocre.\textsuperscript{431}

Denmark’s exhibition of landscape paintings in 1878 was smaller in comparison to those of Sweden and Norway. Their landscape painters tended to adhere neither to French nor Düsseldorf techniques, but rather held onto the principles of the Danish Golden Age developed nearly four decades earlier. Though celebrated in Denmark, Golden Age landscape painters such as Wilhelm Khyn never succeeded in gaining popularity in France, and when exhibited at the Universal Expositions only attracted the ire of French critics. The disappointments of Denmark at the Universal Exposition of 1878 would be a wake-up call for its artists to modernize, helping push ahead the Skagen landscape painters led by Peder

\textsuperscript{430} Mantz, “Les Beaux-Arts à l’Exposition Universelle,” 22
\textsuperscript{431} Dubosc de Pesquidoux, L’art dans les deux mondes. Peinture et sculpture (1878), vol. 2, 336
Severin Krøyer, whose landscapes would be enthusiastically welcomed by critics, and who would help rejuvenate Danish art in the eyes of French critics in the 1880s. Nonetheless, the relatively slow evolution of landscape painting in Denmark would continue to have lasting effects, as critics would continue to define Danish painting as a school primarily of genre painters throughout the rest of the century.

The Politics of Internationalism

The various critical responses to Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian art at the Universal Exposition of 1878 cannot be easily categorized according to political or ideological lines. Those who expressed support for the Nordic exhibitions – Mantz, Dubosc de Pesquidoux, and Enault – came from quite different backgrounds. Amongst these three, Mantz was the only career art critic and historian. Politically he was a republican, and within the arts he was a firm believer in progress, aligning himself with Thoré and Blanc, and expressing interest in Courbet and other Realists. Dubosc de Pesquidoux, a Catholic legitimist who affirmed that the hierarchies of art were immutable, seemed to subscribe to a philosophy opposite to Mantz’s. Enault, on the other hand, only dabbled in art criticism occasionally, focusing instead on writing travel books of both the fictional and non-fictional variety.

Despite these seemingly stark dissimilarities, one of the ideologies consistently expressed by these three critics is that art was an international affair,  

---

and that taste was to a large degree relative in character. Throughout the nineteenth century, travel writing strongly overlapped with art criticism. Voyager accounts oftentimes included descriptions of artworks and architecture; art critics and historians oftentimes engaged in journalistic travel writing; and artists lent their artworks for reproduction within travel publications. Indeed, with the expansion of automated travel and the rise of empirical aesthetic ideals, the practice of painting itself was largely becoming more akin to travel illustration, with artists tending to render either domestic or exotic motifs rendered from an explicitly subjective vantage point. At the time of the Universal Exposition of 1878, many art critical volumes came to have a strong resemblance to voyager accounts, dividing chapters according to nation, featuring geographical and ethnological descriptions of each region, and featuring alluring cover illustrations and titles alluding to international travel, such as Mario Proth’s series, *Voyage au Pays des Peintres* [Fig. 3.20]

In this regard, the reason for Enault’s and Mantz’s shared admiration for the artists of Sweden and Norway is evident. Both critics admired the expression of topographical variety and ethnographic veracity found within the genre and landscape paintings of these countries.\footnote{Louis Enault, *Les Beaux-Arts À l’Exposition Universelle de 1878*, pp. 46-47} In the words of Mantz concerning artistic production in any country, it is necessary that “la nature reste le texte sacré.”\footnote{Mantz, “Exposition Universelle: Les Écoles Étrangères IX: Etats-Unis – Suisse – Danemark – Suède et Norvège,” 6} The expression of national and individual authenticity remained one of the top priorities – if not the ultimate end – of art. For similar reasons, both critics panned the Danish exhibition, which they found to be trite in its Academicism. Enault argued that the
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\footnote{Louis Enault, *Les Beaux-Arts À l’Exposition Universelle de 1878*, pp. 46-47}

Danish exhibition was monotonous and lacking in individuality.\textsuperscript{435} Similarly, Mantz complained that although the Danes knew how to execute a painting, their works were lacking in spirit.\textsuperscript{436} Mantz’s belief that Danish painting was somehow false and outmoded is best expressed in his critique of Exner’s genre paintings. Although he admired Exner at the past Universal Expositions, Mantz now found him sickly sweet in character ("un rustique doucereux"), deriding his peasant genre paintings as having the same character as a cheap chromo-lithographs sold in common markets.\textsuperscript{437}

In other words, the naturalist belief in the expression of authenticity in art – particularly national authenticity – was a core feature that stimulated French interest in foreign artists. While this aesthetic philosophy is largely associated with modernist critics, surprisingly, it is also a key feature of the otherwise traditionalist aesthetics of Dubosc de Pesquidoux. This critic gave priority to religious works and classical influence; therefore unlike Mantz and Enault he was attracted to the Academicians of Denmark including Bloch. Nonetheless, Dubosc de Pesquidoux’s belief in an eternal artistic hierarchy of genres neither prohibited admiration for genre and landscape painting nor excluded the influence of national character on contemporary painting. As Misook Song has noted, one of the most pronounced characteristics of nineteenth-century French art criticism is its eclecticism.\textsuperscript{438} In the

\textsuperscript{435} Louis Enault, Les Beaux-Arts À l’Exposition Universelle de 1878, p 104
\textsuperscript{438} Misook Song, Art Theories of Charles Blanc, 1813-1882 (Ann Arbor, MI: UMI Research Press, 1984), 1-10
case of Dubosc de Pesquidoux, the critics’ writings demonstrate how the succession of Universal Expositions from 1855 to 1867 to 1878 cemented the ideas of historical progress and national schools as readily-accepted facts within art.\textsuperscript{439} The author above all praised female artists including Mimmi Zetterstöm as the guardians of Swedish culture, the expression of Danish physiognomy and indigenous values through Exner and Christian Dahlsgaard, and the aptitude of Norwegian and Swedish landscape painters to paint landscape scenery with both high exactitude and sublime effect.\textsuperscript{440}

Perhaps the most important mechanism of thought that binds together the conservative ideals of Dubosc de Pesquidoux and the modernist ideals of Mantz in the appreciation of Nordic painting are the shared belief in the positive influence of France in the development of Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian art. Mantz reserved some of his highest praise for the Norwegian and Swedish artists residing and exhibiting in France at the time of the exposition, including Wahlberg, Gegerfelt, Hugo Salmson, Carl Skånberg, Axel Lindman, and Hans Løvaas.\textsuperscript{441} These artists were a point of pride for Mantz, for in proving their success, they “rend[ent] un hommage indirect à l’école française.”\textsuperscript{442} Mantz declares that France has for long been loved in the Northern countries, citing as evidence his country’s history of benevolent

\textsuperscript{439} See for example, Dubosc de Pesquidoux’s discussion of the progress of arts in both Sweden and Norway: Dubosc de Pesquidoux, \textit{L’art dans les deux mondes. Peinture et sculpture (1878)}, vol. 2, 257
\textsuperscript{440} Dubosc de Pesquidoux, \textit{L’art dans les deux mondes. Peinture et sculpture (1878)}, vol. 2, 279, 283, 317-21
patronage to Swedish and Norwegian artists from the prior century, including Roslin, Hall, Lundberg, Sergel, and Wertmüller.\footnote{Mantz, “Exposition Universelle: Les Écoles Étrangères IX: Etats-Unis – Suisse – Danemark – Suède et Norvège,” 6}

Dubosc de Pesquidoux would similarly couch his praise for Danish art within a pro-French narrative, citing what he believed to be the lasting influence of French Neoclassicism on Danish painting. The critic notes that Wilhelm Christian Eckersberg, the so-called father of the Danish Golden Age, had studied under Jacques-Louis David in Paris from 1811-1813. Eckersberg’s students included the Academic painter Wilhelm Mastrand, who was later the teacher of Carl Bloch, winner of a first-class medal in 1878 and Dubosc de Pesquidoux’s favorite artists in the Danish exhibition. Thus, the lasting influence of classicism on Danish painting was championed by the critic as a product of French rather than Italian influence.

At least one other critic, Mario Proth in his \textit{Voyage au Pays des Peintres}, recounts a strikingly similar narrative of French art historical influence over Denmark’s artists. Remarking on the visibility of Jacques-Louis David’s technique in Bloch’s \textit{Roi captif}, Proth asserts this as evidence of Denmark’s continued love of France: “on aime la Grèce, là-bas, au pays de Thorwaldsen, et la France aussi, l'Athènes de jadis et l'Athènes modern.”\footnote{Mario Proth, \textit{Voyage au Pays des Peintres: Salon Universel 1878} (Paris: Ludovic Baschet), 223} As noted in the first part of this chapter, the notion that France had played an essential role in the development of the arts in the Nordic countries becomes a recurrent idea within French writing after the Franco-Prussian War. Whereas debates over the existence of Scandinavian art had
largely centered on its independence from other – particularly German and French – artistic traditions, during the 1870s several art critics in France would reorient this discussion to align with patriotic French attitudes; and, as would be the case with Dubosc de Pesquidoux, praise of Franco-Nordic relations in art oftentimes went in tandem with anti-German sentiments.\textsuperscript{445}

Amongst those critics analyzed that rejected the Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian exhibitions – Blanc, Duranty, and Monod – a more cohesive set of common beliefs and attitudes can be distilled. Undoubtedly holding more lasting reputations than any of the critics discussed above, these critics readily fit within the mold of the modernist critic. Politically, all three were Republicans.\textsuperscript{446} With regards to art, all three were proponents of naturalism. The Realist novelist and critic Duranty is still remembered for writing one of the first cohesive analyses and defenses of the Impressionists through his 1876 pamphlet, \textit{La nouvelle peinture}. More eclectic in ideology and at times more conservative in his reverence for so-called eternal ideals of art, Charles Blanc nonetheless firmly believed in the democratic nature of art.\textsuperscript{447} Furthermore, Blanc frequently associated with major naturalist critics of his time, employing writers such as Paul Mantz, Théophile Thoré, and Maurice Chaumelin for his journal \textit{Gazette des Beaux-Arts} and his art

\textsuperscript{445} Dubosc de Pesquidoux, \textit{L'art dans les deux mondes. Peinture et sculpture (1878)}, vol. 2, 342-43
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historical anthology, *Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles*. Monod, less known for his art criticism, is an important figure in the development of the modern historical method. An admirer of Taine, he shared the same positivist approach to history expressed by many contemporary art critics in France, treating art as an artifact of human culture; but unlike the more conservative Taine, Monod also held onto the optimistic modernist belief in the forward-march of human society – a belief he also applied to his analysis of art.

With regard to the Nordic exhibitions of art, Duranty, Blanc and Monod shared a similar critique. The problem for these critics was the lack of what they considered to be genuine national expression in the work of Nordic artists. “Les pays scandinaves peuvent difficilement être étudiés comme ayant une individualité artistique,” remarks Monod; “Leurs bons peintres vivent presque tous à l’étranger.” Blanc echoes Monod’s sentiment in claiming that while Sweden and Norway might have some worthy painters, their artists “ne sont pas absolument indigènes” given their proclivity for studying abroad in Munich, Düsseldorf, and Paris. Denmark on the other hand, asserts Blanc, never had a genuine national art. “Les Danois ont encore des artistes,” quips Blanc, “mais ils n’ont plus d’art.”

Another important commonality that united the criticism of Monod and Duranty was Germanophilia. Duranty agreed that there was little of anything to be deemed national
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in the painting exhibitions of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway beyond their landscapes and interiors: “En somme, sauf par les tendances météorologiques, et sauf dans l’attache spécial qu’ont les Danois pour les scènes d’intérieur de leur pays, point de peinture danoise, point de peinture suédoise ni norvégienne. Les artistes forts comme MM. Salmson, Heyerdahl, et les bons paysagistes, sont des artistes que la France ou l’Allemagne peuvent naturaliser.”

In contrast to Blanc and Monod, who lamented the dependence of Nordic artists on foreign training, Duranty insists that the only chance of success for these artists is to come to France or Germany. On the surface, Duranty thus seems to resemble the cosmopolitan visions of critics including Mantz and Dubosc de Pesquidoux. Yet, to the contrary, Duranty’s critique is founded on a disdain for the so-called provincialism of Europe’s smaller nations, including Switzerland and the Nordic countries, which Duranty claims necessarily must emulate the national arts of France and Germany. Though philosophically more cosmopolitan than Duranty, Monod similarly approached Germany with a sympathetic viewpoint in the wake of the Franco-Prussian War through the 1872 publication *Allemands et Français*. Monod continued to resist the anti-German sentiments expressed by many of his contemporaries within his review of the 1878 Universal Exposition, praising the originality of the Düsseldorf School, and lamenting the decision to exclude battle paintings from the French and German exhibitions.

While Germanophilia should not be understood as a prerequisite for a hostile reception to Nordic artists at the Universal Exposition, it nonetheless serves to highlight
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the role that French patriotism took in the shaping critics’ attitudes towards the artists from Denmark, Sweden, and Norway at the start of the Third Republic. The notion of French art as a guiding beacon of light for the rest of Europe became a rhetorical device frequently employed along with with praise of artists from the Nordic countries. Frequently, this narrative was employed together with the praise of the plein-air painting techniques that several young Swedish and Norwegian landscape artists such as Wahlberg, Salmson, and Gegerfelt had in part acquired from their residencies in France. Praise for Nordic art thus often followed a progressivist, internationalist worldview that melded with a preference for naturalist art, as evidenced by the reviews by Mantz, Claretie, and Delaunay. Other critics across the political spectrum looked back to Nordic artists working or living in France nearly a century earlier, including Roslin, Hall, and Eckersberg, as a means of validating the notion that France had long reigned as the cultural leader of Europe.

At the same time, however, praise for Nordic artists did not generally coincide with decade’s rising avant-gardism. The art produced by Nordic artists that French critics saw and praised was what contemporary historians such as Robert Jensen have called a juste milieu style, creating a hybrid of academic and avant-garde styles learned from various teachers from France, Germany, and their home countries. Accordingly, these artists frequently found support from ideological moderates such as Mantz and Claretie, but also occasionally conservatives such as Dubosc de Pesquidoux. The Opportunistic Republicans, as the political moderates were called, would continue to gain power in the 1880s and carry with them an internationalist vision of Europe in

which France would be ordained its leader. As Rachel Esner has argued, along with the rise of this cosmopolitan ideal, France’s critics would slowly warm up to Germany again;\textsuperscript{458} but even as the image of Germany as arrogant, bellicose, and backward began to soften, the counter-image that rose amid post-1870 anti-Germanism describing Scandinavia as honest, poetic, progressive, and most importantly a natural ally of France, continued to proliferate along the rest of the century. The continued emigration of Nordic artists to France to during the 1880s and 1890s to learn pleinairist French principles, participate in the Salon and, increasingly, seek the patronage of French collectors, would stoke French pride in its cosmopolitan self-image, and bolster the prominence of Nordic art within French institutions.

**Conclusion**

Emerging beyond the critical debates and arguments, the general success of Nordic painting at the Universal Exposition of 1878 confirmed for French critics the narrative of a Franco-Scandinavian bond that had been developing since 1870. Even René Ménard, who lambasted Nordic artists at the Vienna International Exposition of 1873 for their so-called subservience to the Düsseldorf School, revealed a radical revaluation of thought with his 1881 book, *Le Monde Vue par les Artistes* (1881). Ménard’s descriptions of the German character were no less biting than in 1873. Beer and charcuterie, according to the critic, were part of the national character, and the German penchant for intellectual thought was counterbalanced by a desire to eat.\textsuperscript{459} By contrast, in the chapter on Danish, Swedish, and
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Norwegian artists titled “Pays Scandinaves,” Ménard describes Swedish and Norwegian artists as naturally a naturally affable and welcoming people. A Germanic people by race, the Scandinavians possessed the same slowness of movement (lourdeur) as the Germans; yet as much as the Scandinavians are drawn to relaxation, they are hardworking, capable of the most exhausting physical labor. “Une fois qu’elles ont pris leur élan,” remarks Ménard, “rien ne les arrête.” The so-called laziness of the German spirit is thus countered by Scandinavian industriousness; and many of the qualities that French writers had once admired in the Germans at the beginning of the nineteenth century were now applied to Scandinavia.

Even Menard’s memory of Nordic art at the Vienna International Exposition had gone through a subtle shift. At the time of the Exposition, the critic had little doubt that Denmark, Sweden, and Norway had become subservient to Germany, having lost their national originality in the poisonous miasma onset by internationalism. Now, at the start of the following decade, Ménard remembered the Vienna Exposition as a death knoll for Düsseldorf School, and the birth of the Scandinavian School:

La France ne se doutait pas, avant 1855, qu’il existait une école scandinave, et elle ne fut pas peu surprise en 1867 d’apprendre que le roi de Suède était lui-même un peintre de paysage. Cette école, née d’hier, subit naturellement un peu les influences étrangères, et on y trouve deux courants très marqués : l’un a pour point de départ Dusseldorf, où beaucoup d’artistes suédois ont fait leurs études et où quelques-uns sont même domiciliés, l’autre prend son mot d’ordre à Paris. En 1855, les peintres suédois semblaient former à peu d’exceptions près une simple annexe de l’école Allemande, mais en 1867 l’influence contraire commençait à prévaloir, et nous avons pu voir, à l’exposition de Vienne en 1873, que la facture épinglée de Dusseldorf était à peu près abandonnée en Suède, où les artistes ont adopté une touche plus grasse, plus nourrie, et en rapport avec leurs efforts du côté de la couleur et de l’effet.461
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From the recently deceased masters, Höckert and Tidemand, to the more recent Salon luminary, Wahlberg, Ménard viewed the Universal Expositions from 1855 to 1878 as a lineage of progress in the development of *l'école scandinave*. Ménard emphasized the young school’s liberation from German painting techniques as a key factor in *l'école scandinave*’s self-realization, yet, like other critics looking at Nordic art during the Third Republic, Ménard asserts that it was only through the guidance of France that they found their proper path.

I think you will want to do considerable tightening up in this chapter when you are ready to revise.
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Chapter IV: National Art and the Transnational Plein-airists
**Introduction: The Politics of Pleinairism**

The 1880s were a period in which not only Paris, but also outdoor artist colonies would take on increasing significance within Nordic art. Some of the most notable locations where artists started communities during this decade include Grez-sur-Loing, just north of Paris, Skagen, in the northern tip of the Danish peninsula of Jutland, and Fleskum, to the west of Oslo. At these sites, artists had the opportunity to freely exchange ideas and practices about art, mingle with other international artists, study the local working-class residents, and of course practice painting en plein air.

It is true that neither the practice of residing in an artist colony nor painting outdoors were completely new to Nordic artists during this decade. Danish artists had started to frequent Skagen in the 1860s and 1870s, where they took interest in recording the seafaring community. The Swedes Oscar Törnå and Hugo Salmson had visited Grez-sur-Loing in the mid 1870s.\(^{463}\) Around the same time, several other rural French colonies were visited by Nordic artists, including the forest of Fontainebleau, visited by Carl Ferderik Hill, as well as the western regions of Brittany, Normandy, and Picardie, where artists including the Norwegian Harriet Backer, the Finn Helene Schjerfbeck, and the Dane Laurits Tuxen travelled to paint. Various manners of painting outdoors had been a common practice since the mid nineteenth-century, including amongst Norwegian and Swedish artists training in Düsseldorf or Karlsruhe, as well as painters of the Danish Golden Age residing in their home country. Finally, Norway, given its lack of a formal school of fine arts, has its own long

history of outdoor painting going back to the beginning of the century, when artists such as Johan Christian Dahl, the Dane Johannes Flintoe, and Norwegian Military Academy drawing instructor Gerhard Munthe documented the mountainous western and interior regions of the country.464

In the 1880s, the frequentation of plein-air artist colonies merged with anti-academic sentiments of the period, expressed through secessionist movements arising in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Finland, as well as France, all arising within the first half of the decade. Not only did the practice of painting in independent, artist-dominated outdoor settings correspond to the egalitarian ideals of many of these secessionist groups, but many of the founders of such groups visited Skagen, Fleskum, and Grez-sur-Loing early in their careers, thus helping spawn the idea that artist colonies had given birth to avant-gardism. The summer night paintings made at Fleskum in in 1886 by artists including Harriet Backer, Erik Werenskiold, Kitty Kielland, Christian Skredsvig, Eilif Peterssen, and Gerhard Munthe, are viewed as key to the Norwegian Neoromantic movement of the late 1880s and early 1890s.465 Krøyer would be one of the leaders of the anti-academic Artists’ Study School in the early 1880s, and his impressionistic paintings of Skagen beach from the same time period are understood as pulling Danish art out of a post-Golden Age period of darkness.466 Several other avant-garde painters would come around the same time, including Christian Krohg. Krohg would also visit Grez-sur-Loing alongside the future

Fleskum artist Skredsvig, where they joined an international community of English, Irish, American, Japanese, and other Nordic artists. It is within the history of Swedish art, however, as argued by Alexandra Herlitz, that Grez-sur-Loing is given the most attention, since several the Swedish painters visiting there in the early 1880s, including Carl Larsson, Julia Beck, Richard Bergh and others would form the core of the secessionist Opponents group in the middle of the decade.467

Within French art criticism, evidence at the Salons that Nordic artists were incorporating French plein-air methods further supported the notion that les artistes Scandinaves had a natural kinship with those of France, and that France’s role was to help foster the artistic gifts of Nordic artists through artistic training and guidance. This narrative was largely born out of post-1870 culture wars between France and Germany. Witnessing within the Nordic countries a similar resentment against Germany due to the Schleswig-Holstein War of 1864, along with an influx of successful Nordic painters at the Salon, French critics were eager to declare that Paris had now unequivocally replaced Düsseldorf as an international destination for artists. Even after the rhetoric of revanchism had begun to quiet in the liberal Opportunist era of the 1880s, the idea that the pan-national art scandinave had been born out of French artistic practices not only persisted, but became more resolute. This notion that contemporary French painting methods had given birth to the a pan-national Scandinavian style is particularly evident in the writings of Charles Ponsonailhe, who argued at the Universal Exposition of 1889 that it was the

acquisition of pleinairism from France’s teachers that allowed the previously artless inhabitants of the Nordic countries to develop their own pan-national style: “La Suède, la Norvège et le Danemark, libres de traditions picturales, peuples tout palpitants d’une belle et féconde jeunesse, ont eu tôt fait de peser l’inanité de l’enseignement académique ; sans hésitation aucune, ils ont adopté le plein-airisme qui était à la fois d’accord avec leur raison et leur tempérament.” Ponsonailhe, perhaps willfully, forgets that both Sweden and Denmark had Academies since the 18th century, and that it was in part a rebellion against these Academies that had led some Nordic artists to embrace pleinairism as an alternative. The birth of a uniquely Scandinavian art had become perennial discovery of critics since the start of the Paris Universal Expositions, with every new generation proclaiming a different underlying cause for the school’s naissance.

Like many other critics appreciative of Nordic art in the early stages of the Third Republic, Ponsonailhe regards Scandinavia not only as a beneficiary of French education, but as an ally, marching alongside France. “L’art scandinave,” writes Ponsonailhe, “… s’avance résolument sur nos côtés, ainsi qu’une armée auxiliaire, un corps d’élite, et parfois, avec une heureuse audace, il nous devance. Nous lui devons des conquêtes.” Ponsonailhe’s military metaphor applies not only to the critic’s avant-gardist philosophy, which praised artistic intransigence, but also for the residual effects felt from France’s military defeat by Prussia nearly two decades earlier. Finding itself in a newfound state of political isolation, France sought new allies in the culture war against Germany.
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Ponsonailhe’s belief that France had become an important hub for Nordic artists within recent years is certainly correct. In addition to frequenting the outdoor artist colony at Grez-sur-Loing, many Nordic artists continued to train at the Atelier Bonnat, which starting in the late 1860s had provided education for several painters who gained success in France in the 1870s, including Nils Forsberg and Gustaf Cederström. The number of Nordic students training under Bonnat would increase throughout the late 1870s and early 1880s, including those with prominent careers in France such as Krøyer, Skredsvig and Heyerdahl. Meanwhile, also beginning in the late 1870s, the Académie Trélat would become a popular school for several prominent female artists, including Elisabeth Keyser, Asta Nørregård, Helena Shejerfbeck, and Harriet Backer. Many of these artists gathered in small communities in Paris, including in Montmartre, where they would come to gather at cafés such as the Café de l’Ermitage, the restaurant des Lilas, and Jesus Syrach.

The 1880s would bring the Nordic artist community increasing success as well. The accolades garnered at the Salon throughout the decade would be capped off at the Universal Exposition of 1889, when more than sixty of the exhibiting Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, and Finnish painters would bring home medals. As awards increased, so did sales. In comparison to the 1870s, when the French state only acquired a handful of paintings by Nordic artists, the number of state purchases would rise significantly. Several artists also found success outside of the Salon at the galleries Georges Petit and Boussod, Valadon, & Cie, the successor of Goupil & Cie. These galleries provided only economic support but
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social resources as well, bringing Nordic artists into the fold of the decade’s cosmopolitan avant-gardism, where they rubbed shoulders with other successful artists such as Claude Monet, Albert Besnard, and James McNeill Whistler.

As opportunities for exposure in Paris diversified in the secessionist-fueled decade, career paths diverged as well. Edelfelt is arguably the archetype of the rising success of the so-called juste-milieu artists of this period, garnering official accolades at the Paris Salon, while at the same time, as Robert Jensen argues, attempting to “construct an artistic elite”472 within the commercial realms of gallerists such as Georges Petit, where Edelfelt exhibited with the dealer’s Société international de peintres et sculpteurs throughout the 1880s. Of the same generation of Edelfelt is the the Norwegian marine painter Frithjof-Smith Hald, who would pursue a rather different but nonetheless brilliant career route. Like Edelfelt, who had studied in Antwerp in the 1870s, Smith-Hald also received international education, studying first with his compatriot Hans Gude in Karlsruhe and later in Düsseldorf. Smith-Hald weighed the option of pursuing a career in one of Europe’s major art capitals - London, Berlin, and Paris – but ultimately decided on Paris, which he considered to be “le siège principal d’art.”473 Smith-Hald moved to France in the late 1870s, and as noted by other Norwegian artists living abroad, immediately found immense success. At his first Salon exhibition of 1879, his painting Le retour des pecheurs was purchased by the National Gallery of Cologne.474 At the next Salon, his painting Station de

bateaux à vapeur en Norvège [Fig. 4.1] would be purchased by the French state and deposited in the Musée des Beaux-Arts in Lille. Throughout the 1880s, Smith-Hald continued to sell multiple paintings to French museums outside of Paris. In contrast to Edelfelt, Krøyer, Heyerdahl, or other Nordic artists who exhibited Petit’s Société international and pursued medals at the Salon and Universal Exposition, Smith-Hald would find success via the alternative routes of exhibited in France’s provincial Salons and selling paintings with Goupil & Cie. Although his paintings are often thematically-similar to the Bastien-Lepage-inspired naturalism of his colleagues, Smith-Hald would always maintain the romantic plein-air style of Düsseldorf – a style that, by the end of the decade, would be denounced by art historians.

This chapter explores the maturation of l’école scandinave from its contested status in the 1870s to its wider acceptance in the 1880s. One of the most radical changes to occur would be expansion of l’école scandinave to include Finland. The enormous success of Swedish-speaking Finnish painter Albert Edelfelt in France would play a substantial role in shifting scholarly attention towards artists from Russia’s Duchy of Finland. Similarly, the Skagen painter Peder-Severin Krøyer would play an important part in revitalizing the reputation of Danish painters in France. Although French critics had frequently treated Danish art as a corollary to Swedish and Norwegian art since the first Universal Exposition, Swedish and Norwegian artists had been substantially more successful than those from Denmark. Not only did Krøyer woo French critics through his adoption of plein-air painting techniques, but his role in helping flatter French critics and historians invited to the 1888
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Exhibition of French Art in Copenhagen would play an important role in revitalizing the reputation of Danish artists.

Along with the inclusion of Finland alongside Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, the 1880s would also see further shifts in the definition of *l’école scandinave* through a deeper affirmation Scandinavian artists with plein-air painting. French dealer Georges Petit’s exhibitions championing young international artists, including Krøyer and Edelfelt, would affirm critics’ associations between Scandinavian art and the ideals of French modernism. Although overt expressions of xenophobia and the rhetoric of anti-Germanism had substantially toned down after the 1870s, revanchism continued to exert itself in subtler forms, such as through the conduits of art history. As critics declared French art to be synonymous with modern progress, and as *l’école scandinave* was further drawn under the wing of *l’école Française* by French writers, critics would denounce the Nordic artists who continued to work within the style of Düsseldorf.

**From Russian to Scandinavian: The Emergence of Finland**

The 1880s would mark another significant change in the way in which French critics wrote about and defined Scandinavian art by the inclusion of Finland alongside Denmark, Sweden, and Norway. Before the 1880s, French art critics had spent little time writing about Finnish painters. The notion of a unique an *école finlandaise* was rarely if ever mentioned by any art critics, nor was it included alongside the other *écoles scandinaves*. Instead, Finnish artists tended to be looked upon as relatively indistinct from Russians, who at the time ruled over Finland. Nonetheless, it was the politics of the First French Empire at the beginning of the century that would have a major impact on shaping
Finland’s political situation in the nineteenth century, long before critics of the Third Republic began to ponder the expression of Finnish national identity in art.

Finland had been ruled by Sweden since the twelfth century, but was captured by Russia in 1808 during the Napoleonic Wars, officially becoming a Grand Duchy of Russia in 1809. Shortly after the loss of Finland, in 1810, the French Field Marshall Jean-Baptiste Bernadotte was elected to rule Sweden as Crown Prince Carl Johan, succeeding the heirless Carl XIII. Rather than attempting to recapture Finland, Carl Johan instead turned his attention to capturing Norway from Denmark, then allied with France. Siding with Russia against the armies of his former commander, Napoleon, Carl Johan agreed to not attempt to reclaim Finland in exchange for Norway. Norway was surrendered by Denmark in 1814, but Norwegians violently resisted Swedish rule before agreeing to enter a personal union with Sweden, ruled by the Swedish king but with their own constitution intact.

Norway’s cultural and relative political autonomy from Sweden under the Dual Monarchy was reaffirmed at the Paris Universal Expositions, in which Norwegian art was exhibited separately from Sweden but in near proximity, as well as within the language of France’s art critics, who frequently distinguished Norwegian from Swedish art. Russia had similarly made concession to grant Finland a degree of internal autonomy in 1809, allowing the Grand Duchy to retain its laws, religion, and official use of the Swedish language. Yet in contrast to Norway, there was little to no distinction between the Duchy of Finland and Russia within the Universal Expositions. Russia abstained from participating at the first
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Universal Exposition due to the Crimean War, which by extension excluded Finnish artists from participation as well; and during the following two expositions of 1867 and 1878, Finnish artists continued to be categorized as Russian nationals. When the Finnish neoclassical sculptor Walter Magnus Runeberg received an honorable mention at the Universal Exposition of 1878, for example, he was listed in the awards catalogue as a Russian artist.\footnote{479} By consequence, at a time when the notion of the emergence of new national schools became a major facet art of critical discourse, few French art critics actively sought to define and distinguish Finnish art, either as a school of art within its own right, or in relationship to Russia or Scandinavia.

Within the Dutchy of Finland, the desire to distinguish Finnish nationality had been a major concern since the Dutchy's emergence at the beginning of the century. Like Scandinavism, Fennomania emphasized the importance of a shared spoken language and folk culture as an important prerequisite for defining a nation. The first publication of the Finnish national epic, the *Kalevala*, in 1835 *Kalevala* would be extremely influential in spawning discussions over the promotion of a national Finnish culture throughout the century. The epic was published by Elias Lönnroth, who had collected folk poems from the region of Karelia telling stories about the creation of the world and recounting the feats of mythological heroes including Väinämöinen, Aino, and Lemminkäinen.\footnote{480} Equally influential would be the works of Johan Ludvig Rosenberg, oftentimes considered the

\footnotetext{479}{A similar situation would occur with Polish artists. The painter Henryk Siemiradzki (written H. H. Siemirdaski in the French exposition catalogue) receives a medaille d’honneur in 1878, but like the Finn Runeberg, is listed as a Russian.}

national poet of Finland, which celebrate Finland’s history and its landscape. Rosenberg’s most famous poem, *The Tales of Ensign Stål*, first published in 1848, tells the story of Finland’s struggle against Russian occupation at the beginning of the century, and from which would spawn the Finnish national anthem *Vårt Land* (*Our Country*).\(^{481}\)

Both the epic poems of Rosenberg and Lönnroth would be important sources of inspiration for the development of Finnish National Romantic movements in the visual arts during the second half of the nineteenth century. In 1858, the historian Zachris Topelius pointed to the *Kalevala* and the Finnish landscape could be used as the basis for the development of a Finnish national art.\(^{482}\) Topelius’ call would be taken up by many Finnish artists working in different styles and media, some of the most famous of whom include the generation of young Finns working in Paris in the late 1870s and early 1880s. Naturalist painter Albert Edelfelt would rise to international fame for his Finnish peasant genre scenes and landscapes, including *Service divin au bord de la mer, Finlände* [Fig. 4.2], as well as his illustrations for the 1900 republication of Runeberg’s *Tales of Ensign Stål*.*\(^{483}\) The Symbolist painter Akseli Gallen-Kallela, who came to Paris to study in 1884, would achieve equal success with his paintings of heroic tales from the *Kalevala*, including *The Defense of the Sampo* (1896) and *The Aino Myth* [Fig. 4.3]. The latter painting depicts one of the principal Finnish mythological heroes, Väinämöinen, during his courtship of Aino, who rejects Väinämöinen’s love, drowning herself, and transforming into a fish. *The Aino Myth*
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marks the beginning of Gallen-Kallela’s Kalevalan style and was painted twice by the artist, first in 1889, and a second time in 1891 as a commission for the Finnish senate. Fanny Churberg had a short career as a landscape painter in the 1870s, producing paintings expressive of her Düsseldorf training, such as *Brûlis, terres cultivées en Uusimaa* (1872). Churberg’s most important contribution to Finnish National Romanticism, however, would stem through her foundation of the Friends of Finnish Manual Arts, which promoted the production of traditional Finnish crafts and textiles.

Although most of these artists and writers spoke and wrote in Swedish, promotion of the Finnish language was another crucial component of the folkish National Romantic movement. Swedish was the language of the educated elite and a minority of farmers, but most of Finland’s population spoke Finnish. The Finnish Literary Society, founded in 1831 and of which Lönnroth was a member, was one of the early groups to promote Finnish language and literature. Some Swedish-speaking Finns sought to demonstrate their patriotism by taking on a Finnish name, including the national historian Yrjö Sakari Yrjö-Koskinen, who was born Georg Zacharias Forsman, along with the painter Akseli Gallen-Kallela, who chose to “fennomize” his name, Axel Gallén in 1907.

Fierce disagreements about the language of Finland nonetheless prevailed throughout the second half of the nineteenth century, and by extension created debates about the proper means of developing a genuinely Finnish art and culture. Fennomania and Scandinavism were oftentimes discussed together as intertwined causes, and the Finns regarded themselves as Scandinavians. At the 1843 Scandinavian student meeting in Lund,
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the Danish poet Carl Ploug encouraged his Swedish colleagues to take greater concern for Finland. Although Scandinavism was rejected by the Russian Empire as dangerous, several Finns attended the student meetings of 1843, amongst whom, at least one attendee – a Fennomane – expressed skepticism toward Scandinavism. While some Fennomanes remained wary of what they viewed as Swedish desires to subjugate the Duchy of Finland in the name of liberation from Russia, some Suecomanes – pro-Swedish language Finnish nationals – by contrast, sought to affirm Finland’s European heritage, rooted in the tradition of German liberalism, and in struggle against the Asiatic despotism of Russia.  

Within France, the issue of Finnish art and identity by and large was undiscussed by French critics until the 1880s. The Universal Exposition of 1889 would mark one of the most significant points of transition, marking the first time that Finland would be distinguished from Russia. Given the exposition’s special status as centenary celebration of the French Revolution, many of the European monarchies, including Russia, declined to officially participate, allowing privately-funded groups to organize their national exhibitions. In the absence of direct Russian control, a Finnish committee presided over by the civil engineer Hjalmar Londen erected its own pavilion for the Grand Duchy of Finland, separate from the privately-organized Russian pavilion. For the first time, artists from the Grand Duchy were recognized as Finnish by the French, given their own exhibition space and separate designation within the official catalogues.  

It was at this point that l’art finlandaise largely solidified itself in the lexicons of French critics. Rather than discussing
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Finnish art within the context of an *école russe*, they viewed it as a completely unique national entity.

With this artistic schism with Russia, critics linked Finland to Sweden and more broadly to Scandinavia. Maurice Hamel, who had reviewed the Copenhagen Exhibition of 1888 on year earlier, took a Suecomane interpretation of Finnish art, declaring that Finnish art was an annex of Swedish art. Russia, by contrast, failed to provide any pedagogical guidance to the Finns. Though advanced in literature, according to Hamel, the country failed to create any equivalents to Tolstoy or Turgenev in the visual arts.\(^{489}\) Instead, Finnish artists followed the path of their Swedish colleagues by pursuing French instruction, using plein-air painting techniques to their natural surroundings: “L’art finlandais est une annexe de l’art suédois – même éducation française, bonhomie d’observation, même sentiment de la nature chez Edelfelt, Gallen, de Becker.”\(^{490}\) Offering a slightly different viewpoint, Charles Ponsonailhe interpreted Finnish art through a pan-Scandinavist lens at the 1889 exposition. Ponsonailhe treats *l’École finalandaise* as a distinct artistic entity, yet related to the Scandinavian states. Together with the artists of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, the artists of Finland form part of the larger *École scandinave*, which, like Hamel, Ponsonailhe saw as rooted in plein-air practices.\(^{491}\)

The motivating, unifying factor behind Hamel’s and Ponsonailhe’s Europeanist interpretations of art in Finland is neither an anti-Russian nor anti-Fennomane worldview, but rather French nationalism. Both authors praise Finnish art for its plein-air naturalism –
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a practice synonymous with French art for many critics – while singling out for praise almost exclusively artists who had studied in France, including Albert Edelfelt, Akseli Gallen-Kallela, Adolf von Becker, and Helena Schjerfbeck. The same francocentric pattern of thought would echo in the reviews of other French critics in the 1880s and afterwards, including François Thiébault-Sisson’s article “L’Art dans les Écoles Étrangères.” Thiébault-Sisson emphasizes that despite Finland’s political and geographical contiguity with Russia, Finnish art is at heart Swedish, and by education French. “La Finlan de est une province russe, les géographies en font foi; l’art finlandais, par contre, est une province suédoise et qui deviendra française avant peu,” remarks the critic.492 The reason that in Thiébault-Sisson saw Finnish art as becoming French is due to his own understanding of Swedish art as itself rooted in French education and artistic practice. “Paris est le vrai centre des Suédois,” asserts Thiébault-Sisson; “ils y ont leur atelier, ils y passent la plus grande partie de leur année, ils s’y mêlent au moment de nos artistes et, sans rien abdiquer de leur personnalité, ils en reflètent l’agitation, le bouillonnement, les piquantes et gaies-nouveautés.”493 While asserting that Paris, and not Stockholm, is the Sweden’s artistic capital, Thiébault-Sisson emphasized that Swedish artists retained their own personality, or national character. In increasingly orientating its artists towards France, therefore, Finnish art too was almost paradoxically seen as coming to embody its own genuine character.

The idea that a painter must first learn to be French to become Finnish, Swedish, or more generally, a national artist, is frequently recounted in French writings on Nordic art

493 Thiébault-Sisson, “L’Art dans les Écoles Étrangères,” 149
in the Third Republic. Pleinairism was considered a value-neutral practice rooted in an ability to observe and reflect one’s natural – and generally national – surroundings. As an expression of French national identity, pride in pleinairism was directly linked to France’s defeat in the Franco-Prussian War in 1870. In the wake of the losses of Alsace and Lorraine to Germany and deeply weakened political influence in Europe, French critics latched onto younger generation Nordic – mostly Swedish – artists such as Alfred Wahlberg and Hugo Salmson who had renounced the German training centers favored by the older generation in favor of working in French ateliers around the dawn of the Third Republic. French critics heralded this group of successful young Nordic artist émigrés as evidence of France’s continued status as the cultural leader of Europe even in the face of military ruin. At the same time, critics saw pleinairism as having liberated the national character of *l’art scandinave* from the oppression of Germany, and particularly the Düsseldorf School, where many earlier generations of Nordic artists had sought artistic education.

That French art was liberating Nordic artists from the yoke of German oppression played into broader views that France was engaged in a mortal struggle to prevent German cultural imperialism, and for which Nordic artists provided an important ally. After the Franco-Prussian war, French critics immediately found themselves sympathizing with the Danes, who had lost the territories of Schleswig, Holstein, and Lauenburg to Prussian and Austrian forces several years earlier in 1864. Their artists subsequently abstained from working in Germany. By extension, the artists of Norway and Sweden, with their already-sizable presence in France, were grouped together with Denmark as part of a Franco-Scandinavian alliance to further progress in the arts while battling against German artistic decadence.
By the 1880s, a young generation of mostly Swedish-speaking Finnish plein-air painters began to gain the attention of critics. The most notable of these artists were Albert Edelfelt, Gunnar Berndston, Eero ärnafelt, Berndt Lindholm, and Akseli Gallen-Kallela, whose success throughout the decade would be affirmed at the Universal Exposition of 1889, when all would receive medals for their artworks within the newly-independent Finnish painting section. At this point, critics such as Ponsonailhe, Thiébault-Sisson, and Hamel began to apply to Finnish art within the same narrative of national liberation that had been applied to the rest of the école scandinave. It was a narrative that would last well into the early twentieth-century, as can be seen in Louis Réau’s chapter on Scandinavian art in André Michel’s *Histoire de l’Art* (1923), in which the author examines the influence of Russia, Sweden, and France, arguing that Finnish art emerges in the nineteenth century, but only becomes truly independent in the early twentieth century:

L’art finlandais ne date guère que de la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle et, avant de prendre un caractère spécifiquement finnois, il reste assez longtemps, malgré le rattachement politique du Grand-Duché de Finlande à l’Empire russe, dans l’orbite de l’art suédois... Mais, comme la Suède de 1880 était elle-même une province de l’art français, c’est en définitive à Paris que prennent contact Finlandais et Suédois... L’art finnois proprement dit ne s’émancipe de la tutelle suédoise qu’à l’aube du XXe siècle.

Although Réau places the genuine emergence of Finnish art at a relatively late date, he nonetheless follows the same narrative established by Thiébault-Sisson and others at the Universal Exposition of 1889 – namely the emergence of Finnish art in the 1880s, and

494 In 1889, Gunnar Berndston, Akseli Gallen-Kallela, and Berndt Lindholm receive Silver Medals, Eero Jarnefelt wins a Gold Medal, and Albert Edelfelt win the Grand Prix. Amongst several other Finnish painters, Edelfelt and Lindholm had participated at the prior 1878 Universal Exposition in the Russian section.

liberation from foreign influence, including French influence, paradoxically via French tutelage.

Just as Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists had worked and gained recognition in France long before the Universal Expositions, a number of Finnish artists worked in France before the 1880s. Adolf von Becker, Severin Falkman, and Wladimir Swertsehkoff all entered the atelier of Thomas Couture in the late 1850s. Couture’s atelier had become popular with Nordic artists around the time of the first Universal Exposition of 1855, and allowed the Finns the chance to rub shoulders with many of their Scandinavian artistic neighbors while in Couture’s atelier. While Falkman and Swersehkoff stayed in Couture’s atelier for only a year, von Becker invested several years training with the French master, staying until 1861. As Albert Boime notes, the influence of Couture’s impasto brushwork style is evident in many of von Becker’s works from this period such as A Game of Piquet [Fig. 4.4], which the artist exhibited at the Universal Exposition of 1878.496

Though von Becker would lead a successful career in his native Finland as an instructor at the University of Helsinki and through his own private school, he would return to Paris periodically throughout his life to exhibit his work and train under various French masters, including Léon Bonnat.497 Amongst von Becker’s students include Schjerfbeck and Gallen-Kallela, both of whom would themselves form the basis of l’école finlandaise in the 1880s.498 Von Becker’s career thus serves as a transition between the

497 Boime, Thomas Couture and the Eclectic Vision, p. 541; Challons-Lipton, The Scandinavian pupils of the Atelier Bonnat, 1867-1894, Appendix A
older generation of Finnish artists focusing on French genre styles to the younger and comparably larger generation of naturalist artists coming to France in the 1870s and 1880s, including Berndt Lindstrom, Albert Edelfelt, and Gunnar Berndtson, who was Edelfelt’s cousin. After initially studying in Düsseldorf, Lindstrom, like von Becker, would enroll in the atelier of Bonnat at the end of the 1860s, while both Berndtson and Edelfelt would choose Jean-Léon Gérôme as their teacher in the mid-1870s. Thus, much like the influence of Walhberg and Salmson on contemporary Swedish art, it was the generation of Finnish artists coming to France around the beginning of the Third Republic that would help shift Finnish art towards France and away from German influence - a trend would become more readily visible in the early 1880s as an increasing number of Finnish artists began to enter French ateliers. Several female Finnish artists would study at the Académie Trélat, including Schjerfbeck, who would exhibit in Paris throughout the 1880s, winning a bronze medal in 1889 for her painting *Le Convalescent* [Fig. 4.5].  

499 Gallen-Kallela, coming to France in 1884, chose instead to study instead at the Académie Julien and the Académie Cormon.  

While many Finnish artists chose to learn from Academic teachers, it was the plein-air styles learned outside the studio that would have the greatest impact on the reception of Finnish art in France. Many other Finnish artists were inspired by Realist and Naturalist painters such as Gustave Courbet, Edouard Manet, Jules Breton, and above all Jules Bastien-Lepage. Bastien-Lepage would be a common source of inspiration for Finnish artists.  

500 Other female artists studying at at the Académie Trélat during the same time as Schjerfbeck include Helena Westermarck, Ada Thilén, Ellen Favorin, and Alma Engblom. Challons-Lipton, *The Scandinavian pupils of the Atelier Bonnat, 1867-1894*, Appendix A.  

500 Ojanperä, “L’art finlandais et la France,” p. 65
artists throughout the 1880s, and his images of rural France painted in an impressionistic but meticulous manner would be a source of inspiration for many Nordic artists.\footnote{Sinisalo, “L’art National et International de Finlande,” p. 15}

Voyages to the Breton villages of Concareneau, Pont-Aven, and Gréz-sur-Loing in the mid 1880s had an important impact on Finnish artists including Elin Danielson-Gambogi (p. 307), Amélie Lundahl (310), Aukusti Uottila (315), and Richard Hall, whose painting of a Breton knitting lesson, *La Classe manuelle, école de petites filles (Finistère)* [Fig. 4.6], would be purchased by the French state in 1890.\footnote{Archives Nationales, cote F/21/7659, folio 12 (Album photo des salons)}

Undoubtedly the most successful Finnish artist of the generation of Finnish painters rising to stardom in the 1880s would be Albert Edelfelt. Albert Edelfelt had already achieved a minor success at the Salon of 1877 and Universal Exposition of 1878 with his painting *Blanche de Namur et le prince Haquin*, which was reproduced and sold by Goupil & Cie as a cabinet card photograph.\footnote{See chapter III} It was one of several historical paintings Edelfelt would produce in the late 1870s, painted in the popular anecdotal style of which his French teacher, Gérôme, and his Swedish colleague, Gustaf Cederström, were well-known.

Edelfelt’s historical genre paintings from this period are frequently national romantic in quality, depicting persons and events from Finland’s early modern history. While *Blanche de Namur et le prince Haquin* is scandinavianist in tone, celebrating the formation of the Kalmar Union – which incorporated parts of Finland – in the fourteenth-century, other paintings, such as *Village incendié, episode de la révolte des paysans finlandais en 1596* [Fig. 4.7], is more explicitly nationalist in tone. The painting, exhibited at the Salon of 1879, depicts a scene from the Club War in which Finnish peasants, armed with only rudimentary
weapons, revolted against a professional Swedish army.\textsuperscript{504} Finnish nationalists in the nineteenth century, like the historian Yrjö-Koskinen, interpreted this event as part of a longer struggle for Finnish independence led by the peasantry against an oppressive foreign nobility.\textsuperscript{505}

The celebration of Finnish folk life would continue be at the core of Edelfelt’s work during the artist’s rise to success in France. At the very start of the 1880s, however, Edelfelt would exchange the historical genre style of his teacher, Gérôme, for the naturalist depictions of everyday peasant life inspired by his friend and mentor, Jules Bastien-Lepage, whom Edelfelt had met in 1875. Quickly after Edelfelt’s embrace of pleinairisme around 1880 would come a series of increasingly lofty exhibition awards, winning third and second class medals in 1880 and 1882, and winning the grand prix at the Universal Exposition of 1889. At the Salon of 1882, the French state and would purchase its first work from Edelfelt, \textit{Service divin au bord de la mer}, which subsequently after its acquisition would immediately enter the Musée du Luxembourg. Within little over a decade, two more of Edelfelt’s paintings would be purchased by the French state, including \textit{Portrait de Monsieur Pasteur}, acquired in 1886, and \textit{Journée en décembre en Finlande}, acquired in 1893. Like \textit{Service divin au bord de la mer}, Edelfelt’s Finnish landscape painting, \textit{Journée en décembre en Finlande}, would also be acquired by the Luxembourg, making him one of the rare artists, along with his Swedish colleague Hugo Salmson, to have more than one painting in the

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{504} Frank Claustrat, “L’œuvre d’Albert Edelfelt et sa reception en France 1877-1889” \textit{L’Horizon Inconnu: L’art en Finande 1870-1920} (Helsinki: Musée nationale des Beaux-Arts Ateneum, 1999), 23
museum’s collection. In addition to exhibiting at the Salon de Champs Élysées, the Salon de Champ de Mars, and three Universal Expositions, Edelfelt also exhibited frequently at Georges Petit’s international group shows from 1882 through 1892, during the height of the artist’s fame in Paris.

Undoubtedly one of the most successful Nordic artists in nineteenth-century France, Edelfelt followed an artistic formula that was deeply attractive to French critics, rendering national folk imagery and landscape in a modern French plein-air style. One of Edelfelt’s earliest successful iterations of this formula, *Service divin au bord de la mer*, was praised by *Le Monde Illustré* for its depiction of the unique, so-called Northern poetry of Finland’s unique landscape (“pays des marais”) along with the pious temperament and rustic way of life. Paul Mantz appreciated Edelfelt for similar reasons, praising his painting as “extrêmement finlandais” and for the artist’s attachment to an “idéal exotique.” Although critics explicitly recognized the artist and his artwork as Finnish, it is within a Scandinavian framework that the Finnish-ness of Edelfelt’s painters were interpreted. Since 1855, French critics had frequently associated art from across Scandinavia with poetry, mysticism, profound Christian fidelity, sincerity, and humility. Many of these terminologies were now used to describe Edelfelt’s work, and even though Mantz found *Service divin au bord de la mer* to be “extremely Finnish,” he nonetheless saw it as a representative of the “école suèdoise.”
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506 “Service divin au bord de la mer (Finlande) tableau de M. Edelfelt,” *Le Monde illustré* (15 juillet 1882): 43
As has been discussed throughout this dissertation, the national character of painting as an organic expression of specific cultural values and attributes was of great importance to French critics through the second half of the nineteenth century. National schools of art were born and died naturally, while influencing and giving life to new schools, thus creating a complex taxonomy of interrelated genera, species, and subspecies, forming an organic and evolving whole. It is a tendency seen not only in Taine's biological model of art, or in Chennevières aristocratic view of France's patriarchal duty in the arts, but in a much longer history of literature extending from the eighteenth to nineteenth century in which France was often seen as a amalgamation of Northern and Southern influences. Especially after the Franco-Prussian War and the consolidation of Republican political power at the end of the 1870s, the cosmopolitan character of France became a common ideological facet espoused by liberal critics including Mantz. For Mantz, Edelfelt was simultaneously a Finnish artist, a representative of the Swedish School, and a “demi-Parisien.” Indeed, in parallel with the success of Swedish artists including Salmson and Hagborg in the 1870s, the rise of Finnish artists including Edelfelt in France during the 1880s has greatly to do with not only to do with the burgeoning of Finnish National Romanticism, but also critic’s interest in affirming France’s radiating artistic influence across Europe.

Edelfelt’s next and arguably greatest success in France, Portrait de Monsieur Pasteur [Fig. 4.8], is a testament to the importance of the French cosmopolitan ideal for Edelfelt’s painting. Edelfelt painted Louis Pasteur’s portrait in 1885, the same year Pasteur successfully administered a vaccine for rabies, gaining international celebrity. The portrait

509 Mantz, “Exposition de la Société Internationale,” 3
had been requested by his son, Jean-Baptiste Pasteur, an art critic who had his own portrait done by Edelfelt in 1881. The younger Pasteur had been greatly impressed by Edelfelt’s work exhibited at the Salon of 1880 – the year the artist won his first Salon medal – praising the artist’s craftsmanship, and heralding him as the leader of the new “École finlandaise.” When Edelfelt exhibited his portrait of Pasteur at the Salon of 1886, critics praised Edelfelt for depicting Pasteur, not as a bourgeois public figure, but alone in his laboratory, absorbed in his scientific studies, glass vial in hand, and poised next to his microscope. Portrait de Monsieur Pasteur was the naturalist answer to portraiture, depicted the subject in his natural milieu, and painted in a mixture of taught and atmospheric brushwork such as to give attention to the effects of light and color in the laboratory. At the Salon, Edelfelt’s painting outshone both the artist’s more typical Finnish peasant genre scene, L’heure du retour des ouvriers – Finalnde, as well as the French painter and teacher Léon Bonnat’s own portrait of Pasteur, exhibited the same year. A year after the portrait’s purchase by the French state that year in 1886, Portrait de Monsieur Pasteur would be placed in the collection of the Université de la Sorbonne, where it remained until being transferred to the Musée du Luxembourg in 1922.

510 Riitta Ojanperä, “Portrait de Louis Pasteur (1822-1895), 1885” Echapées Nordiques (Paris: Somogy, 2008), 74
Portrait de Monsieur Pasteur would earn Edelfelt the honor of a nomination to *chevalier* of the Légion d'honneur in 1887 thanks to the recommendation of Edmond Turquet. Two years later, in 1889, Edelfelt would be promoted to the rank of *officier*, and in 1901, he would achieve the rare distinction – perhaps the only Nordic artist in the nineteenth century to do so – of being promoted to the rank of *commandeur*. Edelfelt was therefore, through and through, an institutionalized French artist; yet his success within the French Salon and gallery system, in tangent with his career-long focus on Finnish national themes, would be essential to fostering dialogue on Finnish nationality in painting amongst French critics. Though as a whole Finnish artists working in France would consistently remain overshadowed by their Swedish colleagues, who were greater in number and had a longer history of collaboration with French artists, the transition of Finnish art from being classified as Russian, to Swedish, to Scandinavian through the course of the early Third Republic is a unique and telling case of how nationality was negotiated in nineteenth-century French criticism.

**Marketing Internationalism: Secessionism in France and the Nordic Countries**

The 1880s would be a time of schism between art and state institutions in both France and the Nordic countries. The Salon of 1880 had been such a catastrophe in the eyes of many of France’s artists and critics that the state-run exhibition would never completely recover from the event. The failure of the Salon, as Fae Brauer argues, was in large part due to the ill-informed changes implemented by Edmond Turquet, the State Arts Under-Secretary. Although Turquet’s intentions were to reform and “Republicanize” the Salon, aiming to
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make the exhibition more open to the new Naturalist schools of genre and landscape and
by increasing the number of participants and awards, the result was chaos and revolt. The
unwieldy size of the exhibition was exacerbated by Turquet’s decision to eschew the
alphabetical system of arrangement of paintings by artist that had been in place since the
Second Republic. In contrast to “Republicanizing” the Salon, the result was a more
pronounced elitism where pride of place was given to prior medal winners, while other
artists saw their works unceremoniously crammed into the poorly-lit peripheries of the
Palais des Champs-Elysées. Several artists involved in the organization of the Salon,
including President of the Painting section, William-Adolphe Bouguereau, resigned because
of what was felt to be Turquet’s tyrannical control over the exhibition. Likewise,
approximately fifty Salon veterans, led by Vice President of the Salon, Léon Bonnat,
subsequently sent in a letter of protest to Turquet’s subsequent scapegoating of the
Academic establishment.515

The result was not only Turquet’s termination (and succession by Antonin Proust),
but also the termination of the government’s administration of the annual Salon. Beginning
in 1881, the Salon would be run by an independent council of artists, the Société des
Artistes Français. Although as Patricia Mainardi argues the new Salon of the Société des
Artistes Français hardly differed from the old Salon in its retention of a conservative
artistic ideology, the move would usher in a wave—already begun by the Impressionists’
Société Anonyme in 1874—of secessionist movements in France over the next decade,
beginning with the establishment of the Société des Artistes Indépendants in 1884 and the

515 Fae Brauer, Rivals and Conspirators: The Paris Salons and the Modern Art Centre
(Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2013) 44-53
Société National des Beaux-Arts in 1890.\textsuperscript{516} The artistic rebellion in France would be mirrored in the Nordic countries, largely spearheaded by proponents of Naturalism. In Norway, revolt occurred against the Christiania Arts Association, an organization that patronized Norwegian artists and purchased works for its members, beginning in 1880. Sensing bias against the Naturalist tendencies of artists trained in Munich and Paris, a group of artists led by Erik Werenskiold demanded that the Association’s future purchase decisions be made by the artists themselves. Two years later, the rebelling artists would form their own self-governed exhibition, the Autumn Exhibition (Høstutstilling), and soon received official sponsorship from the Norwegian government.\textsuperscript{517} In Finland, an artist-led revolt similar to that which had played out in Norway would occur at around the same time. In 1882, the Artists’ Association was formed in reaction to the authoritarianism of the Finnish Fine Arts Association, whose members would include the artists Albert Edelfelt and Akseli Gallen-Kallela. Like the Impressionists’ prohibition against exhibiting at the Salon, the Artists’ Association was a stylistically diverse group united by a mutual abstention from exhibiting with the established Finnish Fine Arts Association.\textsuperscript{518}

Though the Danish secessionist Free Exhibition (Den Frie Udstilling) would not occur until 1891, a Naturalist-led rebellion began to make waves against the academic establishment in 1879. Students at the Royal Academy of Copenhagen successfully petitioned the Danish government for funds to start the Artists’ Model School. The school,

\textsuperscript{516} Patricia Mainardi, \textit{The End of the Salon: Art and the State in the Early Third Republic} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993) pp. 85-86


\textsuperscript{518} Lindwall, “Artistic Revolution in Nordic Countries,” 38-39
headed by Laurits Tuxen, proposed a plein-air course of study along with a democratic system of organization where teachers were elected by the students themselves. The school soon seceded completely from the Academy and was renamed the Artists’ Study School (Kunstnernes Studieskole), led by teachers such as Tuxen, Peder Severin Krøyer, and Kristian Zahrtmann, who would in turn be foundational members of the Free Exhibition. Finally, in Sweden, rebellion began in the mid-1880s when a group of artists, inspired by their plein-air studies in France and the artistic revolts in the neighboring Nordic countries, mounted a group show in Stockholm in 1885 titled *From the Banks of the Seine*. The group of artists called themselves the Opponents for their rejection of the Royal Academy of Fine Arts in Stockholm and advocated a student-led system of artistic education. Emboldened by the success of *From the Banks of the Seine*, the Opponents mounted an eponymous second exhibition just five months later, organized by two of its main members, Ernst Josephson and Carl Larsson. While convening in France in August of 1886, the Opponents started their own secessionist movement through formation the Artist’s Association (Konstnärsförbundet), holding annual exhibitions in Stockholm and Gothenburg beginning in October of that year.

The pan-European secessionist phenomenon, with its embrace of Naturalist painting ideals, mixture of cosmopolitan and nationalist sensibilities, and small group shows, would be quickly imitated by galleries. Left-wing ideologies were a common aspect of groups such as the Artists’ Association, whose members including Carl Larsson were
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proclaimed socialists. The Artists’ Study School was based on an ideal of free education. Yet dealers such as Georges Petit, whose clientele tended to be upper class, could successfully mimic the avant-gardist structure of secessionism for economic gain.

Marketing Nordic Art in the early 1880s

One of the first individuals to attempt to market the rising generation of Nordic avant-garde artists to French audiences was the little-known Norwegian dealer H. G. Petersen-Gade. Petersen-Gade became active in Paris in the early 1880s, working as a publisher, art critic, and dealer specializing in modern Nordic art, and who been appointed secretary for the Swedish commission at the Universal Exposition of 1878. The dealer’s gallery, l’Art Scandinave, was located at 5 avenue de l’Opéra in central Paris, where, beginning in 1881, he briefly represented some of the most famous Nordic artists of the end of the nineteenth-century. At the Salon of 1882, nearly a dozen painters – primarily Norwegian – listed Petersen-Gade’s name and address in the exhibition catalogue, including Christian Krohg, Kitty Kielland, Erik Werenskiold, Hans Heyerdahl, Adelsteen Normann, Asta Nørregaard, and Johannes-Martin Grimelund. It was an impressive cohort of painters, selected from some of Norway’s most prominent vanguard artists, whose artworks Petersen-Gade evidently saw as an untapped resource ready for marketing in France. Apart from Heyerdahl, who had already gained a solid reputation in France following the success of his painting Adam et Eve at the Universal Exposition of 1878, most of the artists represented by Petersen-Gade were still unknown in France, and rising stars

522 “Billedkunst,” Illustreret Tidende (18 December 1881): 146
in their own country. Werenskiold, Krohg, and Kielland would soon become canonized as forerunners of modernism within Norway, and some of the most important artists of National Romantic movement. The fjord and seascape painters Grimalund and Normann, though arguably somewhat less well-known today given their residences abroad, would also have equally impressive careers outside of Norway. Though Grimalund settled in Paris and Normann resided in Berlin, both would have great success internationally, including in France, exhibiting works with gallery Georges Petit and selling paintings to the French state in the 1890s.

Despite Petersen-Gade's impressive acumen for predicting artistic success, the dealer's attempt at promoting Nordic avant-gardism in France would come to a dramatic halt almost as soon as it began. Having amassed an astounding debt of around 160,000 francs through his gallery operations, Petersen-Gade fled Paris.\textsuperscript{523} The gallery l'Art Scandinave was shuttered and the paintings were possessed by the bankruptcy courts, leaving Petersen-Gade's artists struggling to regain their artworks. According to the Norwegian newspaper Bergens Tidende, it was only through the intervention of government envoys from Denmark and Sweden-Norway that Petersen-Gade's former artists could recover their artworks.\textsuperscript{524}

In 1881, a year before the gallerist's bankruptcy, Petersen-Gade published Quatorze Dessins Originaux des Artistes Scandinves, an album of heliogravures reproduced from drawings by ten artists from Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and Finland. The artists included

\textsuperscript{523} “Romning for Gjæld,” Nedenæs Amtstidende (11 November 1882): 2. Another newspaper, Bergens Adressecontoirs Efterretninger, reports that the debt was 150,000 francs. “Et Privatbrev fra Paris . . . ,” Bergens Adressecontoirs Efterretninger (31 Oktober 1882): 3
\textsuperscript{524} “Om den skandinaviske Kunsthandel i Paris,” Bergens Tidende (23 November 1882): 3
were primarily those involved in the wave of secessionist rebellions in the Nordic countries during the 1880s.\textsuperscript{525} Amongst the more notable names include the Danes Laurits Tuxen and Peder Severin Krøyer. Around the time of the book’s publication, Tuxen had helped lead the Artists’ Model School’s rise and struggle with the Royal Academy in Copenhagen, while Krøyer, in addition to achieving great success in France, would commence his Skagen travels in northern Denmark the following year, where he would be a central figure in the developing plein-air artists’ colony.\textsuperscript{526} Also included are the Finn Edelfelt, the Swedish Opponents and Salon luminaries Salmson and Hagborg, as well as the future Autumn Salon artists from Norway, taken under the wing of Petersen-Gade in Paris, Heyerdahl and Werenskiold.

Though photographically-aided reproductions of works by international artists – including Nordic painters such as Salmson – for mass consumption by European audiences had been pioneered by Goupil a decade earlier, the avant-garde direction of Petersen-Gade made the style and presentation of \textit{Quatorze Dessins Originaux des Artistes Scandinaves} quite different from similar albums published by Goupil around the same time. While Goupil’s albums mimics the official prestige of the Salon in their alphabetical presentation of jury-certified artworks, replicated in sleek photogravure prints, Petersen-Gade’s album mimics the avant-gardist presentation methods of the French gallery, curating a select group of

\textsuperscript{525} The full list of artists, arranged by country, include: Frantz Henningsen, Peter Severin-Krøyer, Vilhelm Rosenstand, and Lauritz Tuxen (Denmark); Gunnar Berndtson and Albert Edelfelt (Finland); Hans Heyerdahl, Eilif Petersen, Nicolai Ulfsten, Erik Werenskiold (Norway); August Hagborg, Carl Larssson, Hugo Salmson, Alfred Wahlberg (Sweden). \textit{Quatorze Dessins Originaux des Artistes Scandinaves}, ed. H. G. Petersen-Gade (Paris: L. Baschiet; Christiania: Alb. Cammermeyer; Copenhague: Lehmann & Stage; Stockholm: C. E. Fritze’s Kgl. Hofbokh, 1881).

\textsuperscript{526} Patricia G. Berman, \textit{In Another Light: Danish Painting in the Nineteenth Century} (New York: The Vendome Press, 2007), p. 155
artists organized by nationality, and emphasizing the uniqueness of the artists’ drawings, whose gestural handiwork is exactingly reproduced through the photomechanical process. Peasant and genre images and depictions of everyday life in either France and the Nordic countries, including Krøyer’s *Jeune fille cousant* [Fig. 4.9] and Werenskiold’s *Sauvé* [Fig. 4.10], dominate the album thematically, accompanied by two landscapes by Wahlberg and the Norwegian Nicolai Ulfsten. The naturalist subject matters paired with the loose, intuitive execution of the drawings, firmly entrench Petersen-Gade’s album within modernist perspective.

At the beginning of 1882, the gallery *L’Art Scandinave* opened a sizable exhibition of nearly forty Nordic artists, featuring paintings, drawings, and sculptures. Nearly all the artists whose works were printed in *Quatororze Dessins Originaux des Artistes Scandinaves* exhibited drawings or paintings at the gallery, along with many of the artists who would list Petersen-Gade as a representative in the Salon exhibition catalogue that year. Along with more famous names associated with the Nordic avant-garde, including Werenskiold, Krøyer, Edelfelt, and Larsson, the exhibition included several older artistic veterans of the Parisian art world. These artists include the Norwegian landscape painter Hans Gude, whose works at the first two Universal Expositions played a large role in stirring contemporary French interest in Nordic art, the Danish artist Lorenz Frølich, whose illustrations were ubiquitous in France during the Second Empire, the Swedish history painter and portraitist Christine von Post, whose painting *La Mère de Moïse exposant son enfant sur le Nil* had been bought by the French state following the Universal Exposition of 1867, along with the famous landscape and genre painters of the 1870s, Ludvig Munthe, Hugo Salmson, Alfred Wahlberg, and August Hagborg. In addition to these names several
other artists who were just starting important careers in France also exhibited, including the Norwegian marine painter Johannes Grimelund, the Swedish aquarellist Anna Gardell-Ericson, and the Norwegian animal and genre painter Christian Skredsvig.

The exhibition at *L'Art Scandinave* was reported on in *La Presse* by the journalist de Baldini. De Belina describes Petersen-Gade’s exhibition as a cultured affair for the “*high life parisen,*” in contrast to the overcrowded Salon and boorish commercialism of many of Paris’ galleries, where members of the “public intelligent” would have the opportunity to appreciate the undervalued artists of Scandinavia. The artists’ nationalities were therefore presented as an exclusive commodity for the speculative art collector, framed in the avant-gardist ideals of novelty, authenticity, and cosmopolitanism. De Belina’s praise for Petersen-Gade exhibition of Scandinavian art exhibition falls well in line with the ideals of secessionism, which as described by Jensen are founded upon “determined internationalism” and belief in “social and artistic progress.” The belief in, desire for, and occasionally fear of the progressive melding of national styles of art had been a common point of discussion for French art critics throughout the prior Universal Expositions. Like the spread of scientific knowledge and technology, the advancement of art in one nation would inevitably spread to others. Underlying and oftentimes motivating the belief in the virtues of internationalism would there nonetheless persist an unwavering focus on the strengths and weaknesses of the individual nation, which makes itself apparent in de Belina’s review of the exhibition at *L'Art Scandinave.* “*C’est vrai qu’on nous dira que l’art est international, cosmopolite, et que point n’est besoin d’une classification par nationalité,*” de

---

527 De Belina, “L’Exposition des Oeuvres des Artistes Scandinaves,” p. 2
528 Jensen, *Marketing Modernism in Fin-de-Siècle Europe,* p. 6, 11
Belina argued; "Mais ne convient-il pas d’établir aussi les progrès accomplis par chaque pays sur ce terrain des beaux-arts?" Presumably, Petersen-Gade’s “high life” cosmopolitan clients located in Paris would have also been attracted by the gallerist’s presentation of highly-reputable modern artists from the Nordic countries. Less than nine months after de Belina’s review was written, however, L’Art Scandinave would be permanently shuttered, leaving many of the Nordic artists formerly represented by Petersen-Gade to find other dealers to market their works.

Petersen-Gade's stake in the internationalist art market would be taken over – along with many of his former artists - by the French dealer George Petit, whose gallery opened on rue de Sèze in Paris the same year that L’Art Scandinave held its first and final exhibition. As with Petesen-Gade’s gallery, nationalism was a selling-point for Geroge Petit. Petit’s twin exhibition groups, the Société international de peintres et sculpteurs and the Exposition Internationale de Peinture, debuted the year of the gallery’s overture. The first Exposition Internationale de Peinture was held in the spring of 1882, featuring artworks by artists from France, Belgium, Italy, Holland, Russia, England, Germany, Spain, Austria, Sweden. As stated in the following exhibition catalogue the following year, the aim of the exhibition, was to “représenter l’art des différentes nationalités.” The similarly-themed Société international de peintres et sculpteurs was first held in the winter of 1882, but intended to shine a light on a cohort of younger international artists. Accordingly, the

529 De Belina, “L’Exposition des Oeuvres des Artistes Scandinaves,” p. 2
529 Jensen, Marketing Modernism in Fin-de-Siècle Europe, p. 6, 11
already well-established Wahlberg exhibited with the *Exposition Internationale de Peinture* in its debut, while the up-and-coming Edelfelt exhibited with the *Société international de peintres et sculpteurs*, along with artists includes John Singer Sargent, Giovanni Boldini, Jean-Charles Cazin, and Pascal Dagnan-Bouveret.

Any solid distinction between the two exhibitions appears to have dissolved after the first year, after which Georges Petit would hold one annual exhibition of international artists. *Exposition Internationale de Peinture*, as the exhibition was frequently titled, was held from 1882 through 1887 before recommencing again three years later in 1890. Along with Edelfelt and Wahlberg, most the Nordic artists exhibiting with Petit in the 1880s came from the avant-gardist core Petersen-Gade’s gallery, which include Heyerdahl, Krøyer, and Larsson, followed later by the participation of Grimmelund and Hagborg in the 1890s. Beyond the *Exposition Internationale de Peinture*, Nordic artists had opportunities the exhibit in other shows organized by Petit as well. In 1888, at the *Exposition de peinture et sculpture par 33 artistes français et étrangers*, Skredsvig and the Danish Skagen artist Viggo Johansen would both exhibit, with the latter exhibiting two of his Skagen paintings. These artists, many of whom were involved within secessionist movements in their respective countries, would be united through Petit with group of international artists with similarly plein-air or otherwise modernist aesthetics, including James McNeill Whistler, Alexander Harrison, Jules Bastien-Lepage, Jean Charles Cazin, Ludwig Knaus, Giuseppe de Nittis, Alfred Stevens, Alfred Roll, Albert Besnard, Henri Gervex, John Singer Sargent, and the sculptor Auguste Rodin.

Though Georges Petit promoted a small group of avant-gardist artists, he dealer simultaneously supported artists who had already achieved official success. One notable
exception to the secessionist-leanings of the gallery’s Nordic artists is the Swedish painter Carl Gustaf Hellqvist, largely known for his history paintings, who exhibited 1884 *Exposition Internationale de Peinture*. What unites this Nordic to the others exhibiting with Petit in the 1880s is that Hellqvist, along with each of the others Nordic artists, had recently been awarded at least one medal or received an honorable at the Salon. Several of these artists had also recently sold paintings to the French state through the Salon, including Edelfelt, Heyerdahl, and Larsson, the latter of whom had sold his landscape *L’étag à Grez-sur-Loing* in 1884, the year before exhibiting alongside Edelfelt at the *Exposition Internationale de Peinture*.

Thus, Georges Petit used the Salon as a vetting system for selected artists to invite to his international exhibition groups, and included alongside the pleinairist cohort of the gallery’s exhibitions were more established names, including Gérôme.

The balancing act Georges Petit played between official and avant-gardist credentials can be seen in the advent in 1882 of the galleries’ international exhibitions, the *Exposition Internationale de Peinture* and the *Société international de peintres et sculpteurs*, in which the Wahlberg and Edelfelt respectively participated. Rather than being molded in the spirit of secessionism, the first *Exposition Internationale de Peinture* was an extravagant show featuring a dozen of some of Europe’s most celebrated painters. Amongst the exhibitors were the Barbizon master Jules Dupré, the historical genre painter Jean-Léon Gérôme, Belgian society painter Alfred Stevens, and of course the Swedish landscape artist Alfred Wahlberg. The critic Edmond Jacques would describe the show as, une sorte de
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532 Larson [Larsson], *L’étag à Grez-sur-Loing*, Archives Nationales, Cote F/21/7654, folio 7; [Album photo des salons]
tournoi d’anciens vainqueurs, tous haut placés dans l’estime des gens de goût,” noting that most of the artworks exhibited were already well-known to the French public.533

Opening at the end of the year, the Société international de peintres et sculpteurs conformed more closely with the avant-gardist image marketed by the George Petit gallery. The exhibition featured a larger group younger international artists associated with the modern school of naturalism, including the French painters Pascal Dagnan-Bouveret and Jean-Charles Cazin, the American John Singer Sargent, the German Max Liebermann, and the Finn Edelfelt. “Le visiteur peut être assuré par avance qu’il ne trouvera à l’exposition qui vient de s’ouvrir dans les salons de M. Georges Petit aucune œuvre académique, aucune page inspirée par le culte d’idéal des anciens jours,” remarks Paul Mantz. “Français ou étrangers, tous les peintres qui font partie de la Société internationale sont des jeunes, du moins par la recherche du pinceau, et tous sont à la mode de demain.”534 Most all the exhibitors eschewed traditional academic precepts of craft and finish, preferring instead the fashionable bravura of Impressionism. Yet the modishness of these artists’ techniques, as Mantz notes, clearly placed them beyond the more radical limits of the avant-garde: “Sachons le bien: nous n’entrons pas ici dans le temple de l’intransigeance, mais sommes peut-être dans la section des agités.”535 The cosmopolitan cohort of the Société international de peintres et sculpteurs were all in fact seasoned “Parisiens,”536 well acquainted with the Salon, and leaving little doubt to any visitor – or potential buyer – as to the future success of these young artists.

535 Mantz, “Exposition de la Société Internationale,” 3
536 Mantz, “Exposition de la Société Internationale,” 3
As George Petit’s biannual international exhibitions merged into one annual exhibition, the *Exposition international de peinture* became a stalwart of official avant-gardism, helping establish the reputations of several Nordic artists in France. The 1887 *Exposition internationale de peinture* of 1887 would be the gallery’s ultimate manifesto of cosmopolitan vanguardism. Claude Monet, Berthe Morisot, Pierre-Auguste Renoir, Camille Pissarro, and Alfred Sisley, all key members of the Impressionist circle, which staged its final exhibition just one year prior, would all exhibit at Petit’s gallery. The French Impressionists would be joined by the tetrarchs of *l’art scandinave* in France – Heyerdahl from Norway, Larsson from Sweden, Krøyer from Denmark, and Edelfelt from Finland – each one representing one branch of the Nordic nations, alongside other ambassadors of art including Alexander Harrison and Whistler from the United States, along with Liebermann and Wilhelm Leibl from Germany.537 The secessionist status of the 1887 *Exposition Internationale de Peinture* and its international artists was affirmed by the critics. In tangent with the plurality of national schools of art, one critic writing for the *Journal des débats politiques et littéraires* noted that each artist, with a few exceptions, came from “cette école qu’on appelle impressionniste.”538 Critics also saw Petit’s exhibition in oppositional terms with the Salon – which even after being wrested from government control, continued to draw the ire of critics – with George Petit’s gallery offering a more democratic, better-organized, alternative exhibition.

537 As a noteworthy curiosity, while *Le Monde illustré* journalist Olivier Merson ranked Monet, Morisot, and Renoir as representatives of *l’art français*, he pairs Pissarro together with Krøyer as representatives of *l’art danois*. The author then ponders, perhaps jokingly, what “école exotique” Sisley must come from. Olivier Merson, “Exposition international de peinture et de sculpture, rue de Sèze, 8,” *Le Monde illustré* (4 juin 1887): 370.
Amédée Pigeon complained that the Salon organizers treated their foreign exhibitors unjustly, despite the merit of their artworks. The paintings of Otto Sinding, Richard Bergh, and Laurits Tuxen, the critic notes, were all hung either too high or in inconspicuous places, while Viggo Johansen and Christian Skredsvig were both denied medals despite their great talent.539 “Mais tout le monde (j’entends tous ceux que l’art intéresse),” rebuts Pigeon, “sait aujourd’hui ce que le jury seul feint d’ignorer et n’ignore peut-être pas. On se presse à l’exposition de la rue de Sèze, où MM. Kroyer, Heyerdahl, Harrison, Leibl, Whistler montrent qu’ils peuvent bien soutenir la comparaison avec les plus célèbres les plus justement admirés des peintres français... Par conséquent, la cause que défend le jury est perdue d’avance.”540 The idea that public opinion should give the final say on an artwork’s value, and not a jury of so-called experts, had been placed forward by artists for more than two decades who complained that the Salon favored an elite minority of established history painters while being biased against less-established artists who oftentimes painted in a naturalist style. Pigeon redirects the established complaint to suggest that the French public taste was increasingly directed towards internationalism at odds with those of the Salon’s nationalist jury.

No matter how art historians and historiographers care to define the styles of the artists exhibiting with Georges Petit, whether as juste-milieu painters, world

539 Amédée Pigeon, Le Passant: Revue Littéraire & Artistique, no. 89, 4e année (Mars 1887): 212-213
540 Pigeon, Le Passan, 214. Journal des débats writer A. H., though expressing a much more conservative aesthetic ideal, is similarly critical of the Salon, remarking that the exhibition latter is too large and disorganized, while Petit’s gallery offers a more concise and harmonious vision. A. H., “Informations. Exposition international de peinture et de sculpture à la galerie Georges Petit,” 3
impressionists, national romantics, or naturalists, there can be little doubt as to the impact that the *Exposition Internationale de Peinture* would have on shaping the future of Franco-Nordic artistic relations. Georges Petit would continue to exhibit the works of Nordic artists in the 1890s, including Krøyer and Edelfelt, along with new artists including Anders Zorn, Frits Thaulow, and Johannes Grimalund. As a cause and consequence of their relationship with the French dealer, each of these artists had no-less-than illustrious careers in France. Perhaps even more significantly, however, is that the group exhibitions at Georges Petit’s gallery helped forge a network of interchange between the avant-gardes of France and the Nordic countries. Core artists of the gallery, including Rodin, Besnard, Roll, and Carolus-Duran formed long-lasting friendships and professional relationships with their Nordic colleagues.\(^{541}\) When these French artists helped found the somewhat exclusive secessionist Salon, *Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts* in 1890, they immediately extended invitations to Skredsvig, Larsson, and Edelfelt to become official members of their society. In turn, the Norwegian Autumn Salon (Høstutstilling) would exhibit works by Rodin, Besnard, Roll, and Carolus-Duran the following year, and would continue to showcase the works of other alumni of the *Exposition Internationale de Peinture* in the 1890s, including Monet, Pissarro, Krøyer, and Liebermann.

**The Moonlight Painters at Goupil & Cie**

Both Petersen-Gade and Petit gravitated towards a similar group of Nordic artists. These artists, including Edelfelt, Krøyer, Heyerdahl, and Larsson, mainly painted genre paintings and scenes of everyday life and painted in a plein-air style. As such, they were largely anti-Academic not only in style but in philosophy, and participated in secessionist movements in their respective countries. Perhaps most importantly, almost all of them had received some form of education in France and achieved major successes in the Salon. They were, according to contemporary French standards, modern artists, but highly reputable ones for whose works there was a ready market in France. Goupil & Cie appealed to a similarly upper-class, cosmopolitan clientele, and several the artists who exhibited with Petit were also sought after by Goupil, including Heyedahl, Salmson, Edelfelt, and Wahlberg. Goupil’s repertoire, however, clearly gravitated towards Nordic landscapes and marine paintings which played a comparatively minor role in Petit’s gallery. Some of the most prominent of these artists include Gegerfelt, Smith-Hald, Wahlberg, the Dane Wilhelm Xylander, and the cousins Ludwig and Gerhard Munthe. Though several including Wahlberg and Smith-Hald lived in France and were deeply influenced by modern French painting practices, these artists generally had extensive education in Germany, and maintained a greater allegiance to the styles of Gude or Corot than to Bastien-Lepage. Goupil’s legion of Nordic artists therefore encapsulated a style of landscape influenced by the legacy of Romanticism that was arguably less avant-gardist in ethos, but by no means outmoded to contemporary tastes.

Goupil began to develop relationships with Nordic artists a decade before Petit did, at the very beginning of the Third Republic. It was at this moment that a new generation of Nordic artists, led by the Swedes Wahlberg, Gegerfelt, Hagborg, and Salmson, began to take
interest in French naturalist painting. These artists quickly amassed both medals and positive critical reviews through the Salon, attracting not only the attention of Goupil, but also that of their slightly-younger contemporaries including Larsson as well as Smith-Hald. Goupil focused heavily on selling moonlight paintings by Nordic artists including Wahlberg, Gegerfelt, and Xylander, of which more than two dozen were sold throughout the 1870s and 1880s. In contrast to the luminism of contemporary French plein-air practices, moonlights had been a staple of the Barbizon painters active in the early-to-mid-century. There was no coincidence in Goupil's preference for Nordic paintings that held a certain resemblance to those of the older Barbizon School. Goupil had invested heavily in Barbizon paintings in the 1870s, the same decade it began to collect works by Nordic painters, selling numerous original paintings as well as printed reproductions of works by artists including Corot, Dupré, and Rousseau through the nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{542}

The continued appeal of Nordic moonlights to French buyers during 1880s is apparent in the popularity of Smith-Hald's work, who would sell multiple paintings to both the French state as well as Goupil during the decade. In 1887, Goupil would sell Smith-Hald's \textit{Marine, Clair de lune} to the wealthy Auban-Moët family, relatives of the French wine dynasty, living in Épernay, France for 1000 francs.\textsuperscript{543} A few years earlier, in 1883, a similar moonlight by Smith-Hald titled \textit{Lever de Lune (Norwège)} [Fig. 4.11] would be sold as a print in Goupil's \textit{Publication's Nouvelles}. The high-quality photogravure was sold in a large format of 51 by 73 centimeters, suitable size for framing and hanging on a wall, and was


\textsuperscript{543} Smith-Hald, Frithjof, \textit{Marine, Clair de lune}, purchased October 17, 1884, sold February 15, 1887 to Auban Moët in Epernay, France, PI Record No. G-26228
sold in both monochrome and color editions, ranging between 25 and 50 francs. Lever de Lune (Norwège) was sold as part of a series of landscapes by other Nordic artists. The series included Wahlberg’s Soirée d’été [Fig 4.12], Jernberg’s Clair de lune, and another work by Smith-Hald, Le Calmè the reproduction rights of which had been bought from Smith-Hald for 500 francs before being sold to a buyer in New York for 1000 francs in 1885. Goupil frequently advertised prints as pairs, pendants, and series as a means of enticing collectors to purchase more works, oftentimes recycling old prints with new ones to renew their appeal. However, the visual association made between Goupil’s so-called suite of landscape paintings by Jernberg, Smith-Hald, and Wahlberg is telling of how Goupil’s repertoire of Nordic paintings was stylistically unique from that of his rival Petit’s, and was closely aligned with the French vogue for the Barbizon School near the end of the century.

The Continued Relevance of the French State: Expanding the Collections of French Museums

Despite the opposition to state interference in the lives of artists expressed throughout the decade, seen in the rise of secessionist exhibitions in both France and the

544 See: Publications Nouvelles de la Maison Goupil (Asnières: Imprimerie Goupil & Cie, (Avril 1883), p. 3; ... (Octobre 1883), p. 3; ... (Octobre 1885), 4
546 Robert Verhoogt, Art in Reproduction: nineteenth-century prints after Lawrence Alma-tadema, Jozef Israels and Ary Scheffer (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2007), 318
Nordic countries, the development of independent artist groups and colonies, and the increasingly significant role of galleries in acting as mediators between the artist and the public, having a work purchased by the French state continued to be a significant goal for Nordic artists exhibiting in France. The French state would take an increasing interest in Nordic artists as well, as the number of paintings acquired and sent to museums would rise significantly during this decade. Apart from 1883 and 1885, the French State purchased at least one artwork – and usually more – by a Nordic artist during the decade. More than fifteen canvases and works on paper were acquired from the Salon and other venues from eight different Nordic artists, including the Norwegians Heyerdahl, Smith-Hald, Skredsvig, and Thaulow, the Finn Edelfelt, and the Swedes Larsson, Salmson, Zorn, and Allan Österlind.

547 At this time, the state was purchasing approximately one hundred artworks from the Salon annually. A chronological list of acquisitions from the Salon recorded by the Archives Nationales includes: Smith-Hald, Une station de bateaux à vapeur en Norvège, purchased 1880 Salon (Cote F/21/7650, folio 18); Skredsvig, Une ferme à Venoix (Normandie), purchased from 1881 Salon (Cote F/21/7651, folio 19); Edelfelt, Service divin au bord de la mer, purchased from 1882 Salon (Cote F/21/7652, folio 17); Heyerdahl, L’enfant malade, purchased from 1882 Salon (Cote F/21/2086); Salmson, Première communion en Picardie, purchased from 1882 Salon (Cote F/21/7652, folio 12); Larsson, L’étang à Grez-sur-Loing, purchased from 1884 Salon (Cote F/21/7654); Salmson, A la barrière de Dalby, à Skane (Suède), purchased from 1884 Salon (Cote F/21/7654, folio 10); Smith-Hald, Le vieux filet, purchased 1884 Salon, (Cote F/21/7654, folio 8); Edelfelt, Portrait de Monsieur Pasteur, purchased from 1886 Salon (Cote F/21/7655, folio 8); Österlind, A la maison mortuaire, purchased from 1887 Salon (Cote F/21/7657, folio 14); Skredsvig, Le soleil de Mars à Lépaud (Creuse), le soir, purchased from 1887 Salon (Cote F/21/7657, folio 28); Österlind, Fin de journée, purchased from 1888 Salon (Cote F/21/7658, folio 9); Zorn, Un pêcheur, purchased 1888 Salon (Cote F/21/7658, folio 17). Outside of the Salon, acquisitions were made at the Universal Exposition as well as at provincial salons. For example: Fritz Thaulow, L’hiver en Norvège, purchased 1889 and attributed to the Musée du Luxembourg, Paris (Archives Nationales, Cote F/21/2114/A); Smith-Hald, Soir d’octobre en Norvège, purchased from 1886 Galerie de la Société des Amis des Arts, Bordeaux, Joconde: Portail des collections des musées de France, culture.gouv.fr. Accessed 2/12/2017
The augmentation the museum collections of Nordic paintings reflects trends in the acquisitions of other national groups. According to Véronique Wiesinger, in her study of artists from the United States in the Luxembourg’s collection, the museum acquired its first painting by an American in 1879 with Henry Mosler’s *Le Retour* – the same year that the museum acquired its first two Nordic paintings, Salmson’s *Une arrestation dans un village de Picardie* and Hagborg’s *La Grande Marée dans la Manche.*\(^{548}\) These two Swedes and one American were the only foreign artists to enter the museum amongst the fourteen Salon paintings acquired in 1879, alongside French works like Gustave Guillault’s *Laghouat; Sahara algérien* and Aimé Perret’s *La Saint-Viatique, en Bourgogne* [Fig. 4.13]. Just as Wiesinger notes that American paintings purchased by the French state tended to fall neatly in line with French aesthetics, so too a strong resemblance in both luminous painting technique and ethnographic and religious genre motifs connects the Luxembourg’s Nordic artists to the bulk of its French collection.\(^{549}\) Nonetheless, French acquisitions of Nordic art do seem exceptional in the 1880s insofar as they outshined their American colleagues. Although the French state would purchase six more paintings by American artists in the 1880s, no more paintings would enter the museum until 1889, with Walter Gay’s *le Bénédicité.*\(^{550}\) By contrast, six more paintings by Nordic artists including Thaulow, Salmson, Edelfelt, and Smith-Hald would enter the Luxembourg during the same span of time.

\(^{548}\) Wiesinger, “La politique d’acquisition de l’État français sous la Troisième République en matière d’art étranger contemporain,” 273

\(^{549}\) Wiesinger, “La politique d’acquisition de l’État français sous la Troisième République en matière d’art étranger contemporain,” 273

\(^{550}\) Wiesinger, “La politique d’acquisition de l’État français sous la Troisième République en matière d’art étranger contemporain,” 274
The paintings acquired further demonstrate the significance of the Nordic plein-air naturalists within the French art world. Representations of work, leisure, death, and landscape, all placed within a distinctly modern Nordic and French settings, comprise the entirety of this collection. Artists such as Edelfelt and Heyerdahl, who had made their reputations in the late 1870s in France through their historical and religious paintings, had firmly moved towards naturalism. One prime example of the success of Heyerdahl’s naturalistic style in France during this period is *L’Enfant malade* [Fig. 4.14]. Originally titled *L’Enfant mourant* when exhibited at the Salon of 1882, the painting depicts a scene of a family gathered around the crib of a dying child. One year earlier, in Petersen-Gade’s *Artistes Scandinaives*, Heyerdahl had depicted a similar scene with *Scène de famille*, depicting a boy attending the deathbed of an elderly relative. Although other artists like the Norwegian Christian Krohg and the Dane Michael Anker depicted similar motifs of sick children around the same year, Heyerdahl’s painting, much like his drawing, is exceptional in its harsh, unidealized rendering of death and expressive use of pigment, which had a profound impact on the young Edvard Munch.551 In France, the painting was not only sent to the museum of Riom (now called the Musée Mandet) after its purchase, but also earned Heyerdahl the Grand Prix de Florence, allowing Heyerdahl to spend 1883 and 1884 in Florence.552

552 “Grand Prix de Florence,” *Courrier de l’Art* (8 Juin 1882): 1. According to the *Revue générale de l’architecture et des travaux publics*, the biennial prize was founded in 1876 by the journal *l’Art* and was open to all artists of any nationality less than 26 years of age, allowing two years of study in Florence through an award of 5,000 francs. C.D., “Concours
Explicit representations of life in the Nordic countries purchased by the state, including Salmson’s, *A la barrière de Dalby, à Skane (Suède)*, and Thaulow’s *L’hiver en Norvège* [Fig. 4.15], likewise conformed to the decade’s taste for depictions of the modern world. Many paintings acquired in prior decades, such as Höckert’s, *Un prêche dans une chapelle de la Laponie suédoise* (purchased 1856), Tidemand’s *La toilette de la mariée* (acquired 1861), and Zetterstöm’s *Intérieur lapponais* (acquired 1875), are images expressive of a world of unchanging traditions, set against picturesque, even exotic scenery. In the case of both Höckert’s and Zetterström’s Lapland paintings, both artists had traveled far from their native residences to the northernmost territories of Sweden to depict the Sami people. Salmson, by contrast, sets his Swedish peasant genre painting within the gentle plains of Sweden’s southernmost – and much more accessible – region of Skåne, where the artist traveled to in 1883 as well as in later years. An avid sportsman, Thaulow depicts a scene of modern leisure as men and women ski outside a farm in Vester Aker, right outside of Christiania (now Oslo), where he was born.

Both Thaulow’s and Salmson’s paintings would be chosen to be hung in the musée du Luxembourg, along with several other paintings by Nordic artists that decade including a second painting by Salmson, *Première communion en Picardie*, Smith-Hald’s *Le vieux filet*, Edelfelt’s *Service divin au bord de la mer*, Zorn’s *Un pêcheur*, along with Larsson’s aquarelle, *pour le Grand Prix de Florence,* "Revue générale de l'architecture et des travaux public, 4e série, 3e volume, (1876) : 40


To have an artwork acquired by the French State and hung in a museum was a feat sought-after by Nordic artists. Pride of place was given to having a work placed in the Musée du Luxembourg, France’s national museum of contemporary art, situated in the middle of Paris, visible to colleagues, art critics, and potential patrons throughout the city. Though still a national museum by definition, the Luxembourg had been slowly augmenting its collection of foreign artists since the late 1870s, including Salmson’s *Une arrestation dans un village de Picardie* and Hagborg’s *Grande marée dans la Manche*.

Seeing the paintings of many of his Nordic colleagues enter the Musée du Luxembourg emboldened Thaulow to seek the same honor. After receiving an offer to have his painting *L’hiver en Norvège* acquired by the French State following the Universal Exposition of 1889, Thaulow agreed to sell the work for 1,200 francs – on the sole condition, however, that the painting be hung in the Musée du Luxembourg. It was by no means uncommon for artists to negotiate prices, solicit the purchase of works, or have influential colleagues write in on one’s behalf to try to sway arts administrators into buying a painting. There are many examples of letters from Nordics artists addressed to the Direction des Beaux-Arts offering the sale of a painting after the Salon, some of which were met with success and others not. Thaulow’s request, nonetheless, managed to ruffle the...
feathers of Étienne Arago, the successor of Philippe de Chennevières the museum’s curator since 1879. Responding to the Directeur des Musees nationaux, Albert Kaempfen, Arago expressed his opposition to the acquisition of Thaulow’s work. The museum, the curator complained, was already scheduled to take in twenty-five paintings that year, and Arago was unwilling to deaccession any more works to take in another painting. Moreover, Arago complains in a second letter, the Luxembourg already owned sixteen paintings by foreign artists, Arago complains, and taking Thaulow’s work would only encourage other foreign artists to try to have their paintings acquired by the Luxembourg as well.

Nonetheless, despite Arago’s role as curator of the Musée du Luxembourg, he had little say in what works would enter his museum. Museum acquisitions were instead largely decided by a committee of administrators and curators, the comité consultatif des musées nationaux. The comité consultatif, presided over by the Directeur des Musées Nationaux, and was composed of a panel of curators and adjunct curators, meeting twice a month to give their opinion on any propositions put forward by the director. The purpose of such a committee, set in place during the first decade of the Third Republic, was to limit the power of either the director or any single curator on making major administrative decisions.

---

*après la longue nuit d’hiver; - Norvège septentrionale and Funérailles, à Lopoten; - Norvège septentrionale* – writing directly to the Directeur without success, before instead selling them in England. Two letters, Otto Sinding to le Directeur des Beaux-Arts, Paris [1885]; Christiania, 5 juin 1885, Archives Nationales (Cote F/21/4341). Similar letters, both successful and unsuccessful, can also be seen in the artist files of Christine de Post, (F/21/173), Vilhelmina Zetterstöm (F/21/261), and Allan Österlind (F/21/4331) at the Archives Nationales.
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decisions, including the accession of an artwork. Arago was confident that the comité consultatif would vote against acquiring Thaulow’s work for the Luxembourg. In the past, the committee had already rejected several similar offers made by French painters, who unlike Thaulow, had offered their works for free in return. Given the debate surrounding Thaulow’s painting, the comité consultatif decided to visit the Universal Exposition to see L’hiver en Norvège in person. Going against Arago’s preliminary wishes, however, the comité consulatatif voted to acquire Thaulow’s painting for the Musée du Luxembourg.

The history behind how Thaulow’s L’hiver en Norvège entered the Musée du Luxembourg reveals that the acquisition of Nordic works for French museums should not necessarily be read as a reflection of the ideological concerns of a single curator. Without doubt, the Musée du Luxembourg’s collection of foreign artists rose during the 1880s, transforming from a national museum to an international museum. It was a shift that Philippe de Chennevières had attempted to push forward, and yet ultimately failed to realize, during his own career as the museum’s curator. Instead, this shift occurred during the tenure of Chennevières’ successor, Arago, who by contrast expressed resistance to the collection’s increasing internationalization. Arago counted sixteen paintings by foreign artists in 1889, while the Musée du Luxembourg’s catalogue reveals that 1884 there were only twelve. The normalization of internationalism is visible in the artists that were
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563 Notice des peintures, sculptures et dessins de l’École moderne exposés dans les galeries du Musée national du Luxembourg (Paris: Imprimeries réunis, établissement D, 1884)
exhibited as well. The Luxembourg was actively replacing its collection of paintings by foreign artists with new works produced by an increasingly diverse group. Of the eight foreign artists – all of whom were Swiss, Dutch, or German, and mostly longtime residents of France – Chennevières counted in the Luxembourg’s collection in 1863, only two remained in 1884, even though the number of foreign painters increased to ten. Included within this group are the American Henry Mosler, the Italian Joseph de Nittis, the Finn Edelfelt, and the Swedes Hagborg and Salmson.

While it is difficult to pinpoint the cause of the subtle transformation of the Musée du Luxembourg’s collection on a single individual’s will or a single institutional policy, it is evident, as I have argued throughout this and the preceding chapter, that France’s community of foreign artists coming to train or exhibit was increasingly an object of discussion for many French writers and cultural critics during the Third Republic. Indeed, for a large segment of these writers, French identity was increasingly intertwined with the ideal of cosmopolitanism. This broad belief in the national importance of internationalism in the arts would begin to transform into policy at the decade’s end through the work of Léonce Bénédite, Aragot’s attaché since 1886. Bénédite is broadly credited with the transformation of Musée du Luxembourg into an international museum, greatly expanding the Luxembourg’s collection of foreign artists, and workings towards the creation of a special section of the museum designated solely towards their works.  

564 Letter from Philippe de Chennevières to le Comte de Nieuwerkerke, Surintendant des Beaux-Arts, Palais du Louvre 1863, Archives Nationales, Cote 20144785/2
Bénédite would not replace Arago as the museum’s curator until 1892, according to Véronique Wiesinger, he was already allowed to play a significant role in the influencing the museum’s acquisitions in 1889. By 1894, after only two years of assuming the role of curator, the Musée du Luxembourg now housed fifty-one paintings by foreign artists in a collection of 326 paintings, of which ten were created by Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, and Finnish artists, alongside artists from an increasingly diverse array of nations including Spain, Russia, and Scotland.

The sizable presence of Nordic artists at the Salon, in Parisian galleries, and in French museums, the visibility of which was bolstered by largely positive critical reviews, undoubtedly played a significant role in bolstering the argument of Opportunist-leaning writers and critics that France’s role and destiny in Europe was rooted in internationalism. Finnish artists too, mainly through the major success of Edelfelt, were now included within the ranks of les écoles scandinaves alongside Denmark, Sweden, and Norway; and yet there were relatively few successes to be counted amongst Danish artists. The Luxembourg would not acquire any Danish paintings during the 1880s, and very few medals were won by Danish artists at the Salon. Just as l’école finlandaise largely rested on the shoulders of Edelfelt, l’école danoise’s presence in Paris was largely due to Krøyer, and yet Krøyer, did not receive nearly the number of accolades or the same amount of press attention as Edelfelt. As the influential art history professor and Louvre curator Georges Lafenestre would remark at the Universal Exposition of 1889, Denmark lagged behind the other Scandinavian schools, and even their best artist, Krøyer, was no match to others such as

\[566\] Wiesinger, “La politique d’acquisition de l’État français sous la Troisième République en matière d’art étranger contemporain,” 263
Heyerdahl, Zorn, and Gallen-Kallela. Nonetheless, an artist’s reputation in France depended not just on technical virtuosity, but also the ability to make personal connections. Much like his predecessor Elizabeth Jerichau-Baumann and his contemporary colleague Frits Thaulow, Krøyer tended to be gregarious and tenacious, helping him build an expansive international social circle. Denmark’s reputation would shift at the close of the decade, thanks in large part due to Krøyer’s work helping set up the Exhibition of French Art (Udstillingen af Franske Kunstværker) in Copenhagen in 1888. Arranged by the brewer and art collector Carl Jacobsen with the aid of Krøyer, the exhibition would not only be a major presentation of French artworks in Denmark, showing over 600 artworks of diverse media, but also bring some of France’s top artists, administrators, and other notable persons to Copenhagen, including Antonin Proust, Louis Pasteur, and Pierre Puvis de Chanvannes, to serve as delegates. The Exhibition of French Art was conceived as an accompaniment of The Nordic Exhibition of Industry, Agriculture, and Art (Den Nordiske Industri-, Landbrugs- og Kunstudstilling), which featured over 1000 diverse works by Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian artists. Both the Nordic and French exhibitions would be important to elevating the exposure to Danish art to French critics, while reaffirming the notion of a natural friendship shared by the countries of Denmark and France.

The Exhibition of French Art in Copenhagen, 1888

The Nordic Exhibition of Industry, Agriculture, and Art and the Exhibition of French Art both opened in Copenhagen during the late spring and summer of 1888. Along with
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Krøyer’s aid, the Exhibition of French Art was organized primarily by Carl Jacobsen and the architect Vilhelm Klein. Writing to Krøyer in the February of 1888, Jacobsen stated that he desired to advertise the show as, “The biggest and most significant exhibition of French art outside France ever taken place.” Displaying over six hundred artworks, Jacobsen’s exhibition of French art was almost certainly the largest Denmark had ever seen, and by no means insignificant. The exhibition not only featured numerous paintings by popular contemporary artists like Alfred-Philippe Roll and Jean-Léon Gérôme, but works from of France’s most celebrated artists of the century, including the Romantic painter Eugène Delacroix, the Realists Edouard Manet and Gustave Courbet, the Impressionist Claude Monet, the Barbizon painters Charles Daubigny and Théodore Rousseau, and recently deceased masters such as the Naturalist Jules-Bastien-Lepage and the Orientalist Gustave Guillaumet.

The organization of the French Art Exhibition was similarly bolstered by famous French names. Jacobsen gathered a group of French artists, intellectuals, and politicians to help organize the exhibition, bringing in established painters including Pierre Puvis de Chavannes, Jean-Léon Gérôme, Léon Bonnat, the sculptor Louis-Ernest Barrias, the architects Charles Garnier and Lucien Magne, the dealer Georges Petit, and several of the younger generation of naturalist painters at Georges Petit’s gallery including Carolus-Duran, Alfred-Philippe Roll, and Albert Besnard. The group was led by former Ministre
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569 The numerous letters sent by Petit to Klein in the Carl Jacobsen Letter Archive held in the Carlsberg Foundation reveal that the dealer played a significant role in bringing artists together for the Exhibition of French Art. The Exhibition of French Painting was seen at
des Arts Antonin Proust, serving as president alongside Louis Pasteur, the group’s honorary president. Beyond being one of France’s leading celebrities due to the creation of his rabies vaccine in 1885, Pasteur had been a friend and colleague of Jacobsen’s for several years, with his work on pasteurization having been of vital importance to the collector’s brewing practice. Krøyer painted a group portrait of the French committee alongside their Danish colleagues, including Pasteur, Klein, the painter Tuxen, and Krøyer himself. The painting might well be read as Krøyer’s response to Edelfelt’s famed portrait of Pasteur, which was heralded for its naturalistic rendition of the famed modern scientist at work in his lab. Painted in luminous tones that emphasize the competing natural and artificial light sources, the painting depicts some of the leading artists, scientists, politicians, and businessmen hard at work in their collaboration, working long into the afternoon as the sunlight begins to dim. The painting is a manifesto of the liberal belief in the progress of society through the merger of art, science, and capitalism, propelled forward by a fraternity of Danish and French thinkers.

The Gazette des Beaux-Arts would provide substantial coverage of both the Nordic and French exhibitions, with art critic Maurice Hamel reviewing the Exposition of Fine Arts and Industry, while the art historian André Michel along with architect Lucien Magne – who three years later would teach the history of architecture at the École nationale des

least in part as a commercial opportunity, as many of the works in the exhibition catalogue were listed with a sale price, some of which reached up to 20,000 or 30,000 francs. According to Frank Clastrat, Jacobsen himself bought numerous sculptures and paintings from exhibiting artists including Jules Bastien-Lepage, Carolus-Duran, and Eugène Delaplanche. See for example, letter from Georges Petit to Vilhelm Klein, Paris, 14 février 1888, in which Petit discusses his correspondence with artists who will be shipping their works to Copenhagen. Clastrat, “Carolus-Duran et les Nordiques,” p. 47

beaux-arts de Paris⁵⁷¹ – wrote on the events surrounding the invitation of the French Committee to the Exhibition of French Art. One of the most noteworthy persons to cover the event would be the politician and art historian Armand Dayot, Inspecteur des Beaux-Arts and future founder of the review L’Art et Les Artistes, writing a two-part review of the events in Copenhagen for Le Figaro. The words of Michel and Dayot would have weight, as both men were founding figures of art history in France. The relationship established between Krøyer, Dayot, and Michel would perpetuate further dialogue between the two French historians and Nordic artists over the next two decades. Both Dayot and Michel would publish further articles shining a positive light on Nordic artists, portraying them as leaders of modern art, and in Dayot’s case, leading to personal relationships.⁵⁷² Not only would Dayot maintain a correspondence with Krøyer for years after the exhibition,⁵⁷³ but also form a close friendship with the Swedish painter Anders Zorn throughout his life, with Zorn creating an etching of Dayot’s wife in 1890, and Dayot helping arrange a meeting two years later between Zorn and La Vie de Jésus author Ernest Renan, during which the artist created his portrait of the author.⁵⁷⁴ Zorn’s famous etching of Renan [Fig. 4.16], which

⁵⁷¹ Therrien, L’histoire de l’art en France, p. 471
⁵⁷³ Undated letters 2859-2862 from Armand Dayot to P.S. Krøyer, DHS. P.S. Krøyers arkiv, Den Hirschsprungske Samling, Copenhagen, Denmark.
bears a dedication to Dayot from Renan, was so highly prized by the art historian that he exhibited the work at Georges Petit’s gallery that same year.575

The French Committee along with several journalists were invited by Jacobsen to Copenhagen to see the exhibitions of French and Nordic art. Jacobsen did much to flatter his French guests, treating them lavishly over a series of several days and throwing several celebrations in their honor, all filled with tricolor flags, patriotic anthems, toasts to the French nation, and to the delight of the French guests, many francophone Danes. Jacobsen also took the opportunity to show off his own country’s own cultural riches, taking them on tours of Rosenborg and Frederiskborg castles, the Thorvaldsen Museum, and the Museum of Nordic Antiquities (the predecessor to the National Museum of Denmark), the latter of which greatly impressed French journalist with its collection of bejeweled medieval works whose decorative splendor seemed to place it beyond the paradigms of European culture.576

Underneath the celebrations of Franco-Danish friendship loomed allusions to the mutual antipathy towards an enemy – Germany. “Hip! Hurrah! Pour le Danemark,” writes Dayot, mimicking a typical Danish toast, “le seul pays de l’Europe qui jamais ne porta les armes contre nous.”577 Since the loss of the Franco-Prussian War in 1871, many art critics and writers across the humanities issued praise for the Nordic countries as a means of implicitly critiquing Germany, opposing the image of an expansive, barbaric, and bellicose

576 Magne remarks that the antiquities seemed to suggest “une origine orientale.” Lucien Magne, “Correspondance de Copenhague, Artistes Français en Danemark,” Gazette des Beaux-Arts, tome 38, period 2 (1888): 163
German Empire to that of the diminutive, cultured, and peaceful Nordic kingdoms. The narrative that the Scandinavian peoples had long ago given up their arms in favor of artistic pursuits was reiterated by the French convey sent to Copenhagen. Reporting on the group’s tour of the Scandinavian Antiquities Museum in Denmark, Magne recalls – with Michel recounting the same event in his own article – the observations of Antonin Proust on the transition of the Danes from a band of nomadic warriors to a civilization of artists:

[Danemark est] un pays qui croit encore à autre chose qu’a la force et où les conquêtes de l’art et de la science sont glorifiées de préférence à toutes les autres. Comme le disait excellement M. Antonin Proust, après notre visite au Musée des Antiquités scandinaves « Que reste-t-il aujourd’hui de ces illustres guerriers, ensevelis jadis avec leurs armes, sinon les œuvres d’art trouvées dans leurs tombeaux? »

Proust no doubt intended his comment as a compliment to his Danish hosts, comprised of artists and art collectors alike; yet the critique of Germany is nonetheless a fundamental subtext of Proust’s praise. The backdrop of mutual resentment felt towards Germany for the annexation of Danish and French territories had been reinforced through the beginning of the trip, given that the French Committee had to traverse the German Empire – including Holstein – to reach Copenhagen. Without needing to mention the events of recent history, the French critics evoked the unsaid memories of the past through their impressions of the landscape, their interactions with German soldiers, and their descriptions of the heavy fortifications that remained near the country’s border with Denmark.

The only direct criticism of Germany came from Magne, the architectural historian, who could not resist denouncing the derivative nature German Gothic monuments, describing the Cologne
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Cathedral as “un pastiche de nos monuments français du moyen âge, insuffisamment étudiés et mal compris.”\textsuperscript{580}

Similar undertones of revanchism echoed in the kind words and gestures bestowed by the Danes upon their French guests. One of the first celebratory events welcoming the French Committee took place on Danish naval draped in tricolor flags, where the guests were invited on board to sound of a band playing \textit{La Marseillaise}. The vessel on which these patriotic festivities was the Helgoland, named after an archipelago which was site of several decisive naval battles that occurred during both Schleswig Wars. At the Universal Exposition of 1867, Danish marine painter Carl Dahl had even exhibited a painting depicting the 1864 Battle of Helgoland (also spelled Heligoland), in which the artist depicted the destruction of the Austrian ship \textit{Schwarzenberg} by the Danish navy. Just as importantly, however, the Helgoland islands was a former Danish territory ceded to England after the Napoleonic Wars, and which just two years later in 1890 would be peacefully annexed by Germany. The vessel’s commander would delicately evoke the shared national traumas of geographical disfigurement at the hands of German in proposing a toast to France, “toujours belle, quoique mutilée comme la Vénus de Milo,”\textsuperscript{581} and meeting with uproarious applause from his guests.

Such references to past conflicts were not also without contemporary political context, of course. The moderate Republican Opportunists coming to power during the early 1880s were challenged by a surge of nationalist, right-wing activity throughout the second half of the decade. The most iconic figure to emerge from this political shift is
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General Boulanger, the Minister of War from 1886-87, whose bellicose, anti-German, populist ideals inspired for several years a movement of likeminded politicians and supporters, known as Boulangists. Many of those promoting revanchist sentiment during the period advocated for the establishment of a Franco-Russian alliance to counter the Triple Alliance of Germany, Austria-Hungary, and Italy. At least one author proposed the inclusion of Denmark in the Franco-Russian alliance, anonymously penning a lengthy treatise titled, *L’Alliance Triple de Demain*. The author recounts a long history of Franco-Danish exchanges going back as far as the seventeenth century, and emphasizing the nation’s mutual humiliation at the hands of Prussia. Unlike many French texts of a similar nature, however, the author repeatedly expresses regret for Napoleon III’s abandonment of the Danes in 1864, and even dedicates his book to the fallen Danish soldiers of the Battle of Düppel in 1864.

As Robert Jay argues, right-wing politics deeply affected the arts during this period as well, leading to the rise of organizations such as the *Ligue des Patriots* and *Revanche*, who promoted French art and protested German cultural events, as well as the proliferation of military paintings throughout the decade. Two of the most emblematic military paintings of the late-1880s would appear together at the 1888 Salon – *Le Rêve*, by French painter Édouard Detaille, and *La Fin d’un Héros* [Fig. 4.17], by Swedish painter Nils Forsberg. *Le Rêve* depicts young recruits of the Republican army dreaming of France’s glorious military past, with an army of both Imperial and Republican soldiers waving the
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tricolor flag charging through the clouds above the sleeping soldiers’ encampment.

Forsberg’s *La Fin d’un Héros* looks back to a more somber but no-less-dramatic military past, depicting a scene from the Siege of Paris in which a dying soldier receives his last rites. Both paintings received great acclaim and garnered the jury’s highest honors, with Detaille’s painting receiving a Médaille d’Honneur, and Forsberg’s painting receiving a First-Class Medal. *Le Rêve* was acquired by the Musée du Luxembourg and *La Fin d’un Héros* was purchased by Swedish collector August Röhss, who toured it around Sweden, and back in France again for the 1889 Universal Exposition, before donating it to Sweden’s Naitonalmuseum.585 Several journals spoke of the broad popular appeal of Forsberg’s painting as well, noting that *La Fin d’un Héros* was widely reproduced through engravings.586 Although critics widely lauded the painting for its patriotic sentiment, at least one writer was critical of its nationalism, calling it a “mélodrame chauvin.”587

The exhibition of Nordic art featured 519 Danish paintings, along with 54 Swedish paintings, 136 Norwegian paintings, organized by country. Though Finland was not included, Edelfelt exhibited alone as the sole finsk kunstner, showing only one painting, though arguably his most famous – his portrait of Louis Pasteur. The exhibition was covered by Maurice Hamel for the Gazette des Beaux-Arts, and was the likely the largest exhibition of Nordic art reviewed by a French critic. Hamel’s review is a succinct summary of the origin story that had developed around Nordic art during the years of the Third Republic. At the opening of his review, Hamel informs the reader that Nordic art is a young
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school founded only ten years earlier in 1878 at the Paris Universal Exposition. In Hamel’s words, Nordic artists came to the Universal Exposition like the Hajj (l’hégire), leaving behind them the fleeting influences of Munich and Düsseldorf, and learning from the practices of Millet and Bastien-Lepage.588

Similar narratives accounting for the birth of the Scandinavian schools in the acceptance of French naturalism and the rejection of German influence had been pronounced by numerous critics for more than a decade. One novel addition to Hamel’s review, however, is the critic’s inclusion of the contemporary French painters Besnard, Roll, Carrière, Cazin, Raffaëlli, and Monet as key figures guiding the development of Nordic painting.589 Each one of these artists exhibited at the contemporaneous Exhibition of French Art in Copenhagen, and had been involved with Société international de peintres et sculpteurs. In effect, Hamel canonized the naturalist, cosmopolitan, secessionist model of art associated with Georges Petit’s gallery as being at core of contemporary Nordic painting.

Though francocentric in his judgments, Hamel’s criticism was not born out of an of ignorance of the history of Nordic painting outside of France. Within his review, Hamel outlines a substantial and studied history of Danish art from the first half of the nineteenth century, drawing a line between the naturalist painters of present-day Denmark and their predecessors including Christoffer Wilhelm Eckersberg, Johan Thomas Lundbye, Peter Christian Skovgaard, and Christen Købke. Few French art critics had ever recognized the artists of the Golden Age, let alone tried to weave them in a narrative of Danish national art

589 Hamel, “La Peinture du Nord,” 388
history. Hamel ascribed the greatest importance to Lundbye, seeing him as the first artist to interpret the Danish landscape. Hamel describes Lundbye in a manner echoing Zola’s description of Manet, praising his “notes blondes,” his “délicate vision de coloriste,” and the “simplicité” of his work.590 “Enfin,” Hamel remarks, echoing Zola once more, “s’il ne sait pas tout dire, il dit l’essentiel . . .”591 The implicit comparison between Lundbye and Manet is significant. Manet, who had recently passed away in 1883, was in the early stages of becoming canonized as the father of French modern art. Louise Gonse famously described Manet “le symptôme précurseur d’une révolution”592 in 1884, while many of Paris’ artistic milieu, including Hamel, would petition the Musée du Luxembourg to acquire Manet’s Olympia in 1890.593 Hamel interpreted the current state of Danish art in similarly avant-gardist terms, quipping that rather than going through a “révolution,” Danish painting was “en pleine évolution.”594

In Hamel’s view, the seeds for Denmark’s artistic evolution came from within, sowed by the artists of the Golden Age; however, it was only through the nurturing of France that modern art could further grow. The French art critic was critical of what he believed to the isolationist nationalism of Niels Laurits Høyen. “[Høyen] voulait un art d’inspiration locale, en quoi il n’avait pas tort,” argues Hamel, “mais il oubliait que les progrès accomplis dans l’expression pittoresque appartiennent à tout le monde (d’autant qu’ils sont presque toujours des vérités retrouvées), et qu’avec les mêmes méthodes on peut dire des choses
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fort différentes." After a period of stagnation, held back by a fear of outsiders, Danish art once more flourished when the artists came to Paris in 1878, gathering from the Exposition and from French museums the new method of painting light and nature. For this reason, Hamel found the greatest value in the plein-air Skagen painters such as Krøyer, but also the interiors of Viggo Johansen, another Danish painter known in Paris. Within Johansen’s genre paintings such as *La Grande Mère*, Hamel found an excellent balance between modern chromo-luminous principles and native intimism that French critics had appreciated within Danish art since the earliest Universal Exposition; and if Johansen and Krøyer stood as the present masters of the Danish school, he saw the future in artists still relatively unknown in Paris, including Georg Paulsen, Vilhelm Hammershøi, L. A. Ring, and Joakim Skovgaard.

In contrast to the progress Hamel saw in Danish art, Hamel was much less impressed with the Swedish section of the Copenhagen Exhibition. On the one hand, Hamel complained, the Swedes were still producing the same style of work that they had a decade earlier. On the other hand, unlike the Danes, who still guarded the distinct imprint of their forbearers, the Swedes expressed little of a national imprint. Amongst an exceedingly mediocre group of paintings, the only painting Hamel singled out was Richard Bergh’s pastel, *Matin*. Though French critics valued seeing their own reflection in Nordic art, there was a fine line dividing being fashionably international and being derivative. “Très assimilateurs les artistes suédois se laissent facilement prendre aux petites habiletés qui
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sont monnaie courante à Paris,” Hamel concludes in his short review; “ils devraient avoir le
courage de rester eux-mêmes.”

The tables had quickly turned for Denmark and Sweden. Since the Second Empire,
Danish artists had always played second fiddle to Swedish artists in France, who almost
always garnered the most awards, the longest and most praiseworthy reviews, and the
greatest number of acquisitions. Regarding Norwegian artists, French critics had long been
attracted to the so-called exotic qualities of their landscape and genre paintings, going back
to the first Universal Exposition. Hamel’s praise for the Norwegian section in Copenhagen
recalls the excitement that critics felt towards Adolph Tidemand in 1855:

On respire un air plus réconfortant dans la section norvégienne. Tout y est franc et
sain, d’une fraîcheur d’impression qui agit sur les nerfs comme un tonique. Moins
intime et moins savant que l’art danois, cette jeune École, forte allégée de traditions,
entreprenante et robuste, part bravement à la conquête du monde extérieur. Ils
savent mettre l’unité d’harmonie sur de vastes surfaces, ils abordent le plein-air
hardiment sans supercheries et peignent à ciel ouvert en gens qui n’ont pas froid aux
yeux ni aux doigts.

Norwegian artists embodied the naïveté that Hamel found attractive in Nordic art the
Copenhagen exhibition, confirming the naturalist, anti-Academic philosophy from which
his criticism sprung. The critic was particularly drawn to Skredsvig, who already had more
than one painting purchased by the French state by 1888. His paintings expressed the
poetic “l’amour du silence” that complimented Norwegian art’s brusque exterior. Along
with Skredsvig, Hamel also praised the works of Elif Peterssen, Nils Hansteen, and Kitty
Kielland, singling out her painting Après le coucher du soleil.
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While Hamel’s review of Danish art tended to focus on painters already well-established in France before 1888, his review of Norwegian art incorporated a broader scope of artists. Hamel also wrote at length on Krohg and Werenskiold, both of whom, along with Kielland, would be heralded within their own countries as leaders of Norway’s National Romantic school. Though all three artists had all been associated with Petersen-Gade’s gallery at the beginning of the decade, none were particularly known in France. Hamel singles out Werenskiold’s Enterrement de paysan, a now-canonical painting depicting the burial of a Norwegian peasant painted within the naturalist style, and being one of the few times that the judgments of French critics would align with that of their Norwegian counterparts.599

The Copenhagen exhibitions of Nordic and French art significantly vitalized Danish painting in the eyes of French critics. The Danish painting exhibition, substantially larger than the Danish section at any of the Universal Expositions, affirmed a national history rooted in plein-air painting that led up to the contemporary Skagen painters. A decade earlier at Universal Exposition of 1878, the success of Carl Bloch convinced French critics that Danish art was entrenched in the so-called (and by then unfashionable) School of David. Now in 1888, rather than seeming inert, Danish art not only seemed up-to-date, but in the modernist ethos, truly progressive, demonstrating its own evolution from within its own national history, as well as its active synthesis with contemporary global – particularly French – artistic practices. Just as importantly, the exhibitions established personal bonds between the French guests and Danish hosts that would continue to resonate into the future. Writing to Krøyer immediately after the exhibition, Dayot remarks, “Depuis mon
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Je ne puis faire un pas sans être questionné sur nos bons amis les Danois et sur leur fraternelle réception.” The organizers of the Exhibition of French Art had sufficiently flattered the French Committee through their lavish reception and displays of French patriotism, reaffirming that the friendship between the Danes and the French was not merely a personal affair, but tied the two nations together as allies as well.

Krøyer himself recognized the importance of maintaining the momentum of the Copenhagen exhibitions. Krøyer would serve as a committee member in the organization of the Danish art section at the Universal Exposition of 1889 and had high hopes for another success. As Thor Mednick describes it, Krøyer warned his colleague Johansen in January of 1889 that all of Europe – and particularly France – was now watching them, and that it was essential that the Danish exhibition in Paris meet the high public expectations now placed upon them. Krøyer’s hard work would pay off. More than fifteen Danish painters would win medals at the Universal Exposition that year, making it the country’s most successful exhibition in Paris, and leading to further success for Krøyer. Krøyer had built a circle of influential French colleagues around himself through his work in Copenhagen and Paris, including Jean-Charles Cazin, Alfred-Philippe Roll, Henri Gervex, and Albert Besnard. In 1890, these artists would help found the secessionist Salon the Société Nationale des Beaux-Arts, and it was undoubtedly Krøyer’s friendship with them through their exhibitions together at Georges Petit’s gallery and in Copenhagen that led to Krøyer’s
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600 Undated letter 2860 from Armand Dayot to P.S. Krøyer, DHS. P.S. Krøyers arkiv, Den Hirschsprungske Samling, Copenhagen, Denmark. Although Armand’s letter is undated, the author mentions to Krøyer that his article on the Copenhagen exhibitions will appear in eight days. Dayot’s article for Le Figaro, “Autour du Monde, de Paris à Copenhague, notes et impressions,” appeared on July 7th, 1888, situating his letter around June 29th.
induction as a member to the otherwise exclusive society. Krøyer’s friendship with Besnard would be particularly close beginning in 1888 as their correspondence reveals, with the two artists gifting one another several of their own works.⁶０² A decade later, in 1899, Besnard would donate one his paintings by Krøyer, Bateaux de pêche, to the Musée du Luxembourg, the artist’s first work to enter the national collection.

Finally, the Copenhagen exhibitions proved to be significant not only for Denmark, but for the historical reception of artists from the other Scandinavian countries as well. By presenting Danish, Swedish, and Norwegian painters together under the same roof, the Copenhagen exhibition reaffirmed the unity of Scandinavian art in the eyes of French critics, while also allowing critics to parse out differences between each of the national écoles. The Universal Exposition of 1889 would give rise to some of the most expansive attempts at classifying les écoles scandinaves in French art critical literature, while also being undoubtedly its biggest critical success yet.

The Universal Exposition of 1889

The fourth Universal Exposition was to be a crowning achievement for both France and the Nordic countries as well. It would be remembered for its lavish visual display of technological progress. Colored electric lights stretched up the newly-erected Eiffel Tower and along the Champs de Mars enchanted visitors with an atmosphere of unparalleled modern spectacle alongside other inventions such as gas-powered vehicles and phonograms. Alongside being a celebration of technological accomplishment, the Universal

⁶０² Armand Dayot to P.S. Krøyer, letters 2817, 7 juillet 1888, and 2818, décembre 1888, DDHS. P.S. Krøyers arkiv, Den Hirschsprungske Samling, Copenhagen, Denmark.
Exposition of 1889 marked the centennial anniversary of the French Revolution. First conceived by Jules Ferry nearly a decade earlier in the early stages of the Opportunists’ triumph over the MacMahon’s monarchist coalition, the exposition was a tribute to the perseverance of Republican principles throughout a century of wars, revolutions, and both progressive and reactionary governments.603

Along with being the most spectacular Universal Exposition, 1889 would also be the most controversial. To the irritation of the exposition organizers, many of Europe’s monarchies, including Denmark, Great Britain, Russia, Germany, Austria, and Sweden, refused to participate on grounds of the event’s revolutionary backdrop. Around thirty governments chose to officially participate, amongst whom were the United States, Haiti, the Republic of Chile, Greece, and Norway.604 Despite the official abstention of numerous governments, many private organizations took the reins to ensure that their nations would be represented in the displays of fine arts and industry in Paris. In the case of the Grand-Duchy of Finland, the nonparticipation of Russia was a boon, allowing for the first time an independent Finnish exhibition to be mounted by a private Finnish commission.

**Overview of the Danish, Swedish, Norwegian, and Finnish Exhibitions**

The Palais des Beaux-Arts on the Champ de Mars would once again house the exhibition of international artworks. Denmark, Sweden, and Norway would all be situated next to one another on the second floor of the Palais, sandwiched between Belgium and the United
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604 Picard, *Exposition universelle internationale de 1889 à Paris*, tome premier, 356-360
States. Denmark would continue its path to resurgence, staging its largest exhibition yet, which featured nearly two-hundred paintings and drawings by more than seventy artists. For the first time ever, the Danish exhibition rivaled that of Sweden, who had a comparable number of works on display by an equivalent number of artists. Norway had a smaller, but nonetheless significantly large exhibition featuring approximately 130 paintings and drawings by nearly sixty artists. The Finnish exhibition would be situated on the ground floor apart from the other Nordic galleries. Though the Finnish exhibition was independent from Russia, whose art exhibition was also privately-organized in 1889, the Finnish galleries were nonetheless displayed surrounded by those of Russia, signaling the Grand-Duchy’s continued allegiance to the Empire. In comparison to the other Nordic countries, Finland would also have the smallest exhibition, featuring approximately sixty paintings and drawings by twenty artists.

In terms of juried awards, the Nordic countries would all do equally and outstandingly well. 1889 would be the most successful Universal Exposition for Nordic artists. Four of the eight Medals of Honor and Grand Prizes awarded at the exposition would go to Nordic artists, including Finland’s Edelfelt, Norway’s Werenskiold, Denmark’s Krøyer, and Sweden’s Bergh.

The exhibition would be a major success with French critics as well. Those reviewing the Nordic exhibitions in 1889, including Maurice Hamel, André Michel, Charles Ponsonailhe, and Georges Lafenestre, gravitated primarily towards the same artworks commended by the exposition jurors, and had few objections about the artworks exhibited. With regards to the Danish exhibition, the efforts Krøyer and the Danish organizing committee placed into the exhibition paid off, leading to a generally warm reception by the
critics. The Danish exhibition demonstrated a greater sense of diversity and cosmopolitan style favored by French critics. Though Carl Bloch, who was both praised and disparaged in 1878, exhibited again in 1889, the exhibition mainly excluded historical paintings in favor of portraits by artists such as Peder-Severin Krøyer and August Jerndorff, landscapes by Julius Paulsen and Viggo Pedersen, and Skagen paintings by Anna and Michael Ancher. Lighthearted interior scenes of Danish families and children playing continued to be a prominent motif, but the exacting brush of Julius Exner – well-regarded during the Second Empire, but panned by French critics in 1878 – was replaced by the naturalist style of artists such as Otto Haslund, who would win a bronze medal that year through works such as *Concert* [Fig. 4.18]. It was Viggo Johansen, however, who would be considered the leader of the Danish intimist style, winning both a gold medal for his paintings along with the praise of Hamel, Ponsonailhe, and Michel. The only major critique came from Lafenestre, who argued that the Danes continued to fall behind the rest of the Nordic painters.605

The Swedish exhibition highlighted artists already well-established in France, such as Wahlberg, Salmson, and Hagborg, borrowing several their works from the Luxembourg collection. Critics, however, largely focused on the younger generation of artists who had gained popularity in France over the last decade, including Bergh, Zorn, and Larsson. Bergh would prove to be the favorite amongst the critics, who appreciated his intuitive brushwork and composition, praising his "naïveté intelligente"606 and the "vérité sentie"607 of his works. Above all, it was Bergh's portraits that stood out to critics,
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especially the portrait of his wife, *Ma Femme* [Fig. 4.19], which Michel would herald as masterpiece. Larsson’s sole painting exhibited, *Triptych* [Fig. 4.20], for which he received a gold medal, also stood out to critics. The painting, rendered as an allegory of the history of painting, was composed of three panels, with *La Renaissance* taking the central panel, the *le XVIIIe siècle* forming the left wing, and *L’Art moderne* forming the right wing. Although *La Renaissance* was given compositional priority, standing for the foundation of all arts, critics payed the greatest attention to *L’Art moderne*. Centered on the banks of the Seine with a half-constructed Eiffel Tower in the background, and painted in a luminous palette with blue pigments simulating plein-air effects, the Swedish artist's painting unequivocally affirmed critics’ belief that Paris was the capital of arts in Europe, and would continue to be so in the future.

A large contingent of the Swedish exhibition clearly strove towards flattering France, receiving both the admiration of critics, but also a warning by Michel against the dangers of excessive imitation. The Norwegian exhibition, by contrast, seemed completely novel to the French critics. Lafenestre would describe the artists of Norway as the “plus rebelle à l’assimilation,” while Michel would liken the exhibition to, “fraiches bouffées d'air pur, de vivifiantes brises de mer, de montagnes et de glaciers . . .” One of the noticeably new aspects of the Norwegian exhibition was the large assembly of recent summer night paintings by the Fleskum artists, including Skredsvig’s *la Nuit de Saint-Jean en Norvège* [Fig. 4.21], Elif Peterssen’s *Nuit d’été*, Kielland’s *Après le coucher du soleil*, and
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Munthe’s le Soir à Eggedal. Alongside these paintings, critics such as Ponsonailhe would also single out the winter landscape paintings of Frits Thaulow for their “exotique” quality.\textsuperscript{612} The most commented-on painting, however, would be Erik Werenskiold’s l’Enterrement à la campagne, which Ponsonailhe described as the Norwegian exhibition’s best work, and which helped the artist receive the Grand Prix at the Universal Exposition.\textsuperscript{613}

The Finnish exhibition, despite having its own gallery space in the Palais des Beaux-Arts apart from Russia, would receive considerably less analysis from French critics. Most critics focused on the well-decorated Salon veteran Edelfelt – the only Finnish painter at the Universal Exposition to have won any medals in France – whom they unanimously described as the leader of the Finnish school. Along with his iron-clad reputation amongst French critics and juries, Edelfelt also had a sizable visual presence at the Finnish, showing eleven paintings and one watercolor, including his Portrait de M. Pasteur. Critics also tended to praise in passing the genre paintings of Edelfelt’s contemporaries Akseli Gallen-Kallela and Eero Järnefelt, along the early Finnish émigré to Paris, Adolf von Becker. What was distinct about the Finnish exhibition, however, was that despite its physical detachment from the other Nordic galleries in the Palais des Beaux-Arts, critics now grouped Finnish artists alongside Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, as part of the les artistes scandinaves.\textsuperscript{614} While artists of the Grand-Duchy of Finland had largely remained

\textsuperscript{612} Charles Ponsonailhe, “L’Art étranger à l’Exposition Unvierselle,” second article, \textit{La Grande Revue} 2\textsuperscript{nd} année, tome IV (1889): 181
\textsuperscript{613} Ponsonailhe, “L’Art étranger à l’Exposition Unvierselle,” 180
undistinguished from those of Russia at the prior Universal Expositions, since Edelfelt’s success in the beginning of the 1880s, French critics had slowly begun to isolate *l’art Finlandaise* as a distinct national style, and more akin to the art of Sweden than Russia. The grouping of Finland alongside Sweden, Denmark, and Norway in 1889, however, more broadly signals a shift towards the canonization of *l’art scandinave* within French literature as distinct pan-national group rooted in plein-air painting.

**Between Memory and Forgetting: The Historical Impulse in 1889**

Beneath the grand visual spectacle of technological progress, the Universal Exposition of 1889 was thickly underlined by the theme of historical reflection. In addition to coinciding with the centennial celebration of the start of the French Revolution, the Universal Exposition featured a retrospective of 1,600 French artworks dating from 1789 to 1889. Situated in the central galleries of Palais des Beaux Arts, with sculpture and architecture occupying the first floor and painting occupying the second floor, the exhibition featured works by celebrated French painters including David, Géricault, Delacroix, Corot and Millet, along with the more recently accepted oeuvres of Courbet, Manet, and Bastien-Lepage and even the works of living artists including Puvis de Chavannes, Meissonier, and Roll. Included in this collection are numerous now well-recognized paintings of nineteenth-century French art, including Manet’s *Olympia* (Musée d’Orsay), Courbet’s *Les Desmoiselles des bords de la Seine* (1857, Petit Palais), Corot’s *Le Bain de Diane* (1855, Musée des Beaux-arts de Bordeaux), Géricault’s *Officier de chasseurs à cheval de la garde impériale chargeant* (1812, Musée du Louvre); yet the objective of the Exposition Centennale was more than to house a collection of French masterworks. While
establishing a canon of nineteenth-century French masters, it also attempted to subsume these artists under an umbrella of art historical movements, tracing a progressive historical lineage from the past to the present.

Serving as the Inspecteur Principal de l'Exposition Centennale was Armand Dayot. His long introductory treatise in the Centennale’s catalogue, *Un siècle d’art*, develops the historical underpinnings of the exhibition, placing the life of each artist under the current of subsequent *grandes périodes*, beginning with *l’école classique* and *l’école romantique*, and up to *jeune école naturaliste*. The logic of Dayot’s treatise was to place the careers of notable artists within a flux of artistic reactions and developments, situating the artists within the context of each period’s historical milieu, alongside writers such as Théophile Thoré and Walter Scott, or the naturalist critic Jules-Antoine Castagnary. It not only canonized artists of the past, but affirmed the living generation of naturalist artists as leaders of *l’école française*. Historical retrospection had arguably always been essential to the Exposition Universelle’s philosophy of cultural and technological advancement, used frequently as a measure of progress by critics writing on the Expositions. However, the theoretical models of history had changed. Writing at the first Universal Exposition, Théophile Gautier understood the rise and fall of *écoles* as a cyclical force more or less outside of material cause, while the utopian outlook of early naturalist critics such as Castagnary tended to look at the history of art through the lens of teleology. Dayot’s writing on nineteenth-century art is subtly different in its adherence to – at least at face value – neutral evaluations of historical changes, and is indicative of much larger
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615 Armand Dayot, *Un Siècle d’Art: Notes sur la peinture française à l'Exposition Centennale des Beaux-Arts* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1889), 5-6, 69, 81
transformations in discipline of art history in France during the era. Only recently, in 1885, had the curator Georges Lafenestre inaugurated his course l’Histoire de la Peinture at the École du Louvre. As Lyne Therrien notes, Lafenestre’s course on the history of painting was the first of its kind in France, and would eventually lead to the first chaired professorship at the Louvre in art history in 1899 – thus affirming the study of art as a historical science rather than a philosophy of aesthetics.616

Nordic art would be swept up in the retrospective gaze that would shape the Universal Exposition, due again to the profound impact the Copenhagen Exhibition of French art continued to have on France’s leading art critics and administrators. Like the Centennale, Jacobsen’s exhibition in 1888 had brought together paintings by French artists from across the nineteenth century, from Romanticism to the contemporary Naturalist school. Moreover Jacobsen, like Dayot, had a similar view of which painters and movements should be given pride of place within the nineteenth century, emphasizing the works of artists including Delacroix, the Barbrizon painters Daubigny and Rousseau, and the recently deceased masters of the new school, Courbet, Manet, and Bastien-Lepage. Antonin Proust, acting as Commissaire Spécial, wrote the introduction to Dayot’s essay and catalogue for the Centennale. In the introduction, Proust would look back on his voyage to Copenhagen in 1888, crediting Jacobsen for having pioneered “la première Exposition centennale de l’Art Française,”617 and for having in part inspired the present exhibition:

Je garde de ce voyage un souvenir particulièrement cher, parce que nous avons pu constater à l’Exposition de Copenhague, avec quelle sûreté de jugement les peuples amis apprécient nos vertus. Pour bien voir les choses il y a, en effet, un recul indispensable. Nous n’avons nous-mêmes jamais aussi bien vu nos

616 Therrien, L’Histoire de l’Art en France, 203
compatriotes que de ce pays où on leur a fait se grand accueil, et nous devons savoir un gré infini à M. Carl Jacobsen de nous avoir permis de faire cette répétition de l’Exposition de 1889.618

According to Dayot, Proust already outlined an idea for a retrospective exhibition in 1885.619 Nonetheless, Proust’s flattery of Jacobsen underscores the residual impact the Copenhagen exhibitions of 1888 would have on that year’s reviews of contemporary Nordic painting, along with the profound effect historicist modes of thinking would have on that year’s exhibition reviews.

Lyne Therrien argues that art history emerges as a formal institution in France through the second half of the nineteenth century, beginning with the study of Medieval architecture at l’École des chartes in 1847 culminating with the creation of the Sorbonne’s first formal professorship of art history in 1899, held by Henry Lemonnier.620 Throughout this period of institutionalization, argues Therrien, the study of art was transformed from a discipline rooted in “aesthetic judgment” (jugement esthétique) to one of “historical justification,” (justification historique) whereby which artworks are organized into a chronology and subsumed under categories such as country and school.621 The transformation of the study of art from a philosophical to a historical discipline towards the end of the nineteenth century would have a noticeable impact on how critics approached Nordic art at the Universal Exposition of 1889. Two of the critics reviewing the Nordic exhibitions, Lafenestre and Michel, were both important figures in the development of art history as a formal discipline. Both were professors at the école du Louvre, where

618 Proust, “À Monsieur Armand Dayot,” vi
619 Dayot, Un Siècle d’Art, 3
621 Therrien, L’histoire de l’art en France, 29
Lafenestre taught the history of painting beginning in 1885 and Michel taught the history of medieval, Renaissance, and modern architecture since 1896. While neither Hamel nor Ponsonailhe were professional historians, they too adopted the burgeoning historicist manner of analysis, publishing books on topics including Dürer, Titian, Egyptian and Syrian Art, and the seventeenth-century French painter Sébastien Bourdon.

Each of these critics in their reviews of the Nordic exhibitions would exhibit different historicist modes of analysis in their reviews. For Lafenestre, the history of painting rested upon the dialogue and exchange between different nations across time. Taking a reductionist approach, Hamel theorized that art was an expression of cultural ideals, themselves the product of environmental and social conditions. In either case, art was understood as a product relative to the time and place of its production, which Ponsonailhe referred to as “l'heure historique,” and the role of the art critic was not only to judge but to assume “l'esprit d'impartialité" to evaluate works of art according to the relative values and conditions from which they arose. The historical impetus to locate cause and effect was paired with drive to demarcate and categorize different national

622 Therrien, L’histoire de l’art en France, 468-69
624 “L’histoire de la peinture, plus encore que celle de l’architecture et de la sculpture, parce que la matière transmissible y est plus mobile, n’est guère que l’histoire de ces échanges intermittents et réciproques d’exemples et d’excitations entre les différentes nations.” Lafenestre, “Les Peintres Étrangers à l’Exposition Universel de 1889,” 175
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styles. A great proliferation of écoles, Lafenestre argued, had arisen out of the conditions of exchange afforded by the Universal Expositions.\textsuperscript{628} Therefore, the development of taxonomies of national and regional schools of art became another prominent tendency of critics in 1889, and had a particularly strong impact on reception of \textit{l'art scandinave}.

While reviews of Nordic art at the prior Universal Expositions had followed a pattern of either debating or denying the existence of any one genuine school of art coming from the Nordic countries – oftentimes centering on the question of whether the Nordic artists were subservient to either France or Germany – 1889 would be the first Universal Exposition to find a general uniformity of opinion amongst critics, each of whom would affirm that the Nordic nations had developed their own distinct pan-national style. Critical discourse instead centered around what the interrelationship between each of the four Scandinavian nations – Denmark, Finland, Sweden, and Norway. Thus, the historical bent of the critics’ methodologies drove their reviews towards the development of artistic taxonomies through which the Nordic nations could be systemized and understood.

Both Ponsonailhe and Michel argued that \textit{l'école scandinave} was a homogenous group, even though each country formed its own national \textit{école} and exhibited independent characteristics. “\textit{Leur petite bande forme},” writes Michel, “\textit{dans la vielle Europe, une des écoles les plus homogènes et les plus vivantes, où chaque groupe, Norvégiens, Suédois et Danois, et on peut y ajouter les Finlandais, conserve, d’ailleurs, sa physionomie propre}.”\textsuperscript{629} The unity of the \textit{école}, both critics argued, arose from the unique qualities of Scandinavian nature, which the artists were only beginning to discover and exploit for their artworks.

\textsuperscript{628} Lafenestre, "Les Peintres Étrangers à l’Exposition Universel de 1889," p. 176
\textsuperscript{629} Michel, “Les Beaux-Arts à l’Exposition Universelle, Les écoles étrangères,” 1
through plein-air methods of painting. Like Ponsonailhe and Michel, Hamel and Lafenestre treated the four Scandinavian schools as unified; however, both critics also tended to emphasize the distinguishing characters of each of the national schools, and created more complex taxonomies. Referring to the pan-national group as “les écoles scandinaves” rather than as a singular école, Hamel distinguishes Denmark from the other Scandinavian countries, arguing that Danish art was in part “un prolongement de la Hollande,” while Norway and Sweden were united by pleinairism. Finnish art, on the other hand, was merely an annex of Swedish art, and therefore was not accorded the same level of national distinction as the other schools. Lafenestre agreed pleinairism distinguished Norway, Sweden, and Finland from Denmark. In contrast to Hamel, however, who argued that Finnish art lacked a national character distinct from that of Sweden’s, Lafenestre argued that it was Danish art that lacked true distinction. Noting the eclectic mix of painting genres and styles at the Danish exhibition, Lafenestre remarks that “l’école danoise est aussi à la recherche d’un art national,” falling behind the other schools.

Critics’ complaints were quite limited in 1889, paling in comparison to past accusations that Nordic art was derivative of – and inferior to – the art of Germany and France. Just eleven years prior to 1889, at the Universal Exposition of 1878, such polemical critiques of Nordic painting had amplified, with leading critics and historians including Charles Blanc, Gabriel Monod, and Edmond Duranty not only lambasting Nordic art as
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unoriginal, but also decrying the inherent ugly ness of Nordic nature. Above all the Danish exhibitions had consistently received the harshest treatment, labeled as cheap, monotonous, or even being outright ignored by critics sympathetic to the artists of Sweden and Norway, including Paul Mantz, Ernest Chesneau, and Louis Enault.

This turbulent reception history of Nordic painting in France since the 1850s makes the standout success of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and Finland in 1889 all the more relevant. Certainly, the Nordic countries had staunch defenders in the past, including Auguste Geffroy, Muarice Chaumelin, and Jules Claretie, and certain artists such as Johan Höffert, Adolph Tidemand, and Alfred Wahlberg, had been almost beyond reproach from even the harshest critics; but the uniform praise of the artists of the Nordic countries at the Universal Exposition of 1889 set the event as a landmark in the reception history of Nordic painting in France. Critics would voice in near-harmony their affirmation of Scandinavia, citing the school’s pan-national nature, the modernity of its artists, and the beauty of Nordic wilderness. Beyond merely marking a moment of celebrity or success, 1889 marks the canonization of *l’art scandinave* in France.

**National Romanticism: Canonizing l’Art Scandinave**

The exhibition of fine arts at the 1889 Universal Exposition was aimed at making sense of the history of the nineteenth century, placing contemporary French artists as the inheritor of a long evolution of artistic movements. Critics’ memories, however, were much shorter when it came to art from the Nordic countries. From the start of the Universal Expositions, critics commonly referenced the names of past artists deemed influential as a means of measuring the advancement – or denigration – of the Nordic exhibitions. To
summarize: in 1855, critics cited the deceased Neoclassical sculptors Bertel Thorvaldsen and Bengt Fogelberg; in the early 1860s, they became interested in the Swedish Rococo artists of the ancien régime, including Alexander Roslin and Gustaf Lundberg. By 1867 and the early 1870s, critics referred to prior standout artists at the Universal Expositions, including Höckert, Gude, Tidemand, Sweden’s King Charles XV; and in 1878, more than one critic looked to Eckersberg as a means of explaining the classical leanings of contemporary art in Denmark. Just one year earlier, at the Nordic Exhibition of Industry, Agriculture, and Art in Copenhagen, Hamel had looked back to the Danish Golden Age to explain the flourishing of plein-air painting in the 1880s. Yet critics would remain almost entirely silent about the longer-term history of Nordic art at the Universal Exposition of 1889.

In 1889, critics tended to describe l’école scandinave as a recent formation. Michel refers to Scandinavia as a “jeune école” in his review; yet it was not out of ignorance that the historian, along with the other critics, chose to remain largely silent on the history of Nordic art before the Third Republic. Hamel had similarly described Denmark, Sweden, and Norway as the “jeune École” in his 1888 review of the Nordic Exhibition. Although he would go on to describe the history of Danish art in length, Hamel informs the reader at the beginning of his article that the École’s origins were to be found in the Paris Universal Exposition of 1878. For Hamel, the artists of Scandinavia had remained in a state of semi-slumber before 1878, arrested by stifling isolationism on the one hand and the negative influences of Düsseldorf and Munich on the other, only to be liberated by the lessons of modern French artists such as Monet, Rafaëlli, and Roll. René Ménard had already proposed the idea that Scandinavian art had been liberated through the exposure to French
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pleinairist practices in 1878 at the start of the 1880s, but the narrative would take on full force at the decade’s end, when the success of Nordic art at the subsequent Universal Exposition seemed to affirm the triumph of French naturalism in the 19th century.

During the Universal Exposition of 1889, French critics would carry forward the narrative that the adoption of French pleinairist practices had unshackled the artistic abilities of Scandinavian artists, thus leading to the birth of the jeune école scandinave; however, explicit mention of the rejection of the Düsseldorf School would fall into the background of the writings of critics, who focused instead around a romanticized view of the Nordic peoples as artistic primitives, inspired by the purity of their cultural traditions and pristine nature. The word naïve would stand out prominently as word favored by critics to praise the artists of the Nordic countries. Ponsonailhe’s review articulates at length this ideal of the virginal Scandinavian temperament, writing: “La Suède, la Norvège et le Danemark, libres de traditions picturales, peuples tout palpitants d’une belle et féconde jeunesse, ont eu tôt fait de peser l’inanité de l’enseignement académique; sans hésitation aucune, ils ont adopté le plein-airisme qui était à la fois d’accord avec leur raison et leur tempérament.” Primitivism and naïveté, without doubt, two of the defining ideals of French art in the long nineteenth century, going back to primitifs of David’s atelier around 1800, and taking on renewed force at the time of the 1889 Universal Exposition, Paul Gauguin and his synthetist followers organized the Volpini Exhibition. Affirming the naïveté of Nordic artists, however, was crucial for French critics to argue that l’art scandinave was both a genuine expression of national character and yet also, paradoxically,
a product of French influence. The notion that naturalism was both a cosmopolitan even universal movement in the arts, yet also a product of French ingeniousness, was essential to the movement’s liberal, progressivist principles. For Lafenestre, naturalism went together with the ideals of truth, justice, liberty, and humanity, all germinating from the French Revolution and spreading throughout Europe the tools of liberation.638

Echoing Lafenestre’s revolution-based interpretation of naturalism, Ponsonailhe argues that the école scandinave in learning from the modern French painting style, does not imitate France, but rather becomes another actor in the forward progression of the arts:

[C]ette école, dis-je, ne se traine pas en arrière copiant la France. Certes, elle a pris chez nous le mot d’ordre. Elle ne s’en cache pas, elle le proclame hautement. ... Mais si elle a tout appris dans nos ateliers, elle ne nous imite pas. L’art scandinave fait mieux que cela : il s’avance résolument sur nos côtés, ainsi qu’une armée auxiliaire, un corps d’élite, et parfois, avec une heureuse audace, il nous devance. Nous lui devons des conquêtes.639

Rejecting the militarist analogies of Ponsonailleh and Lafenestre, Michel would take a slightly different interpretation of naturalism and its means of influencing Nordic artists. Rather than fighting against academicism or classicism, Michel argues that naturalism is simply a means of giving voice to the genuine and peaceful nature of the Nordic people:

Le grand malheur de ce que nous avons appelé réalisme ou naturalisme fut de naître tout armé, et d’être, dès son apparition, une doctrine de combat. ... Rien de pareil chez les Scandinaves. Leur réalisme est-il une doctrine ? je ne le pense guère ; il est plutôt une manière d’être ; il est fait de sympathie affectueuse ; il ne s’insurge contre personne ; il va tout bonnement à la nature qu’il aime ; il nous parle sans emphase, comme sans fausse honte de chose très simples et familières : réunions d’amis, causeries sous la lampe, baptêmes, communions, enterrements [sic], vie et travaux des champs, pêcheries ; - il nous parle surtout avec une vibrante tendresse de la terre natale, de ses eaux brillantes et glaciées,
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des splendeurs de ces rudes hivers, de la douce magie de ses lents crépuscules et de ses claires nuits d’été.\textsuperscript{640}

Despite Michel’s and Ponsonailhe’s differing interpretations of naturalism and its spread through Europe, both sought to affirm the same message: naturalism was not a doctrine, but a means of liberation, and \textit{l’art scandinave} could only be itself insofar as it adopted the painting method invented by the French moderns. This idea would be affirmed throughout the late nineteenth century and into the early twentieth century, becoming an integral part of the French narratives on the history of Nordic art. Writing his chapter on “L’Art dans les Pays Scandinaves” in Michel’s \textit{Histoire de l’Art} in 1923, Réau would succinctly reiterate the liberation narrative in introducing the history of post-1850s Nordic art:

A mesure que les trois pays Scandinaves, jadis unis ou associés, prennent conscience de leur originalité nationale, l’art danois, l’art norvégien et l’art suédois, auquel se rattache l’art finlandais, tendent à se différencier. Mais ils ont ceci de commun que, à partir de la seconde moitié du XIXe siècle, tous s’orientent vers l’École française, à laquelle ils vont demander le stimulant et les moyens d’expression nécessaires pour développer leur individualité.\textsuperscript{641}

It was necessary, paradoxically, for Nordic artists to emulate \textit{l’École française} to gain their national independence in the arts. The practices naturalism and pleinairism were seen as neutral conduits for affirming truth, without national bias – although, as Réau maintains, it was from the \textit{École française} that naturalism originated.

As a means of affirming naturalism, and responding to the importance that national romantic landscape painting would play at the Universal Exposition of 1889, each of the critics would emphasize Nordic nature as one of the primary sources of inspiration for the young school of artists. Landscape was highly visible at the Nordic exhibitions in 1889,

\textsuperscript{640} Michel, “Les Beaux-Arts à l’Exposition Universelle, Les écoles étrangères,” 1
most notably through the presence the Norwegian Fleskum artists that year, whose
summer night paintings Michel placed emphasis on as definitive of l’école scandinave, and
comparable in importance to the school as Barbizon was to France:

Dans ces pays d’extrême Nord, où la lumière plus froide est comme filtrée par
les glaces du pôle plus voisin, où les crépuscules d’été s’attardent dans les ciels
d’une exquise douceur, les nuits claires offraient aux peintres, tard venus, un
motif singulièrement tentant, fait à souhait pour ravir un œil d’artiste. – Les
Scandinaves sont en train de découvrir leur pays (comme nos paysagistes
découvraient la France vers 1830).\textsuperscript{642}

Contrary to Michel’s assertion of about the novelty of Nordic landscape painting in 1889,
however, the genre had rather been a staple in France since the midcentury through
popular artists including Per Wickenberg, Hans Gude, Edward Bergh, and Ludvig Munthe,
and even featured in the personal art collections of Napoleon III. Many of these artists,
however, exhibited a Düsseldorf influence that was currently being excised from art history
by French writers as inauthentic and opposed to genuine national expression.

Hamel would associate the climate and topography of the Nordic land with the
culture and physiognomies of the Nordic peoples, and particularly those of Norway. To
French critics including Hamel, Norway was particularly appealing as an example of the so-
called virginal Scandinavian temperament. French critics were less acquainted with the
history of Norwegian art than that of Sweden or Denmark, and in contrast to the other
Scandinavian countries, had no Royal Academy, and therefore provided an exemplary
model for the French naturalist philosophy, as seen in Hamel’s description:

On y perçoit la lenteur de geste et la sensibilité réfléchie propre aux pays de
d vie clairsemée, la carrure d’une race taillée à coups de hache, tendre sous une
rude écorce. Cet art est pêcheur et paysan, un peu fruste, très sincère, empreint
de cordialité brusque : on sent qu’il a grandi dans une nature vierge, dans la
féerie des fjords, des hauts rochers, des glaciers qui descendent vers la mer.

L'éblouissement des soleils d'été, le goût des colorations heurtées qui se retrouvent dans les intérieurs, les meubles et les costumes, mais aussi l'amour du silence, le mystère des longs crépuscules, l'intimité des hivernages . . .

Hamel’s description of the Norwegian “race” as having been “taillée à coups de hache” is reminiscent of Taine’s reductionist determinism, tracing the products of human society and culture to the physical minutiae of blood and environment. Just as Dutch art sprang from the waters that border and travers the Low Countries, Norwegian art germinates from the woods of the mountain forests. At the same time, Hamel’s criticism takes on a distinctly Romantic air in his evocation of the mystery, silence, intimacy, and fairytale-like quality of Norway’s long summer nights and glacial setting. This is the Northern Europe of De Staël rather than Taine, an ancient nocturnal universe where the cold air heats the soul and conjures up poets. Hamel’s analysis of Norway’s artists evokes the Romantic epistemology of De Staël, which alongside explaining the relationship between immaterial and material causes, simultaneously resists totalizing explanation by affirming the irreducible and ineffable nature of the human spirit.

In many ways, critics’ romantic descriptions of the Nordic land and people in 1889, couched in climatological theory, resembles those espoused by critics at the first Universal Exposition in 1855, when critics marveled at the exotic scenery and “Northern poetry” of the works exhibited by Tidmand and Höckert. Just as Claudius Lavergne evoked lines from the poetry of Walter Scott his review in 1855, comparing Tidemand’s elegiac Funeral Feast to Scott’s sorrowful cold tears falling like hail from the North, Michel would cite Leconte
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de Lisle’s poem “Épiphanie” when describing Eilif Peterssen’s *Nuit de Été*, comparing the painting’s placid waters to the “douceur infinie” of Norwegian eyes:

Elle passe tranquille en un rêve divin,
Sur le bord du plus frais de tes lacs, ô Norvège !...
Quand un souffle furtif glisse en ses cheveux blonds,
Une cendre ineffable inonde son épaule ;
Et, de leur transparence argentant leurs cils longs,
Ses yeux ont la couleur des belles nuits du pôle.646

Both Michel and Lavergne associate the North – including, and above all, Norway – with inherently elegiac qualities, mirrored in both the demeanor of its populace and in the severity of its environment. The critics employ a similar method of critique based on *ut pictura poesis* association, merging painting and literature through poetic evocation; and yet despite the strong similarities of style and taste, these critics espoused radically different theories of art. Classicist, Catholic, and anti-naturalist, Lavergne’s conservative doctrines would appear to oppose the historical method of Michel, which evaluated changes in artistic style to a modernist progression of movements.

---

Chapter V: Conclusion
The paradox of critics’ reviews of the Nordic exhibitions in 1889 is that they simultaneously attempted to situate these artists within the historical progression of nineteenth-century art, rendering it as an autonomous école with a consistent structure, and yet these same critics would simultaneously attempt to negate the prior lineage of Nordic artists who had maintained a reputable presence in France since the mid-eighteenth century. The mechanisms of history writing include the dual processes of sanctification and erasure. The same air of novelty that let critics marvel at Nordic painting at the first Universal Exposition was reborn more than forty years later in 1889 because critics willfully turned their heads from the past to affirm recent developments in French naturalism. Canonizing Manet, Monet, and Bastien-Lepage as successors of Courbet and Millet required overwriting French movements that did not fit into the narrative including Rococo, but especially German traditions once considered influential including the Düsseldorf School and the Nazarenes. The jeune école scandinave would incorporate artists steeped in the naturalist tradition including Krøyer, Edelfelt, Heyerdahl, and Larsson, but would forget their predecessors such as Gude, Höckert, Tidemand, Jerichau-Baumann.

The assassination of the Düsseldorf school in French history, though once greatly admired by critics, is evident through the historical erasure of its pupils. Although critics no longer felt the need to rebuke Germany directly within their reviews in 1889, revanchism would continue in subtler forms and implications. Germany, as Ponsonailhe would aptly remark, was “celle à laquelle on songe toujours, alors même qu’on ne la nomme point . . .”647 Indeed, silence would be the art historian’s greatest strategy for revenge, as a means of

writing artists and movements out of history. Amongst the excluded would also be contemporary Norwegian artists who aligned themselves with the Düsseldorf landscape tradition more than the French tradition, including Adelsteen Normann, Anton Rasmussen, Carl Nielsen, and Hans Dahl. All four artists specialized in depicting dramatic scenery from Norway’s western coast, a popular tradition in Norwegian painting going back to the beginning of the century through painters such as Johan Christian Dahl, and exhibited scenery that year from the regions of Sogn, Hardanger, and the Lofoten.

Normann, a Norwegian painter born in Bodø, trained in Düsseldorf, and residing in Berlin, who specialized in depicting the landscape of his native northern Norway, was labeled by Ponsonailhe as the leader of this style. Depictions of modern steamships against hazy skies and the overpowering mountains of the Lofoten islands, such as Dampskipsanløp i Lofoten [Fig. 5.1], are typical of the artist’s work during the late 1880s. Normann depicted three Lofoten landscape paintings at the Universal Exposition, and became the target of Ponsonailhe’s critique:

Le plein-airisme a certes rallié la majorité de ses artistes, mais il y a encore lutte, et une école dissidente, celle de M. Normann, y compte quelques partisans. De cette peinture, que la plus mauvaise chromolithographie égalerait, qui se place en face de la nature avec la prétention de l’embellir, de l’attifer, et n’a aucun souci de la vérité, de l’étude des masses aériennes, des tons justes, je ne parlerai pas.  

The insult of having one’s painting compared to chromolithography had been used before in 1878 by Paul Mantz, another French critic who, though otherwise sympathetic to Nordic artists, used the term to deride what he viewed as the outmoded genre painting style of

Johan Exner along with the rest of the Danish exhibitors.\textsuperscript{649} Ponsonailhe’s comparison of Normann’s paintings to a chromolithograph was to criticize the Norwegian’s exacting realism as mechanical, false, without exhibiting the temperament of the artist, and in contrast to the attention to the loose, atmospheric style of French naturalism.

Ponsonailhe’s allusion to chromolithography, moreover, was to criticize Normann’s painting style as commercial, appealing to the crude taste of an unsophisticated public, and therefore artless.

Ponsonailhe’s criticism of Normann is particularly biting since the artist was by no means unpopular in France. The Norwegian painter not only won a bronze medal at the Universal Exposition, but also exhibited with both Georges Petit and the Société des Artistes Français in the 1890s. Two years later, Normann’s Automne ; Vue sur le Raffond-sur-Lofoden (Norvège) would be purchased by the French state from the Salon des Artistes Français. Furthermore, although Normann lived in Germany, several other contemporaries made successful careers for themselves in France through their moonlights and marine paintings of Norway’s northern coasts, including Sigrid Bølling, Johannes Grimelund, and Frithjof Smith-Hald. Several of Grimelund’s marine paintings would enter French museums during the 1890s, including Matinée d’été à molde [Fig. 5.2] in 1895.\textsuperscript{650} In 1892 he held a successful exhibition of paintings held at Georges Petit’s gallery, praised by critics for the “loyauté de son observation” and “la subtilité de la lumière,” followed 1894 by another exhibition of northern coastal scenes titled “Nuits Hyperboréens.”\textsuperscript{651}

\textsuperscript{651} Raoul Sertat, “Grimelund (Exposition de M.),” Revue Encyclopédique, (1892): 889
Yet even Smith-Hald, who received strong critical praise throughout the decade, would come under the criticism of Ponsonailhe that year for resembling Normann: “J’ai failli oublier un peintre norvégien au nom fort répandu, M. Smith-Hold [sic]. Il est mal représenté au Champ-de-Mars par des toile entachées des défauts d’Adelsteen Normann.”

Smith-Hald, exhibiting two paintings titled Soir and Solitude that year, might be described as representing the juste-milieu between French and Düsseldorf naturalism. On the one hand, his marine paintings were Romantic in character, with moody palettes and tonalist skies set above crystalline bodies of water. On the other hand, having lived in France for almost a decade, Smith-Hald had adopted the bravura brushwork of the French naturalists and painted peasant genre motifs in a vein similar to his colleagues Salmson and Hagborg. Smith-Hald was a demonstrably popular artist in France, even still in 1889, when critics including Lafenestre still singled him out for praise; however, some French critics decided that the Düsseldorf style that continued to be evident in Smith-Hald’s work, and which indeed made him marketable in the 1880s, now appeared to be a wrinkle in the greater history of French painting, and subsequently needed to be ironed out.

The problem with artists similar to Normann was that the persistence of the Düsseldorf style ran contrary to the historical narrative of the rayonnement of French naturalism throughout Europe during the nineteenth-century. For Ponsonailhe, the entire history of the “évolution de l’art moderne” was rooted in naturalism’s acceptance outside of France. Other competing international styles – and above all Düsseldorf – had to
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be excluded from history. For this reason, Normann and the others had to be labelled an école dissidente. They not only seemed dissimilar from their naturalist-influenced colleagues, but were outliers from history – artists who did not follow the natural unfolding of history. In the 1860s, the crisp Düsseldorf style had reigned supreme amongst the Swedish and Norwegian artists who achieved fame in France. Gude’s Montagnes de Norvège hung in the palace of Napoleon III; Adolph Tidemand, Edvard Bergh, and Ferdinand Fagerlin were the recipients of distinguished awards at the Salons and Universal Exposition; and Paul Mantz praised Johan Fredrik Eckersberg’s monumental paintings of Norway’s mountains for their topographical expertise and truthful vision. In 1889, Ponsonailhe would turn Mantz’s praise on its head, deriding the Düsseldorf style of Normann as inherently false, and moreover a blemish in the école norvégienne. The problem with Normann was not simply that anything suggestive of German cultural influence was unpalatable to French tastes, but that in becoming France’s ally, l’école scandinave was supposed to have shed its Düsseldorf tendencies after 1878. At the beginning of the 1880s, art historians such as Ménard had weaved the disavowal of the so-called false and outmoded aesthetics of the Düsseldorf style into the evolving narrative about the emergence of l’école scandinave. If national liberation had been brought to the Nordic artists by France, any indication of an alternative manner of painting was to be labeled as dissident, and therefore not truly Scandinavian.

“Si je place au premier rang la Scandinavie,” Ponsonailhe writes at the beginning of his review, “c’est que j’ai cœur de suivre un ordre à la fois aussi flatteur pour la France et

reconnaissant pour les Écoles Étrangères qui sont filles de l’art français.”

Ponsonailhe’s statement succinctly describes the reception of Nordic art in France since 1871. Over the course of two decades, la Scandinavie had served as a sympathetic ally, bound together by mutual humiliation at the hands of the German military, and mirroring back France’s own wounded dignity. At the same time, la Scandinavie acted as a surrogate to France’s own losses, not only for the territories of Alsace and Lorraine, but for the ideal of De Staël’s l’Allemagne that had to be abandoned in the aftermath of the Franco-Prussian War. La Scandinavie served as the French ideal of the nation, once celebrated in Germanism, but soon despised in its realization as the German Empire at Versailles in 1871. The Romantic image of Germany as the land pure and honest philosopher-poets – an ideal itself constructed as a mirror to civilized, Antique, and decadent France – was recast into la Scandinavie. Ancient German kings were replaced with Vikings and forests were traded for fjords, but la Scandinavie also came to associated the French values of progress and modernity, marching hand in hand with France towards the future, rather than reflecting on an ideal past. For many art historians, naturalist painting, with its empirical underpinnings and the seemingly democratic way it could be practiced by artists regardless of national origin, embodied the liberal values of the Third Republic. The popularization of plein-air painting during the 1870s and 1880s amongst Nordic artists including Wahlberg, Salmson, Krøyer, Edelfelt, and Werenskiold seemed to not only confirm France’s authority as a cultural leader, but also la Scandinavie’s place as France’s main ally.
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656 Ponsonailhe, “L’Art étranger à l’Exposition Universelle,” first article, 91
The consequences on the writing of art history would arguably be longstanding. While the reputations of figures such as Zorn, Krøyer, and Edelfelt have been revitalized in recent years, few remember the names of Normann, Grimelund, Smith-Hald, or Bølling because few have written about them since their heyday in the late nineteenth century. Louis Réau, writing his chapter on “L’Art dans les Pays Scandinaives” for Michel’s *Histoire de l’Art* in 1923, helped codify complete the process of erasure in when writing on Norwegian art:


Vers 1870, la conversion des pays du Nord à l'art français est un fait accompli.657

To repeat another author’s statement, Ponsonailhe had referred to Germany as “celle à laquelle one songe toujours, alors même qu'on ne la nomme point .”.658 Similarly, in Réau’s art historical text on Scandinavia, the unnamed and unsaid shine through. It is not surprising that in his generalized historical overview Réau’s seems to blot out Tidemand’s rise to success in France during the Second Empire, or the popularity of Munthe throughout the 1870s and at the 1878 Universal Exposition; and it is no less surprising that Réau gives no mention to the so-called *école dissidente* of Normann and his compatriots. What resonates most clearly, however, is the way Réau’s characterization of an art historical shift

658 Ponsonailhe, “L'Art étranger à l'Exposition Universelle,” first article, 87
in 1870 between Düsseldorf and Paris acts as a cover for the political conflict between Prussia and France that same year.
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