

Edvard Munch as Photographed for his 75th Birthday, 1938: Strategies in Defense of a Legacy

Reinhold Heller

Reinhold Heller is Professor emeritus of Art History and Germanic Studies at the University of Chicago. Heller is author of *Edvard Munch: The Scream* (1973) and *Munch: His Life and Work* (1984). He curated the exhibition *The Birth of Expressionism: Brücke in Dresden and Berlin 1905-1913* (2010, Neue Galerie New York) and co-curated *Munch and Expressionism* (2016, Neue Galerie New York). He is now writing a book on Expressionism (VSI Series, Oxford University Press).

rheller@uchicago.edu

ABSTRACT

In collaboration with photographer Ragnvald Væring, in 1938 Edvard Munch had himself photographed on the occasion of his 75th birthday. More than simple commemorations or visual documentation of his continuing life and health, the photographs – intended for publication – reveal Munch not as artist but as curator, concerned with the preservation of his art at a time when his work was removed from German museums and his position in history appeared threatened.

Keywords

Edvard Munch, Ragnvald Væring, Portrait photographs, Entartete Kunst, Art exhibitions, City Hall, Oslo, mural competition

On December 12, 1938, Edvard Munch celebrated his 75th birthday. Several days later, in the Oslo newspaper *Tidens Tegn*, the following succinct announcement from the artist appeared: “Since it is difficult for me to thank everyone for the honor shown to me on my 75th birthday, I therefore allow myself to give my heartfelt thanks in this manner.”¹ It was Munch’s efficient, if impersonal, effort to recognize the numerous congratulatory messages he received on his birthday. As another newspaper reported that day:

One automobile after another drove up onto the otherwise peaceful Jarlsborgveien out at Skøyen this morning. However, it was mostly florists and telegraph delivery boys who brought their respective missives with flowers and telegrams up to Edvard Munch’s house. The master

himself was nowhere to be seen... [L]ike other famous men, Edvard Munch seems to avoid almost totally any form of publicity and vehemently insisted that he be left in peace during his 75th birthday. As we understand, the master intended to spend the day painting!¹²

An accompanying photograph shows Munch's housekeeper receiving telegrams and floral bouquets for him (ill. 1). Munch himself remained unseen, invisible to the city of Oslo and the world inside his home and studio.



III. 1. "Edvard Munchs 75-års dag". Clipping from unidentified newspaper, dated 12 December 1938. Munch Museum, Oslo.

If not with a personal appearance, however, Munch did make himself visible to the public in another way on his 75th birthday. Shortly before that date, he collaborated with the Oslo photographer Ragnvald Væring to create a trio of formal photographs that depicted him within the environment of his winter studio, standing or seated, surrounded by his artworks (ills. 2-4).



III. 2. Ragnvald Væring: Photograph of Edvard Munch in his Winter Studio, Ekely. November or December 1938. Munch Museum, Oslo.



III. 3. Ragnvald Væring: Photograph of Edvard Munch in his Winter Studio, Ekely. November or December 1938. Munch Museum, Oslo.



III. 4. Ragnvald Væring. Photograph of Edvard Munch in his Winter Studio, Ekely. November or December 1938. Munch Museum, Oslo.

At other times assiduously protective of the hermit-like isolation afforded by his home and studio, he allowed his isolation to be destroyed by Ragnvald Væring with his equipment for these photographs.³ Not only did the photographer enter the otherwise protected privacy of Munch's home and studio, once published the photographs would transform what was private into something public. At least through the virtual reality of photographs, the public would enter Munch's private space, there to be confronted by the photographic ghost of Munch himself. The three photographs, as well as the process of staging and taking them, represent a remarkable invasion of Munch's habitually and vehemently protected privacy.

A partial answer as to why Munch cooperated with, even instigated, this intrusion may be provided by a brief telephone interview with Munch published in *Morgenbladet* on his birthday. When asked if he intended to spend the day entirely in the "peace and quiet of his private life," Munch responded, "Yes, you know, I largely live withdrawn, after all. It is as if I need to live somewhat in isolation..." Moreover, he observed, "Today, what pleases me most is being able to begin to work again... As you know, during recent years there have been so many things that interfered and resulted in me not doing very much, at any rate far less than I would have liked... But now that is over completely, yes it is, indeed. Now I feel fabulous and am fit as a fiddle and, as I said, I am extremely glad to be able to get to work seriously again."⁴ In light of this interview, the photographs might be considered as the seemingly objective visual documentation of the otherwise reclusive artist's health, vitality and continued life as he reached age 75. Surprisingly, however, few newspapers published any of them except severely cropped to the figure of Munch himself. Only *Lordagsavisen* reproduced one of the photographs in full – that of Munch seated in his studio.⁵ As a major effort to establish the image of the then-living Munch and his studio surround for the Norwegian public, the tripartite photographic project largely missed its mark.

Munch, however, did not give up. As the New Year of 1939 approached, he circulated the photographs within the more limited community of friends by sending them as Christmas greetings.⁶ Somehow, it seems, he was insistent on getting the photographs into the public realm. However, it was not until after his death in 1944 that the photographs finally became widely available, published in commemorative articles by his friends.⁷ Today they are ubiquitous, appearing as visual "documents" in virtually every Munch exhibition catalogue to accompany chronologies of his life.

In a sense, that is how Munch intended the photographs to function, as documents. Taken on his 75th birthday, once distributed in newspapers or otherwise, the photographs should bear public testimony to Munch's living presence in his studio, and they continue today to transmit that seemingly neutrally objective testimony. That neutrality and objectivity are problematic, however, as Roland Barthes and others have observed:

The Photograph is an extended, loaded evidence – as if it caricatured not the figure of what it represents (quite the converse) but its very existence. The image, says phenomenology, is an object-as-nothing. Now, in the Photograph, what I posit is not only the absence of the object; it is also, by one and the same movement, on equal terms, the fact that this object has indeed existed and that it has been there where I see it. Here is where the madness is, for until this

day no representation could assure me of the past of a thing except by intermediaries; but with the Photograph, my certainty is immediate: no one in the world can undeceive me. The Photograph then becomes a bizarre medium, a new form of hallucination: false on the level of perception, true on the level of time: a temporal hallucination, so to speak, a modest, shared hallucination (on the one hand “it is not there,” on the other “but it has indeed been”): a mad image, chafed by reality.⁸

As confirmed by the mechanics and chemistry of the photographic medium, Munch was actually, existentially, physically “there” in 1938 so that his image could be preserved in tones of black, white and gray by a professional photographer and his camera. Within the photograph itself, however, Munch is no longer physically or existentially “there” as his “thereness” and the moment of his “thereness” have been transformed into a configuration of chemicals and dyes on photographic paper, after already having been transformed in the processes of developing the film or glass negatives onto which the “thereness” of Munch originally was projected through the camera’s lens. While the photographs appear to offer up Munch’s presence, they serve as witness to loss. Stillness becomes a form of death, as Susan Sontag observed: “All photographs are *memento mori*. To take a photograph is to participate in another person’s (or thing’s) mortality, vulnerability, mutability. Precisely by slicing out this moment and freezing it, all photographs testify to time’s relentless melt.”⁹ To return to Barthes’ terms, a hallucination is shared by the photographs’ spectators as the Munch of the photographs is not “there” but the photographs nonetheless demonstrates that he “has indeed been there.” Ironically, as Munch proposed his photographs as testimony to his continued existence and vitality, the very nature of a photograph contradicted that testimony. Necessarily, the photographs and their “hallucination” testified to what had been, not to what then was or now is. They are indeed, as Barthes concluded, “mad images chafed by reality.”

If the very nature of photographs’ images raises questions about the reality of the Munch seen, there are other questions to be posed of them as well. The photographs’ “moment sliced out of time” or “temporal hallucination” deserves consideration. If the focus of perception is shifted away from the shade of Munch and instead onto the photographed environment, then the paintings, prints, and sculpture surrounding him in his studio become a recollection of time prior to the moment of the photographs. Temporally, they refer to the time when the artworks were made and completed, rather than the preserved and departed moment of the photographs themselves. The artworks surround Munch, who neither works on, nor interacts with, them. They have attained a point of stasis. Activity is relegated to the past. In the manner discussed by Susan Sontag, these photographs function as *memento mori* of the moment of their own production, but contain within themselves further references to a similarly dead past through the relics that are the completed artworks recognized behind the ephemeral Munch, through the products of his past activity.

Surrounded by his own prior productivity, Munch stands or sits, inactive. An ironically persistent past – the completed artworks – and the transitory present moment of Munch posing for the photographs, which also is past, become fused. As photographed

by the professional photographer Væring (with whom he had a long collaboration) and staged by him and Munch at Ekely, the photographs were not private souvenirs such as snapshots from someone's birthday party, but rather produced for commercial public imagery to be reproduced, published, and distributed in order to be viewed by general and undefined future spectators. In that way, the photographs from 1938 can enter today's present moment. They allow viewers today to gaze at them, injecting their entrapped visual hallucinations into the viewers' own shifting reality and consciousness in order to participate in the temporal fusion of past, present and future that the staging of the photographs elicits.



III. 5. Unknown photographer: Photograph of Edvard Munch "painting" his Portrait of Dr. Daniel Jacobson, Copenhagen, 1909. Munch Museum, Oslo.

Moreover, the inactivity of Munch in these photographs is remarkable. The artworks surround him, but he gazes silently and immobile towards the camera or, alternatively, towards the photographs' future viewers, away from his own art. Munch's inactivity contrasts to standard formulae of artists' portraits and self-portraits extending back to the Renaissance and in which the artist appears to be actively engaged in the process of creating an artwork.¹⁰ Photography, with its aura of apparent objectivity and seeming instantaneity, readily adopted and propagated this fiction of the spectator's witness to the process of creation, especially as the photographic portraits appeared in newspapers and periodicals, to be consumed by an ever expanding, insatiably curious public. Munch too repeatedly had himself photographed painting, possibly most memorably as he "painted" the portrait of Dr. Daniel Jacobson in 1908, although – intriguingly – he himself seems never to have had this iconic photograph published (ill. 5).¹¹

The 1938 photographs break with that tradition, however. They adhere, instead, to a related, alternative practice of photographing artists in their studio environment, without the artist seen working, but identified with them through other devices. However, Munch's 1938 photographs also break with this trope even as they employ it. If it were not already known that these photographs depict Munch himself with his own artworks at Ekely, they might equally be considered to depict an art collector accompanied by objects of his collection, the common formulation for collectors' portraits, stressing possession and identification gained through possession. Just as if he were a collector, Munch posed inactive, formally dressed, surrounded by a collection of artworks, spatially and psychologically separate from them even as they intruded into or defined his space. The artworks might be considered as extensions of him, in the sense of possessions or reflections of his personal taste, but within the photographs themselves there is no clue, there are no iconographic devices, to identify Munch as the artist. The paintings, prints and sculpture in this collection are all by Edvard Munch, so that in this context Munch, as collector, possesses a highly specialized collection devoted to the work of a single artist, Edvard Munch.

The photographed ghost of Munch as Susan Sontag's *memento mori* can still be accepted, as can the perception of the artworks as mementos of a past time prior to the photograph's own moment, but if Munch is considered as collector rather than creator, then the artworks take on an altered significance. Collectors preserve, rather than create, artworks. A collection also testifies to a system – whether it serves to materialize personal aesthetic preferences or a recognition of historical, artistic or commercial significance and value – that transcends the personal existence of the collectors and that transcends their mortality. For the viewers of the collector photographs, the artworks of the collection act to signal their continued existence after death, or of their existence beyond death, of their independence from the photographs' "hallucinatory moment." The artworks are the legacy or bequest of the collector to the future. They transcend the impermanence of the elusive photographic moment and function to proclaim their own significance and longevity, a process in which the collector – Munch, in this case – serves only as temporary caretaker and transmitter to the future. Viewed in this way, the photographs' primary content is not Munch the person at all, but rather the artworks arrayed around him.

An intriguing temporal shift or synthesis emerges as well. Munch, although seen in the foreground, now serves largely as the ghostly intermediary or transmitter in a tripartite relationship. This relationship consists of the artworks displayed at Ekely, of the elusive moment of the photograph as Munch posed for it, and of the viewers of the photographs relegated to the future, which the continued existence of the artworks now shares as well. Through the presence of the artworks in the photograph and with Munch in the role of collector, the past, the present and the future combine to overcome the transitory *memento mori* quality of the photograph itself so long as the artworks photographed are recognized as objects from the past that are preserved in order to remain present in the future.

The temporal symbiosis of past, present and future in the 1938 photographs of Munch as collector also provide another answer to the question of why Munch allowed them to intrude into his life in December 1938. At that time, in December 1938, he was particularly aware of the fragility of his historical renown and of the future of his art, and also continued to resent not being included among the artists commissioned to contribute work to the new Oslo City Hall.¹²



III. 6. Exhibition: «Utstilling av Edv. Munchs Malerier og Grafikk», Oslo. Harald Holst Halvorsens Kunsthandel, September 1938.

Although Munch was not included (or included only for a day or so) in the infamous 1937 *Entartete Kunst* exhibition in Munich, nonetheless his works were caught up in the sweep and confiscations of German museum holdings during 1937–38.¹³ More than

80 Munch paintings as well as graphics were confiscated. Of these, the Oslo gallery of Harald Holst Halvorsen obtained 14 paintings and numerous prints to exhibit and sell at auction during January 16–23, 1939.¹⁴

Just a few months earlier, in September 1938, Munch himself had organized an apparently impromptu exhibition at Halvorsen's of almost the same size, with 13 paintings and 27 prints. Included was his large painting depicting the construction of his winter studio at Ekely in 1929 (ill. 6) as well as earlier works, several likewise focused on workers, including those from Warnemünde from 1907.¹⁵



III. 7. Edvard Munch: *Winter Studio under Construction*, 1929 (Woll 1648). Oil on canvas, 152 x 230 cm. Munch Museum, Oslo.

According to Halvorsen, Munch phoned suddenly one evening to say he wanted an exhibition and then showed up unannounced at the gallery door the next morning with some of his paintings.¹⁶ Whether or not Halvorsen's anecdote is accurate, it is tempting to view the hurriedly self-organized exhibition as a pre-emptive strike by Munch that argued, in effect, that despite the breakup of German museum collections, he retained and preserved the major single collection of his works for posterity. As early as 1933, Munch remarked laconically to Jens Thiis, "This is the second time I was thrown out in Germany...I can be pleased that I was so reluctant to sell; they came [to me] on their knees to buy both here and in Germany. Only with sorrow did I sell my paintings that were all important to me for my continuing work."¹⁷ However, the paintings did not only serve as impetus to create further paintings. By the end of 1938, the preservation of his art as such had become a significant concern for Munch.

There is another aspect to the September 1938 Halvorsen exhibition that needs to be taken into account, however. Since the 1920s, the theme of workers was one Munch had tied to his proposed paintings for Oslo's City Hall.¹⁸ Munch, however, was not among the artists selected to contribute to the project, despite the many years during which his name had been proposed.¹⁹ Essentially, he was snubbed and he recorded his displeasure in numerous notations and letters at the time. The Halvorsen exhibition appears, in part, to function as a public manifestation of his displeasure as he focused the little exhibition around *Winter Studio under Construction* (1929, ill. 7), the massive painting of workers building his winter studio at Ekely, and also accented his large watercolor *Horse Team on a Building Site (City Hall)* (1928–29).²⁰

Exhibited as No. 10, *Workers (Arbeidere)* in Halvorsen's exhibition, *Winter Studio under Construction* was among works included in Munch's never-completed *Workers' Frieze* project and appears to have been considered by him for the City Hall. By exhibiting the painting for the first time in 1938, nearly ten years after it was created, and by surrounding it with several others of the same "workers" theme, Munch could reassert his desire and ability to fulfill the City Hall commission.²¹ At least one critic agreed with him, and wrote: "Has everything been done to allow Munch to put his stamp on the City Hall with his art? His exhibition demonstrates that he is the man who can accomplish the task."²² As he was excluded from artists commissioned for City Hall art and thus feeling that he was being rejected in Norway (despite continuing calls for a Munch Museum to be built), and seeing his works condemned in Germany, Munch viewed himself and his art under renewed attack and his legacy endangered.

It is against this background of perceived rejection in Norway, of the German *Entartete Kunst* confiscations and of the approaching Halvorsen auction that the 1938 photographs of Munch must be interpreted. Understandably, by the time of the photographs, he was concerned about the fate of his art, its future historical status, and its heritage. The apparently impulsive Halvorsen exhibition in September 1938 countered negative evaluations being brought to his work and proclaimed that he remained actively productive. The photographs reaffirmed his endurance and offered assurance that – by means of his own collection of his own work – he himself remained on guard to protect his art against external attacks and destruction. Indeed, Munch's presence, position, and poses in the photographs might well be considered as representing Munch as barrier, guardian and protector, alert and steadfast, prepared to defend what was entrusted to him: his own collection of his own art. The photographs then function much like the 1938 Halvorsen exhibition as defiant gestures of assurance. They testified through the apparent objectivity of photography that Munch's major earlier work remained intact within his own collection, even as his work disappeared from German museums and other artists began work on the Oslo City Hall decorations, excluding him. Munch's role as collector, guardian and proponent of his own art was fundamental in such a climate of rejection, and the Væring photographs were staged to communicate that information to their future viewers.

The photographs themselves, combined with his rushed exhibition in 1938 and, later, the auction of works from German museums in January 1939, all suggest that the future fate of his art remained very much on Munch's mind. A little more than a year later, on

18 April 1940, nine days after the German invasion of Norway began, he replaced his prior last-will-and-testament with a new one that offered the City of Oslo the entire collection of his artworks, hoping they would form the collection of a future Munch Museum.²³ Essentially, he transferred the curatorship and propagation of the art that surrounded him and which formed his art collection in his 1938 photographs to the city and to the unknown future that the photographs already addressed. His elusive presence – the elusive “hallucination” at the center of the lost moment of the photographs – serves as a fulcrum between his artistic past and his art’s future destiny, allowing past, present, and future to join conceptually within their illusory photographic union. Within Munch’s strategy of preserving his art and legacy against real and imagined attack, the photographs of 1938 functioned as key components.

NOTES

- 1 «Da det er vanskelig for mig å få takket hver enkelt for den ære der blev vist mig på min 75-årsdag, så ber jeg på denne måten å få si min hjertelig takk.» Edv. Munch, “Edv. Munch takker,” *Tidens Tegn*, No. 292, 16 December 1938. Newspaper clipping, Munch Museum, Oslo.
- 2 «Bil efter bil svingte i formiddag op til den daglig så fredelige Jarlsborgveien på Skøyen. Men det var vesentlig blomsterhandlers og telegrafverkets kjøretøier som bragte sine respektive bører med blomster og telegrammer frem til Edvard Munchs hus. Maleren selv var ingensteds å se, men hans omgivelser forteller oss at allerede lørdag begynte blomstene og telegrammene å strømme inn. Nogen deputasjoner var ikke anmeldt; som andre store men nærer Edvard Munch en utpreget skyhet for offentlighet i enhver form og har uttrykkelig bedt om å få være i fred på sin 75-årsdag. Såvidt vi forstod, hadde mesteren til hensikt å tilbringe dagen med å male!» Newspaper unidentified, dated 12 December 1938, Newspaper clipping, Munch Museum, Oslo.
- 3 Munch’s association with the photographic studio of O. Væring dates back to the beginning of the 20th century (Cf. Arne Eggum, *Munch og fotografi* (Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1987), 200, f.n. 18). Earlier in 1938, prior to taking the 75th birthday photographs of Munch, Ragnvald Væring was at Ekely to photograph Nikolai Rygg posed as in Munch’s portrait of Rygg (Woll 1743), cf. Eggum, *Munch*, 186. It seems probable that Munch also had himself photographed at this time seated in his wicker chair, as published in “De siste bilder av Munch på Ekely,” *Lørdagsavisen*, 10 December 1938. (Newspaper clipping, Munch Museum, Oslo). Also see f.n. 5 below.
- 4 «... Ja, De vet, jeg har jo trukket mig svært tilbake da. Jeg har likesom været nødt til å leve litt isolert....Hvad jeg imidlertid gleder mig mest til idag er å begynne å arbeide igjen.... [I] de senere år vet De at det har været så mange ting, som har spilt inn og medført at jeg ikke har fått gjort stort, iallfall ikke på langt nær så meget som jeg gjerne vilde... Nu er det over, ja. Nu føler jeg mig svært så oplagt og gleder mig, som sagt, meget til å kunne ta fatt igjen for alvor.» “Klb”, “Munch gleder sig til å ta fatt igjen,” *Morgenbladet*, 13 December 1938. Newspaper clipping, Munch-museet, Oslo. According to Nicolai Rygg, when he sat for Munch’s portrait of him in 1938, Munch observed, «Jeg var syk sist De var her. Det var bronkitten. Den har jeg to ganger i året... Jeg kunde knapt stå på benene, jeg var i trance. Jeg er dårlig idag også, jeg sveder.» Nicolai Rygg, «Noen timer med Edvard Munch,» in *Edvard Munch: Mennesket og Kunstneren (Kunst og Kulturs serie)* (Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 1946), 106.
- 5 See “De siste bilder av Munch på Ekely,” *Lørdagsavisen*, 10 December 1938. Newspaper clipping, Munch-Museum.

- 6 One photograph, apparently not sent, was addressed to Carl Dørnberger. Munch Museum, Oslo.
- 7 Among the first (possibly, the first) post-1938 publications of the photograph is Christian Gierløff, "Litt fra Skrubben og Ekely," in *Edvard Munch: Mennsekete og Kunstneren*, 95.
- 8 Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*, trans. Richard Howard (New York: Hill and Wang, 1981), 115.
- 9 Susan Sontag, *On Photography* (New York: Picador, 1973), 15.
- 10 The full history of this formula or fiction of artists' self-portraits has yet to be written, but two interrelated examples Munch knew well are Rembrandt's 1669 *Self-Portrait at an Easel* (Paris, Musée du Louvre) and Van Gogh's 1889 *Self-Portrait* (Washington, D.C.: The National Gallery of Art).
- 11 The Dr. Jacobsen photograph is characteristic of the photographs taken by others of Munch. If one surveys the publications of photographs of Munch other than his own self-portrait photographs, most frequently they are injected into chronologies of Munch's life or into other texts as unproblematic documentation, as a type of incidental visual anecdote, more decorative than informative. No history of the photographs' publication is cited. No commentary or analysis accompanies these reproductions of the photographs; frequently only a date and possibly the site where the photograph was taken are the sole information supplied. Often the photograph is arbitrarily cropped; the name of the photographer is seldom revealed. In the literature on Munch, no other body of documentation concerning him is as abused as are photographs of Munch taken by others.
- 12 Gerd Woll, *Edvard Munch: Monumental Projects 1909-1930* (exh. cat) (Lillehammer: Lillehammer Art Museum, 1993), 89–103.
- 13 The most extensive study of the fate of Munch's work in Nazi Germany remains Cornelia Germer, "Die Beschlagnehmung der Werke Munchs im Nationalsozialismus," in *Edvard Munch. Sommernacht am Oslofjord, um 1900* (exh. cat.) (Mannheim: Städtische Kunsthalle Mannheim, 1988), 340–350. The sole documentation of Munch's temporary inclusion in the Munich *Entartete Kunst* exhibition is a letter from the publisher Reinhardt Piper to Ernst Barlach, dated 28 July 1938, according to which Munch's work was removed from the exhibition following protests from the Norwegian embassy. Cf. Ernst Piper, *Nationalsozialistische Kunstpolitik: Ernst Barlach und die "entartete Kunst"* (Frankfurt a. M.: S. Fischer, 1987), 198.
- 14 *Edv. Munchs malerier og grafiske arbeider fra tyske museer*. Oslo: Harald Holst Halvorsen i Wangs Kunsthandels lokale, 18–19 January 1939.
- 15 The exhibition title varies intriguingly from the exterior cover, *Utstilling av Edv. Munch: Malerier og Grafikk*, to the inner title page, *Utstilling av Edv. Munch's Malerier og grafikk* (Oslo: Harald Holst Halvorsens Kunsthandel, September 1938). The first variant clearly indicates Munch as the artist whose paintings and graphics are exhibited, but the second, with its possessive noun, could well be read as referencing Munch's *collection* of paintings and graphics.
- 16 Atle Næss, *Munch: En biografi* (Oslo: Gyldendal Norsk Forlag, 2004), 520.
- 17 «Det er annen gang jeg er smid ut i Tyskland – [...] Jeg kan være gla der så nødig vilde selge; man krøb på knæ både i Tyskland og her forat få kjøbt. Jeg har blot med sorg solgt mine billeder der alle har været mig vigtige til videre arbejde» Edvard Munch, Letter to Jens Thiis, 1933 (MM N 2957), Munch-museet, Oslo. Dated to 1937 at http://emunch.no/HYBRID_FACSN0-MM_N2957.xhtml (accessed 13 Nov. 2016). The letter is generally dated to 1937, including at emunch.no, presumably because of its reference to an *Entartete Kunst* exhibition, assuming this to be the Munich exhibition of that year. However, Munch indicates he read in the *Deutsche Allgemeine Zeitung* about what was the first exhibition entitled *Entartete Kunst*, which took place at the town hall of Dresden in 1933. Other events discussed in the letter likewise date from 1933, not 1937.

- 18 Woll, *Monumental Projects*, 89–103.
- 19 Concerning the City Hall projects, both architectural and decorative, see Ulf Grønbold and Gunnar Sørensen, *Rådhuset i Oslo - nationens storstue* (Oslo: Aschehoug, 2000).
- 20 Identified as number 12, *Arbeide* (aquarell), in the exhibition listing, it can be identified in a photograph of the exhibition, seen through a doorway in a small, narrow room and isolated conspicuously on an easel near a window, to be confronted immediately by an exhibition visitor upon entering the room.
- 21 Significantly, Munch also included in the Halvorsen exhibition as No. 9 an early sketch for his *Human Mountain* (*Towards the Light*).
- 22 Gerd Woll, “Byggherren på Ekely,” in *Munch og Ekely 1916-1944*, (exh. cat.) (Oslo: Munch-Museet and Labyrinth Press, 1998), 110.
- 23 Karl Stenerud, “Edvard Munchs testamente,” in *Edvard Munch: Mennesket og Kunstneren*, 1-6. Cf. Edvard Munch, “Testament,” *Bomapper*, Avd. III - Aker, nr. 4 (PN 1253), Statsarkivet i Oslo. Dated 18.04.1940, as reproduced at <http://emunch.no/HYBRIDPN1253.xhtm> (accessed 13 November 2016).