Roelofs both visited Barbizon yet each drew different conclusions. The Barbizon pioneers were, in fact, still uncoordinated as a body of artists, who, while having much in common, were conveniently grouped together by the media, and, of course, shrewd art dealers, who began to see commercial advantages to placing artists together under one convenient meaningful banner.

Nevertheless, the School of Barbizon left a fascinating legacy that directly influenced not only artistic methodology, composition and ideology, but now showed how social creativity could be achieved in a village, as much as in the city. They had a strong foundation group with Rousseau, Millet and Corot, but their leadership was not necessarily charismatic. Together they acted as a model for all independent, informal, cultural gatherings, which could be made without compromising their core values and were also sustainable over decades. The relocation actually acted to give them a sense of freedom and thus regenerated their beliefs. They did this by adapting to changing circumstances and not by isolating themselves from society, as with brotherhoods. They demonstrably kept up-to-date with the latest technologies and commercial practises. Thus they became a byword for progress and an invaluable point of reference for all future artists’ colonies, as no other single movement had done before.

Chapter 4 - The Financial Imperative – Money Matters, Art Markets, Transport Improvements and other Technological Innovations

‘Fortune favours the brave.’ Such a maxim is only useful when applied under conditions of free trade, for only then does it allow the full pursuit of self-interest. In the first half of the nineteenth century, there was little such freedom in the art profession, for the majority of artists were forced into monopolistic systems of control headed by the state art academies. During the second half of the century the crisis loomed even larger, seen by the chaos experienced in the huge annual salons, the main mechanism for sales of contemporary paintings in most countries. They had become spectacles of entertainment rather than efficient selling system. The artists hit hardest by this structure were the young and the modernists; those that had not yet made their reputations and were, therefore, the least likely to be considered for the top contracts in the public or private sectors. The numbers of disaffected artists grew in all countries. What they required were alternative mechanisms and new marketing strategies.

Different countries developed different systems to cope with the crisis, the character of which related largely to their contrasting art histories. Yet the evolution of modern processes in selling art remained slow, despite the fact that representational images were being produced, and replicated, in larger numbers than at any time before. Born out of the deep frustrations with the state systems came the need for independent alternatives. Art societies were formed, but it was

---

the rise of the new generation of art dealers who accelerated the trade and better generated interest in modern art generally. Seeking a competitive edge caused the modernists to encompass many innovations in commerce, in applying new technology and in organising themselves, amongst which was the formation of like-minded artists into groups. Artists’ colonies were part action groups, part co-operatives and part self-help, grass-root responses to the situation.

Irrespective of fluctuating national economies, the situation was not helped by the rapid increase in well-trained, newly-certified professional painters, in most countries, all of whom were in competition with each other and the ‘old guard’. In Paris alone, there were over 4,000 registered painters in the early 1860s, a sum that had doubled in a decade.\textsuperscript{370} The exact amounts differed in other cities of western Europe but the pattern of increases remained equally problematic. “There are too many artists” wrote Bergeret as early as 1848.\textsuperscript{371} One result of this was the number of works submitted to the official salons became over-whelming, unmanageable, expensive and counter-productive (1:4). In Paris, for example, the watershed year was 1848, when the acceptance committee at the annual Exhibition of Living Masters was abolished, and “they were obliged to accept” 5,180 works for display.\textsuperscript{372} The experiment was never repeated. Generally, the chances of works by new artists being accepted were reduced and of more than one work being accepted was even more unlikely. The likelihood of any radical work being easily visible was also weakened. Thus, the chances of new artist’s work being shown and sold in the Academy-Salon System was disheartening. The official means of selling fine art was seen by many to be a shambles, an increasingly reactionary process and open to ridicule by the likes of Daumier. A new independent trading system arose in each country, the Dealer-Critic System,\textsuperscript{373} that acted to accelerate sales generally and modern art in particular. The rise of this system and the formation of artists’ groups, especially eponymous village artists’ colonies, was a symbiotic act. While some nineteenth century groups undoubtedly wished, ideologically, to look back to past models, such as the Nazarenes and the Pre-Raphaelites, many more artists wanted to appear up-to-date leaders, viz. the avant-garde. In an age of unbridled capitalism, society found artistic commercialism acceptable and painters thus employed the newest methods and materials, greatly assisted by a new generation of suppliers and technicians. The monetary rewards of new art were much in evidence, in the press, in the old auction rooms and in the new chic art galleries, in every city and in every country. Modern artists overcame traditional prejudices and combined well with certain commercial innovations, as seen in printing and publishing, as never before. This kind of publicity helped to broaden and smooth the financial base of many individual artists, and it also offered greater visibility to the earliest independent groups, so that identifying with a ‘colony’ soon became a widely used career strategy, for a greater or lesser period of time.

There were many reasons why artists went to the countryside. One was because it was made suddenly easier. The relationship between the development of new railway networks and rural art is common in the literature, but this is by no means always a simple linear or chronological correlation. There were, in fact, a large number of engineering, technological and

\textsuperscript{370} Bellier de la Chavignerie, \textit{Dictionnaire Général des Artistes de L'Ecole Français}, 1882. The official figures for registered artists were: 3,280 male painters, 950 female painters, 700 sculptors and 450 lithographers and graveurs. The 1848 Paris census estimated only 1,900 painters. The 1866 Paris census estimated 4,200 painters. The number of art students at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts remained capped at 120.

\textsuperscript{371} Bergeret, 1848 p. 19, cited in White & White, 1993, p.1. What he meant, in effect, was that there were not enough patrons, collectors or buyers.

\textsuperscript{372} Lethève, 1968, p. 110.

\textsuperscript{373} See, White & White, 1993.
even chemical inventions that also had a profound effect on the development of modernism, especially lithography and photography. This study asserts that it is not only that inventions improved that was so important, but how they became affordable and when they were cost-effective. Some innovations had a positive affect on painting, while others were perceived as a threat, at least at first, such as lithography and photography, again. In many ways the existance of so many rural artists’ colonies was proof positive that certain innovations worked, for these groups were test-beds for many experiments, financial arrangements and marketing strategies, irrespective of ideology or artistic style.

Pooling knowledge, experience and resources in the form of a group began to look increasingly attractive, especially after widespread publicity, in national newspapers and new illustrated art magazines, was directed at certain successful art circles.

However, it must be remembered that the term ‘School’ was not applied to either Barbizon or The Hague painters in their hey-day. The economic and social disorder of the Napoleonic Wars continued to reverberate across Europe for many decades, despite visible industrial expansion. Applied science and international trade lay behind much wealth creation, but the speed of change and the effects of unrestrained capitalism had many critics, including artists. For many painters, industrialisation and urbanisation were enough reasons to send them into the countryside. Yet, ironically, the new generation of artists also wanted to be seen as part of this modern world, at the cutting edge of fashion and reform. The new mobility of labour that was ushered in by the railway networks fueled the artists frustrations to the point that they were now easily able to access the major art market cities, which, in effect meant Paris and London. Paris encouraged the training of painters and tolerated thier eccentricity in ‘Latin quarters’, such as Montmartre, but London had the greater capital and commercial potential. However, the rise of the middle-classes everywhere meant that traditional patronage of the arts was no longer dominated by one elite group. Market forces began to shape most aspects of art production and distribution.

One of the new major catalysts for change to emerge in the modern and international trade in contemporary artwork was undoubtedly the new generation of art dealers. These men were not from the traditional antiques and auction-house trade, but arose often from the sale of prints and painters’ materials, such as Paul Durand-Ruel in Paris, Ernest Gambart in London, Adolphe Goupil in Paris and The Hague, the Cassirer brothers in Berlin and Valdemar Kleis in Copenhagen. But, which came first, the business or the art? The dealers were shrewd strategists and keen observers of the buying public but they had, of necessity, to be patient. The rise of the modern art market took decades and the rewards could be significant for the dealers and the artists involved if one did not weaken.

If there had not been economic advantages to joining rural artists’ colonies they would not have been as popular as they undoubtedly were. Yet, this economic migration was not as straight-forward as many undoubtedly believed it to be at the time. To many painters the immediate focus of economic attention was simply on the availability of a cheap village inn, but moving to the countryside was no guarantee of artistic development or success. The history of such communities shows that while some villages had no guest-houses at all when the artists first arrived, yet others had too many. Artists, like any self-employed people, acted on probabilities for much of the time; weighing up the options; balancing budgets; sacrificing a meal perhaps to
buy a tube of good quality paint. Money matters applied to all artists, irrespective of their backgrounds, age, nationalities or styles. The avant-garde were affected as much as those that chose the juste milieu. As artists’ colonies were open forums for discussion, it follows that all manner of practical information was exchanged, including what to invest in, where to save and how to sell.

**The Effects of New Technologies**

Sometimes only a few new technologies may bring about major change: so it was with how and where painters painted. There are few real inventions: rather, they may be regarded as technological improvements, for most things have an historical precedent. If one takes photography, for example, then ‘Daguerrottyp’ was first patented in 1839, yet, Leonardo da Vinci, amongst others, described and used the camera obscura. Light sensitive-materials were known about in the eighteenth century, when John Herschel discovered the value of hypo-sulphides, in 1819, for fixing those images. What the art profession soon found out, by the 1850s, was that rapid improvements in the development of cameras and the use of negatives had a direct effect on their incomes. Photography had a profound and direct effect on society, in general, and portrait painting, almost immediately, yet there were many other manufacturing break-throughs that matured, and also became cost-effective, by the second half of the century. It was not so much that they were invented, discovered or created at that moment which made them so important, but that they improved quality, were more reliable, more widely available and affordable that made them such a powerful force for modernism, in art, in applied art and design.

Financial considerations affect every stage of a product’s development, including the technological research, production and distribution. Suddenly, after mid-century artists’ materials and equipment became much cheaper and fashionable. Some innovations seemed to capture artists’ imagination almost immediately, such as the ‘square-brush act’ of Bastien-Lepage, which, though mocked, was seen in action from Brittany to Sweden and from Volendam to Newlyn. He promoted the use of the new, broad, thin, square, metal-ferruled brushes and even palette knives, not for under-painting, as previously, but throughout, and whose strokes were allowed to be visible on the final canvas. Hand-made round brushes were still common, but the new, mass-produced, tin-capped brushes were easily affordable and just as effective. Traditional materials and equipment were usually maintained until the new inventions proved themselves and the prices fell. One of the best examples of this cost-benefit analysis was the new packaging of oil paints, which was traditionally done in skin bladders. They were inefficient and dirty, but they were simple, portable and cheap. Glass, brass and tin syringes were all developed in the 1830s, but proved inadequate and too expensive. In 1841, George Goffe Rand (1801-73) patented the first “metallic, collapsible tube for oil paints” and their process of manufacture, which solved problems of colour preservation and cleanliness. Soon they were mass-produced in
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347 One interesting new book on this subject is by the artists David Hockney, 2001.
348 Hartrick, 1939, p. 28. He encountered many Bastien-Lepage followers in Brittany in 1884 and wrote of him “if he is to be believed he used brushes two inches in width”, what he referred to as the ‘square-brush act.’
tin alloys. Colourmen saw the benefits for amateur and professional painters and investment was made that soon stimulated the industry globally. However, tubed oil-paints were not initially cheap and only wealthy artists, such as Corot, could afford to use them in the early 1840s.\textsuperscript{377} By contrast, his Barbizon colleagues kept to the cheaper options for at least another decade. The full potential of certain new technologies are not necessarily realised immediately, for only when the tube franchise was bought by more dynamic manufacturers, such as Lefranc in Paris, Charles Roberson\textsuperscript{378} and Winsor & Newton in London, in 1842, did it provide a major stimulus to chemists and technicians to experiment further with pigments, oils and additives. What, one wonders, would the French Impressionists have achieved without the new generation of cheaper, brighter tubed-paints and the new, mass-produced, tin-ferruled, square-brushes?

Before examining the many innovations in artists’ pigments and equipment that allowed artists to work more-easily in the countryside, it is useful to focus on a much larger, heavier and nation-wide development that is commonly associated with causing rural artists’ colonies, the railways. This relationship is not as easy as is commonly accepted, for it explains the general mobilisation but not the concentration of artists, per se. A typical recent comment: “They [colonies] were also facilitated by the spread of the railway network into inaccessible areas.”\textsuperscript{379} This statement is broadly correct, yet this study points out a great many exceptions, as Egmond, Newlyn, Skagen and Worpswede had no direct rail links at the time of artistic colonisation. The opposite is true in some cases. P.S. Krøyer was of the opinion that “Now that the railway has come the place is so overrun...the happy old atmosphere...has become impossible.”\textsuperscript{380} There is a price to pay for all improvements and sometimes it proved too much for the pioneer artists.

Cost-effectiveness was of constant concern to the adventurous pleinairists in artists’ villages, yet, as with all factors, it was a matter of degree. The cheapest way to travel is to walk, but it did not get artists far and few painters are actually recorded as striding out beyond the city limits.\textsuperscript{381} There is every reason to agree with those who considered much early French Impressionism as art at the end of the railway, as they painted so often around the periphery of suburban Paris, most famously at Argenteuil and Pontoise. For a landscape such as The Netherlands possessed, water proved to be an expensive obstacle to the building of a national railway network. Its extensive water-transport system does not seem to have been exploited by artists to any great extent. In this type of situation, it was the development of inexpensive, narrow-gauge tramways, which appeared in the 1880s, that finally attracted waves of painters to villages, such as Katwijk, Laren, Scheveningen, Volendam and Zandvoort. Mainline railways undoubtedly helped painters access the most distant regions, but it did not follow that just because there was a railway there was a rush of artistic interest. Long-distance travel was made easier and cheaper and presented more opportunities and variety, not less. The distance from the city was of less importance than the time, the convenience and the cost.

Most authors seem to have missed the simple spatial factor that village artists’ colonies were never more than one-day’s journey from the capital city. St. Malo, Douarnenez, Quimperlé,

\textsuperscript{377} Hermens, 2002, p. 115, claims that Corot used tubed paints in the early 1840s, which promotes him as one of the first recorded artists so to do.
\textsuperscript{378} Charles Roberson \& Co. Archives (ledger - MS.245-1993., p. 367) show that they started buying Rand’s tubes at least as early as June 1842. Between June and the end of November they bought a sizeable 900 dozen empty tubes.
\textsuperscript{379} Fox, 1993, p. 9.
\textsuperscript{380} Saabye, 1990, p. 152. citing a letter from Krøyer to Heinrich Hirchsprung in 1891.
\textsuperscript{381} Gigoux walked from Besançon to Paris, at the age of fourteen, a distance of c.300 miles, while Daubigny considered walking to Dauphiné in 1839, twice that distance, on 150 fr. or 40 sous a day for twenty days. These are rare examples of painters hiking long distances to work.
Pont-Aven and Concarneau, were right on the limit of a one-day’s travel from Paris, c.450 kilometres, by the 1870s. Fano and Nymindegab were one-day’s rail travel from Copenhagen and the North Frisian islands were the same from Berlin. The position of Skagen, however, presents a number of interesting exceptions to the general pattern. The Danish pioneers who traveled to Skagen from Copenhagen were in for a difficult time which-ever route they took. There was no direct rail link over the three hundred, or so, kilometres, and any journey required tedious ferriage. Frederikshavn, the nearest town and port to Skagen, joined the national rail network only in 1871. There was no good highroad to Skagen, which required a treacherous wagon ride along the beach to complete the last twenty kilometres. As early as 1833, North Jutland was connected to Copenhagen by scheduled paddle-steamer, for H.C. Andersen and Martinus Rørbye took a steamboat together the first time they visited. Yet, importantly, Frederikshavn also received ferries from Gothenburg and Christiania (Oslo), which are much closer to it than Copenhagen. This explains the large proportion of Swedish and Norwegian artists amongst the Skagen’s pioneers. Only Krohg seems to have arrived directly by sail boat on Skagen’s beach, in 1879, although Frits Thaulow owned a yacht which he sailed as far as Belgium and Holland.

One of the largest groups of art enthusiasts, who participated in the development of artists’ colonies, in the 1880s, had come at even greater cost in time and money. The Americans, although there were a lesser number of Antipodeans and even a few Japanese, had braved long ocean voyages. North American art students had already invested much by crossing the Atlantic Ocean by ship. This made their journey a major financial undertaking from the start. It also affected their attitude about returning to their homeland, especially during summer holidays, for example, when the academies traditionally closed. Having risked much to get to Europe, they wanted to maximise their investments by using all their time conscientiously and working in a village, especially on the cooler coast, for the summer was therefore seen as less of a gamble for them. Many artists took ferries yet few considered the option of sailing their own boats or persuading fishermen or merchant traders for a lift. Krohg’s compatriot, Fritz Thaulow, went one better and sailed his own yacht down the North Sea as far as Zeebrugge and into the Zuiderzee. Yet, he was beaten to Volendam by a French artist, Henry Havard, who sailed around the Zuiderzee in 1873, looking for ‘undiscovered’, remote, and therefore unspoilt villages.

Artists much preferred to travel on land. Horses do not seem to have been considered very much as an option, although the Anglo-American duo of G.H. Boughton and E.A. Abbey famously toured North Holland in an open, one-horse wagon. On assignment for Harper’s Monthly Magazine in 1880, they wrote about and drew the charming landscape, in general, and Volendam, in particular. Their illustrated articles and book, Rambles Through Holland, 1885, that resulted from their wagon-rides, greatly influenced other artists to explore the same countryside, but not in the same manner. Scheduled coaches connected towns and all but the smallest villages, by this time. Horse-drawn trams were installed on some particularly popular routes, especially where the coast was near a city, as with Scheveningen from as early as 1839. One Dutch song-sheet cover illustration called ‘The Tram-way March Galop’ shows a crowded coach on rails, horse-drawn, on Scheveningen sea-front, with its stylish pavilion and pleasure-
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382 Nooren & Jensen, 1983, p. 92. The horse-drawn Wagons Dietz were replaced by steam-powered trams in 1879 and connected The Hague directly to the sea front.
The tracks were laid down in the 1860s and in the early 1880s, typically, the Dutch tramways had steam-powered locomotives, as seen in Mesdag’s *Panorama*, completed in 1881. They were so cheap and convenient for some Hague School painters that it lessened their need to lodge in Scheveningen’s hotels and logement. They were able to gauge the weather from their homes in The Hague and catch the suburban tram accordingly, and within less than one hour they could catch the right weather. It also offered the possibility of greater continuity, when matching their atmospheric renditions on a day to day basis. The main disadvantage, for these artists, was that railways also brought in masses of visitors, yet tourism often brought about the investment to modernize transport in the first place.

Surprisingly few artists actually chose to paint the new railways, although they used them. The Dane Julius Exner painted *In a Railway Carriage*, 1890 (4:4), a rare subject for a fine-art canvas, although a common enough situation by then and a service he was familiar with as he regularly crossed the country to visit Fano and the North Sea coast, every summer from 1877-1910. His wagon interior echoes a more famous water-colour, *The Third-Class Carriage*, by Honoré Daumier, c.1862. Probably the most sensational reaction of all to the coming of the new locomotives was earlier still, in England, by J.M.W. Turner, characteristically based on a real event, and called *Rain, Steam and Speed*, 1844. In Mesdag’s *Panorama*, 1881, one can just see the narrow-gauge-railway winding its way across the marshes and dunes away from the city, but, curiously, out at sea none of the ships pictured are steam-powered. Similarly, the waters that surround Skagen were very busy shipping lanes yet most artists omitted to paint the steamboats. What Mesdag and his colleagues often show are distant chimney stacks and the billowing smoke clouds coming from these steamers. One of the few coastal artists’ colonies that seemed to welcome this technology was in Germany, at Ekensund, north of Kiel. The easiest access to this little village, with its old shore-side brickworks, was by paddle-steamer from the port at the far end of the fjord, Flensburg. Rather than share the normal ambivalent feelings towards industry, invention and steam-power these modernists accepted it as part of the regional topography.

One of the leaders of the Ekensund colony was Alex Eckener (1870-1944), whose elder brother, Hugo (1870-1954), was also a pioneering aeronautical engineer, director of the Zeppelin company, from 1911, and commander of the Graf Zeppelin.

The rapid organisation of a nationwide railway network allowed German artists based in the inland cities to access the coast. It enabled one group of Munich painters lead by Hans Olde and Lovis Corinth to gamble on forming their colony on the most-northerly island of the Frisian archipelago, Fano, in 1884. Later, the urban avant-garde expressionists of Dresden, Die Brücke, enjoyed cheap tram-trips to the Maurititzburg Lakes just north-west of the city and then soon risked the further adventure of 450 kms., by rail, to another part of the North Sea coast, at Dangast, in the hope of starting a coastal artists’ colony. This distance is about the maximum one.
could travel comfortably in one day, although later a more direct line from Prague, through Dresden, on to Altona-Hamburg and then Husum brought the scenic Frisian islands of Sylt, Amrum and Föhr into reach of most central Europeans.

Across the North Sea in England, artists found that coastal villages were suddenly simple, cheap and easy to reach, such as Southwold from 1879 and neighbouring Walberswick in 1881. They are only 150 kms. from the metropolis and required just one change of train from Liverpool Street Station in central London to the tranquillity of this sandy stretch of coast. So popular was the village of Walberswick with London artists that it gained the nick-name ‘W.C.3 by the sea’, a satirical reference to the seasonal migration of ‘Chelsea’ artists to this coast.

However, the development of artists’ colonies in relation to the railways is not necessarily so consequential or predictable. When, for example, one examines the chronology of events that led to England’s largest cluster of artists’ colonies, all around the Cornish coast, then the pattern is not so conveniently sequential. After 1876, the completion of the Great Western Railway past Plymouth finally enabled the far end of the Cornish peninsula to be reached in a day from London, distance c.400 kms. This undoubtedly helped Newlyn, St. Ives and then Lamorna Cove to grow as early artists’ colonies, yet this new line reached Cornwall as early as 1851, a quarter of a century earlier. In 1852, there were rail lines all across this county and, as early as 1796, the Cornish tin mines had, in fact, lead in the invention of steam engines and locomotives, through the actions of the Cornish mining engineer Richard Trevithick, amongst others. It was industry, not tourism, which brought about its earliest developments. The problem of linking Cornwall to the rest of the country was the turbulent waters at the mouth of the River Tamar. Before, artists such as the Turner (1811) had simply sailed around the coast or used the Saltash ferry, but it seems that most Victorian painters were far less adventurous. This railway problem was not solved until Isambard Kingdom Brunel completed the Saltash Bridge in 1859. This still left another two decades until the first wave of plein-air painters initiated the artists’ colonies.

Cornwall and Devon have a wealth of attractive fishing villages, mostly near a railway before 1880, yet few artists’ colonies developed there at that time, compared to Brittany. The Great Western Railway aimed for the distant and strategic port of Penzance. This town is not at the end of the peninsula. It was too uneconomic to push the railway further round Mounts Bay, so Newlyn, at the far end, never had a station. However, the economic prospects for St.Ives were considered advantageous enough for them to push a line over to this north coast harbour. Here, the rail company built its own grand hotel, The Tregenna Castle, in 1878, recognising, already, and hoping to profit from the increase in visitors and tourists. Such hotels were far too expensive for most roaming painters, who were now beginning to explore this region, but this village was
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385 The nearest station at Halesworth to Walberswick was inland, at the head of the estuary, on the main line that ended at Lowestoft, a major port and fish processing centre in the late nineteenth century. Two narrow-gauge railways were built, the first to Southwold along the higher ground on northern side of the valley.

386 Officially named: The Victoria and Albert Bridge.
quick to offer alternative and cheaper lodging-houses for artists, including the welcoming Sloop Inn overlooking the harbour.

Following typical Victorian notions of the day regarding the high moral duty of art, a number of painters were first attracted to the primitive human conditions of the traditional fishing village at Newlyn. It is interesting to note that one of the first artists here was the art student Caroline Burland Yates, who soon married her colleague Thomas Cooper Gotch (1854-1931) yet they did not settle here until 1887. Both were prior friends with the Cornish painter Henry Scott Tuke (1858-1929). The breakthrough for the group came with the arrival of several painters and a photographer, all from Birmingham, led by Walter Langley (1852-1922). He was kept busy supplying various commissions from galleries and patrons, yet these allowed him to become the first artist to settle in the village.

By contrast the clear opalescent waters of St. Ives, its sandy beaches and dramatic scenery attracted landscape painters rather than genre artists. The expansion of the village economy grew rapidly because of the railway, so that its shops and businesses thrived. One merchant on the High Street, James Lanham, noticed the influx of artists in the mid-1880s and started selling stationery and then artists’ materials. In 1887, he risked opening the village’s first art gallery. The artists’ colony in and around St.Ives grew apace only from 1883, undoubtedly helped by the fact that it lay at the terminus of railway, yet it also took the arrival of a few painting celebrities to further advertise its charms. Chief among them was James Abbot McNeill Whistler, accompanied by two young acolytes. Documents have not lasted that tell which of the three classes of carriage they travelled in, but it is difficult to imagine Whistler taking Third Class. It was a simple process, for they boarded the train at Paddington Station in Central London in the early morning and, with little delay, by sunset, they could alight onto the warmer, and always frost-free, platform of St. Ives. They over-wintered in St. Ives, 1883-84. However, no major paintings resulted from this group or any of the earliest St. Ives artists, certainly not by comparison with Newlyn’s painters. Langley achieved their first triumphs, but it was the arrival of Stanhope Forbes and his immediate success with a series of salon pieces that advertised the village’s reputation. Because of physical restrictions Newlyn was not able to grow in size, so that St. Ives benefited from the constant wave of visitors. One local historian, H.H. Robinson noted that it was an: ”abode of a continuously residential colony” rather than “a temporary sketching ground” used by Londoners. It also attracted many more foreign artists, who enhanced its reputation, such as the Swedes, Anders Zorn (1860-1920), who notably changed from using watercolours to oils here, and Julius Olsson (1864-1942), who settled, opened an art school and even became a local Justice of the Peace. The talented Finnish artist Helène Schjerfbeck (1862-
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387 In 1880 Langley was commissioned to complete twenty watercolours by the Edwin Chamberlain Gallery. In 1881 the Birmingham businessman J.W. Thrubb agreed to buy his whole year’s work, just over 100 watercolours, for £723, the equivalent of £30,000 in 1997, according to his biographer Langley, 1997, p. 56.

388 For example, several newspapers were printed here, as presses could now be reliably transported. The Western Echo and The St.Ives Weekly and Visitor’s List, reflect this demographic change before 1900, as did the Domburgsch Badnieuws (1883-1930) in western Walcheren.

389 Lanham’s Art Galleries were bought by Benjamin Bramham in 1911 and again in 1919 by Martin Cock, a wine merchant who had started the local newspaper, The St.Ives Times, in 1889.

390 Menpes, 1908, pp. 135-53. Menpes (1860-1938) was a young Australian and Walter Sickert (1860-1942) was born in Munich of a Danish-German father, from Flensburg, with an Anglo-Irish mother. Sickert was always cosmopolitan and initially trained for the stage, touring with Henry Irving, before entering the Slade Art School in 1881. Sickert had previously visited Cornwall, including St. Ives, where the fishermen recognised him and gave him fish as a present, much to Whistler’s chagrin.

391 Robinson, 1896.
1946) worked in St. Ives in the mid-1880s, along with more Scandinavians, French, Germans, Austrians, Australians and North Americans, all greatly helped by the convenience of the trains.

The railways brought in more and more artists, yet as this network is a two way system it also facilitated the export of their artwork. Each year, just before the all important Royal Academy show, these Cornish artists cooperatively hired a whole carriage to take their paintings safely to London. This allowed and perhaps encouraged the larger ‘salon-pieces’, such as Stanhope Forbes *Fish Sale*, 1885 (121.5 x 155 cm.) and his *The Village Philharmonica*, 1887 (131 x 168 cm.); Frank Bramley’s *A Hopeless Dawn*, 1888 (122 x 167.8 cm.) and Norman Garstin’s *The Rain It Raineth Every Day*, 1889 (94 x 161.7 cm.). Forbes settled permanently in Newlyn, for the last fifty years of his life, so that it is probable that most of his 223 academy pieces also travelled this way. Without a train it is difficult to imagine these artists being able to either conceive of or transport their works to any of the city exhibitions, as they did, and gain the sales they needed to further their careers. Smaller *plein-air* canvases predominate in rural artists’ colonies, partly for reasons of economy, yet it appears to remain important to the painters to offer the salons a regular *grand machine* to enhance or continue their reputations, alongside the ‘pot-boilers’. Some artists, such as P.S. Krøyer, had a village studio and a city studio, so he could finish the larger pieces right up until the show day, in Copenhagen. Yet, he still managed to complete and transport some of his larger canvases before the rail link to Skagen, for example, *Summer day on the beach. Bathing Children*, 1884 (154.6 x 212.5 cm.). Similarly, it is difficult to imagine Mackensen’s massive (235 x 376 cm.) *Sermon on the Moor*, 1895, being transported to Munich’s Glaspalast from Bremen by any practical means other than a freight-car.

The distribution pattern for artists’ colonies in The Netherlands is slightly more diverse, but was still largely governed by the relationship of railways to the water, especially near sands. The first section of the Dutch national railway network was laid down between 1843-45, to link the most important economic centres in Holland, Amsterdam, Haarlem, Leiden, The Hague and west Rotterdam. 1845 also saw the completion of one single line that went straight inland. It ran south and east from Amsterdam through Utrecht and terminated abruptly at Arnhem, on the sandy north bank of the River Rhine floodplain. There was not a gap of years, as with Cornwall, before artists invested in this journey, for it immediately provided Hague School painters with easy access to a rather rare environment, for The Netherlands. An area of natural ancient forest lies west of Arnhem, on the poor sandy soils of Veluwe, and this was exactly what they came to paint. The penultimate stop on this railway, just before Arnhem, on the edge of the escarpment, lies the village of Oosterbeek, 75 kms. from The Hague. An artists’ community of sorts collected here over the following twenty-five years, producing refreshing pictures of mature woodland glades and the dense, mossy, forest floor. Curiously the *Nederlandsche Rijnsloorweg Maatschappij* was reluctant for the line to continue further eastwards, on into Germany, for almost another decade. When it did link up with Westphalia, the artistic flow was reversed downstream, especially amongst professors and students from the Düsseldorf Art Academy, who happily flocked down to their nearest sea coast.

Lacking major heavy industry, investment in the Dutch railways came more from the potential it held for passenger transport. Tourism was one contributing factor to the expansion of
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392 Hefting, 1981, lists at least twenty painters, with an average age of 27. Some predate the railway, such as B.C.Koekkoek (1803-62), but the majority arrived soon after its completion, such as J.J.Cremer from 1844, Willem Roelofs, after 1847 and Koekkoek’s teacher P.J.C.Gabriel in 1854.

393 Veenendaal, 2001, p. 12. The line from Arnhem to Emmerich (am-Rhein) and the rest of Germany was not completed until 1856.
many trams and rail systems, as seen between The Hague and Scheveningen, or Leiden and Katwijk. In other countries, such as Germany, artists generally had an uneasy relationship with mass-tourism even though it was a powerful sponsor for modernising transport links and erecting hotels. In England, one unforeseen result of the arrival of a railway into a fishing village actually destroyed its economy, much of its character and the attractiveness for its small artists’ colony. On the rocky coast of the North York Moors, at Staithes, the development of the village was closely related to the catching, processing and exporting of North Sea herring. There were few tourists, yet the fish merchants were rather cosmopolitan, coming from all over Britain, Holland and France to buy the catch. Artists came from the provincial cities nearby, such as Leeds, Newcastle, Sheffield and Nottingham to picture this characterful way of life and its traditional sailing fleet. The completion of a railway to the harbour at Staithes, in 1875, had two consequences: a new brick viaduct immediately destroyed the traditional architectural views over and above the village; and, more significantly, the fish-processing activities declined as it became more economical to transport the fish, by train, to other, larger, central factories. By 1881, the trawler-fleet had almost disappeared and, soon enough, most of the painters left. Artists Laura and Harold Knight lived on in Staithes until 1907, then moved to Newlyn, a very similar fishing community under the cliffs, now with a new harbour, but not a railway.

Over the century a great many exciting new innovations in materials and equipment stimulated the creative processes. Prime amongst these new technologies was the invention of the “metallic, collapsible tubes for oil colours” patented in 1841. This simple yet brilliant invention caused wide ranging changes to the production and distribution of paints. Tubes resolved all the problems of preservation and clean efficient packaging, so they were taken up immediately by city colourmen who soon enlarged and invested in new ‘manufactories’, with the latest steam-powered grinders and impact extrusion machinery. They invested much more in research and development, than ever before, and the range of pigments and accessories expanded accordingly. By the 1830s, widespread interest had been shown in the improvement of packaging and selling of artists’ paints. In London, for example, brass syringes were promoted, but they were costly, at £4-10sh. per dozen.

6:4 – Winsor & Newton’s famous old display board, 1st August, 1911, now in their museum at Harrow-on-the-Hill, West London.
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395 Harold Knight (1874-1961) and Laura Knight (née Johnson, 1877-1970).
396 Rand’s tubes were first sold by Thomas Brown, 163 High Holborn, a colourman favoured by J.M.W. Turner. Harley, 1971: Rand made several complex franchise deals that ended by favouring Winsor & Newton, although he also started several companies that continued making tubes, including organ pipes, in London, on Howland Street, then Cleveland Street and finally at 24a Cardington Street, Hampstead, before he returned to New York (372 Broadway, c.1850).
397 In April 1822, James Harris, submitted his invention of “a syringe for the purpose of preserving oil paints” to The Royal Society of Arts, in London. Winsor & Newton advertised glass syringes in the Art Union from August 1840.
Cheaper ones made of tin, at £3-10sh., still did not prove popular. In 1840 Winsor & Newton pioneered glass syringes (6:4), but all efforts by colourmen were quickly eclipsed by Rand’s invention. In 1842, the major tube franchise was bought by Winsor & Newton, of London. The industrialisation of artists’ paints now began in earnest and the economics of scale soon began to apply, providing much better quality, stability and practical standardisation of the product. Prior to this invention, local colourmen sold cheap, traditionally ground, pigments in simple pig-skin pouches or bladders. It would be erroneous to suggest artists immediately abandoned bladders, despite their many disadvantages, for they were messy, seeped and once punctured, with a tack or peg, soon solidified or coagulated. On request, it is known certain colourmen, such as Blackman in 1790, mixed stiffer paints for ‘excursions’ in the countryside. By the 1850s artists’ paint manufacturing was big business, as seen by the rise of many major internationally-trading firms in London, Paris and Düsseldorf.

Paints kept for much longer in the new tubes with screw-tops and especially after opening. Armed with a box full of these tubed-paints, artists were not only free to travel they could go for longer periods, and because of standardised catalogues and numbered systems, they could even re-order by post, or over the new telegraph lines, from stockists in any distant city. However, in reality, the general adoption of artists’ oil paints in the new tubes was neither simple nor quick. Even in Paris, artists were slow to use these tubes because of their costs. The first documented appearance of tube paints in Paris was an advertisement in 1847, although Constantin writes that they were not more generally affordable until well into the 1850s. Analysis of the early catalogues from the Paris firm of Lefranc and the London-based Winsor & Newton reveals a number of interesting details. Typically, Alphonse and Jules Lefranc had started their business in 1720, selling watercolours in hard-cakes, tablets or pans and oil paints in bladders. The invention by Rand of collapsible metal paint tubes gave London a distinct trading advantage, although they were largely used for gouache, not oil paints. As the watercolour tradition was strong in England, it particularly helped the firm of Winsor & Newton launch their new ‘Moist Colours,’ also called body-colour, in this easy-to-use form. Their huge success laid the foundation for the company to expand and reinvest in machinery, for oil paints. Watercolourists were required to use a slightly different method of application when using gouache than the normal cakes, yet they were just as portable, as Walter Langley, amongst others, found to his benefit when working in Cornwall, Brittany and Holland. In their catalogues the colourmen promoted guides on how to use the new paints and books on the many new colour theories, such as M. Mérimée’s The Art of Painting in Oils, which first appeared in France c.1820 and then in an English edition in 1839, and George Field’s Chromatography, from 1835. Winsor & Newton’s catalogues from the 1840s onwards offered a number of helpful books for sale including Harding’s Principles and Practice of Art: “The Act of painting in Water Colours has been greatly assisted by the improvements in the preparations of the pigments: the
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399 Winsor & Newton, 38, Rathbone Place, Bloomsbury, founded in 1832, eventually had four shops in the area and a South London Works, or ‘Manufactory’, in Kentish Town. Charles Roberson of Long Acre, London also acquired Rand’s tube franchise in 1842, seen in its archives held in the Hamilton Kerr Institute, Cambridge University.
401 Constantin, 2001, p. 53.
402 The firm of LeFranc combined with another colourman Joseph Bourgeois, in 1867. Their main outlet was at 18 rue de la Croix des Petits Champs and they had a factory on the then outskirts, just south-east of Paris, at Issy.
403 Harley, 1965, p. 27. Carlyle, 2001, pp. 299-302. George Field (1777-1854) was also famed for being the favourite colourman to members of the Pre-Raphaelite Brotherhood.
greatest advantage, however, has been the introduction of moist colours, which, I believe, are a French invention, but greatly improved by Messrs. Winsor & Newton.404 Harley concludes: “During the early 19th century the range of pigments was wider than ever before, owing to the contribution of chemists and colourmakers, yet the necessity for painters to make wise use of their colours was correspondingly great. Fortunately, increased availability of technological information together with a new attitude to art training gave painters ... a considerable advantage over their immediate predecessors, and they were consequently in a position to make intelligent use of the contribution of science to art.”405

Analysis of retail catalogue prices over the following half a century show that the paints in tubes did not increase in price.406 Manufacturers now offered a superior range of pigments, mediums and stabilizers than ever before. Different colourmen were favoured over others for specific paints or additives. For example, the firm of Colcomb-Bourgeois, in Paris, was noted for good quality Antimony Yellow and Cobalt Blue, yet the basis of their fame was their own Madder Carmine. The company of Charles Roberson, in London, was internationally celebrated for producing its own Artists’ Medium. Their subscribers’ records, from 1820-1939, show many hundreds of artists as diverse as William Morris, Jozef Israëls, J.M. Whistler, Stanhope Forbes, while he was resident in Newlyn’s artist colony; George Hitchcock, while he was resident at Egmond; and even rival firms, such as, the firm of Schmincke in Düsseldorf, used it specifically.407 The Roberson’s catalogue for 1841 shows “colours sold in both bladders and tubes,”408 but by the 1870s and certainly 1880s oil paint tubes dominated the trade. Bladder-packaged paints were the traditionally cheaper option but they were inherently risky, the quality varied, pigment strength was inconsistent, additives were dissimilar and, once pricked, also had a tendency to separate the jelly. Manufacturing not only improved the quality of the paints it modernised the range of materials on offer and their distribution. This new packaging helped create a fashionable image for painting en plein-air, as well as being brighter, more colourful, having entirely newest pigments, being cheaper, cleaner and more convenient to use.

Around 1850, Tomel estimated that a medium-sized canvas (125 x 80 cm.) took approximately 100 francs worth of paint.409 This was already quite a large investment for a struggling artist, even if one excludes from the total the cost of turpentine, oils, mediums, varnish, other additives, canvas, and the frame. With the rise of plein-air painting, manufacturers and suppliers thrived, feeding the amateur and the professional alike. In the 1895 Lefranc catalogue prices for tube oil-paints average approximately two francs for a size number 6, c.60 ml. (an equivalent of Winsor & Newton’s double-three inch tube). Tomel suggests that the average artist used around 50 standard oil-paint tubes per medium canvas. Yet, in reality, picture production is an on-going dynamic process with many variable costs that overlap. Larger tubes of basic colours were made available, to save time and money, but, while the artist is looking to make some savings, the one area he cannot afford to sacrifice is paint quality. It is worth noting that Lefranc’s size 13 tube, their largest, at over 15 cm. long and 3.5 cm in diameter, c.200 ml.,

404 Winsor & Newton, Trade Catalogue 1849.
405 Harley, 1965, p. 188.
406 Winsor & Newton, 1863-1901: most prices remained remarkable stable over the period, as with the standard four inch tubes: Treble size: one shilling (twelve pence); Double size: eight pence; and, Regular size: four pence. (The multiples ‘treble’ and ‘double’ refers to the width or capacity of the tube.)
407 Charles Roberson & Co. started at 51 Long Acre, London from 1828-53, expanded to number 99 Long Acre, after 1853 and even had an outlet in Paris, 26 rue Chaptal, by 1862.
409 Tomel, 1898, quoted by Lethève, 1968, p. 150.
cost five francs each,\textsuperscript{410} one of which alone was approximately equivalent to an average labourer’s daily pay. The very largest sizes were available only for a few of the most common pigments, not black but white.

One of the few artists’ travel paint boxes that survived complete from that period, around 1900, belonged to the Dutch artist G.W. Dijselhof (1866-1924).\textsuperscript{411} The variety of tubed oil paints here indicates how artists favoured different products from different manufacturers, in this case: Schmincke (Düsseldorf), Schoenefeld (Düsseldorf), Briault (Paris) and Schouten & Voskuyl (Amsterdam). Most of the contents, c.65 small tubes, came from the Amsterdam firm of Claus & Fritz. They were founded in 1841 and became one of the most popular colourmen in Holland by the end of the century. Typically, they ground some pigments under their own name, but also acted as agents for other leading suppliers from England, France and Germany.\textsuperscript{412} Lethèvre suggests that purchasing one oil-paint tube at that time was also equivalent to the cost of a day’s food.\textsuperscript{413} If one puts this together with Tomel’s postulation of fifty tubes, then the average artist planning a season in the countryside had to make considerable sacrifices for his art, even before he got on the train. Producing smaller-sized canvases was one simple solution. Plein-air painters already produced studies that were the size of the lid of their travel paint-boxes, c.30 x 28 cm., to which they were pinned and now it became increasingly common to finish the work quickly and at one sitting, \textit{alla prima}. This size of canvas became closely associated with the early Impressionists. Most impressionists stopped using varnish altogether, another saving, whereas various lacquers were an integral part of traditional techniques. Landscape scenes and many topographical subjects, by implication, abrogated the need to pay fees for hiring models, yet more financial savings.

There were paint makers in most cities across Europe, but not necessarily artists’ colourmen. Chemists and house-painters also made up pigments, but the quality varied. By the second half of the century market forces now reduced their number as big manufacturers emerged to compete internationally because of cheap transport costs. The better paint companies produced printed catalogues and had agents. According to one recent study, by Stéphanie Constantin, Paris in the 1860s probably had the largest number of individual suppliers. There were at least fifteen main Parisian firms used by the Barbizon painters and another ten minor shops that were patronised.\textsuperscript{414} Provincial colourmen were thought of as producing inferior quality and so it paid to form a close working relationship with a particular supplier. In 1859 Alexandre Lefranc became the manager of the family firm and duly expanded the business. He

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{410} Only a few basic colours were put into the largest tubes, such as their ‘Blanc d’argent’, silver white, or ‘carbonate de plomb’, lead white; equivalent to W. & N.’s half pound tubes of Chemnitz-, Silver- and Flake-White.
  \item \textsuperscript{411} Laar, 1995, pp. 195-208. The paint-box is now in the collection in Drents Museum, Assen.
  \item \textsuperscript{412} The oldest artists’ paint company is said to be one founded by four painters in 1664 in The Hague. It was run by the St. Lucas Guild and Pictura Brotherhood from 1682-1882. Its fortunes increased in tandem with the rise of many Hague School ‘masters’ and supplied Mesdag’s spectacular Panorama of 1881. Sons of the artist Willem Roelofs ran it from c.1905, when it was subsequently called \textit{Oudt Shevenigen} or \textit{Oudt Hollandse Olieverfmakerij}.
  \item \textsuperscript{413} Lethève, 1968, p. 149.
  \item \textsuperscript{414} Constantin, 2001, pp. 49-61.
\end{itemize}
supplied Paul Delaroche and he became friends with many other leading artists, including Millet, who painted his portrait. Of all the Barbizon artists, Millet, however, varied his patronage the most, but his actions had more to do with his fluctuating finances than any varying quality of materials or equipment from artists’ suppliers.

From a supplier’s point of view, there were many new business opportunities to be gained from the new enthusiasm for painting outdoors. Winsor & Newton’s 1849 catalogue already identifies some major areas for special attention. There are many sizes of traveller’s boxed-sets, in mahogany or ‘japanned’ tin. The size and range of watercolour or oil paint sets were large enough to suit every taste, use and class. Catalogues were packed with information, prices and were well-illustrated, showing, for example, various types of easels; collapsible seats or pinchards; “sketching umbrellas” or parasols; wood and metal palettes; millboards, pencils, chalks, gums, papers, ‘German Silver Ferrule’ brushes, chemicals, mathematical instruments, drawing-boards, sketchbooks, pads, etc. They offered, in one convenient compendium, almost all the requirements for the atelier and for the field. As all major artists’ suppliers produced these illustrated catalogues and advertisements for equipment regularly featured in newspapers and magazines, it may easily be concluded that the trade confirmed the trend, as well as generating the widest possible interest in painting, particularly in the countryside.

The leading artists’ paint makers tended to own at least one or more central metropolitan shops of their own and a more spacious ‘manufactory’ on the edge of the outer suburbs, partly because of the increasing demand but also as the tubes, chemicals and paints themselves were often toxic. For example, Winsor & Newton had ‘works’ out in Kentish Town and Lefranc’s manufactory was situated at Issy-en-Seine (7:4). They also relied on the new railways and telegraph networks to supply shops all across the country and internationally. Their integrated marketing system is another example of innovative business structures that first came to prominence only in the second half of the nineteenth century, just as the dealers and publishers were doing.

Early catalogues have prices that refer to a standard range of approximately thirty common pigments. Most pigments were traditional and tended to be either simple earths or organic in origin and were therefore reasonably cheap. For the more exotic pigments, such as Aureolin and Orange Vermilion, prices rose to thirty pence each (one eighth of a pound sterling), and for organic compounds that required a long extraction process, such as Madder, 48 pence per tube (one fifth of a pound). The most expensive pigment, historically, was Full-Strength Ultramarine, which retailed, in 1863, at one guinea, twenty-one shillings or an astonishing 252 pence, for the standard tube. This one pigment alone was a major investment. It therefore attracted the attention of entrepreneurial chemists to create a cheaper yet suitable substitute. This first became available in 1828 in France and soon after in Britain where it was called French Ultramarine or, more commonly, Ultramarine Ash, although one might obtain weaker grades, half-strength compounds at proportionately lower prices. Paints might be purchased at cheaper prices, but then artists risked sacrificing quality. Consequently, at the top end of the market, manufacturers put greater emphasis on the integrity of their products. Use was made of endorsements, a typical practise of the period, and names of famous contemporary painters were printed at the front of their catalogues. In addition, Winsor & Newton employed the use of the Royal warrant of the Prince Consort, Albert, in its catalogues after 1849. W.& N. displayed its new products at the 1851 Great Exhibition in London’s Crystal Palace, commissioning a large, specially-designed, glass and mahogany display-cabinet. They also presented Queen Victoria with a huge, luxurious, ebony and ivory box-set of paints, including tubes, that also went on
show. The 1883 Winsor & Newton catalogue printed details of medals awarded at the 1851 International Exhibition and later ones, such as the 1893 Chicago “World’s Columbian Exposition” and in 1894 at Antwerp, where they won another Gold Medal and Diploma of Honour. These factors raised the profile of the business enormously and, by implication, gave themselves a competitive edge in the fast growing international market.

Typical of the new generation of suppliers was the firm used by the animal painter Rosa Bonheur, P. Pièle, who had three shops in Paris by the 1890s. Their illustrated catalogue has a layout, price-lists and sizes very similar to that of Winsor & Newton. Their text includes information on Lefranc’s oil paint in tubes sold to the following countries: “Spain, England, Portugal, Russia, Italy, Austria, Sweden and Norway, Switzerland, Germany, America, etc....” The names of many painters are mentioned as recommending Lefranc’s products, among them is Richard Bergh (1858-1919), a Post-Impressionist Swede who had first worked at Grez-sur-Loing in the 1880s, but is mentioned in the catalogue as living at Varberg, then a major coastal artists’ colony south of Gothenburg. This shows the breadth and depth of their marketing structure at the height of the artists’ colony movement. The evolution of the paint tube had been slow, taking decades to reach market dominance, but tubes were now on sale in most cities and in many artists’ villages by the close of the century. One of the few artists’ hotels to sell painting materials was the famous Hotel Baudy in Giverny, which sold products from the Paris paint firm of Lefèvre & Foiret, a relatively new company not mentioned in Constantin’s survey. David Schulmann started selling artists’ materials in Laren from 1901, initially in the Pension Kam on St. Janstraat, then from his own shop on the village green. Other rural outlets appeared in village shops along the coast, such as the small stationers, N. Schild of Egmond, North Holland. It sold materials from the Düsseldorf firm of Schoenfeld, most probably at the suggestion of the American artists George Hitchcock and Gari Melchers, who had connections to that city’s art academy before moving to this small fishing village in 1883 where they starting their art school.

Colourmen traditionally sold artists’ pigments, along with apothecaries. Chemists began to develop a huge new range of pigments that became commercially interesting from mid-century, seen in their catalogues. The formulas for these new colours were soon printed in the catalogues, adding to the period’s fascination with science and reaffirming their faith in new technology. The first, fully-documented artificial pigment was Prussian Blue, Ferric ferrocyanide, formulated as early as 1707 in Berlin, by Diesbach and Dippel. But, it was in the nineteenth century that most new, improved and cheaper colours arrived, such as Cobalt Blue, Cobalt aluminate, discovered in 1802, by Gahn and Wenzel, although not widely found until after the Napoleonic Wars. Other include: Viridian (Veronese Green) in 1838, the Cadmiums after 1846, Cerulean Blue in 1860 and Alizarin Crimson in 1868, which all combined to double the paints available. One focus of attention was into the properties of the wonder material of the age, Coal, which produced both good and bad results. The choice of very cheap coal-blacks and bitumen-browns was rued later by painters as they proved somewhat unstable, or ‘fugitive’. Artists’ faith in coal derivatives was restored, somewhat, because of a bright new range of aniline dyes, such as Mauve, Magenta and Geranium Lake. Mauve was the first to be isolated, by

415 Bonheur used a number of different suppliers before 1895 including P. Pièle. Surviving catalogues in Chateau By give three addresses for Pièle, at: 1, Passage du Jeu-de-Boules; 146, Rue Amelot; and, 14, Boulevard Voltaire.
416 Richard Bergh is also of interest for buying Gauguin’s Brittany Landscape (1889) in 1892, in Copenhagen. The picture became a great source of inspiration for the Varberg artists’ colony.
418 Lannoy, 1969, p. 145.
William H. Perkin (1838-1907) in 1856, and in use by at least 1872. The second aniline dye, *Magenta*, or *fuchsine*, was discovered in 1860. There is at least one close link between Magenta and a coastal artists’ colony, for “one of the most striking qualities about Volendam, its color [sic], caused the artists-illustrators to dub it the Magenta Village.” The American artist, Edward Penfield (1866-1925) wrote: "With partly closed eyes, looking down the broad pathway, magenta was overwhelming. It showed on the red tiles of the tiny houses, on the shirts of the men, it peeped up from the brick pavement, and a soft haze near the horizon scintillated its colors." What this indicates is that these artists shared the traditional artistic temperament yet were acutely aware of new trends and the most up-to-date technological discoveries at the same time. Armed with this new range of pigments and materials, artists now could hardly fail to produce more colourful pictures, more quickly and more expressively, even in the countryside.

“The significance and therefore importance of these innovations has been obscured by the more easily understood influence of photography, the development of which occurred in the same decade.... Furthermore, photography, watercolour cakes, and oil colours in tubes had their predecessors – the *camera obscura*, Chinese inks, and the bladder colours. It was nevertheless the introduction of photography, that ushered in a revolution in painting by influencing the way we see and the way we apply the observations so made.” Photography undoubtedly had the most profound effect on the art profession, for it quickly hit them in their pockets and diverted revenues from portrait painting. Soon after Louis Daguerre (1789-1851) officially showed the photographic process in Paris, on 19th August 1839, it became demonstrably popular with the public, confirmed by the sales figures and the proliferation of studios. It has been estimated that by 1847 already 100,000 portrait ‘Daguerrotypes’ had been sold in Paris alone. This figure far outstrips normal portraiture, although these huge quantities were due mostly to their use as *cartes-de-visite*. In London, an estimated 105 million photographs were developed in just one year, 1862. “The alarm of artists … was unmistakable.” In 1841, one Paris photo-studio charged a mere 15 francs for a portrait, as opposed to several hundred for a commissioned painting. In 1845, Beard’s studio in central London charged one guinea for a bust portrait and was quoted later as saying he made “18 shillings profit”, on 3 shillings costs.

The training and cost of being a photographer was minimal by comparison with that of a professional painter. Their numbers not only rose, they were also quick to mobilise, travelling to the most distant villages, setting up tents in country fairs and festivals. Studios multiplied in the cities. London had over 200 photo-studios by 1861, 35 on Regent Street alone. Hamburg and Berlin had almost 60 studios by 1850. Between 1885-87, the number of photographic studios in
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419 The complexities of paint and pigment manufacture are well-covered in Chapter 8, pp. 147-62, of Carlyle, 2001.
422 In a letter from Barbizon in 1849, Millet asked his friend and patron Sensier to get him a list of paints, but the word tube was not mentioned, although later, 8th February 1865, in a letter to his colourman Blanchet he is more exact: “20 tubes of Cobalt, 10 Vermillon (3,50); 6 Verona-Green (1,80); 6 Venetian Black (1,20); 6 Bitumen (1,50); 6 Raw Sienna (1,20); 6 Burnt Sienna (1,20); 4 Red-brown (80); 3 Van Dyck Red (75); 3 Italian Orange (1,80); 2 Indigo (90); 6 Raw Umber (1,20); 6 Burnt Umber.” The bracketed numbers were the prices in *centimes*. See also Sillevis, 1885/86, p. 210.
423 Ayres, 1985, p. 111.
424 Ibidem.
427 Ibidem.
Copenhagen grew from 60 to 92. Even taking into account that much of their business was commercial and involved reproductions, rather than being concerned with aesthetic representation, photography hit hard at the pockets of many artists, for portraiture was still the bread-and-butter of most professional painters. “Though the camera has never eliminated portrait painting, it robbed painters of their most predictable livelihood,” wrote Hyatt Mayor.428

The first specialist artists to suffer were the miniature-portraitists. This may be gauged from their rapid decline in exhibitions. In England, for example, the entries at the Royal Academy shows between 1800-1810, annually average 200 miniatures, but by 1870 this was reduced to only 33.429 Photography satisfied much of the mood of late Romanticism, being both expressive and objective, but purists were horrified at the dominance of mechanical means, which blinded them to its artistic potential. Baudelaire, in his Salon critique of 1859, attacked the process, Daguerre and other artists who were seduced by it: “A revengeful God has given ear to the prayers of this multitude. Daguerre was its Messiah....From that moment our squalid society rushed, Narcissus to a man, to gaze at its trivial image on a scrap of metal. A madness, an extraordinary fanaticism took possession of all these new sun-worshippers. Strange abominations took form.”430 However, “Many artists and critics affected to despise the new invention until....they decided they wanted photographs of their mothers.”431

The history of art includes many mechanical instruments as aids, namely the camera obscura and camera lucida, which were still used. Fritz Thaulow is known to have used a camera lucida at Skagen, for example. The American Alfred Stieglitz made some remarkable beach photographs in Katwijk from 1894. Irrespective of ideology, artists found uses for photography, as Daguerre originally intended, as an aide-mémoire. P.S. Krøyer bought his first camera in the summer of 1885 for about fr. 500, or Dkr. 300. To help put this into some kind of perspective, Krøyer was asking Dkr. 3,000 at the time for just one small painting.432 His purchase came as a set, some of it rather bulky, for he developed his own material. His Skagen kit included a large tripod, medium-sized glass plates (13 x 18 cm.), extra lenses and bottles of chemicals. His masterpiece Hip, hip, hurra, 1884- 88 (1:1), was based on two photographs taken by Stoltenberg and Krøyer’s series Summer Evening on Skagen’s South-beach (8:4), were based on his own Cynotypes, which had the advantage of working in poor light. Many of his colleagues are also known to have used cameras, including Hammershøi, Willumsen, Slot-Muller, Rohde and Michael Ancher, who based his Anna Ancher returning from the Field, 1902, on a photograph.433

The invention of another mechanical process was also a major breakthrough in artistic creativity and reproduction. It was viewed more positively than photography from the start by

428 Hyatt Mayor, 1971, (no pagination)
429 Ibidem.
431 Rosen & Zerner, 1984, p. 99. This is a direct reference to Baudelaire, who is said to have asked the photographer Gaspard Nadar (1820-1910), the close friend of many Impressionists, to take a series of pictures of his aged mother in 1865, despite having made strong criticisms of the process publicly, in print, since at least the Salon of 1859.
432 Saabye, 1990, p. 145. The painting was called Italian Peasants.
433 See, Exh. Cat. Århus, 2000, p. 24, the photograph of which is in Skagens Lokalhistorisk Samling.
most artists as it offered some financial security for natural drawing talents, which found it
difficult to progress as painters. Lithography first appeared in Munich in 1804,\textsuperscript{434} but it is
probably best known because of the fine satirical works of the artist Honoré Daumier (1808-79),
in Paris from the 1830s. Daumier’s first commissions were in the anti-government weekly \textit{La Caricature}
and then in the magazine \textit{Le Charivari}. He is said to have completed at least 4,000
lithographs. Such large quantities were not unknown with other lithographers. For example, the
Hamburg artist Otto Spekter (1807–71) is said to have completed ‘1000 Bildnisse auf Stein’,\textsuperscript{435}
but his pictures are much more of a topographical nature, than Daumier’s social comments.
Spekter took over the family printing business in 1834, although he, and his brother Erwin
(1806–1835) had already begun exploring the region, looking for suitable topographical subjects,
including the coasts north of Hamburg, as far north as Fanø, the first professional artists to reach
that island.

In Denmark, J.W. Tegner (1815-93) completed at least 1,000 lithographs for his series
\textit{Billeder efter danske Malere} (1830-80).\textsuperscript{436} This popular anthology included portraits of the
earliest Danish Golden Age painters and, more importantly, promoted many contemporary
painters, including all the major members of Skagen’s artists’ colony. Tegner, together with A.
Kittendorff (1820-1902), ran a small, adventurous printing house from 1851-93, initially
consolidating their business using lithographical illustrations for popular book series, such as
Danish Manor-Houses and the Danish Artists. They managed to persuade even conservative
painters of the medium’s usefulness. For example, they combined the draughtsmanship of the
conservative painter Julius Exner with the popular, lyrical poetry of Christian Winther. The
result was a children’s book called \textit{Billeder og Vers}, which they published in 1862.\textsuperscript{437} Lethève is
of the opinion that “few artists enjoyed greater freedom” because of high demand for
lithographers, as publishers were anxious to get work out on the streets ever quicker.\textsuperscript{438}
Lithography held much potential for small and large commissions with printers and publishers
that helped overcome temporary financial setbacks. In an era that had no dole, social security or
welfare state, and few tenured art teachers in state schools, illustration work provided a degree of
steady financial support and the possibility of a spring-board to other areas of creativity.

The larger and therefore the most profitable print runs were not done with lithography or
the improved woodblocks, but with line-block steel engraving. Lithography, etching and other
intaglio printing could not keep pace with the new steam-powered printing methods. The affect
of printing on nineteenth century art was manifest in several different ways: as an art form in
itself; in reproductions of fine-art; as illustrations; and in publishing material generally. One
example of how potent the new printing method was may be deduced from the success of \textit{The Penny Magazine},
founded in 1832. They had been printing 1,000 sheets a day, which then rose to
18,000 double sheets per day but soon reached astonishing runs of 200,000 copies on their new,
steam-powered presses. The first illustrated art periodical is said to be \textit{L’Artiste}, founded in
1831, closely followed by \textit{Gazette des Beaux-Arts} and, in 1839, \textit{Journal des Artistes}. Their early
illustrations employed wood-blocks, but promising sales figures stimulated further investment,
so that the second generation of magazines used lithographs, notably \textit{La Caricature}, owned by

\textsuperscript{434} Lithography was invented by the German Johan Aloys Senefelder (1771-1834) in 1798 as a cheap means to
reproduce his theatrical productions. His book \textit{Vollständiges Lehrbuch der Steindruckerey} (1818) was soon
translated into English, \textit{A Complete Course of Lithography} (1819).
\textsuperscript{435} Feddersen, 1984, p. 165.
\textsuperscript{436} Nygaard, 1922, p. 52.
\textsuperscript{437} Exner & Winther, 1862.
\textsuperscript{438} Lethève, 1968, pp. 162- 65.
Charles Philipon. Popular illustrated magazines started up in most countries within a few years that were informative and more irreverent. For example, in 1841, *Punch* magazine started in London, in imitation of the new satirical Parisian publication *Le Charivari*. In 1842, *The Illustrated London News* began and, in 1843, *Die Illustrrierte Zitung* was founded in Stuttgart. This was also the year the bi-weekly *L’Illustration* started in Paris, which employed many artists, and which, in 1849, was responsible for publicizing the first wave of *plein-air* painters and their favourite villages around Fontainebleau.

Those early Barbizon artists included a high percentage of illustrators and engravers, for example, Karl Bodmer (1809-93), Charles Jacque (1813-94), Olivier de Penne, who worked for *L’Illustration*, Ferdinand Chaigneau (1830-1906), and Millet, who accepted one contract to illustrate a popular American novel about Daniel Boone, as early as 1851.439 This trend towards commercial graphic work continued throughout the century as more artists explored more ways to create a healthy income. As transport and communications also improved greatly over the same period it was only a matter of time before artists took full advantage of this potential to visit or settle in the countryside. Importantly, it also allowed them to keep in contact with their publishers and printers in the city, on a regular and affordable basis. One excellent example of this new kind of mobile artist-illustrator was Willy Sluiter (1873-1949), who was an active member of several artists’ colonies, including Katwijk, Laren and Volendam. He lived in Katwijk, from 1898, then Laren, from 1904, but worked for publishers all over The Netherlands. His first cover-design was for *Pictura*, in 1895, a catalogue for the art society of Dordrecht. He worked for *De Nieuwe Groninger Courant*, in the North, but most contracts were in The Hague, *De Nieuwe Groene*, *De Haagse Post*, *De Kampioen* and the satirical magazine *De Ware Jacob*. He had political interests and worked for socialist newspapers, such as *De Criticus*, *De Hyda*, *Het Hamertje* and *Uilenspiegel*. He also worked for the popular liberal newspaper, *De Nieuwe Amsterdammer* from 1915-18. His poster designs included one for a tyre company, *Bakker Branden*, in 1908; the *Splendo Tabaksartikelen*, 1916; and, *Naval Peppermint*, 1920. In addition, there were book illustrations and comic caricatures for, amongst others, *De Nieuwe Scheveningen Koerier*. Thus, by 1916 over half his income came from printing contracts.440

Print-sellers, art dealers and publishers became common in most cities as the century unfolded and enriched certain artists who fed the demands of the public for visual images. Fine-art reproduction has a long and diverse history, but the new generation of engravers with powered-printing presses combined to offer a vast imagery as never before. A select number of artists who recognised this early on and whose work was easily adaptable made fortunes, such as Jozef Israëls, Ary Scheffer and Laurens Alma-Tadema, from The Netherlands. Works by them were replicated not only in larger print runs, but in special editions, folios and in finely bound albums, astutely arranged by publishers rather than the artists. As the financial rewards increased so too did the tensions over ‘protecting one’s interests’. This may be judged by an acceleration of legal cases and increased legislation across Europe over intellectual copyrights.441

The historic concept of artistic ownership and copyrighted material emerged from literature and the theatre in the eighteenth century, but owing to the technological improvements

439 Murphy, 1984, pp. 38-4. Millet’s friend and neighbour in Barbizon, Karl Bodmer, asked him in 1851 to complete this book contract, for four large lithographs showing episodes in the American frontier life of Daniel Boone. Rousseau always refused such commercial work, but it shows that practical considerations counter certain carefully crafted images of Millet, especially by Sensier, who wrote in the Preface to his Millet biography: ”he was first of all a man of strong convictions”, Sensier, 1889, p. 2.

440 Marijnissen, 1999, p. 64.

to mechanical reproduction one sees a change of emphasis shifting from the craftsman to artist to technician, a debate that continues today. For example, in the 1700s various engraving acts appeared in modern countries that protected the artist, who usually did all the work or supervised it. Then amendments shifted the emphasis to protect the engraver’s skills. In England, there was the Copyright Engravers Act of 1766. In France, there was a similar Copyright Act, of 1799. In The Netherlands, decrees were made in 1793, 1796, 1803, 1817, 1881, and so on, that amply illustrate the concern over this fast evolving process.442 In 1852, again in England, protection was afforded to prints taken using mechanical means, primarily because of lithography, and amended in the Hogarth Act in 1862 to include photo-lithography. In France, one pivotal trial occurred in 1861-62. It concerned the photographers Mayer & Pierson who accused Beteber & Schwabbe of pirating images, portraits ironically, claiming copyright under the 1793 and 1810 laws, which applied to replication of the arts.443 The results of the many court cases fought over this issue are of value alongside the knowledge that successive legislation never quite caught up with commercial potential apparent on the streets and in the print shops, all across Europe. Artistic replication continued to stimulate an ever wider thirst for more images, some more realistic, others more stylised, yet they both offered employment possibilities to artists.

Public interest was aroused by the publicity surrounding artists’ copyright fees at least from 1815, when J.-A.-D. Ingres (1780-1867) sold the reproduction rights to his La Grande Odalisque for twenty times more than the purchase price. The Art Journal, June, 1846: ‘as a circumstance to excite no little surprise in England, and perfect astonishment on the Continent, that for the four paintings by Mr. Edwin Landseer this year, he received nearly seven thousand pounds – i.e. £2,400 for the paintings and £4,450 for the “Copyrights”.’ The astonishing figure in question had much to do with Ernest Gambart and print-dealers like him, who in many ways let in a kind of corruption, which had long lasting effects on Victorian artistic styles, techniques and attitudes.444 One consequence of concentrating on painting for printable images was the emphasis it placed on precision, neatly defined form and outline. It affected much fine artwork, yet it also raised issues to do with pictorial integrity and whole the direction of modern art.

Gambart’s career had an affect on art as great as Durand-Ruel’s in Paris, and, like him, he both fed the public’s demand and stimulated its wants. He had originally moved to London as an agent for Goupil, the Paris art dealers, in 1842, to promote prints and copies of French pictures. Much may be deduced from the first exhibitions he made later in his own gallery, the Egyptian Hall on Pall Mall, after 1854. It was not the content of the paintings that brought him fame, but their connections with royalty and the fact that the proceeds were in aid of the Crimean War wounded. It gained him much public goodwill in a business that always had many critics. He also met and befriended some influential figures, especially Sir Charles Eastlake, President of the Royal Academy. Gambart then organised an exhibition of contemporary French paintings, a clever mix of celebrities with more radical artists, which included Eugène Delacroix, Ary Scheffer, Constant Troyon, Théodore Rousseau and the young animal painter Rosa Bonheur. The Queen came with the Prince Consort, any promoter’s dream, economically speaking. They were so delighted they bought twelve paintings, including four works by Bonheur. However, the real profits were yet to come, both for Gambart and Bonheur. Between 1853-68, Gambart bought or commissioned fifteen of her pictures, including their copyrights, for 284,000 francs, which was more than enough for her to buy herself a mansion, the Chateau By, right on the edge of the

442 Ibidem.
Forest of Fontainebleau and live there in comfort for the remainder of her days. Such actions gave the business of the art market a powerful reputation and gave new hope to all aspiring young talents.

In London, Gambart had trouble with copyright infringements of Bonheur’s masterpiece *The Horse Fair.* From 1862, he ran two legal cases against photo-printing piracy; one against Sidney Powell of Chandos Street and another against the proprietor of a shop run by a Mr. Ball in the district of High Holburn. Interestingly, the defence council revealed that, under Crown Law, it was still illegal for an engraver to copy a photograph but not for a photographer to copy an engraving. The law remained imprecise and in his frustration Gambart penned a long article in April, 1862, entitled “On Piracy of Artists’ Copyright.” Nevertheless, what Gambart and Bonheur’s successful and highly visible collaboration showed was the enormous financial rewards possible in the Dealer-Critic system. Her fame spread worldwide in her lifetime and she was, arguably the richest woman painter ever. Although she is often associated with the School of Barbizon her technique owes little to their pioneering realism. In 1865 she was knighted and became the first woman to have the higher Imperial Order of the *Legion d’honneur.* Empress Eugénie came to tea and she was a favourite of Queen Victoria, to whom the engraving of *The Horse Fair* was astutely dedicated by her agent Gambart.

Gambart’s biographer, J. Maas, notes that: “over the years the relationship between Rosa Bonheur and Gambart ripened into one of the most singular [financial] liaisons in the history of nineteenth century art.” She was invited to London and brought her Salon piece, a typical ‘grand machine’, *The Horse Fair,* 1852-3, which measured an impressive 8 feet by 15 feet (240 x 450 cm.). Unfortunately, she had failed to sell this masterpiece to her home town, Bordeaux, which could not raise the fr.12,000 she asked. Going for export, she raised the price to fr.40,000, or £1,600. Gambart bought it, including its copyright, and immediately ordered an engraving from Thomas Landseer (1798-1880), brother to the Queen’s favourite animal painter Edwin (1802-73). Queen Victoria ordered that *The Horse Fair* be transported to the palace, but, although impressed, did not purchase it. Gambart put it on show, a not-untypical enterprise with monumental pictures at that time, the entrance fees from which easily brought in revenue to match the original price. Visitors paid one shilling each and the catalogue was priced six pence, both standard prices for such exhibitions. The engraver was paid c.800 guineas and the first print run of 10,000 cost Gambart 1,000 guineas. These figures indicate how much the print market was booming and the Art Journal’s earlier comments about copyright inflation were correct. “By 1860 not an eyebrow would have been raised at this.” Fine art printing opened up all manner of new possibilities in the expanding art markets all across Europe and replaced portraiture as the financial basis for the professional painter.

---


446 Maas, 1975, p. 159.

447 Maas, 1975, pp. 70-72.

448 *Illustrated London News,* 1858, p. 254. One advertisement for a show that included Bonheur’s *Horse Fair,* Meissonier’s *Chess Player* and Ary Scheffer’s *Ecce Homo* shown at the City Art Gallery, is accompanied by another for Colnaghi, a rival printer but sometime collaborator, for this exhibition was at Gambart’s French Gallery. Both exhibitions charged an entrance price of one shilling, with a catalogue priced at six pence.

449 Maas, 1975, p. 20.
High fidelity painting, such as the historic, costumed moralities of the Pre-Raphaelites, were seen as revolutionary around mid-century and proved highly adaptable to engraved reproduction. Gambart bought at least ten Millais paintings, including *Ophelia, Isabella and the Pot of Basil, Autumn Leaves, The Black Brunswicker* and *The Blind Girl*, all with an eye to printing them. From Holman Hunt, Gambart bought *Finding the Saviour at the Temple* in 1860, including its copyright, for a total of £5,500, “the highest sum for a living artist.”\(^{450}\) One of the dealer’s main contracted artists was William Powell Frith (1819-1909), who became enormously popular for his crowd scenes of contemporary life, such as *Derby Day*, 1858, and *The Railway Station*, 1862.\(^{451}\) Frith’s *Ramsgate Sands* (or, *Life at the Seaside*), 1851-54, confirmed the theme of holiday-making on a beach. Unfortunately this sentimental photo-realism so dominated the Victorian art market that it undermined the spreading of other modernist movements, such as those being developed across the Channel by the Realists, Colourists, Dutch and French Impressionists. Something of this printing dilemma affected other art markets in countries around the North Sea, for the commercial reproduction of paintings greatly helped the careers of, for example, Julius Exner in Denmark; Arnold Böcklin in Germany and, of course, Jozef Israëls in The Netherlands. Unfortunately, in Britain the scale of this trade was so powerful that this trend in verisimilitude became so ingrained that it dominated public and private patronage of the arts for generations.

Lithography lent itself well to small printing commissions and print runs, such as postcards, greetings cards, letterheads, pamphlets, business cards, posters and advertising flyers. In the case of Emil Nolde (1867-1956) one contract was enough to set him on the road to independence and settle him back on the coastal plain from where he came. He made a series of cute comic anthropomorphic Alpine postcards, when in St. Gall in Switzerland, which paid him handsomely. On the strength of it, 25,000 Sfr., he gave up his teaching job, in 1896, got married and returned to North Friesland, where they lived off that fee until 1904.\(^{452}\) Further down that coast other printing commissions were accepted by artists in small resorts, for example, the gentle rise of tourism in Katwijk stimulated much local enterprise who in turn wanted much small-scale yet well-illustrated printing jobs done, so that Sluiter, Toorop, Munthe and Hans van Bartels all made graphic designs for local firms. The German Eugene Müller (1869-1925) made lithographic letterheads for one of the artists’ favourite hotels, the *Hotel du Rhin*, c.1905. Sluiter designed and illustrated menus.\(^{453}\) Toorop and Munthe made posters for the big outdoor fishing exhibition and collaborated with the Dutch VVV tourist agency (9:4).\(^{454}\) In other coastal locations tourism

\(^{450}\) Maas, 1975, p. 119, Gambart made £6,000 over four years on the viewing of this picture alone (p. 131)

\(^{451}\) The dealer Lloyd bought Frith’s *Ramsgate Sands* for 1,000 guineas but when Queen Victoria expressed a wish for it, he sold it to her without profit, but cleverly he kept the copyright and made huge profits. Similarly, Jacob Bell bought *Derby Day* for 1,500 guineas, but Gambart kept the copyright, printing 5,000 reproductions on the first run.


\(^{453}\) Marijnissen, 1999, pp. 64-65. He had many commissions for menus: in 1897 he was paid only f25 for a Congress in Dordrecht; in 1900, he received f70 for 18 menus; and, in 1923 his highest fee was f50 for one.

\(^{454}\) VVV is the abbreviation for *Vereeniging Vreemdelingen Verkeer*. For Munthe, see Kraan, H & J.P. Brakel, 1989.
was anathema to many artists, but at Katwijk the younger generation came to terms with the problems and turned them to their advantage.

Toorop invested in a printing press for his Katwijk villa on the seafront, in 1892, where he designed and made many of his finest graphic works, such as *Apocalypse*, 1892; *The Three Brides*, 1893; *Nirvana*, 1895; *Hooge Land*, 1896; *Venus of the Sea* and *The Young Generation*, both of which caused a sensation when exhibited in Paris. The year after he purchased the press he joined one of the first specialist graphic societies in The Netherlands, the *Etsclub*. His interest in the print media extended to his time in the other artists’ colony in his life, at Domburg, where it can be seen from their printed catalogues that most of the core members produced prints for sale, of one kind or another over the decade. Mies Elout-Drabbe, in their 1912 exhibition, for example, offered fine *Isographie* portraits of Toorop; Toorop showed two different sets of prints; one print from Jan Heyse; Piet Mondriaan offered four different graphic works, as did his fellow expressionist Lodewijk Schelfhout. Priced at between ten and forty guilders each, they were within the range of most buyers and, in the context of sales in a small sea-side resort, more likely to sell than the f 2,000 Hart-Nibbrig asked for his canvas *De legende van Veith den vedelaar*, that same year. Toorop’s health stopped him painting but not producing graphic works.

Artists’ colonies were demonstrable showcases for all kinds of styles and techniques. It can be seen that they also wanted to apply the commercial practises they had experienced in city galleries and art societies. The leaders usually brought direct working knowledge of these financial strategies to the group. This may easily be seen in Toorop’s organisation of the Domburg group, 1911-20. This was a well-organised group and had invested carefully in their enterprise, not only obtaining a site and erecting their own stylish exhibition hall, but making simple yet attractive catalogues, better than any comparable artists’ colony along this coast. However, by 1918 and 1919 the content of paintings declined, reflecting the post-war economic depression, and so the proportion of cheap prints increased. Toorop left and the whole enterprise began to reflect a more parochial commercial atmosphere. In reality, the artists’ colony lost its original momentum as Toorop withdrew.

The desire to express artistic creativity in print is stronger in some cultures more than others. This process was reinvigorated as part of the experimental creativity of artists’ colonies. Some of the most interesting art prints were made in distant Pont-Aven and Le Pouldhu, amongst the Synthetists from 1888-95. They produced a fine variety of etchings, lithographs, woodcuts and even ‘Zinkographs’. Maurice Denis, Emile Bernard, Paul Gauguin, Roderic O’Conor, Paul Sérusier and others brought materials with them, but also seem to have improvised from drift-wood, metals and paper that came to hand in the villages. Zink was a relatively-new metal, yet they seem to have made progress using it for etchings and engravings. Quickly, their work was put on sale in Paris, in a special show organised to coincide with the huge *Exposition Universelle* of 1889. Their exhibition poster cleverly pointed out this proximity: *Champ-de-Mars, en face le Pavillon de la Presse*. Unfortunately, their initiative was not a financial success but it does indicate the speed of production possible, the improved communications and the entrepreneurial zeal of the avant-garde, as apparent in the countryside as in the city.

---

456 All the Domburg catalogues were printed by a local company, Van Staarten of Middelburg. The first catalogue featured a fine-line drawing of ‘Charlie’ Toorop and the second also shows Jan Toorops draughtsmanship, with his choice of another portrait, this one of a Walcheren peasant farmer. The 1916-19 Domburg catalogues were designed by Jan Heyse (1882-1960) using a decorative stylish art nouveau style.
458 The first group exhibition of the Synthetists took place in the *Café des Arts*, owned by M. Volpini.
This pattern, of experimental printing, is more understandable in Germany, which has a long and close association with wood-block printing, both commercial and artistic. This seems almost absent or marginalised in countries such as Britain and Denmark, although eccentric individual craftsmen do emerge occasionally, such as Thomas Bewick (1753-1828) and Ernst Hansen (1892-1968). The strong German tradition of printing continued in cities, such as the Munich School of Etching, the Dresden Secession, the Karlsruhe Colour Lithographers and amongst radical individuals, such as Käthe Kollwitz in Berlin. Die Brücke artists saw no reason not to bring printing to their rural retreats. Schmidt-Rottluff and Heckel, for example, brought lithographic stones with them on their first trip to Dangast in 1907. They also continued to carve woodblocks whenever, wherever, and of whatever timber they found in the village. Schmidt-Rottluff was particularly inspired by the brick-kilns near Dangast, (10:4) where he and Heckel also painted. Typically, his woodcuts are simplified and raw, often showing the cross-grain and, judging by the burnishing marks on the reverse of surviving blocks, were sometimes pressed by hand rather than by machine and consequently the print runs were course.459 He is credited with making 663 prints, between 1905-27, of which 446 were woodcuts and 121 were lithographs. Heckel’s output was no less astonishing, 460 woodcuts, almost 200 etchings and 400 lithographs. They did not create a permanent studio in Dangast, but they had at least one local convert, Emma Ritter from nearby Oldenburg, who also made woodcuts, including her fine Überschwemmung, 1911, a view of the Dangast fore-shore at low tide. One other Die Brücke colleague, who visited them on the coast at Dangast, was Max Pechstein. He is more closely associated with Nissen, an artists’ colony on the sandy Baltic coast, although he also worked later, as did Heckel and Schmidt-Rottluff, on the North Sea island of Sylt. Pechstein became more politically active than most of his colleagues and was expelled from Die Brücke, in 1912, not for his radical views but because the group had rigid rules about money. Pechstein had exhibited as an individual in the Berlin Secession, against the Die Brücke regulation of only ever showing together, as one group.

The financial situation amongst the pioneers of the Worpswede artists’ colony was raised when their young colleague, Heinrich Vogeler, received a substantial inheritance, which had two consequences: the first was that he designed and built himself a villa, the Barkenhoff, on the south Weyerberg; the second was that a printing press was purchased and installed in it yet made available to all the colonists. Most of the other colonists had training in Düsseldorf and so it was Hans am Ende in 1894 who taught Vogeler how to etch. Vogeler was a far better draughtsman and graphic designer than a painter, and took to printing quickly, printing his own etchings and working for publishers. The print medium inspired Vogeler more than any of his colleagues and consequently he produced a wider range of material. His first portfolio, ‘An den Frühling’ (To Spring), and was sold from 1899 (11:4). He also seems to have encouraged Paula Becker, who produced twelve etchings in her short career. Sequential aid of this nature is not untypical of village artists’ colonies.

459 Carey & Griffiths, 1984, p. 126.
Vogeler’s most significant professional association was with the new literary journal *Die Insel*, from January 1900. It also strengthened his contacts with many other aspiring German artists, including the poet Rainer Maria Rilke (1875-1926), whom Vogeler befriended and invited to Worpswede. This liaison quickly lead to the first book published on the pioneers of the artists’ colony, in 1903, written by Rilke, which greatly added to their fame and the romantic image of a new rural utopia. Curiously, he omitted any mention of all its early women artists, including his girl friends Clara Westhoff, later his bride, and Paula Modersohn-Becker, arguably its greatest original talent. In contrast to all his Worpswede pioneers, Vogeler is famed for the adoption of a strong linear style, *Jugendstil*, which took over all his graphic designs. It is usual for artists’ colonies to employ more than one style, technique or artistic process, which helped to diversify and strengthen their economic base. However, this style was most apparent in German artists’ colonies, in part because of Vogeler and one other situation, the urban colony at Darmstadt. Here, Grand Duke Ernest Ludwig von Hesse sponsored an arts centre. It was organised specifically to be a show-piece for contemporary international arts and crafts. Stylish contemporary domestic designs were promoted in a series of show-houses and exhibitions. Various artists were invited to contribute to the project, including the architect Mackay Baillie Scott (1865-1945) who designed and built a stylish palace fit for the Grand Duke, in 1898. Scott’s firm, like that of his compatriot William Morris, promoted a range of products, including *Jugendstil* architecture, tapestries, glass, ceramics, furniture and interior designs. He concentrated on markets all across Germany, into Poland and Switzerland, and as far away as the U.S.A. On the North Sea coast was a similar if smaller exercise in rural design-based craft initiatives, not untypical of many enterprises that were springing up in villages. This business initiative blossomed in Skærbæk, a village in the German-Danish borderland, for around two decades. It brought together a number of young artists in a much-neglected corner of the countryside, who provided designs for a hand-weaving work-shop, in reality a rural factory.

This ‘school’ was started by the village priest, Christian Johannes Jacobsen (1854-1919), to help regenerate the economy, by providing immediate employment and training for young women. From 1885, when he first arrived, he started various enterprises, first the ‘school’, then a ferry and tourist facilities for the island of Romø, nearby. These commercial interests eventually got him into trouble with his bishop, but before that he succeeded in attracting many artist-designers and commissions on a surprisingly large international scale. Such were the improved state of communications, in what was the extreme north-west corner of Germany at that time, which it was not necessary for the designers to relocate to or settle in the village. Approximately forty artists were contracted over the years, including Alfred Mohrbutter (1867-1916), Hans Christiansen (1866-1945) and August Wilckens (1870-1939). The weaving firm expanded

---

461 Rilke, 1903.
and they collaborated with other rural craft workshops, (12:4) such as potteries and glass-makers, and especially with a furniture and carpentry school in Flensburg, run by Heinrich Sauermann, the same workshops Emil Nolde attended before leaving for Switzerland. Skærbæk textiles and gobelin tapestries went on show all across Germany and orders came in from as far away as South America.

This kind of rural enterprise, involving the applied-arts and employing villagers, was not uncommon in connection with artists’ colonies, although less common in their pioneering stage. Typical of these enterprises were two in Newlyn in the 1890s: John Drew Mackensie’s copper-beating factory and then the Passmore Edwards Gallery. These businesses tried to meld the proximity of artist-designers and willing but unskilled young labour. The poor state of the local economy encouraged villagers to back almost any enterprise, especially when they invested in training or educating their children. Tourism further encouraged the growth of galleries, art shops, potteries, art schools and other commercial enterprises. These cottage industries came to signify permanent settlement and artistic colonisation, not necessarily as dynamically creative as before for they had customers not patrons and came to supply the trade, and especially, the growth of mass tourism.

Cheap Villages

“Barbizon is a very quiet place where, with no worry of being disturbed, we could lodge and eat inexpensively”, wrote George Gassies in 1907, and this remained the popular consensus of artists’ village life. He had much experience of that pioneering community, visiting the hamlet in 1852, buying a cottage in 1863 and living there for the rest of his days. These rustic relocations were by no means the result of purely financial decisions, but already one can see some clear economic foundation, primarily the reduction of living costs. Knowing one could lodge cheaply was encouraging in itself. The bachelors that made up most of these colonies do not seem to have been inclined to cook, so lodgings that included generous amounts of food were encouraged. However, the long-term financial solution was not found in renting a hotel room.

Artists’ colonies require a few permanent leaders and these residents require housing. One prerequisite, therefore, in such a village was that it had spare rooms, possible studio space and cottages available, for rent or sale cheaply. In reality, behind most of the arguments for or against a particular village lay economic factors, starting with cheap housing. In a situation such as Barbizon’s, which had little or no economy, the villagers welcomed any financial input and even seemed keen to leave their cottages. Attitudes to property, by villagers, varied enormously and critically affected the probability of colonisation. The high proportion of artists’ families that quickly moved into Barbizon was one extreme, yet the ownership of land, even with poor prospects, can be an emotive issue. The other extreme might be exemplified by Skagen, a village with a fluctuating economic history, yet its residents seemed unwilling to part with their poor windswept cottages. Here, houses were rarely rented out to the pioneering painters and hardly any were sold before 1910. Ignored by tourists, there were insufficient visitors to sustain a specialist hotel, up to the mid-1870s, so the artist pioneers had few alternatives to lodging with the Brøndums, an entrepreneurial family who owned the main grocery-cum-guest-house. It was ‘spartan’, but nowhere is it described as cheap.

464 Gassies, 1907, p. 18. He went on to note that there was not a baker, not a butcher, nor a pharmacist either.
465 There are some notable exceptions, including painter Arina Hugenholtz (1848-1935) who resided in Hotel Hamdorff from 1885-1935.
One cheap solution for the poorer artists, when proprietors were sympathetic, was sharing rooms with colleagues, in the hotel or, when available, in a cottage. This was a distinct advantage at Auberge Ganne and briefly in Worpswede, where the pioneers are known to have squeezed into one bedroom at the Hotel Stadt Bremen. Elsewhere, artists became quite inventive in their search for cheap studio space, with some curious results. In Skagen, for example, the marine painter Carl Locher rented the old lighthouse from 1872, premises later used by Anna Ancher, amongst others. Farms and barns were rented in Laren, but it was necessary to get there early in the season to secure them, according to Laura Knight.\footnote{Knight, 1936, vol.1, pp. 133-158. By 1903, Laren was very well known. Knight made deals with farmers one week at a time, for £5, which meant she could work anywhere, outside or inside, even in a sick-person’s room.} In coastal fishing communities, artists frequently found a surplus of wooden buildings to rent cheaply as studios, such as sail-lofts and net-sheds. Sail-lofts were rented out to artists in Concarneau, Walbeswick, Newlyn, Skagen and especially St. Ives, where, from quite an early time, 1885, a whole terrace of them was gradually converted into studios. Here, the previous year, one enterprising painter, Duff Tollemach, made a studio amongst abandoned ruins on a hilltop, Carn Crowse, above the outer harbour. In 1888, the St. Ives Arts Club was formed and soon moved into permanent premises in a wooden sail-loft, immediately converting it into their social centre, café, nightclub and collective studio.

Perhaps the most important example of a cheap yet vital studio conversion in an artists’ colony occurred in Pont-Aven, where the local notary, Tanguy, took some pioneers to an abandoned mansion, Lezaven. From 1865, this group of Anglo-Americans made it theirs. They organised studios, a kitchen, dining-facilities, a hostel, archives, a museum and a store for their Breton bric-a-brac. Without it, the colony would have remained squeezed into ever-more crowded hotels and cottages. Part of the colonising process was to find, as early as possible, the cheapest possible buildings for their social centre and club-house. If artists could not find a suitable space, many problems occurred with the colony’s development and sustainability, as happened at Dangast and Domburg.

Relocation to the countryside where the living was cheaper had immediate appeal to younger, un-established artists, but the practicalities were much more complex than simply finding a run-down village. The attitude of the villagers to the new influx of young men was crucial. When only one or two painters wandered into their community renting a spare room for a few days, or weeks, was simply a small financial bonus, a piece of luck, and of little concern. This opportunity was a welcomed wind-fall, for the peasant family, fisherman or subsistence farmer, as was the case with Barbizon, Sønderho and Laren. When this artists’ migration became a steady stream of visitors attitudes often changed towards them and the new income they represented. Children in Volendam recognised the trend and began to harass painters, which proved off-putting for some, who found they had “dressed-up specially”\footnote{Knight, 1936, vol.1, p. 151.} or “demanded money.”\footnote{Bernard Partridge, *Punch*, August 27\textsuperscript{th} 1898, pp. 88-89, ‘An idyllic Island’: the article describes a visit by three artists to Marken and Volendam, where an old woman enticed them into her house only to demand a charge, and then how the children lined up for a photograph then, knowingly, sternly demanding five cents a head.”} The novelty of visitors altered from a piece of good fortune to an expected, seasonal income, even rivalry and, soon enough, a source of official taxation.\footnote{A gendarme came from Orleans to Barbizon to check the accounts at Ganne’s Inn from 1849, signing the hotel register, several times a year from then on.}

Prices for lodgings varied no less than with the standard laws of demand and supply. For example, one of the earliest painters in Barbizon, in 1810, found a room in a house for a mere
four sous a day.\textsuperscript{470} By mid-century, the Gannes charged only fr. 2.70, which included full board, generous amounts of food and a packed lunch with a bottle of wine.\textsuperscript{471} By comparison, the nearest hotel, \textit{Le Cheval Blanc}, in Chailly, charged the standard three francs a night.

Whenever there is an economic lead other competitors soon cluster around, keeping the monopolistic advantage in check and offering viable alternatives, so that one finds neighbouring homeowners renting out spare rooms, in the season, or opening a small pension themselves, which happened in most villages. This competitiveness occurred along the coast with the new increase in tourism, even though a village, such as Katwijk-aan-zee, already offered old hotels and inns. Visiting artists were recognised as a significant trade, enough for some hotels to offer \textit{en suite atelier}. Larger houses were available that had space for studios (13:4). The family logement here could not offer studio space, yet proved popular as they were so cheap. Katwijk has the highest known figure, c.100, of these registered small homes, where artists lodged.\textsuperscript{472}

As an aid to understanding the primitiveness of some remote villages, even by the 1880s, it is also useful to understand the attitude to coinage itself, at that time. Barbizon was a collection of subsistence farmers and woodsmen, who survived well-away from normal commerce. Their village had no shop. The peasants were self-sufficient, often bartering for everyday goods, so that any direct monetary income was seen as extra-ordinary and special. Coinage represented a potential that enabled one to purchase goods and services outside the closed rural community. Any money gleaned from artists, such as rent or modelling fees, had extra potential. On the more remote North Sea island of Fanø, girls are recorded as spending their modelling fees on fashion accessories normally unavailable to them, purchasing them in fairs or shops on the mainland, in such towns as Ribe and Esbjerg.\textsuperscript{473} Modelling fees also cut across the norms of structured family incomes, for they gave children, adolescents, the infir, and the very old some unforeseen status, as they were more likely to be available to sit for the artists than the busier adults. One much-experienced colonist, Adrian Stokes, was of the opinion that “In England compulsory education keeps children away from artists.” This comment he made after being warmly welcomed by children in villages around the Zuiderzee.\textsuperscript{474}

On the coast, village traditions are naturally bound up with fishing or merchant sailing fleets, sail being the operative word. Traditional wood, sailing ships were far cheaper to make and maintain, more than the new steam-ships, at least up until the 1880s. The state of the village economy was fundamental to its appeal to most early painters. Villages were deemed attractive precisely because they were un-modernised and ‘unspoilt’, the most frequently applied term in the discourse to rural sketching grounds, which implies a lack of investment,

\begin{center}
\textsuperscript{470} Forges, 1962. Père Luche’s house.
\textsuperscript{471} Caille, 1985, p. 48.
\textsuperscript{473} Zenius, 1976.
\textsuperscript{474} Stokes, 1900, pp. 3-5. Travelling just a few years before Laura Knight, he and his wife seem to have been charmed by the same village children she disliked so much, as they called out “Paint me, Paint me, oh do!”
\end{center}
limited incomes, a continued primitiveness and traditional-looking societies. Nevertheless, from an artist’s point of view, the availability of cheap housing was a major factor in choosing a location. This greatly affected residency, without which there was no continuity, no leadership, no communal spirit and, therefore, no chance of artistic colonisation.

Fishing communities suffered widely fluctuating economies, depending, as they do, on a suit of naturally occurring variables, including the weather, fish quantities, markets and the survival of their menfolk. Major North Sea herring fleets developed in Holland, Germany, Denmark and Great Britain, which soon processed the catches on an industrial scale for distant urban consumption. Boats also followed the shoals of sardine and pilchard off Brittany, Cornwall and out into the Atlantic Ocean, sometimes away for weeks or months at a time. For several years after 1882, when the artist Walter Langley first arrived at Newlyn, the catches of sardine had failed, leaving the village acutely economically distressed. Fishing villages also tended to specialise. Some North Frisian islands, such as Föhr and Romø, concentrated on processing valuable whale oils and fats. Their fleets sailed as far away as Greenland. Huge whale-bones were carried back to the islands and were seen in use as arches, gate-posts and fences. Migrating North Sea cod also had an effect on local economies and caused at least one seasonal, annual, gypsy camp to form on the sands below the village of Nynindegab, on the harbourless west coast of Jutland. Their outdoor life based on fish-oil processing attracted a number of artists, including Laurids Tuxen (1853-1927), the Skagen pioneer. At exactly the same time, in the summer of 1879, his friend and colleague, P.S. Krøyer (1851-1909), was, more-successfully, painting the Sardine Fishermen at Concarneau in southern Brittany. He was just one of many hundreds of painters there, who found traditional fishing communities offered the widest range of subjects and the practical means to work there, more than any other rural locality.

Artists all agreed that villages were cheaper but exact lodging prices are not often documented, so it is useful to return to France, before 1870, where there is sufficient data. The standard village inn charged approximately fr. 2.50. The average daily wage for an ordinary labourer, in Paris, has been estimated at only fr. 5. Such comparisons alone suggest that a sizeable investment was made by artists planning a few weeks, or months, working in the countryside. After lodgings, modelling charges were the next urgent financial question. The consensus was that modelling fees were much cheaper in the country than in the cities. Paris which had witnessed a doubling of rates in just three years, especially for women sitters, who were increasingly in demand. In 1871, one American wrote of Pont-Aven: “It is cheap and … as good a place as we could find to paint in as models are easily procured … and are cheap.” In the 1880s, Langley found Breton men charged only fr. 2 a session, women fr. 1.50 and
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475 Langley, 1997, p. 88, quotes The Cornishman for July 1888: “There can be no doubt that distress arising from the want of fish is being felt in the place now. It would be worth some people’s while to ascertain how the poor live here…scores of families in Newlyn have not received sufficient bread since June and we may guess the distress they must be in.”

476 Krøyer, Et Sardineri i Concarneau, 1879 (Statens Museum for Kunst).

477 Sellin, 1982, pp. 39-43. Even allowing for some inflation 2.50 fr. in 1870 was considered about as cheap a daily rate as one might find in any hotel. The cheapest hotel in neighbouring Concarneau charged 5 fr. After the Franco-Prussian war, inflation set in, doubling all prices.

478 Rewald, 1946, p. 185.

479 Lethève, 1968, p. 75. Women were paid more than men, four to five francs for a four-hour session, as opposed to men’s three francs. Between 1852-55 women’s modelling fees rose to ten francs.

480 Sellin, 1982, p. 30, quoted from the correspondence of Frederik A. Bridgman (Granz Collection, Pennsylvania Historical Society).
Generally speaking, the fees for models in the regions were about half those in the cities. However, there were no fixed rates for modelling and there were many variable factors. For example, attractive faces were in more demand and therefore asked higher fees. Availability, neat appearance, attitude and age are just a few other elements in the bargaining process between artist and model. Obtaining sitters for the pioneers, at least, was highly subjective and unregulated, compared to the situation in the cities. In Paris, the demand was so strong for sitters that they organised themselves, by the 1870s, which, in effect, meant asking for higher fees. Immigrant Italians dominated this specialist market, particularly from Naples, because of their classical good looks and fine complexions. Working direct from the live model was a contentious issue in many state art academies across Europe and was never quite resolved in some circles until after 1900. Some art students banded together to pay for special models, a practise that continued in artists’ colonies, but they did not employ nude models, at least not in the pioneering stages. In the context of these villages, artists frequently became close family friends with their models, a good example for which were the Gaïhedes at Skagen, with Christian Krohg and the Anchers. Peasant models were usually cheaper, but setting fees for sitters continued to be problematic as it had in the cities. Even the formation of new art societies, such as Pulchri Studio, founded in 1847, gave rise to early and lengthy debate on the subject of standardizing rates for models.483

Laissez-faire attitudes predominated in artists’ colonies, yet sympathetic innkeepers intervened and exerted some reasonable control over the fees for models, that helped neutralise exploitation, usually by the villagers. Lodgings, food and models’ fees were all cheaper in villages, but calculating the costs of a lengthy stay in the countryside was still a sizeable and complex investment. To put these expenses into some sort of context it is also necessary to know of the norms. It was estimated at the time, by Emile Zola, who was trying to entice Paul Cézanne to live in Paris, in 1860, that approximately fr.80 per month was the bare minimum.484 Ganne’s fr. 2.70 a day, full board and cramped lodgings, was by no means cheap, but it was a useful start. In addition to lodgings, food, drink and models’ fees, an artist planning a season in a village needed to calculate transport costs, invest in materials and equipment. P.N. Bergeret was of the opinion that “of all the branches of industry practised by man there is none where the raw materials used are less costly than painting, both in themselves and later by comparison with the value added to the picture by the labour of the artist.”485 However, these artists might hope that a picture that cost fr. 2-300 in paints and canvas would sell for fr. 3-4,000, but, in practise, they would not get a fraction of these figures until they had gained a good reputation.

Some materials and equipment were needed for outdoor work, assuming that they already owned sketchbooks and watercolour sets. An easel’s quality varied, yet simple portable ones cost less than fr.100. The palette, turpentines and approximately sixty brushes cost another fr. 2-300. Prepared oil colours were relatively expensive, up to one Franc each, yet rare colours could be up to fifteen francs each. A moderately large canvas could absorb fr. 3-500 worth of oil paint. A

482 T. Alexander Harrison (1853-1930) is said to have started the craze for painting nudes outdoors, c.1885, with his picture of women in an orchard, Arcadia, but they were most likely to have been his friends or fellow artists. This fashion soon became common practice amongst other Americans at Giverny, mostly behind walled-gardens.
484 Lethève, 1968, p. 148, quotes from Lettres de Zola à Cézanne dans Vollard – En écoutant Cézanne, p.12: twenty francs per month for a room, eighteen sous for lunch and twenty-two sous for dinner, per day, or fr.60 for food, per month. This is equivalent to approximately $12, £2.10s., f 30 or DMk. 50.
pre-stretched and mitred canvas, c. 125 x 80 cm., cost about fr. 100. These fixed costs alone
provided an incentive for smaller pictures and landscapes rather than large figure compositions.
It is not surprising that these more modest trends in size are found at Barbizon and amongst the
Impressionists, at least at the early stages, as in most artists’ colonies. Lethève concludes that one
medium-sized tube of oil paint cost approximately one day’s food. This all suggests that going
for a period into the countryside to work required not only planning, but saving up, some
sacrifices and much financial investment before-hand.

Millet’s career is reasonably-well documented,\footnote{Sensier wrote his first biography of Millet, \textit{La vie et l’œuvre de J.-F. Millet}, 1881, a copy of which the Dutch artist Théophile de Bock (1851-1904) owned and which Vincent van Gogh borrowed, see Roskill, 1982, p. 146.} and serves as a good indicator of the
more common financial woes and solutions facing any struggling artist at this time. He tried
different styles, subjects and techniques before finding his market. He was from peasant stock
himself, yet seems neither to have been careful with money, nor particularly sympathetic to
creditors when he had some. He made many different deals with agents, suppliers and galleries
to gain the visibility he needed and the finances for his sizeable family. He does seem to have
sold works fairly regularly and much more than his Barbizon colleague Rousseau. A photograph
in his studio reminds one that he was just as likely to risk all his capital on a holiday for his
family, as on paying his mounting bills.\footnote{Sensier, 1881, p. 107. Millet sold three works, including \textit{Woman feeding Chickens}, for fr.2,000 then took his
family to the coast for an extended holiday in the summer of 1854, but soon had the bailiffs knocking again. The
Millet Museum in Barbizon owns a small daguerrotype of the family, on that holiday by Felix Feuardent.}
In the 1840s, his sales averaged only fr. 50-200 for a
small painting, not substantial, but then he was still a bachelor. What he had hoped for, and
persisted in, happened in 1848, with the sale of one of his Salon pieces. This changed the
direction of his career and his life. He sold it, \textit{The Winnower}, for the sum of fr. 500. It is
interesting to note, here, that although his later image is one of a revolutionary he continued to
use the official art academy’s salon system, as did his colleagues. The immediate consequence of
this sale was that he received commissions for more pictures from a leading politician, M. Ledru-
Rollin, amounting to a further fr. 1,800, approximately the sum with which he arrived
the following year in Barbizon.\footnote{Herbertg, 1976; Sensier, 1881, pp. 74-81.} Millet brought with him his entire family, wife and his children,
who eventually numbered nine. The Millets did not register as guests in the \textit{Auberge Ganne}, but
appear to have gone directly to a rented cottage further along the main street from the hotel. This
cottage, with orchard and garden, cost him only fr. 160 per annum,\footnote{Lethève, 1968, p. 100.} a price and space that
would obviously have been impossible at the inn.

Although a surprising number of the pioneers at Barbizon were already married and with
children, most early participants in artists’ colonies were single, financially insecure and were
looking to make their reputations. They were careful with their resources, the better to invest in
their first triumph. Most resident artists had a degree of prior financial security. Some were lucky
enough to have family support and a few benefited from legacies at an early age, such as Corot
and Vogeler. Some artist residents already had a long career, such as B.J. Blommers (1845-1914)
in Katwijk, who could well afford to build his own large villa, \textit{Thérèse}, on the sea-front. In some
ways he is not an ideal example, for he had already a solid reputation as a member of The Hague
School of painters and had little need to participate fully in forming an active artists’ colony.
More typical of the foundation a colony wanted was Jan Toorop (1858-1928), who also built a
villa, \textit{De Schuur}, further down the beach that same year, 1899. He had an entirely different
reputation as an active member of the Dutch avant-garde. He diversified his approach to his
work, including paintings, various graphics, portraiture and designs for ceramics and glass, etc. In Katwijk, resident artists also paid relatively high local taxes. About 2% of Toorop’s earnings went to the local treasury, slightly more than Munthe and twice that of Sluiter. The proportion of resident to visiting artists was minute in Katwijk compared to Domburg, yet its group was a mixture of mostly local opportunists rather than aspiring economic migrants. Analysis of the exhibition committee members shows that three of the five lived nearby, two of whom grew up in the area and the other was a companion of a millionairress. This pattern is not really repeated elsewhere. Domburg was a small resort that wished to remain exclusive and desperately middle-class. It had a rather self-conscious atmosphere, not formally planned but it did avoid the excesses of either Oostend to the south or Scheveningen to the north. This resort’s own newspaper, the *Domburgsch Badnieuws* (1883-1930), documented the holidays of its rich, international clientele. Around its main, central, luxurious palace-hotel were many smaller hotels, private villas, pension and well-appointed guest-houses. Under normal circumstances it would have been simply too expensive for most artists. Toorop, who lived in Nijmegen at that time, could afford the hotels but his more radical colleagues, such as Piet Mondriaan and Cornelius ‘Ceés’ Spoor could not. His women artist colleagues had special conditions added to their financial situations, typically through marriage, as with Mies Drabbe-Elout, who first lived with her parents then married the resort manager, Paul Elout. Jacoba van Heemskerck, more unusually, was the companion to a wealthy patron, Marie Tak van Poortvliet, and they lived in Domburg in their own luxury villa, *Loverendale*, complete with its own studio. Most of the remaining resident painters who exhibited at Domburg lived elsewhere in the district of Walcheren, either nearby, in villages such as Veere, Westkapelle, Zoeteland or in the central town of Middelburg. This type of artists’ colony formed primarily because of the selling opportunities presented by the building of Toorop’s stylish exhibition hall (5:1; 13:4). When this building was finally destroyed in 1920, the colony never quite recovered and quickly dispersed. The village, in effect, attracted them because of the wealth of its potential patrons, rather than a need for creative fellowship or the intrinsic character of the land.

In areas of economic stagnation, tourism was often the only feasible agency for development. Investment in coastal sanatorium-resorts often concentrated the capital in a relatively small area, but it was difficult for villages nearby to be unaffected by the sudden inflation. Most artists that travelled to the island of Sylt, for example, tended to avoid the huge new central resort of Westerland, preferring the older villages of Kietum, Kampen and List, but even these had villas, cafés, pleasure gardens and even a museum. The new German coastal resorts were all well-organised, some might say too well-organised. Not only did one see huge investment in building programmes but also the ancillary mechanisms, such as roads, hospitals, churches, shops, cafés restaurants, pavilions, promenades, trams and ferry terminals. These island villages soon resembled towns or high-density, suburban business parks.

The alien atmosphere that resulted from this kind of massive sudden investment can be seen on the Danish island of Fanø, where a consortium of Austro-German businessmen funded a
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490 Brakel, 1995, p. 26. There were 42 bands of income-tax, but no-one in Katwijk paid the highest rates. Doctors, for example, paid the 17th band. Toorop, on a declared income, for 1902, of c. f 3,000 paid f 60, the 24th band. Munthe paid f 50, the 26th band and Sluiter paid f 30, the 30th band. See also Kraan & Brakel, 1989.
huge sanatorium resort, complete with parkland, tennis-courts and the country’s first golf links. Despite huge amounts of capital directed at it, including the enticement of artists and journalists, the enterprise never quite succeeded. It was one of many such resort developments all along this sandy coast but the only one in Denmark. Formal resorts generally repelled artistic settlement, not least for financial considerations. Such was the lack of investment on this island that just a few kilometres away the village of Sønderho remained isolated and unspoilt and, crucially, artists found cottages cheap to rent and easy to buy.

Ironically, the artist who did most to promote this island to the outside world, Prof. Julius Exner, never seems to have gone to the new resort or even rented a cottage in Sønderho. When he first arrived, in 1877, Sønderho had reached a level of economic stability derived from its merchant fleet, the largest in the country outside Copenhagen. The village population had just reached its peak, approximately 1,000 inhabitants, although most of its adult males were out at sea for much of the year, or for years at a time. Alas, the owners of the sailing fleet failed to reinvest and modernize, so that it soon lost all competitive advantage. Consequently, the village went into a permanent economic decline and much of its population left. By 1900, the population had almost halved. In the context of artistic colonisation, it was an idyllic situation. There were plenty of rooms and cottages available, and villagers were willing to sell them whole or in part, cheaply. So many rooms in homes were available for rent that it had a detrimental affect on the old inn, which under normal circumstances would have been the centre for any artists’ community. Yet, Exner alone remained faithful to this inn, lodging there over thirty summers. Younger and more adventurous artists, such as August Wilckens (1870-1939), were able to buy a small cottages for the price of one medium-sized painting. Johan Rohde (1856-1935), who had previously criticised Skagen as being overcrowded with artists, and later his family, eventually bought a clutch of these Sønderho cottages.

Big palace hotels and stylish villas were built almost anywhere where there was easy access to the sea, clean sand and safe bathing, or paddling. All along this sandy North Sea coast, from Skagen in the north to Domburg and Oostend in the south huge amounts were invested in building these new resorts and ancillary services, stimulating local economies. Artists who were looking for quiet retreats in which to work had to look between these resorts. When the Modersohn-Beckers travelled to the coast they went to the distant island of Amrum, in 1903. Further north, the Danish painter N.P. Mols (1859-1921) owned a simple wooden building in the lee of the sand-dunes at Søndervig, on Holmsland Klit. Johannes Larssen (1867-1961), Denmark’s foremost bird artist and leader of the Kerteminde artists’ colony, also had a simple chalet at Filso, south of Ringkjøbing. However, these inexpensive wooden bungalows were used as summer retreats and were unsuitable in winter. They had a limited potential for hosting larger artists’ communities.

Further north still, at Skagen, before 1900, there is no indication that the housing situation was cheap or that Brøndum’s Hotel ever offered financial services found elsewhere in artists’ villages. It had the monopoly for official hotel accommodation for decades and, although a few competitors did offer rooms for lodgers, most artists remained loyal to Brøndum’s guesthouse. Its guest-book dates from only 1874 yet clearly shows it was used by most visiting artists, with over eighty names of painters as lodgers and at least thirty more writers, sculptors and architects. Tourists only really began to arrive in the 1880s and increased markedly after the

491 Frederiksen, 1980, pp. 31-43.
492 Barrett, 1993, pp. 120-125. As late as 1906, August Wilckens bought a small cottage (matr. nr.179, Nørland) for only 150 Rijksdaler (Kroner), approximately the price of one of his medium-sized paintings.
completion of a railway in 1890. In high dudgeon P.S. Krøyer moved out to a farm annexe, Bendtsen’s, in Vesterby. Writing to his patrons, the Heinrich Hirschsprungs, in 1891: "Now that the railway has come the place is so overrun with travellers in the summer months that the happy old atmosphere of artist life at Brøndum’s Hotel has become impossible. But we live apart from the noise and bustle." Once the founders were financially secure, they often retreated from their central social role in the artists’ community, especially after marriage, such as Millet in Barbizon, Krøyer and the Anchers at Skagen.

The villagers here, in Skagen, seem to have welcomed the extra income derived from visitors, yet retained ownership of their properties, not selling up in these early stages, at least, as in Sønderho and Barbizon. Skagen’s colonists actually rented very few cottages, proportionately. Besides Bendtsen’s farm-house, the most popular one was ‘Miss Storm’s cottage’ on Markvej. It was rented in turn by Holger Drachmann, in 1882, then a group of artists consisting of two Norwegians and two Swedes, in 1883, before being bought finally, in 1884, by Anna and Michael Ancher. The popular image of Skagen as a group of successful painters is distorted somewhat by the inclusion in popular literature of two other artists who eventually owned houses, but, it must be stressed, not during the development of the colony. Holger Drachmann and Laurids Tuxen had both been early pioneers of the village, in the early 1870s. They had then fostered careers elsewhere and spent much time outside the country. They returned to Skagen, decades later, in effect, to buy houses for their retirement. Drachmann bought a small house and converted it into a stylish home, Villa Pax, for himself and his last wife, Sophie (Soffi). Tuxen’s Villa Dagminne, was that old wing of Bendtsens gård, purchased in 1901, previously rented to Viggo Johansen and then to the Kroyers.

The expansion of tourism, naturally enough, had major financial consequences on all aspects of village life. To cope with the building and housing boom other practical utilities had to be invested in, organised and maintained. When the villages were small, matters of piped clean and waste water were not a priority, but after several health scares, town leaders were often jolted into action to save their tourism. Laren hotelier Jan Hamdorff had a vested interest in the tourist trade and it is of little surprise he was a member of the village’s council at the time they finally approved modernising utilities such as street lighting, piped water and proper sewage facilities. After yet another typhus epidemic in Katwijk, in 1873, the new mayor, T.A.O. de Ridder, acted quickly to restore faith in the resort. The primitive sanitation combined with similar health scares along the Brittany coast encouraged many artists to seek alternatives, choosing the Celtic Cornish peninsula instead.

None of the guest-houses, in this survey, survived exclusively on the artists’ trade. The timing of the tourist-development affected the nature of the village, its character and the relationship of artists to that community. The evidence from Scheveningen’s history throughout the nineteenth century shows that a growth in tourism only gradually repelled artistic interest. It is possible to trace fine art activity along this stretch of sandy coast for centuries, peaking with its intimate connection with the Hague School painters, c.1840-80. Its economic presence was visible from at least 1818, when the first permanent bathing facilities were completed. From then on ‘grand hotels’ were built, at least one every decade, along its seafront, culminating in the

494 The Swedes: Johan Krothén and Oscar Björck; Norwegians: Charles Lundt and Christian Krohg. These friends also appear in Krøyer’s masterpiece Artists’ Luncheon, 1883, as they took their meals at Brøndum’s guesthouse.
496 Jacobs, 1985, p. 64. Brittany suffered a series of smallpox epidemics during the 1880s.
erection of a large Kurhaus in 1885. By then satellite enterprises were spreading inland, with a “centre of refined entertainment” on Zeestraat, where the Circus Carré was installed.\textsuperscript{497} Nearby, one new venture alone saw the investment of 100,000 Bfr.\textsuperscript{498} by a group of Belgian entrepreneurs, that combined art, history and entertainment, known colloquially as ‘The Mesdag Panorama’. Curiously, another panorama, Bezuidenhout, opened just the day before Mesdag’s masterpiece was inaugurated on the 1\textsuperscript{st} August 1881. The building of panoramas was not a new phenomenon, but two opening next to each other on successive days illustrates the competitive nature of even that specialized business. Mesdag employed a number of fellow artists, and his wife Sientje, to complete the “toile panoramique,” including his Hague School colleague B.J. Blommers, and the younger painters Theophile de Bock (1851-1904) and G.H. Breitner (1857-1923). Blommers thought it a masterpiece and organised a torchlight parade to Mesdag’s house, presenting him with a scroll bearing 120 signatures, mostly names of fellow artists and club members of the Pulchri Studio, showing how well this financial enterprise was accepted by the profession at that time.

Images of the fishing village of Scheveningen were closely associated with the works of many Hague School painters in their prime. As it grew into an industrial port, they all retreated into their city studios again or, as in the cases of Adolphe Artz (1837-90) and Blommers, they simply relocated up the coast to the still traditional, smaller, quieter and cheaper village of Katwijk. It is wrong to say such coastal villages were spoilt by modernisation for a degree of tourism was accepted by fishing communities as it brought in some revenue, without the need for much investment on their behalf. It is interesting to note that the more remote and ‘unspoilt’ villages that attracted artists to the Breton coast also already had a level of organised tourism in the 1860s, for when the Pont-Aven pioneers were contemplating a trip to that coast they acquired, in Paris, a pile of tourist literature, although when Wylie and his colleagues finally set out, Howard Roberts forgot them all.\textsuperscript{499} In addition, when they arrived in Pont-Aven, which had no railway station or beach, they had a choice of not one but three hotels. The cheapest and smallest one, Pension Gloanec, primarily attracted the more penurious painters, in part as its proprietress had the reputation of offering credit, a policy she allowed for two more decades. Sellin, amongst others, is convinced that “he [Gauguin] probably picked Pont-Aven because he heard from the painter Felix Jobbé-Duval that it was cheap and he could live off credit.”\textsuperscript{500} Credit, unfortunately, was still, even by the 1880s, amongst those place-myths that mesmerised most young artists and was particularly associated with French artists’ village innkeepers, Hotel Baudy at Giverney, the Gannes at Barbizon and the Hotel Margat in Cernay-la-Ville, to name but three.

The Scottish author and artists’ colony veteran, Robert Louis Stevenson, was of the opinion that clever artists cultivated this trait in kindly proprietors, yet he only knew of French examples when he penned: "The institution of a painters’ colony is a work of time and tact. The innkeeper has to be taught, and he soon learns, the lesson of unlimited credit; he must be taught to welcome as a favoured guest a young gentleman in a very greasy coat, and with little baggage beyond a box of colours and a canvas; and he must learn to preserve his faith in customers who

\textsuperscript{497} Nooren & Jansen, 1983, pp. 143-48. The Hague gemeente officially recognised it as a bathing beach in 1819, the year after the first badhuis was built. The Kurhaus was opened in 1885, burnt down in 1886 and rebuilt in 1887.

\textsuperscript{498} Fruitema, 1981, p. 102, details the original contract signed by H.W. Mesdag on 1\textsuperscript{st} May 1880 with the Société Anonyme du Panorama Maritime de La Haye. 100,000 Belgian francs was equal to 47,650 Dutch guilders. The final panorama canvas was 114 m. in circumference and 14.60 m. high.

\textsuperscript{499} Sellin, 1982, p. 16.

\textsuperscript{500} Sellin, 1982, p. 52.
will eat heartily and drink of the best, borrow money to buy tobacco, and perhaps not pay a stiver for a year.” However, running up credit with tradesmen was not so extraordinary for the period or in village life generally, but it did affect the accumulated goodwill necessary in an artists’ colony. It was standard commercial practise to have an account or ‘run up a tab’ with a grocer or baker, but these young hopefuls, such as Vallardi, were so obsessed with their lack of money that rumour and exaggerations concerning innkeepers and credit were almost inevitable. Amongst the earliest recorded evidence of the abuse of this credit facility with tradesmen is also in Barbizon, where Millet seems to have felt no qualms for delaying payment of his bills. He had on-going financial troubles with a number of shopkeepers: “…summons to pay within 24 hrs…tailor, 607.60 Francs. He is a vampire, as he promised to take a note till March…a whole procession of creditors…it will be very lively.”

In the early 1850s, one group of tradesmen sent a bailiff to his house to repossess furniture in lieu of mounting debts to a baker, a grocer and a tailor. Repeated debts to his tailor and other tradesmen seem to indicate that despite poor finances his bourgeois aspirations overcame any notions of thrift for this famed artist.

The Academy-Salon System

Many anxieties over career development and finances sprang directly from the mounting critical attitude artists had towards the state art institutions themselves. Despite capital investments, the official art academies still faced increasing financial pressures from all sides throughout the nineteenth century. The student-teacher ratio more than doubled in most studios, resulting in overcrowding and reduced personal tuition time. The teaching staff at Copenhagen Art Academy, for example, remained the same size, never more than twelve professors, despite the huge increase in student numbers over a century. Generally speaking, monarchs and governments gradually withdrew or failed to increase sponsorship for the state art institutions. For the purposes of this study, it is reasonable to assume that the professional authorities are one and the same, although Albert Boime distinguishes between ‘official’ and ‘academic’ in the long evolution of the modern art academy. All the evidence points to a groundswell of complaint, by the students and members, that the art academies, in every country, were “over-large, exclusive, inflexible, baroque monopolies.”

However, a case can be built that also argues that their success aided their own downfall. Classes were so popular they became over-subscribed, bursting with students, obstructing the necessary relationship between teacher and pupil. A small country, such as Denmark, could afford only one art academy and, naturally, its progressives began to look elsewhere for better training. Many Scandinavians headed towards Paris, particularly the new privately-funded academies. Academy Julian, for example, was so successful they opened seven separate studios to cope with the influx of art students, including two just for women. Women are targeted at this time by shrewd businessmen, who recognised the market. They were charged more for tuition fees than men, by Rodolphe Julian, for example, and even paint-manufacturers provided expensive odour-free paints for ladies, amongst other equipment. Interestingly, May Alcott, a
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501 Stevenson, 1884, pp. 265-72. This article is a little too arch and curried favour with his audience, but he, and his cousin R.A.M. Stevenson, had considerable experience of French artists’ colonies, namely Grez-sur-Loing., Cernay, Barbizon, Trouville and St. Raphael.

502 See Millet’s letter to Sensier, 11th January 1856., cited in Sensier, 1881, p. 117.

503 Meldahl & Johansen, 1904, p. cxxx-cxxxiv.


pupil of W.M. Hunt, late of Barbizon, wrote a booklet for women art students in 1879, suggesting cheap lodgings, restaurants and places to obtain second-hand furniture and antiques, in London, Rome and Paris. 506

A large country, such as Great Britain, had no such excuse for the poor reforms of its art institutions. The Royal Academy of Art in London held the monopoly and remained the hub of all official art circles until absurdly late in the century. Around 1880 English painters had had enough of this lack of broad investment in art training and began to look elsewhere. By 1885, one of the most popular journals felt bold enough to comment: “as an educational institution…it has little or nothing to teach; its students, as soon as they have passed the curriculum it imposes on them they make haste to betake themselves to France to learn, not only how to paint and draw, but to forget as much as they can of the practice and theory acquired at its schools.”507 When an alternative to the Royal Academy did arise, it was not by state sponsorship but through private philanthropy. The Slade School of Fine Art opened in 1871, after its benefactor had died, but it did not become prominent until 1895.508 What is extraordinary is that very few young British painters sought alternative training on the Continent before the 1870s, which may account for the then-sudden rush to modern studios around Paris and in other progressive academies, such as Antwerp, from 1880. For example, many of the pioneers of Newlyn, England’s first artists’ colony, studied abroad: William Wainwright, Frank Bramley and Edwin Harris had all studied in Antwerp, as did Stanhope Forbes, and most of the others who typically, then went on to Paris or paid extensive visits to the Breton artists’ colonies prior to settling down in this Cornish fishing village.

The most visible example of financial frustrations was the annual academy exhibition, almost all modelled on the Paris Salon. These exhibitions of ‘Living Masters’ all grew to be top-heavy by mid-century, containing, sometimes, thousands of items, filling vast rooms with works of art for sale. They did attract big attendances, but more for the spectacle than for trade. The Art Journal estimated that in the 1888 Paris Salon the 4,830 works on show stretched over eight miles. 509 Despite reforms and even redefining entry qualifications, the authorities found no solution to the acute overcrowding. The situation for the most prestigious exhibition in a country was economically discouraging, but the policy of centralisation carried on regardless. Salons became an administrative nightmare, draining valuable resources, but for most artists they were a necessary evil, impossible to either ignore or circumvent, at least until the 1880s. Salon acclaim remained the best guarantee of professional advancement and economic reward, at least until one had made one’s reputation, a phrase that equally applied to participation in artists’ colonies.

The Academy-Salon system was a channel for almost all financial honours, promotion, medals, stipends, grants, contacts, contracts and sales. Where a national art market was tightly delineated, such as in Denmark, the single yearly show, Forårsudstillingen, was of paramount economic importance to all professional painters. Without being sanctioned by the Copenhagen Fine Art Society, in effect the state academy, artists could not hope to gain any major orders, government commissions, royal patronage or develop any meaningful career inside the country. The salon exhibition was the main instrument of control, but there were additional financial

507 Fox, 1993, p. 12, quoting from The Magazine of Art, 1885.
508 Felix Slade (1790-1868) was an English art collector and philanthropist, endowed chairs in Fine Art at the universities of London, Cambridge and Oxford. The Slade School of Fine Art in London was opened in 1871 but its heyday came between 1895-1915, employing some of the most influential professors of modern art and thus producing some of the most illustrious names in British twentieth-century art.
inducements. Medals and grants were awarded to further encourage conformity and dissuade transgressions, for even the semi-official stipends, such as *Hansens Medaille* and the *Neuhausens Pris*, were arranged through the agency of the state academy.\(^{510}\) Only after 1900 did the academy initiate three, separate, official *udstillingsmedailler*, but, these were not awarded every year,\(^{511}\) and, by then, such were the deep frustrations with this system that independent alternative structures had been, and continued to be, organised. Similar state systems prevailed in most other countries. From its inception in 1755, the Danish art academy awarded its most prestigious prizes as silver and gold medals, but the highest honour, *Stor Guldmedaille*, was very rarely granted to any painters, during the nineteenth century. Between 1804-96 only four ‘Great Golds’ were won, and only twenty-four ‘Small Golds, by painters.’\(^{512}\) Sculptors fared much better, ten Great Golds and thirty-two Small Golds, but architects won both, almost regularly. This policy guaranteed to ferment dissension and opposition amongst painters.

Despite the many financial constraints on running art academies, they all grew in size, in terms of students at least. In Denmark, the number of pupils and graduates increased steadily, as might be expected with the overall rise in population,\(^{513}\) doubling over the first century of its existence. However, the number of teachers and professors remained pegged, governed by state revenue and funding. The increase in academy membership roughly followed the overall acceleration in the number of professional painters in Denmark. The Copenhagen city register, *Vejviser*, shows the figure of 116 professional artists in 1863, approximately half of whom were members of the academy. Over one decade alone the increase was c. 45%:

\[
\begin{array}{l}
1880 = 171 \text{ artists} \\
1882 = 182 \\
1885 = 233 \\
1890 = 279 \\
\end{array}
\]

However, this data excludes many artists who chose to live outside the city limits, in Greater Copenhagen and in Amager, for example, and in the city ward of Frederiksberg, which had a special status within the metropolis that included local tax concessions.\(^{514}\) Artists had already started to live in Copenhagen’s dormitory towns, as far away as Helsingør and Roskilde, newly linked by suburban railways, and those artists whose homes were in other parts of the country, such as Anna and Michael Ancher, lived permanently in Skagen, but sold their work primarily in Copenhagen. Typical of such centralised national economies, all artists sought patronage and customers in the capital city. Most other countries had several regional academies and regional art circles, usually for historical reasons, such as in Belgium, rather than out of any state policy of planned diversification. By the 1880s, Belgium, had well-organised art academies and selling mechanisms in Brussels, Gent and Antwerp. Antwerp’s Royal Society, *La Commission Administrative de la Société Royale pour L’Encouragement des Beaux-Arts*, originated as early as 1650 and held annual salons, after new reforms, from 1817. They proved to be enormously popular internationally. In 1873, its catalogue contains the names and addresses

\(^{510}\) Exner won the Neuhausens Pris in 1847, three years after his Salon debut. It gave him the not-inconsiderable sum of 300 Rdlr. or kroner, more than enough to buy and set up a family house in the countryside at that time.

\(^{511}\) Meldahl & Johansen, 1904, pp. 522-23: Thorvaldsen’s Medal after 1906; C.F. Hansen’s Medal, after 1923 and Eckersberg’s Medal, after 1922, all for different genres.

\(^{512}\) Meldahl & Johansen, 1904, pp. 144-51.

\(^{513}\) In 1773 the number of art academy pupils was 317; in 1799 – c. 400; in 1831 – 460 and by 1839 – c. 500.

\(^{514}\) Frederiksberg is a special city ward that contained the Carlsberg Brewery, a porcelain factory and was the home to many artists, such as Heinrich Dohm (1875-1940), who could therefore afford a ‘summer-house’ on Fanø.
of its approximately 2,000 members. That year it showed 1,250 works, almost double that of Copenhagen’s salon, and from a broad base of painters, who included Max Liebermann, Jozef Israëls, H.W. Mesdag, Alma Tadema and many members of the Düsseldorf Art Academy.

For new graduates entering the art profession the situation appeared increasingly daunting, with more graduates every year, the ‘old guard’ continuing on, and a steady accumulation of honorary academy memberships offered to distinguished foreign painters. In the 1850s there were 33 full-members of the Danish Academy, 45 by the following decade and approximately ten new Danish members every decade after that.\textsuperscript{515} New membership outweighed any losses due to natural causes, namely death or medical disability. In 1871 there were thirteen new Danish members alone. It can also be readily seen that many of the members already had jobs in the academy schools, as teachers, docent, assistants and administrators. Between the 1850s and 1890s the number of academy members that were foreigners was maintained at around twenty-five. The reasoning behind the inclusion of such foreign members and their work in the academy was to raise the quality on show, but in financial terms it only added to the competition for young native painters. The foreign contingent consisted mostly of Scandinavian, German or French origin. They were freely advertised, allowed easy access to the annual spring exhibitions and usually gained superior placement in those shows. This system advantaged the already privileged.

State art academies made little provision for financial support after graduation, other than granting official stipends and membership. There were few state teaching outlets for artists at that time and, in the context of Denmark, few possibilities for working in the applied arts, one traditional solution to the overflow problem. The lack of a diverse industrial base meant that there was an extremely narrow range of potential employers in the entire country. One exception, in the decorative arts, was working for one of the porcelain factories, which remained an option long after the turn of the century. For example, the Fano painter Sigvard Hansen (1859-1938) worked in a porcelain factory until 1882 and, like his better known French counterpart August Renoir, this grounding influenced his painting technique. One Copenhagen craft-shop that started c.1900 and markedly promoted high quality modern design was the silversmith firm, Georg Jensen. It became known internationally very quickly, exhibiting in The Hague, for example, from 1905. In 1907, they employed the radical artist Johan Rohde (1856-1935), who was closely associated with the company for many decades. He was a strong, consistent force for a new Scandinavian aestheticism in the arts and crafts. Rohde was a pragmatic pioneer, having helped found the secessionists \textit{Den Frie Udstilling} and promoted, through his teaching, writing and designs, many practical alternatives to the Academy-Salon system, showing by example how modern artists needed to carve out a career for themselves by employing a range of strategies.

Typically, in Denmark, the national economy did not pick up until the second half of the nineteenth century and, consequently, started stimulating the market for fine art amongst new middle-class patrons. By tradition, the largest private art collections in the country were bought by gentry such as Count Moltke. However, he purchased a high proportion of foreign works, usually from well-established names in France and Germany. Gradually, a few major Danish philanthropists emerged who were prepared to be sponsors of the Arts. One millionaire was Carl Jacobsen, the proprietor of the New Carlsberg Brewery, who financed a museum, the \textit{Glyptotek}, in 1888, to house his sizeable art collection. However, this establishment, wonderful as it was,\textsuperscript{515} This should not be confused with the number of practicing artists in Copenhagen at that time, approximately 110 according to the \textit{Vejviser}, nor the larger number who submitted works for exhibition at Charlottenborg.
contained more antiquities than contemporary works.\textsuperscript{516} There was only one other major benefactor who actively supported living masters, the tobacco manufacturer Heinrich Hirschsprung (1836-1908). He directly supported a string of painters from the early 1880s, including K. Zahrtmann (1843-1917); J.F. Willumsen; T. Philippen; L.A. Ring (1854-1933); Vilhelm Hammershøi; Anna and Michael Ancher.\textsuperscript{517} Most of these artists were connected to the new aesthetic movement, \textit{Den moderne Gennembrud} (The Modern Breakthrough) and, naturally enough, its rural wing, Skagen artists’ colony. One painter, in particular, is associated with the Hirschsprung family and benefited substantially from this association, P.S. Krøyer.

The relationship between the Hirschsprungs and Krøyer, patrons and artist, approaches the ideal, for they assisted him financially at almost every stage of his career. They bought their first painting from him in 1875, when he was only 24 years old, and, on the strength of this, commissioned the first of many family portraits. They also sponsored his formative study travels to France, Spain and Italy, and continued to purchase his canvases throughout his life.\textsuperscript{518} Having gained this secure level of steady income Krøyer no longer needed to send works in for sale to the academy shows.\textsuperscript{519} He was a dazzling ‘bravado’ painter, but he proved to be a surprisingly poor teacher,\textsuperscript{520} when he combined forces with Tuxen and others to run a successful major private school for painters, the \textit{Frie Studie Skole}, the first of its kind in the country. Krøyer’s career was keenly followed in the press and his triumphs acted as a spur for many younger artists who sought alternatives to the institutional conservatism inherent in the Academy-Salon system. Yet, he might also be regarded as an example of the academy’s success, as he rose through the academy schools, won the Gold Medal, in 1873, gained official stipends and was commissioned to paint portraits of the nobility, the rich and official committees.

Both Krøyer’s and Laurids Tuxen’s careers branched away from the academy norms after periods spent in Paris, during the later 1870s. After experiencing the changes in French studio teaching methods, in new painting techniques and in the new art galleries, they began to want the same for their homeland. It would take another decade for this to come to full fruition. Other Skagen colonists, namely Michael Ancher and Viggo Johansen, continued desperately to seek the few official stipends and regularly applied for grants. Both had failed to complete their formal studies because of family bankruptcies, yet they maintained links with the Academy, knowing that there were few career options other than using the state system. Ancher is not considered to be a revolutionary painter, although his realism and chosen genre, ‘heroic fishermen’, were relatively new in the country. He finally succeeded with his salon piece of 1880, of Skagen’s fishermen. Part of the legend of this piece concerns its purchase, three times in quick succession, while on exhibition, finally entering the royal collection of King Christian

\textsuperscript{516} Bure, 1966.  
\textsuperscript{517} Mus. Cat. Copenhagen, 1989.  
\textsuperscript{518} “The Smithy at Hornbaek” and “Little girl from Hornbaek” were the first paintings by Krøyer to be purchased, in 1875, the year they were both painted, according to the Hirschsprung catalogue, but Ernst Mentzé, 1980, p. 38, writes that their first Krøyer picture, un-named, was bought in 1874.  
\textsuperscript{519} In 1880, the year of Michael Ancher’s salon triumph with “Vil han klare Pynten”, Krøyer did not bother to exhibit at the same show. The following year, while Michael Ancher capitalized on his success, Kroyer exhibited four already acclaimed paintings, including “The Italian Hat-maker” and “Sardinery at Concarneau”, none of which were for sale. Again, in 1882 and 1883, he again exhibited paintings that were for show but not for sale.  
\textsuperscript{520} Svandholm, 2001, p. 39.
It was, typically, pivotal to his career, and Skagen, and helped his application for an academy grant, of 500 Rdl.

The most valuable art academy scholarship of all was a Prix de Rome. It was an all-expenses-paid study tour to Italy for a period up to four years. Naturally it drew the attention of most art students. Authors who stress the revolutionary aspects of the avant-garde seem to overlook this award’s continued fascination for them, until well into the twentieth century. Just as the modernist continued to criticise the salons yet exhibited in them; just as they mocked the academy for being antiquated but used all their facilities; so too did radicals continue to apply for this official prize. In Holland, for example, Piet Mondriaan, champion of the Dutch avant-garde, applied for this award as late as 1901. He was unsuccessful, but his De Stijl colleague, Cornelius van Eesteren won the prize as late as 1921. This action does not necessarily suggest that their artistic principles were compromised, but that when one is suffering acute financial embarrassment one is likely to take risks, explore every possible avenue, both old and new, to find a solution.

The Prix de Rome was an academy reward system, initiated by the French authorities in 1666 and proved so useful a tool that it was adopted in most countries by the nineteenth century. The prize acted to perpetuate the academy’s classical traditions. Winning the award was seen as the stepping-stone to the highest honours for painters and sculptors. In many ways the system was successful and kept students disciplined and obedient. However, it was at odds with some Romantic tenets that encouraged the artist to remain faithful to his instincts; for example, much debate revolved around the aesthetics of the sketch and especially the notion of originality. According to one French author, in 1815, the works of a genius “are always original.” Géricault, for example, “wanted to reform the Academic instruction because it militated against a pupil’s native originality.” He was one of the first to apply this criticism but other contemporaries noted the separation of the generative and executive phases of painting. In Boime’s convincing study of the French art academic pedagogy during the nineteenth century, he points out this conflict as one of many structural weaknesses of a rigid system. The development of successful independent movements, particularly concerning landscape painting and the sincerity of spontaneity, seen in many Barbizon plein-air works, highlighted the academy’s increasingly isolated doctrines, that, unintentionally, further convinced the modernists of the equity of their actions.

One variation of the Academy-Salon system was popularised in Germany, where official Kunstverein were organised in every city across the country. There were a total of 84 such societies by 1914. They were not salons, yet were officially sanctioned to stimulate the distribution of art, ensuring some sales at least and so by the end of the nineteenth century “painting production had become a flood.” After unification, the nation still remained remarkably “polycentric and fragmented,” exemplified by the proliferation of these autonomous regional Art Unions, by far the largest public organs for art sales. As with academy salons, these exhibitions became ever-larger, unwieldy and steadily more reactionary. In 1836, the Berlin Art
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521 The picture was first purchased by Copenhagen’s Fine Art Society, then the National Gallery bought it from them, before the crown decided its fate. It was more likely to have been Queen Louise rather than King Christian IX who took an interest in acquiring art for the royal collection at this period.
522 Friedman, 1982, p. 236.
523 Droz, 1815, p. 99.
524 Boime, 1986, pp. 166-84.
Academy set the standard with a suitably impressive show containing 1,633 works. Intericity rivalry already stimulated much new investment in art academies, yet the old art centres, such as Nürnberg, founded in 1674; Dresden, founded in 1705; and, Augsburg, founded in 1710, continued their traditional systems of training based on master-classes, but serviced only local needs. The invigoration of Düsseldorf’s art academy, after 1819, resulted from the huge economic growth of the surrounding industrial region. Along with the rapid growth of all German cities they want new cultural institutions. The state craft that resulted from confederation combined traditions and modern methods, yet what chiefly resulted was an economic divide, best seen by the internal rivalries between the Prussian and Bavarian royal courts. The Munich artists’ guild, the Künstlergenossenschaft, for example, had a respectable 556 members in 1868, but by 1907, they accumulated an impracticable 2,500 members, all, naturally, competing for exhibition space and sales. This polarisation of professional artists was similar in Berlin, which had 2,800 members by 1910. One contemporary commentator estimated that in one year alone, 1910, Munich had as many as 40,000 canvases offered up for sale, with an average of 850 works being submitted to the local art union, for auction, every month. The Art Union system controlled exhibiting, selling and distribution, channelled through a series of committees and pooled lottery systems. It generated huge amounts of revenue and at the very minimum guaranteed artists at least some annual income from their sales.

Munich’s official answer to the demand from the art profession to show more contemporary art for sale was to build a huge exhibition centre, the Glaspalast (14:4), which opened in 1854. Its purpose was to promote arts and crafts on an international scale. It was here, for example, that seventeen of the Glasgow Boys exhibited, who in turn directly influenced the Worpswede artists to exhibit in 1895, although by then it was almost in the last throes of its usefulness as a modern trade forum, hence the gamble on these groups. In the context of German painting at that time, the Worpswede submissions were thought to be very avant-garde, but internationally they may be regarded as juste milieu, mainstream. The Worpswede pioneers had many connections to Düsseldorf Art Academy and its radical student’s art-club, Tartarus, founded in 1885, yet Munich’s art market demanded attention, as it was much larger, more international and therefore wealthier. Fritz Mackensen’s entry to the sixth National Glaspalast Exhibition of 1895 used the simplest of strategies under
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526 Exh. Cat. Berlin 1885. Although this was a bicentennial exhibition by the Königliche Akademie der Künste this official prestige event was still relatively under-resourced for this period.
530 The second Munich International Art Exhibition was held in 1890 and they invited seventeen Glasgow painters. Submissions ranged from symbolist works by George Henry and Edward Hornel to Lavery’s lyrical “Bridge at Grez, 1884.” Jan Toorop from Katwijk was also invited, and he submitted, Three Brides, his famous symbolist graphic work.
such spacious conditions. It’s sheer size got it noticed. At 235 x 376 cm., The Sermon on the Moor had taken him over three years to paint and was a huge investment in resources and materials. The picture did achieve its objective, however, for it won fame and fortune for Mackensen and helped his fellow Worpswede colonists in the bargain.

However, Munich’s art circles were notoriously complex, exemplified by the Glaspalast management, from which Leibl and Uhde withdrew. In the year 1888, for example, their policy to encourage international participation back-fired somewhat, for the majority of artists accepted for show were foreign, also drawing criticism. While 661 Germans exhibited 1,258 works, the 706 foreign artists showed 1,876 works. Foreigners also won a disproportionate number of medals and prizes. Of the German participants 393 artists were based in Munich, which also indicates the overcrowded nature of the profession in that city. Criticism rose not only about the financial rewards going abroad, but that the whole enterprise had failed to raise the level of art in the community. One such critic was the influential architect Hans Eduard Berlepsch-Valendas, who wrote a scathing article in the magazine Kunstchronik in January 1893, “A word on the Artists’ Society.”531 He was a founder member of the Munich Secession, yet which managed to divide opinion in the Bavarian art community throughout the 1890s. The Realist Fritz von Uhde (1848-1911), an artists of equal stature to Leibl, chaired its painting committee from 1891, but found the situation all too demanding, distracting and ultimately disappointing.

The official exhibition strategy could not realistically be sustained, by either the artists or the state of Bavaria. These shows had become vastly expensive and barely cost-effective. Analysis of data concerning the Glaspalast reveals that many obstacles still faced most artists, despite the huge capital expenditure involved. Between 1898-1908, it received 90,684 items for show, rejecting 12%. The sales figures remained relatively disappointing, for only 6.8% of the 77,000 works found buyers. Typically, prominence was given to established names and styles, predominantly historic, for these events were massive, patriotic festivals which included much pageantry and parades, and they were costly: for example, in 1874, approximately 125,000 marks were spent organising the event. On one level they were successful, for they generated the necessary media coverage, attracted fine artists and witnessed increased sales and prices. In 1879, the exhibition grossed 457,786 marks, which rose in four years to 1,070,500 marks.532 Yet the feeling persists that large exhibitions, whoever organised them, were counter-productive and not cost effective.

The regional Art Unions were a distinctive German distribution mechanism for contemporary art, based on a wide public membership, but, although they generated substantial capital, the system was slow, functioned through the over-use of committees and allowed the standard of the works allotted to drop. “Nationally Art Unions passed on 1,250,000 marks to artists from 1899-1911.”533 However, the number of artists had also risen over the same period, so that frustrations with the lack of progress in new modern art and its sale continued to ferment. Proof of this may be seen in the number of new independent art groups that formed around 1900, the ‘secessions’ which arose all over the German-speaking world and were all concerned with better exhibition conditions and sales. One other official process that was less evident in other countries was the part played in Germany by city museums, Kunsthallen and Kunstgewerbemuseums. Munich had invested in grand museums, including the Alte and Neue Pinakothek, that promoted arts and crafts. Hamburg, a city famed for its international trade and citizenry of

531 Berlepsch-Valendas, 1893, pp. 225- 32
532 Lenman, 1997, p. 142.
533 Ibidem.
‘workaholics,’ in 1869, invested in its own Kunsthalle and built up a fine collection, of, for example, works by Casper David Friedrich and Max Liebermann. Progress was very much dependent on the character of the director or curator. Bremen Kunsthalle, under Gustav Pauli, had a limited budget but his enthusiasm to show and purchase contemporary art, brought him close to the Worpswede artists’ colony. He, to his credit, encouraged them formally by putting on their first group exhibition, before their Munich ‘debut’, in 1894, and by subsequently buying their works on a regular basis.

One final branch of the state academies is worth including here, which had both direct and indirect influence on the formation of modern artists’ groups. More than any other country in this survey, Germany’s state art authorities encouraged schemes to develop the applied arts, which employed many painters and encouraged the notion of better industrial design. There were approximately 60 state design schools by 1910, more than in any other country in Europe. Trade schools and ‘branch academies’ were closely associated with the leading art academies, connecting, for example, the Meissen porcelain factory with nearby Dresden Art Academy. It was in Dresden’s polytechnic that a group of disaffected students first got together, including Kirchner, Bleyl, Heckel and Schmidt-Rottluff. The German print traditions, in particular, seemed to absorb the ideas of the avant-garde, not only the refined graphics of Heinrich Vogeler at Worpswede but also the raw woodcuts and lithographs of the Die Brücke expressionists at the Mauritzburg lakes and Domburg. This exploration of different techniques and media was a feature of rural artists’ colonies both helping them to broaden their economic base and offer cheaper alternative works of art to patrons and interested buyers.

The economic prospects for painters in The Netherlands might be thought of as traditionally holding more potential than either Scandinavia or Germany, as it had a long history of trading in fine art and artefacts. Yet the market for Dutch contemporary paintings languished until the second quarter of the nineteenth century, when it evolved from an essentially local structure to a national network in just a few decades. There was interest from the top, as first King Louis Napoleon and then King William I supported the organisation of an Academy of Fine Arts in Amsterdam and a regular salon, after the French model. The production and distribution of paintings began showing benefits from the 1830s, despite national economic fluctuations. Against the pattern seen elsewhere, Dutch artists had more commercial attitudes towards their craft, which was understandable given the fluctuating national economy and the gradual withdrawal of state sponsorship. The second half of the century saw the development of an independent sector, specifically on the back of selling contemporary paintings. In many ways it was a model of success for the Dealer-Critic system, for the artists of The Hague generated huge sales, grew in confidence and helped consolidate the ancillary services, such as journalism and major galleries. Here, problems arose precisely because these masters dominated the home art market, which left the following generation deeply frustrated.

Approaching the 1850s, the economic state of The Netherlands did not favour much investment in contemporary art and, further, there were considerable differences between the cities and the provinces. The one place that did experience significant and sustained growth was not Amsterdam but The Hague. There is a close relationship between such positive economic growth and the readiness of the middle-classes to buy art. The Royal Academy, founded 1682, was just one of many cultural institutions that were well-organised yet competitive in order to promote fine art sales to a wealthy elite. One contemporary analyst, H. Floerke, wrote that Dutch
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artists had to develop a flexible approach to their careers because to continue meant attracting a wide client base, and coming to terms with an array of tastes, both Catholic and Calvinist, that resulted in both a “flamboyant” and a “subdued grand style.” Irrespective of religion, the Hague School, at least in its first manifestations, was of the ‘subdued’ kind. The Hague became a magnet for cultural investment, for art dealers and for painters, disproportionate to the number of its inhabitants. Much has been written on the achievements of the Hague School masters, yet only recently has research shown the crucial role played by the careful marketing of their image, not only through the formation of their club, *Pulchri Studio*, (15:4), but also through clever manipulation of the market by art dealers and printers. The obvious financial success of these masters was not, in fact, a particularly good advertisement for the Dutch academies or their salon system, for most of them developed their careers outside the country or through training with older masters. Neither was the wealth they accumulated made through the official Triennial exhibitions, but largely as a result of trade with the new generation of art dealers and print-publishers.

As a result of the academies’ *laissez-faire* attitudes to the career development of its members, many Dutch artists went abroad for training or left permanently to be closer to their clients. Two early prominent and well-publicised examples of this pragmatic approach to the mobility of labour were not Hague School masters: Ary Scheffer (1795-1858), who settled in Paris, and Laurens Alma-Tadema (1836-1912) in London. Numerically, if not quite so financially seductive, was the proximity of Belgium’s healthy art markets. Saskia de Bodt has recently emphasized the pre-eminence of Brussels as providing the important economic contribution for many Dutch painters in the second half of the century, including almost all the masters of the Hague School. It did this in the simplest manner, by accepting their works for exhibition and, especially, by buying them.

Dutch art was in a peculiar position by the 1880s. The art work, in many ways, continued the landscape traditions of the seventeenth century, but in a “nuanced tonalism” that appealed greatly to the bourgeoisie. The Hague painters did not call themselves a radical group or even a school, but they did organise themselves into an official society, in 1847, which soon had grand, purpose-built, exhibition rooms for its members, *Pulchri Studio*. However, long before the end of the century mounting criticism was directed at them, not least from a financial point of view. Stolwijk’s thorough study of Dutch art sales shows clearly how much Hague School artists dominated the market, lead by J. Maris, H.W. Mesdag and J. Israëls. However, their works went almost entirely for export, to Great Britain and North America. Very little was on show, even in the regular Triennial exhibitions, so that the home country did not feel the benefit of
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these masters. “During the 1870s works by the masters of The Hague and Barbizon Schools were rarely collected on any scale in The Netherlands,” with the possible exception of Mesdag’s own collection. 540 What was equally surprising was that when Mesdag and Israëls became chairmen of *Pulchri Studio* and other art societies their policies did not promote modernism but were reactionary.

One of the best images of the calm cultured Dutch art society was the stylish building complex of *Pulchri Studio*, in a fashionable quarter of The Hague. But, it still had its critics: “One must be seriously devoted to art, if one is not to be angered by the viewing organized by *Pulchri Studio* of late. Besides the fact that the throngs of people make it physically impossible to see the drawings properly.” 541 Their rules and regulations were financially restrictive, even monopolistic. There were some particularly strict rules on the membership, the most contentious of which concerned who sold members’ art works, for they demanded an exclusivity on all retailing. One cannot imagine the likes of Mesdag and Israëls complying with these rules, yet they helped to form them. As Bionda points out, “private sales were forbidden in theory, but common in practise.” 542 Few younger artists were in a position to revolt against such rules and regulations, until George Breitner, for one, openly sold wherever he could, proving that “the interests of members apparently outweighed whatever bureaucratic decisions were reached during the founding meeting of the club.” 543

Including this artists’ club with the salon system here seems justified when one examines the second generation of Hague School painters, for it was these who continued to complain about the restrictive practises of *Pulchri Studio*. Generally speaking, the 1880s saw the formation of many clubs and specialist art societies out of frustration with exhibition policies, so that modernists joined Breitner and Willem Witsen, Johann Thorn Prikker, Mondriaan and Toorop, amongst many others, and organised societies such as St. Luke’s, The Dutch Etching Club and *Flanor* in Amsterdam and The Hague’s Art Circle and the *Moderne Kunstkring*. Ironically, one of the first major commissions Piet Mondriaan ever received for an oil painting was not for his own work but to make a copy, of a stereotypical Dutch subject, a windmill, by the Hague School master Paul Gabriël, called *In the Month of July*, c.1889. 544 He had little direct contact with the Hague School yet it was difficult to ignore its influence. At first, the tremendous success of these masters boosted the image of the academies of art and the official Triennial exhibitions, but this did little to re-invigorate the system in the long-term. There was no dramatic increase in art academy student numbers in Holland, for example, mainly as they sought training elsewhere, abroad. Surprisingly, the student intake to the Royal Academy, after 1870 called the *Rijksacademie*, shows little or moderate statistical variation, or increase, during the last three decades, averaging only around twenty new pupils a year. 545 Comparisons with similar state institutions in Copenhagen, Berlin and Munich, amongst others, do not reflect well on the Amsterdam Art Academy, in terms of growth or investment. There was only one slight statistical rise and that is in the early acceptance of women art students. They formed in some years, such
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as 1882, up to half of the total intake. Such data adds to the overall impression that complex changes were afoot that the academies were caught up in but powerless to control. The newspaper De Nederlandsche Spectator was typical of the critical press, complaining repeatedly that the amounts on the market had “increased considerably” over the previous 20-30 years, so that even some art journalists, could “no longer keep up.” Also, when the authorities looked at the financial success of the Hague School it only served to confirm their decisions to withdraw the continuation of state funding. As the state abandoned sponsorship of the important Triennials, it opened the gates to greater commercialism and merchandising, reinforcing the swing to financial alternatives and the notion of greater self-determination.

Innate conservatism was also a feature in the traditional salons and auction-houses, a trade centred in Amsterdam, with firms such as Schulman, Roos, Bom, De Vries and Gijselmann. Amsterdam had a pre-eminent, international reputation based on the sale of ‘Old Masters’, connoisseur collections, liquidations, estate clearances and of colonial or ethnographic crafts. Such auction houses had a vested interest in maintaining the status quo, which, in practise, largely excluded risk-taking on unproven new artists. Despite tentative reforms, such as big salon exhibitions touring provincial cities, most artists felt unsatisfied. Critics had a field day. One of the most prominent commentators of the day, A.C. Loffelt, wrote in Het Vaderland of the “tawdry bazaar of fourth rate art” and “a prosaic wilderness.” Such comments were neither descriptions to inspire the general public to buy nor attract constant financial investment. One might have expected the most successful artists of the era, members of the Hague School, to raise the tone and quality of any exhibitions but, again, in practise, the reverse happened. Their work often became pastiche, if they bothered to send it in at all. One 1893 newspaper article commented: “This year the Hague Academy has the honour of hosting the Triennial. This sounds impressive, but is merely a hollow phrase …There was once a time when even the greatest artists would submit their best works to the Triennial, especially when it was held in The Hague, but owing to the blinding fame they won at foreign exhibitions the emphasis has now shifted. If foreigners who harbour the vain hope of seeing [contemporary] Dutch Masters in their own country wish to spare themselves a disappointment, they would be well advised to go to Munich, Chicago or anywhere else.”

During the occasional periods of economic amelioration, optimism in the profession was enough to cause them to put aside their differences and organise themselves better, which took the form of exhibition societies. The first was in Amsterdam, Arti et Amicitiae, founded in 1839. It was a semi-official salon, but surprisingly poorly organised, judging from the oddly-printed catalogues. Examination of the November 1841 pamphlet and the following year’s offering, in
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March 1842, one sees a confusion of type faces and information; there were approximately fifty members participating, who showed c.125 works, but no data or prices are included. It compares poorly with Copenhagen’s annual exhibition catalogues of approximately the same date, which were the same size but gave useful information such as the artists’ studio addresses and always included special Tombola prizes. Pulchri Studio was a marked improvement in the 1850s, as it should have been, yet in other provincial capitals art circles were already organising themselves in response to the same economic and social ameliorations. In Groningen, for example, the art club Pictura was formed as early as 1832. Initially formed out of a desire to see and discuss fine art, it gradually had more exhibits and eventually, by 1880, organised shows for the sale of pictures.\footnote{Schuller tot Peursum-Meijer, 1982, pp. 7-73.} One factor these art societies all had in common was the inevitable, practical necessity of finding financial resources on a regular basis.

The art societies, irrespective of wider ideological agendas, all held sales, arranged loans and shaped many aspects of their members’ financial interests. Pulchri Studio organised many innovative kinds of painting exhibitions: permanent displays, big annual shows, themed events, imported material and, in rotation, held individual member’s ‘retrospectives.’ On a smaller scale, other regional centres were also becoming better organised. Groningen’s Pictura, for example, organised a Tentoonstelling van Levende Meesters in 1889. It showed a mixture of local and national names, in this case just over 300 works by 204 artists.\footnote{Exh. Cat. Groningen, 1889, Pictura art society.} Despite this shift to smaller shows, the balance of works on display was still not altogether satisfactory, for the vast majority of artists only had one work on exhibition. Most works were on sale for less than f 400, a realistic price, yet Mesdag asked an ambitious f 3,000 for his masterpiece. Some revenue was generated for the local art society, from entrance fees, 25 cents, and an un-illustrated catalogue at f 1.50. The omissions are interesting, for many of the popular Hague School artists were absent, including the major local artist, Jozef Israëls. Women painters were reasonably-well represented with Sientje Mesdag van Houten (Mrs. Mesdag), and the talents of ‘Wally’ Moes and ‘Suze’ Robertson, who each had two pictures in the show. Most of the women artists seem also to have had a strong sense of place, identifying with certain locations, naming their villages and artists’ colonies, including Oosterbeek, Laren and Katwijk.

It is also interesting to compare this 1889 Groningen Pictura exhibition with another it organised in 1902. The later show was made in collaboration with a local bookshop, Scholten & Sons, who also printed the fine, cheap and un-illustrated catalogue. This firm also experimented with picture-dealing in the city, on its upper floor, in contrast to the more typical antique shops, or Kunst en Ivoordraaijers, of which there were four by the 1880s.\footnote{Adresboek van Groningen, 1880, includes four antique dealers but no art dealers. By 1885 there were five art dealers printed, including Scholten. By 1891 the number of official dealers had grown to six.} In the 1902 Pictura exhibition, works from 90 artists were on show, but only four were based in Groningen. Surprisingly, twenty-two participants identified themselves as based in The Hague. It included works by both Mesdag and Israëls this time, but it was now Israëls who asked the unrealistic price of f 6,000, for one of his two canvases. Most, of the 77 works were on sale for under f 1,000, which was still a healthy asking price for the period. The catalogue also shows that many painters were now working in artists’ villages. The 1902 catalogue, for example, prints the now well-known artists’ villages of Scheveningen, Laren, Nunspeet and Katwijk, almost advertising them as ‘brand names’.\footnote{Exh. Cat. Groningen, 1902. Seven out of the ninety artists were from Scheveningen; 5/90 artists were from...} There were five artists from Laren, including Ferdinand Hart-Nibbrig,
who was soon to be a leader of Domburg artists’ colony, and Jan Zoetelief-Tromp, who was resident in Katwijk. Katwijk’s artists were also represented by Willy Sluiter, Jan Toorop, Suze Robertson and Charles Gruppe. The term colony was not used in the catalogue, yet this close identification with certain villages was clearly an accepted promotional strategy by this time.

It can be seen that in most countries there was plenty of criticism of the existing state systems, and economic considerations greatly fuelled those concerns, for they hit at the pockets of almost every single professional artist. Improvements were made to the Academy-Salon system yet even the semi-official structures did not keep pace with the rates of change and adaptability of the private sector. Many talented painters simply left their homelands, attracted by the bigger markets of Paris and London, but, the seeds of another major alternative system were already sown and gathering momentum in most major cities, the Dealer-Critic system. Membership of formal art societies, exhibition centres and state lottery systems provided only temporarily solutions. The painters who pioneered artists’ colonies did so to satisfy certain ideologies and to make gains in their careers. When they also met other artists with similar intent they naturally compared opinions and discovered common frustrations, primarily with their respective art academies. The Academy-Salon system remained a major financial obstacle, but real gains came with the growing independent sector. The new art market was unregulated and risky, but it was fast evolving, flexible and energetic in finding ways of selling fine art, including the development of new themes, styles and groups. Where the academies were inherently conservative, the new generation of art dealers revitalized the whole market and worked closer with modern artists to find strategies for mutual success.

The Dealer in the Dealer-Critic System

The institutional conservatism of the traditional state art academies caused them to lose touch with developments happening in the new art markets and amongst the new buying public. The ever-widening gap between officially-sanctioned and modern art was the result, according to the Whites’, of structural inadequacies increasingly apparent in the old system: “Pressure from the greatly expanded numbers of professional painters on an organisational and economic framework conceived to handle a few hundred was the driving force toward institutional change. The academy system emphasised individual canvases rather than the careers of painters; hence, it could not control the flow of paintings being produced. It did control the flow of recruits through [their] art schools, yet it could not generate economic opportunities sufficient for the flow.” The new art market, or the Dealer-Critic system, found favour with the buying public as it complemented its own values. It rose in importance as the traditional mechanisms lost touch and
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because it adapted better to the current ideas of the middle class buyers, experimenting with and fine-tuning the accepted commercial practices of the day.

Artists were able to see this alternative system in operation on the streets of most major cities by the 1880s because of the growth in the number and variety of print shops and art galleries. Access to them was easy, as Paula Becker found to her satisfaction, when in Paris, London and Berlin. She was enthralled by the spacious, plush showrooms; the calendars of events, that offered musical evenings and “entertainment for polite society.” In 1900, she first saw works by Cézanne, her major influence, in his art dealer’s window, the Ambrose Vollard Gallery. Post-impressionist works were still rare in Germany, yet she was already familiar with Berlin’s progressive art dealers as they were all near her art school on Potsdamerstrasse: Gurlitt was the first to import French Impressionist works in 1883; closely followed by the Cassirer brothers, Bruno and Paul; and the firm Moritz Keller & Carl Reiner. In 1901, her Worpswede colleague Heinrich Vogeler had his first major show at Keller & Reiner’s Gallery, which she attended with the poet Rainer Maria Rilke. Some exclusive galleries offered memberships, but most gave a package of fast-changing cultural entertainments. All this information was readily accessible, for the exhibitions were advertised in newspapers and featured in the new art journals. Even in remote Skagen, for example, P.S. Krøyer had copies of the latest stylish London art journal, The Studio. It was not only the growth in the variety and number of galleries that gave visibility to modern art, but that they linked up with journalism to boost their effectiveness.

The galleries belonging to Durand-Ruel and George Petit, which Paula Becker also visited in Paris, are said to have been modelled on the refined atmospheres of the Grosvenor Gallery and other Bond Street auction houses in London, yet there were dealers for each level of society, from cheap, crowded print shops to spacious, luxurious premises. Cheap print shops were common and swelled by the number of fine-art reproductions suddenly available by the 1870s. Prints were more-easily affordable because of the economies of scale provided by the now huge print runs made from line-block steel engravings. Reproductions of artworks by the likes of Ary Scheffer, Jozef Israëls, Rosa Bonheur, Edwin Landseer and Julius Exner became hugely popular and infused much new capital into the system, for the artists, the engravers, the printers, the publishers and the galleries. Commercial printing and art publishing produced pictorial images as never before, so that illustrations of classical, historical and modern art were within the reach of all. An example of this may be seen from a painting by Christian Krohg of a fisherman’s cottage interior from remote Skagen, in 1879, (17:4). On the wall of the Gaihede’s parlour are prints, including da Vinci’s Last Supper and several pages torn from Denmark’s most popular new journal, Illustreret Tidende. Interestingly, in another painting by Krohg, done the same year in the same room, he shows that on the opposite wall they owned examples of the new rival to such traditional reproductions, two small framed Daguerreotypes. Progress was quick,
even in such remote villages, for this family would soon witness the making of much fine art in their village and then see illustrations of people they knew.

Many art dealers started their businesses by selling stationery, then prints, and slowly graduated to displaying watercolours or drawings. Typically, Durand-Ruel’s original shop sold its own sets of pencils and colours, brushes and materials, which was another way to get close to the artists. Its customers included Corot and Millet. When he decided to concentrate on selling oil paintings, Durand-Ruel left that trade behind for the bigger risks and bigger profits of running a gallery. Even in 1850s Paris, he was not alone in this trade, but very few specialists of any size or significance had yet emerged.\(^{563}\) However, by 1861 there were over one hundred galleries, mostly grouped around the Louvre or on the Left Bank, south of the fashionable new official modern arts centre, the Luxembourg Gardens.\(^{564}\) They were mostly small art shops, but as the market steadily grew investment was made in bigger premises. Astute dealers, such as George Petit, Paul Durand-Ruel and Adolphe Goupil, recognised early the importance of the foreign markets and benefited hugely from trading with and from Holland, Britain, Germany and North America. Durand-Ruel is highly important because of his early promotion of the School of Barbizon and, then, the French Impressionists, yet Goupil invested, at the same time, in Hague School paintings and, consequently, had a more direct effect on the study area and its artists’ colonies.

Emile Zola, who was a keen observer of the middle-classes, wrote an interesting assessment of the hierarchy amongst art galleries in Paris c.1885, something of which was present in most metropolitan art markets at the time. At the bottom of the financial ladder were small, less significant entrepreneurs, such as Aubourg, who bought pictures “for no more than five to twenty francs,” but who could be found in most urban neighbourhoods. There was Martin, who “haggled artists down to 40 francs”, had a rapid turnover and took quick profits; Beugniet was “un Martin en grand” who preferred already recognisable names; Brame, “buys dear and sells dear,” often reselling the same painting several times, thus escalating prices; and, grander still was George Petit, a cold man “nourished by clerics.”\(^{565}\) There were, naturally, many critics of these agents, yet few artists refrained from using their financial services, at one time in their careers. Petit liked to buy at fr.10,000 and sell for fr. 40,000. He specialised in recently dead artists, such as Millet, Rousseau, Corot and Delacroix. He was also the first art dealer to construct a special, purpose-built gallery on the chic rue de Sèze, where he awaited the arrival, each May, of rich Americans, according to Zola. But, the most glamorous gallery, “La dernier chic”, was owned by Sedelmeyer, who “bought at fr. 100,000 and sold for fr. 400,000.” It was he who organised the pivotal Sécretan auction in 1889, where Millet’s The Angelus sold for the extraordinary sum of 553,000 francs. “As much as any single event could, the Sécretan auction announced the victory of the market place over the academic/ Salon system.”\(^{566}\) Curiously, Zola omits to mention Paul Durand-Ruel, the impressionists’ favourite dealer.

The publicity surrounding the return of Millet’s The Angelus to France, one year later, for the even more staggering sum of 800,000 francs, guaranteed even more articles about Barbizon,
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its school of painters and the rising market for modern art. The painting itself seems unremarkable, being small, dark and modest in scope. Soon every detail of its provenance and Millet’s career were reprinted around the world, including, of course, all the financial aspects. For example, the leading English-language art journal, *The Magazine of Art*, gave a detailed report of the auction and the genre almost immediately, even though it had already printed many articles that same year on the Barbizon painters.²⁵⁶ Interestingly, in the same issue of the magazine there was also a fine, full-page, illustration of Frank Bramley’s masterpiece, *Hopeless Dawn*, 1888, a good example of painting from Newlyn’s artists’ colony. This overall density of publicity given to rural artistic creativity and the formation of groups confirmed the trend and helped to improve their financial potential.

The growth in the number of art galleries in Holland related to the huge interest in Hague School works. There were well over one hundred art dealers operating in Amsterdam and The Hague alone in the second half of the century.²⁵⁸ Most of these were small shops and it is interesting that many were inter-connected, often by family, most famously the Van Goghs: Cornelis Maria (1824-1908), Vincent I (1820-88), Vincent II (1866-1911), Hendrik Vincent (1815-77), Vincent Willem (1853-90) and Theodorus (1857-91). It was Vincent ‘Oom Cent’ who amalgamated with the French firm of *Goupil & Cie* in 1846, to make the top fine art gallery in The Hague (18:4). It proved a successful collaboration, yet still mostly for first generation Hague School artists, at least before 1900. It was family firm started by Jan Hendrik Wisselingh (1816-84), also in The Hague, who were the major early Dutch promoters of the Barbizon artists and the first to show works by Corot, in Holland. Many firms were started by lesser painters and in one case it was the widow of a master who started the gallery, namely *Maison Artz*, by Mrs. H.W.O.A. Artz-Schemel, later Artz & de Bois, who promoted more avant-garde art. The foreign element is also evident, mostly French, with another leading art dealership Frans Buffa & Sons, in Amsterdam, who were a little more adventurous, featuring, amongst others, early Toorop, Breitner and van Gogh. Yet, even with the marked increase in the number of art galleries, in the 1880s, young Dutch modernists still had little visibility other than with the smallest dealers. Consequently, new strategies were still required to improve their careers, including forming groups, accepting design contracts and starting exhibition societies.

²⁵⁶ *The Magazine of Art*, founded in 1881, was published in London, New York, Paris and Melbourne. They commissioned many articles on the Fontainebleau painters from at least 1884, when they employed writer Robert Louis Stevenson. In 1889, on p. 381, they reproduced a copy of *The Angelus*, engraved by M. Kinkicht from a photograph by Practorius with permission of the publishers R. Gerart. Articles on Diaz de la Peña also appeared regularly throughout that year.

The new art dealers were in a stronger position to act innovatively, a problem inherent with state conservatism, and were able to gauge more quickly the buying public’s moods and taste. It was in their interest to listen to potential customers and discuss the information on a one-to-one basis. Attendants gently informed clients and helped position each work, in the context of an artists’ career or as part of a movement and a group. Thus an artists’ village name became a shorthand for a kind of artwork. Dealers organised many more exhibitions annually than the salons, promoting their artists’ interests more broadly than by established channels. Many of the dealers’ methods were already in existence in one form or another, but because they had greater flexibility of approach, they were in a position to make more changes with, for example, display, publicity, catalogues and ease of accessibility. The shop window made a fashionable showcase, especially when illuminated at night. Paula Modersohn-Becker saw her first Cézannes this way at Vollard’s Gallery and many Seurat works at Bernheim’s Gallery in 1900.569

The new galleries formed part of the modernist banner. They offered ‘sound’ works by masters, yet collectors liked to think they could find undiscovered new talents at bargain prices. Many dealers were friends as well as business partners to their artists. As businessmen, they were looking for winners to sign up, but the better ones, such as Durand-Ruel, genuinely cared about developing new talent. Maison Goupil made lucrative monopolistic contracts with some members of the Hague School, but not all commissions were as clear cut. In practice, a number of options were employed to help their painter’s finances, from short-term advances to long-term contracts, credit arrangements impossible under the academy system. C.M. van Gogh was, for example, known for his financial acumen, yet he was also recorded as giving cash to struggling painters, but only on certain terms, most notoriously by having them immediately make sepia sketches or paintings, and signing documents, in the backroom.570 Charles Dumas also writes how the dealer van Gogh was not always so calculating, as he also helped young painters get positions in studios, such as the young F.H. Kaemmerer who entered Gérôme’s atelier and Jacob Maris in that of Ernest Hébert.571 C.M. van Gogh’s nephew, Vincent, had on-going, financial problems yet found hope and support from H.G. Tersteeg, the manager of Goupil & Sons in Holland from the late 1870s. He told Vincent he could always go to him for money, which in March 1882 he did, but “only to the accompaniment of much unfriendly criticism.”572 Interestingly, in the postscript to the same letter he mentions his uncle commissioning him to make twelve “small pen drawing, views of The Hague...at 2.50 guilder each.” In 1885, the Parisian dealer M. Portier also held works by Vincent on commission, mentioned in a letter from Antwerp to Theo, “you wrote to me yourself that he was the first to exhibit the impressionists, and that his thunder was completely stolen by Durand-Ruel.”573

Paul Durand-Ruel undoubtedly invested a considerable amount of capital, time, effort and resources in promoting, first, the School of Barbizon, and second, the French Impressionists. The distinguished art historian John Rewald asserts his primary importance, acknowledging their
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rise was “owing to the relentless efforts of the dealer Durand-Ruel.”
His international networking made the difference, especially in
Germany and the U.S.A. Soon the infrastructure of the Dealer-Critic
system spread to across most major European cities to include firms
such as The Cassirer Brothers in Berlin; H.J. Wisselingh and Buffa &
Son in Holland, Ernst Gambart, the Dudley Gallery and The
Grosvenor in London; Goupil’s in Holland, Paris, London, Toronto
and New York; and to previously unrecognised art markets, for
example Copenhagen’s Gallery Valdemar Kleis and the firm Winkel
& Magnussen (19:4).

The chronological development of the ‘modern breakthrough’,
in the context of painting, in Scandinavia can be closely tied to events
that unfolded in these two Copenhagen art galleries. Each, in their
own way, gave encouragement and confidence to modern artists, seen
especially in the formation of the radical arts society Den Frie
Udstilling, membership of which included almost all the Skagen
painters. One painting, by Skagen pioneer Karl Madsen, shows the
interior of Winkel & Magnussen’s first floor premises. It appears
crammed, yet one sees the wide range of work necessary to maintain such a business, including
prints, portfolios, mounted drawings, plaster casts, busts, sculptures, ceramics and a variety of
modest paintings. Most other art dealers in the city were small, unadventurous and, typically,
offered their clients standard patriotic subjects by the National Romantics, such as the firms
owned by Otto Lemming or J.F. Kleinsang, who, for example, both sold works by Exner.
These were by no means spacious chic galleries and not comparable to Wisselingh’s gallery in
Amsterdam or Durand-Ruel’s premises in Paris. Nevertheless, the Gallery Kleis, in Copenhagen,
played a major role in the development of Scandinavian arts and crafts, the founding of Den Frie
Udstilling, when modern artists finally managed to organise their own marketing and exhibitions
on a regular basis.

Tensions came to a head in 1888 when paintings by Johan Rohde, Vilhelm Hammershoi,
Fritz Syberg and Joakim Skovgaard, amongst others, were all rejected from the Copenhagen Art
Academy’s Spring Exhibition. An alternative show, a kind of Salon des Réfusée’ was organised
in the Gallery Kleis. It proved successful enough so that the following year the group built a
temporary wooden exhibition hall in Copenhagen’s central square, Rådhuspladsen. ‘The Open
Exhibition’ caused a sensation and so, after three years successful trading, they felt confident
enough to organise a more-permanent, stylish exhibition centre, designed by another Skagen
artist J.F. Willumsen, at Osterport. Willumsen (1863- 1958) represented another, younger,
generation of artists, who recognised the ever-widening gap between the academy and
modernism. He travelled widely and first went to France in the Winter of 1888, where he met
Paul Gauguin, amongst others, in the crowded artists’ colony of Pont-Aven.

574 Rewald, 1946, p. 94, and in many subsequent monographs.
575 København Vejviser, from 1890- 95, shows an increase from 13 to 16 art dealers. Gallery Kleis on Vesterbro
started as early as 1845. Winkel & Magnussen and Gallery Strøm were founded in 1884. Yet, Peter Magnussen in
his memoir, “1 kunsthandel gennem fyrtretye aar”, in Samleren, 1924, suggested Hermanns Kobberstikhandlen was
one of the eldest, but for prints only, and also cites H.I. Bing & Sons as having started in the early 1880s. Exner
made account books, that show most of his sales, which remain in the family archives in Aarhus.
The Critic in the Dealer-Critic System

The series of events that lead to the construction of the pioneering Den Frie Udstilling building also paralleled efforts to market modern art in neighbouring countries, which also suffered by having few outlets for their endeavours, (20:4). Swedish radicals organised themselves into an action group, the Opponents, who eventually evolved into the more formal Artists’ Association. The rigorous use of print, and publishing generally, is common to these new groups, especially the use of artist-journalists. This process, the Dealer-Critic system, acted to give a new vocabulary to all modern art movements, including the reasoning behind group formations such as rural artists’ colonies. It was not the painters themselves but writers who generally came up with the names for groups, for example, by using the collective noun ‘school’ in relation to Barbizon, The Hague, Newlyn, etc. However, it is not entirely an adequate expression, although it provides some context and at least a little information for the buyers, as opposed to groups with names such as the Barbus, Ancients, Nazarenes or PRB. As newspaper publishers realised the growing interest in art they responded by allotting regular Arts columns or sections and then employed specialists to explain the finer points of styles and events. The bi-weekly Illustreret Tidende, founded in 1858, was highly influential in Denmark and read across all Scandinavia. It only started a regular column on art, Konst, after 1875, although it regularly featured illustrations of paintings and famous artists on its eye-catching front cover. For example, an engraving of Corot appeared that same year on its front along with a comprehensive biography. The first illustration of a Skagen painting appeared in this periodical in 1879. Countries with larger populations and, therefore, a potentially larger readership interested commercial publishers earlier to invest in printing art journals, so that for the German speaking world there emerged titles such as Die Kunst, Der Cicerone and Kunst für Alle. The Studio and Magazine of Art were just two of the popular art journals in the English-speaking market and, for the Dutch, there were the periodicals Kunstkronek and De Nieuwe Gids. Quality newspapers accepted the necessity of employing professional art critics, as they wished to appear culturally fashionable. Many of these articles were written by young painters, such as Jan Veth and H.P. Bremmer in Holland, who were friends and colleagues of modern artists and so could better explain the often complex nature of contemporary trends.

The French were amongst the first to write critiques of contemporary painting. They focussed particularly on the big events, such as the Salons. The recognised father of the genre was Denis Diderot whose first Salon pieces appeared as early as 1759 and, significantly, were reprinted in 1844. Charles Baudelaire, ‘the father of modern art criticism,’ most likely read Diderot’s articles in the journal l’Artiste, for there are stylistic similarities. Nevertheless, Baudelaire’s critiques, 1845-62, proved very popular and influential, not least as they were refreshingly frank, highly personal and well-informed. Although too early to comment on the
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576 Illustreret Tidende, 1879, vol. 995, carries a line-block illustration of Carit Etlar’s Skagen Strand.
577 La Font de Saint-Yenne wrote the first Salon critiques, Réflexions sur quelques cause de l’état présent de la peinture en France, from 1747. Denis Diderot (1713-84) wrote lively and highly conversational Salon revues between 1759-81, an approach widely accepted as influencing Charles Baudelaire.
formation of artists’ colonies, he did champion Realism’s pioneers, such as Rousseau, Corot, Jongkind and their followers. “Rejecting a cold, mathematical, heartless approach, Baudelaire demanded instead a criticism that was ‘partial, passionate, and political’” and, “‘amusing and poetic’...and his writing conveys the excitement of first-hand experience expressed with liveliness and originality.”578 He was partial, but he was not in the pay of any art dealer. Durand-Ruel was not successful in his own attempts to publish an ‘in-house’ journal, *Revue Internationale*.579 However, the public realised his self-interest and soon enough the paper folded, after just two years, in 1871. Yet, it can be seen that in most countries, commentators on modern art became more common, graduating from newspapers to art magazines to monographs, often writing about dealers and artists they knew personally. In Germany, Julius Meier-Graefe carved out his career in this way. He was one of the first to promote the Impressionists in Germany, starting late, in the 1890s, writing for art magazines, such as *Die Zukunft* and *Die Atelier*, then co-founding another, *Dekorative Kunst* in 1898, the model for which was London’s *The Studio*. His first monograph on modern art was *Corot und Courbet*, published in 1905.580 In The Netherlands, Albert Plasschaert and Conrad Kickert are good examples of the new professional art critics, both of whom had close associations with Domburg’s artists’ colony, visiting this far corner of the land, writing about their friends and their exciting exhibitions.581 Similarly, in Denmark, Georg Brandes and Karl Madsen were significant publicists for the modern movement, stemming from personal friendships with many painters. In the case of Madsen, he was also another example of a painter who turned to journalism and art criticism.582 He was closely associated with the Skagen artists’ colony, from 1871, marrying into the Brøndum clan and rose, by 1911, to be the director of *Statens museum for Kunst* in Copenhagen and, from 1928, the first chairman of *Skagens Museum*.

This is not to say that Skagen did not have its negative critics, even amongst the modern movement, for Hendrik Pontoppidan (1857-1943) and Johan Rohde (1856-1935) wrote disparagingly of their experiences in the artists’ colony, after a walking tour in 1872. However, their criticisms were more about the social life and overcrowding than the work produced.583 Rohde is best remembered as a leading art teacher, designer and writer, who promoted a new Scandinavian aesthetic, in terms of applied arts as much as in painting. He wrote articles for a number of newspapers from the early 1880s, the most important of which were in *Politiken* and *Berlingske Tidende*. He also wrote for specialist periodicals, such as *Kunstbladet* and the German magazine *Kunst und Künstler*. He helped found *Den Frie Udstilling* and in 1892 he also made and wrote about a fascinating tour of modern art centres in Holland, Belgium and Northern France.584 His direct experiences of the avant-garde, new studios, galleries, museums and new publishing methods on this tour helped shape developments back in Scandinavia. In Paris, for example, he visited the art dealers Goupil, George Petit and Boussod & Valodon. He also explored smaller specialist dealers including Edvard Sagot and Le Barc de Boutteville, where he saw the remarkable early exhibition ‘Impressionists and Symbolists.’ It was here, in 1892, that
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579 *Revue Internationale de l’Art et de la Curiosité* ran from 1869-71.
580 Moffett, 1973, p. 28.
581 Several of Albert Plasschaert’s Domburg catalogues have survived, RKD archive, The Hague, with his annotations written by hand on them. In 1925, he also completed a biography on Jan Toorop.
582 Karl Madsen (1855-1938) was Art Critic for the Danish newspaper *Politiken*, from 1884; wrote for *Tilskueren*; and, edited another periodical *Kunstbladet*, before becoming Assistant Curator of the Royal Art Collection in 1895.
583 Pontoppidan, 1883.
584 Rohde, 1955.
he made friends with Julian Tanguy, the favourite colourman of Vincent van Gogh, and acquired some of the Dutchman’s works along with posters by Toulouse-Lautrec. Rohde also befriended artists such as Odilon Redon, Maurice Denis, Felix Valloton, Jan Verkade and Emile Schuffenecker, works by whom had not yet reached Scandinavia. He also attended the first van Gogh solo exhibition in Boutteville’s gallery and joined the Nabis group. In Holland, he again made contact with the van Gogh family and more modern art dealers in Amsterdam, such as Buffa & Sons. He visited Mondriaan and Toorop’s Kunstkring exhibition in The Hague, which featured the first works ever shown by Vincent van Gogh in his native country. Rohde well demonstrates the new links between countries, artistic styles, exhibitions, journalism, publishers, galleries, individual artists and groups in the Dealer-Critic system.

The Danish authorities also offer a few examples of the way that commercialism had entered the very top of the nation’s cultural elite. In an attempt to appear more modern, the authorities invested in a number of grand expositions to boost the image of the region internationally, from 1883. Along with the organisation of the exposition, Den Nordiske Kunstudsstilling, the need for an impressively-illustrated catalogue was recognised. Agreement was reached with a consortium of businessmen, including the book-seller August Bang and one young print-entrepreneur, R.F. Hendriksen, who had recently returned from learning the newest printing methods in London. Already he had earned the nickname ‘Xylograf’ Hendriksen from his eager use of this new process for his popular journal Ude og Hjemme. He acquired a vast collection of pictures of paintings preserved for illustration as woodblocks, engravings, lithography, xylography and, after 1884, photo-gravures. His official 1883 edition for the Nordic Art Exhibition is, consequently, well-illustrated and superior, in size, quality and content, to any other art catalogues produced in Scandinavia. As a result Bang and Hendriksen won the contract to produce the academy’s annual catalogues, which they did for many decades.

These expositions were chauvinistic displays for wide international consumption, as well as national anthologies of imagery. Governments allotted extraordinary amounts of money to this end and accepted works of some youthful painters that normally would not be encouraged, just to prove they were modernists. For example, in the Norwegian exhibition there were paintings by the radicals Christian Krohg and Christian Skredsvig, both of whom were ostracized in official Oslo art circles. From Sweden, the young Oscar Björck was present as was Carl Larsson, recently back from Grez artists’ colony. In this exposition, the number of artists directly connected with Skagen is noticeable. Michael Ancher’s Will she clear the point, was featured, not because it was particularly radical, but it had been recently bought by the Danish king. P.S. Kroyer offered a typical dazzling array, the first fruits of his tours around southern Europe, but not as yet from Skagen. The selection of Danish artists still contained many painters of the old school, such as Exner, showing his A Parlour from Fano, 1882, yet the modernists now had a foothold, officially. What is extraordinary is that approximately half of the 550 works of art on show were for sale and the catalogue went so far as to print all the artists’ addresses and studio telephone numbers. This also indicates a general acceptance of commercialism over connoisseurship, even at the top of governments.

585 Official attempts to stimulate interest in modern Scandinavian art and design included Skandinaviska konstexpositionen in Stockholm, 1866, and Copenhagen’s Den Nordiske Industri- og Kunstudsstillingen of 1872.
586 Dansk Biografisk Lexikon, 1893, vol. 7, pp. 339-40. ‘Xylograf’ R.F. Hendriksen (1847-1903) had learnt up-to-date printing methods in London, until 1870. Returning to Copenhagen he worked for Illustrerede Tidende before setting up his own company, which printed journals such as Ude og Hjemme and academy’s catalogues 1881.
The second international exposition held in Copenhagen followed in 1888, **Kunstafdelingen Nordiske Industri-, Landbrugs- og Kunstudstilling.** Xylograf Hendriksen’s catalogue was even larger and better illustrated. Amongst its 170 illustrations one may see his newest technological investment, photogravure, one of which shows Erik Werenskjold’s early masterpiece *A Farmer’s Funeral*, 1885. Werenskjold was yet another revolutionary painter, a social realist and an active member of a number of artists’ colonies, including Modum, just outside Oslo. In this 1888 exposition, almost all the Skagen colonists are represented: Anna Ancher showed three canvases and P.S. Krøyer, had an astonishing eleven works on show, including the exemplary group composition, *Artists’ Luncheon*, on loan, for the first-ever time, from Brøndum’s Hotel. However, the conservative element was still evident, for prof. Exner had ten works on show, including *Presentation for a Guest*, 1887 (18:2), another widely reproduced image of Fanø and also a recent acquisition by the royal collection. Lise Svandholm recently concluded that because of the embarrassment of previous official selections, for these grand international showcases, particularly Paris in 1878, the Danish art academy responded to foreign ridicule by finally bowing to pressure and including the modernists. By 1888, the achievements of the modernists were impossible to ignore officially, not least because of the critical acclaim they achieved internationally and their sales’ figures. The modern movement had its rural wing and this rallying point was Skagen’s artists’ colony.

Many of the criticisms of the art academies concerned training and the general lack of resources. One peculiar example of the complexities that can arise in out-of-touch administrations happened when the Danish government financed an initiative against its own institutions. Although reforms had been suggested as long ago as 1810s, by C.W. Eckersberg, the academy had never fully adopted them. Two academicians, Frands Schwartz and August Jerndorff, revived the idea of certain changes to the training curriculum for painters, as opposed to drawing classes, and, in 1882, asked Laurids Tuxen to head the teaching staff of a separate school, *Kunstnernes Studieskole*. So popular did these life classes prove that the school had to be enlarged and Tuxen asked first Krøyer, then Rohde, to assist him. At the suggestion of A.P. Weiss, a friend from the Ministry of Culture, Tuxen applied for a government grant to run the new, break-away, painting school, and to his amazement the application was approved. This meant that the government was providing funds for a radical alternative to its own official art institute and further sowing the seeds of dissent. Amongst the first pupils at the new school were J.F. Willumsen and Vilhelm Hammershøi (1864-1916).

Major German modern art dealers did not emerge until surprisingly late in the century and this was largely as a result of collaborations with the larger Parisian galleries. However, by the 1890s, the new styles of painting had moved on from Realism and also the early values of the French Impressionists. The early development, therefore, of the Worpswede artists’ colony came
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587 *Ibidem*. In 1884, Hendriksen bought new machinery from the Viennese photo-printing firm of Anger & Gösschl, 588 Svandholm, 2001, pp. 38-39, raises a number of points about the poor showing of Danish art in the Paris exposition of 1878. Copenhagen art academy sent works by Bloch, Bache, Helsted, Exner and Vermehren, amongst others. Their contributions were ‘heavily criticised’, being thought of as old fashioned, ‘vieux style’ (Sigurd Schultz, *Danske i Paris gennem Tiderne*, p. 272; Mario Proth, *Voyage au Pays des peintres, Salon universel de 1878*, pp. 211-28). Danish art was thought to have changed little from the time of Eckersberg. For the next Paris exposition in 1889 they could not escape sending works from the Skagen artists. Although Prof. Otto Bache was still the chairman of the committee, Krøyer and Viggo Johansen were elected members of the selection committee and so they managed to promote the paintings of the younger generation of artists, including Hammershøi and Willumsen.

589 Academies, at this time, mostly taught drawing not painting, instruction for which came in later master-classes.
without the benefits of private galleries, but they did gain from some essentially German solutions to the notion of a contemporary art market: namely big international state exhibitions and the Kunsthallen or museums. Munich’s Glaspalast was built as a permanent trade centre and gave the Worpswede artists’ colony nation-wide media coverage. Nearer to home, the local Bremen museum curator, Gustav Pauli, gave them all the encouragement he could by organising their first group exhibition in 1894, and again in 1899. Fritz Mackensen, the only figure painter in the group, also attracted paying students immediately.\(^{590}\) Lacking a fully supportive Dealer-Critic system meant that provincial journalism went largely unopposed, so that the old reactionary painter Arthur Fitger felt free to pour scorn on the Worpswede colonists, calling them in the local \textit{Die Weser Zeitung}, “Apostles of Hate” in December 1894 and their show in 1899, the “Laughter Room.”\(^{591}\) He was particularly scathing towards the Worpswede women, Marie Bock and Paula Becker,\(^{592}\) so much so that Paula never exhibited again.

Joining this artists’ colony had given Paula Becker the confidence to develop as an artist and gained her the necessary degree of peer-group support and even a degree of financial security. However, she lacked even a fraction of the full, structural support that the Dealer-Critic systems could offer, despite sympathy from curator Pauli. It is now generally accepted that her economic woes influenced her decision to marry Otto Modersohn. Typically, her affluent family had supported her financially through all the years of artistic training, in England, France and Germany, but with the proviso that she also qualified as a school teacher. Artists’ colonies provided much encouragement for women artists, but the groups were not usually in the position to offer sustained financial aid for any individual artist.

Some critics blamed the dollar, “The international competitions for markets, the sensational acquisition by American collectors of European art of all kinds, the high prices paid for heretofore almost unknown artists, made the art market a subject of intense scrutiny, producing serious institutional studies such as Paul Drey’s \textit{Der Kunstmarkt} (1910)….But, from an emergent sociology of art production and distribution to populist polemics was a small step.”\(^{593}\) The prime polemic, here, was the product of Carl Vinnen (1863-1922), a not very successful Bremen painter and late arrival at Worpswede. Vinnen’s famous \textit{Die Protest} pamphlet, of 1911,\(^{594}\) denounced the invasion of the German art market by foreign elements. Up to a point, he was right, as according to Lenman: “Imperial Germany had become the most important foreign market for French Impressionist paintings after the U.S.A.”\(^{595}\) Vinnen’s well-publicised criticisms became a focal point, nation-wide, for insularity and paranoia, curiously, for he had all the advantages of being associated with Wilhelmine Germany’s most well-known, modernist and radical artists’ colony yet he still failed to advance significantly.

Despite Vinnen’s polemic against the purchasing of foreign contemporary art, instigated by \textit{Bremen Kunsthalle}’s purchase of Vincent van Gogh’s \textit{Poppy Field} in 1909, director Pauli had negotiated carefully to build up the quality of this museum’s art collection, including its early French Impressionists, especially by collaborating cleverly with the Berlin dealer Paul Cassirer, for his civic museum’s buying power was naturally limited. Close analysis of the museum catalogue reveals Vinnen’s complaint was somewhat disingenuous, for Pauli had already

\(^{590}\) At least four women art students started working in Mackensen’s studio immediately after his Glaspalast triumph, in 1898, including Ottelie Reylaender, Marie Bock, Paula Becker and Clara Westhoff.


\(^{592}\) \textit{Weser Zeitung}, 20th. December 1899.

\(^{593}\) Jensen, 1994, p. 78.

\(^{594}\) Vinnen, 1911.

\(^{595}\) Lenman, 1997, p. 171.
purchased many works from all the Worpswede pioneers, from the beginning, in 1895, including, for example, Fritz Mackensen’s *Der Säuling* (25:2) and Otto Modersohn’s *Herbst im Moor*. In addition, by 1909, the original Worpswede artists’ colony had already largely dispersed, following Paula Modersohn-Becker’s premature death.

The role of the businessmen Bruno and Paul Cassirer combined many elements of the Dealer-Critic system in the one family, firstly when they ran a gallery together from 1898, then after 1901 when Bruno founded a lavishly illustrated art magazine. The gallery was chic, after the Petit model, with an interior designed by the stylish Belgian architect Henri van der Velde. Business was so good the Cassirer Gallery moved in 1905 to the even-more fashionable address of 113 Potsdamerstrasse. German art dealers were late in developing, but soon had a working knowledge on how to target the new art market because of their excellent international connections in the trade, namely with Durand-Ruel, Pellerin and Faure, as Vinnen implied. Their network spread across Berlin, for example with the Berheim Jeune gallery and across the country to Dresden, in Ernst Arnold’s smart Kunstsalon. Dresden was the first city in Germany, daringly, to witness regular sales of Impressionism and Post-impressionism. When Durand-Ruel’s collection of van Gogh pictures came to be sold in Germany it was shown in these same galleries and, eventually, a total of ten cities in their nationwide network.

Bruno Cassirer was closely associated with the Berlin Sezession. He started his well-illustrated art magazine, *Kunst und Künstler*, with the aim of promoting modern art and impressionism in particular. He used articles by French commentators such as Emile Zola, Jules Laforge and Theo Duret, in translation, and weighty pieces by prominent German painters, such as his friend the painter Max Liebermann, together with museum curators Alf Lichtwark and Hugo von Tschudi. He employed one of the earliest professional art critics Julius Meier-Graefe (1867-1935). Of course, there had been influential art historians in the past, but the new generation went further than commenting on historical and technical matters. Meier-Graefe was not only one of the first to fully describe Impressionism in Germany, he went to great lengths to inform the public about matters of style, the new painting methods and how to look at modern works of art. However, for professional German artists living away from the rapidly growing cities, there remained many difficulties with visibility and accessibility. North of Hamburg, in Kiel, Lübeck and Flensburg, for example, the venues to sell works, exhibit and develop a career were even more limited than to the west, around Bremen or Oldenburg. They produced good painters and reasonably high-quality art, but had little encouragement and few opportunities to show their work. As Hamburg’s Art Museum curator Lichtwark commented in 1909: “the number of artists of whom one knows that actually get the prices they ask is astonishingly small in Germany.” Artists hoping for advancement were forced to seek alternative methods to promote their careers, by forming groups and rural colonies.

Germany’s well-developed commercial print industry provided visibility beyond the regional. Leipzig has strong traditional links with commercial printing and led the way with new

597 Van de Velde previously designed the interior of Keller & Reiner’s art gallery on Potsdammerstr. 122, in 1897.
598 Jensen, 1994, p. 79.
599 Jensen, 1994, p. 76. Cassirer’s exhibitions include - October, 1901: 23 Renoirs; March, 1904: 50 Pissaros; December, 1904: 32 van Goghs; October, 1905: 26 Monets; February 1906: 38 Courbets; and, October, 1906: 72 Monet and Manets.
600 Meier-Graefe, 1907, in this book and in many articles for art magazines, including: Die Zukunft, Das Atelier, Kunst für Alle and Dekorative Kunst.
steam-powered, mechanized print machines. The city’s population rocketed ten-fold in little more than half a century, from 63,000 to 679,000,602 on the back of the printing boom. For example, Karl Bœdeker’s popular travel guides were printed here, as were many new magazines, such as Der Cicerone. This was a typical new art magazine, being bimonthly, stylish, well-illustrated and using the very latest technologies, such as chromolithography and photogravure. Magazine articles described art shows, lectures, events and exhibitions all across Germany, but also included Belgium, Austria and the U.S.A. Each issue also contained many pages of advertisements for private art galleries. In practise few such magazines managed a nation-wide distribution, yet information spread further and more rapidly than before.

Munich was a big enough city to generate its own publishing machine, with early illustrated art magazines such as Die Kunstchronik, founded in 1860, followed by Die Kunst. By the turn of the century these conservative journals generated remarkably avant-garde rival periodicals, such as Pan, Simplicissimus and Jugend. Die Kunst für Alle was one of the largest selling and most widely available titles and shows a lighter lay-out and modern type-face, with at least one illustration per page. Over a one-year period, 1901 for example, it had articles more than 1,000 contemporary painters, mostly German but also a sizeable number of other Europeans. Its coverage included the Worpswede colonists Modersohn, Vinnen and Vogeler; James Guthrie, leader of the Glasgow School and Lynch-pin of the Cockburnspath artists’ colony; and a large number of progressive Scandinavians, such as P.S. Krøyer, Oscar Björck, Akseli Gallen-Kallela and Carl Larsson. The Swedish artist Carl Larsson (1853–1919), in particular, shows how an artist’s career was shaped by collaboration with publishers using the newest printing methods. After he returned from a pivotal period in the artists’ colony at Graz, he had many commissions including illustrations, but his break-through and enduring financial security came because of new colour printing. The simplicity and charm of his watercolours became widely known through his working partnership with innovative printers, the Stockholm publisher Karl-Otto Bonnier, who first printed his At Home, 1897, and then German specialist Karl Robert Langewiesche of Düsseldorf.603 Bonnier also put him in touch with Bruno Cassirer in Berlin, who made an album of Larsson’s works in 1906, a first edition of 600. The first German edition of At Home was 40,000, which by 1919 had risen to a phenomenal print run of 200,000.

“The numerous foreign exhibitions which on the whole are more attractive to our painters, as far as profit and publicity are concerned, than the exhibitions held in The Netherlands, have been detrimental to the latter. We cannot compete with Munich and Berlin.”604 Art journalist A.C. Loffelt commented thus, in 1891, on the poor state of the Dutch art market. There is a certain degree of irony involved in the situation, for the old Dutch masters inspired the new wave of landscape painters, many of whom came to visit the same countryside and coast that inspired them. All the neighbouring countries continued their historic art trading in classic Dutch landscape, marine and genre paintings. Mesdag, for example, spread his works around a large number of dealers internationally.605 There were galleries in London that promoted Hague School works from the early 1870s, such as the French Gallery and the Grafton Gallery, but by

603 Lengefeld, 1993, p. 4.
604 Loffelt, Het Vaderland, 24th May, 1891.
the 1890s there were exclusive ‘branch’ dealings, namely Holland Fine Arts and the Dutch Gallery, who all developed highly profitable links with specific patrons, such as the new industrialists Alexander Young, James Staats Forbes and J.C. Day. All Hague School painters who exported became richer, as did their dealers.

While the Hague School leaders pointed the way forward in technique, composition, genre and topographic excellence, they also showed, by example, how to profit through the reproduction of their work, especially Jozef Israëls (1824-1911). In her biography of Israëls, Dieuwertje Dekkers writes that he “owed his success to a new system of ‘inter-dependency’ of artists, collectors, critics and the public” and its “concomitant demand for specialisation.”

Israëls took the genre format he had seen in Barbizon and made it his own. By simplifying the form he made it easier to print and so he became “the first Dutch artist whose work was reproduced on a large scale.” More than Maris, Mauve or Mesdag, he exploited the print media to maximise the revenues from the same composition. He had agreements with a number of art dealers for his paintings, but the firm of Buffa & Sons recognised this niche early on and started organising reproductions and special print-albums as early as 1858. This firm is yet another fine example of a print-seller turned art dealer and promoter. By the 1870s, Israëls’ reproductions could be found, nationally and internationally, in a variety of limited editions, cards, photographic reproductions, illustrated books, folios and albums. Later, he started etching, including etched copies of his earlier pictures, supplying markets in France and England, especially through the international agencies of Goupil & Sons.

Israëls exploited a highly sentimentalised view of fishing communities, promoting one of the period’s most popular mythic images by elevating their piety in the same way Millet had done with peasant farmers. In the highly competitive art market of The Netherlands, which had rich traditions and many talents, it was necessary to gain an edge by exploiting every possible means. The window of opportunity was relatively narrow, in practise, because, compared with Scandinavia, France or the German states, the Dutch had not traditionally favoured either literature or history as sources of pictorial inspiration. History painting had long been one of the basic subjects of academic art, along with religion and the classical world. But, after 1840, a consensus of opinion began to emerge that promoted a set of romantic ideals concerning traditional coastal communities that, in Holland at least, were “tightly interwoven with bourgeois ideals of piety, domesticity, motherly love, marital fidelity, the [protestant] work ethic and being content with one’s own place in life.” To this myth one might add the drama of the sea, powerful superstitions and the inherent dangers of hard outdoor labour, and, thus, personified by Israëls, a formula for a whole sub-genre was forged: traditional fishing communities.

Israëls was by no means the first to exploit this genre, but he drew on it repeatedly, even to the point of pastiche, and certainly, in later life, left himself open to accusations of commercial
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606 Holland Fine Art Gallery, Regent Street (later Grafton Street), London was a branch of the dealers Cornelis Marinus van Gogh and W.J. van Hoijtema, and the Dutch Gallery was a branch of E.J. van Wisselingh, Amsterdam.
608 Dekkers, 1999, p. 72. One assumes, here, she is, in reality, talking about the modern era.
609 Israël’s painting “Passing Mother’s Grave” was engraved for the first time, but not the last, in 1858.
‘production line’ work. Yet, his career became a model of success, in terms of economics, fame and publicity. He was no radical, but astutely blended the traditional with the new. He was born in Groningen but trained in Amsterdam’s Art Academy, 1851; joined the art society, Arti et Amicitiae, 1852; left for Paris, including at least one visit to Barbizon; had his first professional debut abroad, in Belgium, at the Ghent Salon, in 1853; and, showed at the Universal Exhibition in Paris, 1855, the same year he returned to Holland, on the coast, to the fishing village of Zandvoort. He continued to paint along this sandy coast, showing two Katwijk pictures at his debut in the Paris Salon of 1857, but it was his visit to London in 1862 and his meetings with the Anglo-Belgian print dealer Ernest Gambart that gave another boost to his career and his finances.

“The Dutch press closely followed the critical reception of Dutch submissions to prestigious international exhibitions, ....However, few Dutch people, critics and artists included, visited these events themselves, and reports on such exhibitions were often reproduced from foreign publications...[T]here was little chance that these magazines would devote attention to a still unknown Dutch artist like Israëls."611 There is no doubt that newspapers and magazines aided his early career, for Tempel also points out the importance for him of the critic Tobias van Westerheene (1825-71). Westerheene wrote for the Algemeene Konst- en Letterbode and the more widely read magazine Kunstkroniek. Later, other journalists, such as Carel Vosmaer (1826-88), A.C.Loffelt (1841-1906) and Jacques van Santen Kolff (1948-96), who is credited with inventing the term ‘The Hague School’ in 1875, all played a part in educating the public as to this group, its leaders and the nature of its methodology. This kind of media attention, integral within the Dealer-Critic System, was thus recognised as being acceptable and profitable by all concerned. An internationally experienced artist such as Jan Toorop easily transferred this kind of integrated media structure to Domburg when organising their group exhibitions, for he could by then command substantial and rapid press coverage. Albertine de Haas, for one, wrote articles for Onze Kunst that coincided with each opening of the Walcheren artists’ summer exhibitions.612 Eventually more in depth reports were made about the colony in collaboration with journalists, including Conrad Kickert, ‘Querido’, and especially art critic Albert Plasschaert.

Artists, such as Israëls, Liebermann and Toorop, gained confidence from their secure financial situation, helped by them developing an international reputation. It would be hard to say who was the more commercially-minded, although by 1900 the art world had moved on considerably, in terms of its attitude to prints, drawings, illustration work, reproductions, copyright laws, graphic design and the acceptance of the ethics that came with new art market. Israëls and Liebermann were essentially painters, but Toorop spread his talents over a wide number of graphic styles, techniques and materials, and benefited from them financially. He revelled in the international avant-garde set he encountered in Brussels from the mid-1880s and varied his pictorial styles in imitation of his new friends and Les Vingt colleagues, such as James Ensor, Ferdinand Khnopff, Gustave Moreau and George Seurat. He embraced a monumental graphic style after 1890 and soon produced one of the masterpieces of Symbolist printing.

612 A. de Haas, 1911-13, wrote some of the earliest articles and most timely articles on the Domburg artists’s exhibitions for the journal Onze Kunst.
in *The Three Brides*, 1893. He made three studies for it, in 1891 and 1892 but the final version was shown first in the *Nederlandsche Etsclub* before going to Munich’s *Glaspalast*, also in 1893, and it eventually went to E.J. van Wisselingh’s London dealership. A more immediate commercial reward came from his first poster, *Delftse Slaolie*, 1894 (22:4). His works appeared regularly in the new art magazines, such as *The Studio* and *Van Nu en Straks*, both from 1893; *Pan*, from Belgium, 1895; Munich’s *Simplicissimus* and *Jugend*, from 1895-6; and *Ver Sacrum*, from 1898, in Austria. His reputation was such that his work was readily accepted by art dealers all across Europe, including Copenhagen’s daring Gallery Klies, as early as 1889; Gallery Gurlitt in Berlin, 1894; Gallery Arno Wolffram in Dresden 1899 and, most famously, in the Vienna Secession of 1902, where he was honoured with a whole room dedicated to him. It is little wonder that he encouraged his colleagues in the artists’ colonies at Katwijk and Domburg to follow suit and also used such experiences to help advertise their group exhibitions.

Traditionally, it was hard for unknown artists to get publicity in the press. Joining a group was one way of getting better visibility. It was now seen as financially advantageous, especially when one shared an enthusiasm for a particular style or graphic technique. Collectors were slowly beginning to see merit in drawings and quick studies which had ‘sincerity’ or greater authenticity, compared with more laboured, crafted, polished and idealised compositions. Watercolours, for one, were long recognised as a separate discipline in England, but slowly other countries recognised their qualities. The *Société Belge des Aquarellistes* was founded in 1855 and finally in 1876 the Dutch organised *The Society of Watercolourists*. It was formed by prominent members of the Hague School, naturally, many of whom had already exhibited such works in Belgium, including Israëls, Mauve and Jacob Maris. Typically, the Dutch society invited honorary members from England, Belgium, France and Italy, to bolster the quality on exhibition. Their exhibitions were small, only 100-130 works, but attracted international attention and critical acclaim, at least to begin with. Loffelt described them as “successful almost without exception, and their reputation abroad was so good that connoisseurs and dealers took pains to be present on the opening day to assure themselves of one or another important work.” However, he had also complained of them “monotonous and uninspiring.” These attitudes were not helped by the chairman, Jozef Israëls, who asked in the region of 4,000 guilders for a single watercolour and, not surprisingly sold none. The astute art critic Jan Veth asked provocatively “Where are the younger artists?” He knew well enough, for he was a good portraitist himself and close friends with many of the post-Hague School generation, who, had already, in 1881, formed the secessionist Royal Society of Dutch Watercolourists, which had more flexible criteria for membership, sales and exhibition. “The Society’s initiative to make more room for younger, lesser-known artists was praised.” ‘Lesser-known’ also equated with lower-priced, an attraction for many buyers hoping to invest in an up-and-coming artist.

Many artists’ colonies organised exhibition clubs and shows, but not normally in the first stage of the settlement. St. Ives Arts Club was founded extraordinarily early, in 1888, but much more as a social venture than a commercial proposition, while the opposite may be said for the Domburg group from 1910. With such a transient group as collected at Volendam no formal artists’ society ever formed or had enough time to exhibit together, but at Katwijk there were a
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616 Jan Staphorst, (Jan Veth), *De Nieuwe Gids* 3, 1887, vol.1, pp. 93-94.  
number of group efforts before finally a *kunstvereening* was established in 1902, with a strong economic purpose. The second wave of artists who formed commercial enterprises is typified by ten artists in Laren. This group called themselves *De Tien* (possibly in imitation of the well-known avant-garde Brussels’ arts society *Les Vingt*) formed around 1903. Their original purpose was to organise travelling exhibitions, exploiting the already known name and reputation of the village, by the first settlers, such as the now-famous Anton Mauve and Albert Neuhuys.

The Ten soon settled down and opened a more permanent, cooperative gallery on Station Street, Laren. This was just before a former journalist Nico van Harpen started his Laren Art Gallery in Mauve’s old house, in 1905. This former editor-in-chief of the *Amsterdamsche Courant* opened, together with artist Theo Neuhuys as one of its directors, a second *Larensche Kunsthandel* two years later in Amsterdam, such was its success.618 They organised their own journal, *Bulletin van den Larensche Kunsthandel*, which included articles about the Laren painters, news of art exhibitions and a survey of the gallery’s own collection, all for sale. The village gallery was closed in winter, understandably, so they also took to organising touring exhibitions, but aimed internationally at markets in Düsseldorf, Cologne, Leipzig, Dresden and Berlin, between 1905-26. Van Harpen was nothing if not enterprising, for he offered different levels of membership, up to four guilders, less for artists, for which one received the bulletin and free admission to all events. He even persuaded the mayor of Amsterdam to be its first subscriber, thereby guaranteeing much initial publicity.619 By 1910, business was so profitable and prices were rising steadily that he gambled on further exhibitions to Johannesburg, Jakarta and Buenos Aires.

Special contracts were often drawn up between artists and dealers which made the dealers sole agents, at least for a period of years, such as Laren’s Anton Mauve with Maison Goupil between 1870-80. Even after this period, they sold 160 of his works, an impressively high number. Most young Laren artists had agreements with more than one dealer or they, more typically, left works on commission with galleries, something one could not do with the salons or larger art societies. This was seen, in itself, as encouraging for some younger colonists, as seen in letters written by Wally Moes describing H.G. Tersteeg, the legendary Goupil manager in The Hague.620 Goupil, which had amalgamated with the firm run by C. M. van Gogh, mostly sold Hague School works, but had good contacts with Laren painters, including Valkenburg, Kever, Offermans, Pieters and Moes. Maison Goupil had developed on the strength of its world-wide network, yet the *Larensche Kunsthandel* was quick to follow suit, as agents for major American collectors and dealers, such as Gallery Knoedler in New York. The *Larensche Kunsthandel*’s archives, in the Singer Museum, shed much light on the delicate process of deals between painter, client and distant galleries, who, interestingly, often posted photographs of the paintings in question across the Atlantic.

Part of the huge social shifts that were taking place in the art market during this period can be seen from this Dutch trade in Scotland, for it did not go to its traditional cultural capital, Edinburgh, but to its industrial rival, Glasgow. This port typified new money and fresh enterprise, based on engineering and led by a new breed of industrialists. The two leading Scottish art dealers in French and Dutch art were James Connell and, especially, Craibe Angus (1830-99), who opened his establishment in 1874. His daughter, Isabella, married the Amsterdam art dealer Elbert Jan van Wisselingh in 1887, which helped smooth the business of
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618 The Amsterdam branch of the Laren Art Gallery was located at 495 Herengracht. It ceased trading in 1918.
620 Pol, 1984, pp. 60, 62.
trading across the North Sea. The most important Scottish dealer in modern art after 1889 was Alexander Reid (1854-1928), in part, because of his close connection with the shipping magnate and collector Sir William Burrell (1861-1958), who said of him: “He did more than any other man has ever done to introduce fine pictures to Scotland and to create a love of art.”

Reid gained early business experience and connections while employed at Maison Goupil on the Boulevard Italien, in Paris. He worked under Theo van Gogh (1857-91) at their second, smaller branch on the Boulevard Montmartre and lived, at 6 Place d’Anvers, together with Vincent for a time, who also painted his portrait, twice, his only ever British sitter. By the 1880s, Dutch contemporary art was finding a very healthy market in Scotland, through the combined efforts of younger art dealers, new galleries, journalists and no-nonsense collectors, so that it is little wonder that its art students had access to Dutch pleinairism and that the Glasgow Boys took off to rural villages and out along the coast.

Compared with Laren, Katwijk’s artists’ colony developed few village outlets or sales. They exhibited half-heartedly together before 1900, in the Hotel Du Rhin and, more purposefully, in order to raise money for good-causes in the locality, such as the old church and the orphanage. By far the largest exhibition in the village came about through the collaboration of the artists with the fishing community, for, in 1902, on the sea-front was erected a huge temporary show, the Nederlandsche Visscherij- en Schilderijen-tentoonstelling. Artists did much of the organisation, design and publicity, for Toorop and Morgenstjerne Munthe (1875-1927) printing up posters and folders. Many of the paintings on exhibition were for sale. The success of this enterprise finally encouraged the artists to form a more permanent society, but it cannot be judged a smooth progression, for it took four years to sort out the financial problems. In 1906, the Kunst-vereeniging Katwijk formed and they managed to erect a gallery, adjacent to the Badhotel De Zwaan. They were a rather motley group of enthusiasts lead by the genial artist-illustrator Willy Sluiter (1873-1949). They raised the capital largely amongst themselves, by a complex system of 50 shares. This cooperative proved an unwieldy organisation and, after a few years, it disbanded. When Jan Toorop, who was a member, formed a similar group for exhibition purposes at Domburg, ten years later, he greatly simplified and improved on the process. He raised the initial costs of the hall, which though made of wood, for cheapness, looked suitably stylish. This project was greatly helped by his own financial security together with that of a colleague, the millionairess, Marie Tak van Poortvliet.

The Art Journal, December, 1871: “The influence of the dealer is one of the chief characteristics of modern art. He has taken the place of the patron, and to him has been owing, to a great extent, the immense increase in the prices of modern pictures.” The independent agency of art dealers fitted well with the capitalist attitudes of the era and was generally welcomed by

622 Cumming, 1993, pp. 10-11.
623 Exh. Cat. Katwijk, 1902, shows 71 pictures by 42 artists, including: Mr and Mrs Mesdag, Israëls, Toorop, Sluiter, Hart-Nibbrig, Suze Bisschop, Blommers, Artz, Gruppe, Willem Roelofs and G. Morgenstjerne Munthe.
artist and patron alike. It “spared the embarrassment of having to translate artistic values into commercial terms; patrons often preferred a transaction with another businessman rather than attempting to cope with the artistic temperament.”\textsuperscript{625} Art dealers naturally generated a degree of antipathy, profiting from someone-else’s creativity, but the Dealer-Critic system offered far greater visibility and accessibility than through the salons. Few professional painters did not resort to their financial services, at one time or another. Selling direct from the artists’ studio was a common practise, but it took away valuable time, concentration and required social skills. Many painters were, in fact, happy that a third party took over the role of selling their work, whether it was their old art academy with their salons, a semi-official art society, a museum, a big art union or an art gallery. Leaving pictures with a dealer liberated the painter from the messy business of discussing money, trying to determine a value, haggling or even meeting potential collectors. It added to the set of factors that gradually eased the artist away from the necessity of being in the ever-crowded cities.

Photographs of artists’ homes and studios featured prominently in the new art magazines. These were not longer small cottages, such as Rousseau and Millet had in Barbizon. In Worpswede, for instance, the pioneers soon owned neat mansions, which look surprisingly suburban, such as those of Fritz Mackensen (24:4), Otto Modersohn and Heinrich Vogeler. In Katwijk-aan-zee, over ten artists owned seafront property, many of which were designed with the help of the same architect, H.J. Jesse.\textsuperscript{626} Toorop’s villa was designed by his friend, the prominent architect H.P. Berlage, for whom he also worked occasionally. Artists’ colonies typically brought together a wide range of people, who became friends and colleagues, and helped each other’s careers and life-styles. Naturally, the rise of the new art market proved most profitable for the dealers, who, likewise, maintained grand rustic retreats, where they entertained clients and artists alike. The Belgian dealer Gambart, for example, eventually had a grand villa in Nice, apart from his London residence and another manor at Wexham, near Windsor, where he occasionally entertained his wealthiest section of his network. It was here, in 1855, he brought Rosa Bonheur, one of his most treasured painters, on her first visit to Britain, where she met another esteemed animal painter Edwin Landseer, his brother Thomas, who eventually engraved her works, and the eminent collector Sir Charles Eastlake, president of the Royal Academy.\textsuperscript{627}

The Dealer-Critic system was in a position to act quickly in response to changing circumstances, both feeding the demands of the middle-classes and influencing their views. While some dealers certainly colluded through international networks and others liked to specialise, the opportunities now offered by galleries, print shops, art societies, publishers and journalists was demonstrably more financially beneficial to artists than ever before. Information

\textsuperscript{625} Maas, 1975, p. 44.
\textsuperscript{626} Brakel, 1995, p. 184. Four of the thirteen villas were designed by Leiden architect H.J. Jesse. The prominent Amsterdam architect H.P. Berlage designed a villa for his friend Toorop in 1899 and J.J.P. Oud designed a cubist villa for Menso Kamerlingh Onnes in 1916.
\textsuperscript{627} Maas, 1975, pp. 70-80.
on contemporary art was accessible everywhere, servicing all levels of buyers. The official expositions continued, but more as entertainments in comparison with the calm, refined intimacy of the new art galleries. The *nouveau riche* appeared to prefer the new specialist atmosphere of the galleries than either the classical connoisseurship of the academies or the over-crowded annual salons. The old system was increasingly seen as out of touch with the exciting new art being created, not only in its aesthetic statements but how it was presented. The middle-classes enjoyed the chic of a central gallery or *Kunstsalon*, but they also liked making discoveries in lesser galleries, where a treasure might be found in the jumble of a print-shop or by directly visiting the artists’ villages. Noting the growing achievements of the Dealer-Critic system, by the 1880s, the artists’ colonies began take full advantage of the commercial possibilities of their position and take another step to full enfranchisement.

This ‘discovery’ factor was a feature of a different branch of the art market, yet one that also held the public’s attention. Speculation, or buying in the hope of later profits, began to be a reality rather than another urban myth. It was also acceptable to the middle-classes, who gambled on horses, stock and shares, so why not paintings in a rising market? Auctions, as opposed to galleries, were traditional and as they quantified want by demand, they better reflected the mood of buyers. Village art communities also held much potential for the finding of unknown or developing artists, which in part explains the cluster of galleries in the countryside. One auction, in 1889, confirmed all the complex economic attitudes of the day and spotlighted, spectacularly, the financial potential of modern art. The nature of collecting art is a complex one, which warrants a separate study on its own, yet one result of the well-publicised new industrialists’ acquisition of art, in phenomenal quantities, drove up prices and expectations.628

**Collectors and Speculators**

It is necessary to return to the Sécretan auction of May 1889 for it provided, so spectacularly, the final proof of the victory of the independent art market, the Dealer-Critic System over the Academy-Salon System. The extraordinary high price paid for Millet’s *Angelus* finally was not really the result of rational ‘qualified want,’629 but a contest of international chauvinism. “A competition having been cleverly started by the picture-dealers and worked up by the press in the fashion still approved by publicity. The moneybags of Europe and America were set in competition. We were told that the honour of nations was at stake; and dramatically the picture was saved for France by Mons. Proust, the Government agent,...”630 However, the shock-waves from this one event had considerable consequences. It was a benchmark event that finally confirmed a number of attitudes and trends. First, it asserted that modern masters could live and worke in villages; second, it confirmed that
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628 Dekkers, 1999, pp. 104-13. Exact numbers vary as to how many works by Israëls the Scottish millionaire James Staats Forbes owned, but a general number in excess of 1,000 seems to be indicated. Bionda, 1990/91, p. 67, calculated Forbes owned 175 pictures by Israëls before 1900. By 1904 he had acquired 1,100 works in total from Hague School painters. Forbes eventually owned over 3,000 Hague School works, but also sold many when the market was bullish.

629 This term is used in the antiques trade, to help designate a monetary value for an object.

630 Hartrick, 1939, p. 5.
modern art had a high financial value, a view, perhaps, that only the artists and their dealers held previously; third, it showed that prices for contemporary art could rise quickly and at such a rate as to out-perform stocks and shares. Adventure capitalists and commercial ideologists now paid more attention to modern art as never before.

*The Angelus* (25:4) has a peculiar provenance, traced in one magazine at the time: [painted 1857-59] “it remained in the possession of Arthur Stevens [a Belgian dealer, brother to artists Alfred and Joseph], without any coveting of it”; the Belgian Minister de Praet bought it for £ 100, selling it eventually to J.W. Wilson, for £ 1,440, who kept it until 1881, when W.H. Vanderbilt bought it at Petit’s auction for £ 6,000 [150,000 fr.], from whom the Parisian stockbroker M. Sécretan acquired it. After his death and, “in one of the most exciting scenes ever witnessed in a sales-room” it eventually sold for £ 22,120.631 [580,650 fr.] One year later, it was bought and returned to France for 800,000 fr. by merchant Alfred Chauchard, who finally bequeathed it to the nation.632 This was all a long way from the traditional, quiet, cultured, contemplative connoisseurship of fine art, but for many collectors, and would-be collectors, it was an eye-opener.

*The Angelus* had first been commissioned for 1,000 fr. in 1857 by a fellow Barbizon painter, who eventually got tired of waiting for it.633 It was not even exhibited until 1865. Sécretan was a senior civil servant and stockbroker, who made and lost a fortune speculating in African copper. His art collection included Vermeer’s *Woman and Maid*, which sold at the same 1889 auction for a mere 75,000 fr.634 In some ways, the Vermeer sale represents the traditional relationship between connoisseurs or collectors, in that it was an Old Master, with proven provenance, fully-documented and a sound investment at a stable price. A sound, quality Corot landscape, of the same size, fetched only about half that price, at that time.635 Prices, for Old Masters, remained stable and secure, in part because of the high initial capital entry into this, largely exclusive, circular system, which operated around European capitals and the landed gentry. Changes in value for these masters were traditionally too slow for any real profits to be made. This kind of transaction was more of a cultural statement and a hedge against inflation, than seen as capital investment. Millet’s rather-mediocre and modest canvas, by way of contrast, fitted none of these categories.

French government officials were beginning to note, by the 1880s, that the stream of its finest art was leaving the country, never to return. Previously, under the Academy-Salon system, a degree of institutional control was levelled at the art market, but the rise of the independent sector saw this policy by-passed. France was selling pictures by the ship-load, especially to the U.S.A., despite its trebling import-duty on works of art in 1883.636 Alongside academic, polished compositions by the likes of E. Meissonier and A.-W. Bouguereau, France was exporting the *juste milieu* creations of Corot and now the unpretentious landscapes by the School of Barbizon. With the arrival in the French art market of many rich American collectors, such as Henry Clay Frick, Mrs. Potter Palmer, the Vanderbilts and the Havermeyers, Paris was now haemorrhaging
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632 Lacambre, 1986, p. 35. The collector Chauchard gave *The Angelus* to the state Louvre Museum, in 1909, as part of a bequest including other Millet and Barbizon works.
633 Thomas G. Appleton (1812-84) a Bostonian and patron of the Boston Museum of Fine Art.
635 Alexandre, 1911, p. 15. In one of his first deals, Durand-Ruel bought Corot’s *La Toilette* for 10,000 fr., selling it for 50,000 fr. He also bought Eugène Delacroix’s *Le Sardanapole* for 60,000 fr. At the time he was the most well-known French artist of the Romantic movement. Thus, Durand-Ruel’s approach was balanced rather than high-risk.
fine art, quantitatively and qualitatively, for permanent export. In the same way, but with less
government concern, Hague School works were shipped from Holland in vast quantities,
although it can be seen, later on, that some Dutch art dealers bought a few back from London’s
auction houses for further resale. American millionaires often employed agents and dealers to
seek out their specific requirements, yet one, at least, is recorded as getting closer to a rural art
centre, by visiting a typical artists’ colony. The press-baron, William Randolph Hearst, of New
York, lodged at the Hotel Spaander, Volendam in 1903, a time when he was scouring Europe to
acquire an art collection for his Californian castle.

In 1898, the French state sent a representative, Antonin Proust, to the Sécretan auction to
buy The Angelus, as Millet and the School of Barbizon were now considered worthy. His main
rival was the agent Sutton, who led the American Art Association of New York. This group of
art investors had previously achieved fame and fortune by persuading Durand-Ruel to sail to
New York, in March 1886, accompanied by approximately 300 modern French pictures, for sale
in the U.S.A., including many Barbizon works, early Impressionist pieces and even the early
Georges Seurat canvas, Bathers, Asnières, 1883-84. This trade had proved financially profitable
and crowned a success d’estime. At Seddelmeyer’s opulent dealership, Sutton finally outbid
Proust and sailed off with The Angelus to New York. Next, they put it on show, cashing in on the
extraordinary publicity the auction had received. It toured several American cities and a huge
number of reproductions were printed in order to reap back the costs of this over-blown
investment. This combination of the traditional with timely merchandising typifies the New
World’s business approach to the European art market, including some artists’ colonies. This
auction polarised artistic opinion, yet it was a sign of the times. The reproduction potential of
famous pictures was already a corner stone of many artists’ lives long before the Sécretan
auction, as seen in the careers of artists such as Jozef Israëls, Ary Scheffer, William Powell Frith
and Rosa Bonheur. However, all previous attitudes towards the School of Barbizon suddenly
changed: from being seen as escapists, revolutionaries and idealists they were now demonstrably
bankable. The Sécretan auction asserted what only a few art enthusiasts had known for decades,
that rural artists’ colonies were valuable centres of production, and so, soon enough, depending
of the geographical context, these villages had galleries of their own.

Art dealers, such as the much-publicised Durand-Ruel, did not suddenly appear and make
newsworthy profits from the new schools of art. Paul Durand-Ruel “began his career selling
Salon luminaries alongside more independently minded artists.” He had learnt from watching
the family business grow, yet he also had experience in the state auction rooms of the Hôtel
Drouot, which only opened in 1852. One year after taking over the family business, in 1865, he
 gambled on his first big deal. He bought Corot’s La Toilette from Mme. Desfossés for fr. 10,000
and resold it for fr. 50,000. Corot’s skills were well-accepted in the salons, by the critics and
the public, but the same cannot be said for most Barbizon painters. Profits, for Durand-Ruel,
were not usually that quick or as common. For example, his exile from the Paris Commune, from
1870, caused him to take his large collection of Barbizon works to London. It was a financial
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638 Graves, 1918, pp. 205-16. Art dealers Koekkoek, Wisselingh and van Gogh all bought back Hague School works
from London auction houses, between 1895-1905.
640 Jensen, 1994, pp. 52-54.
641 Alexandre, 1911, p. 15, also offers the example of him buying a Renoir painting, La Source, which he bought
for only 1,100 fr. and resold to Prince Wagram for 70,000 fr.
disaster. He did meet up with both Pissaro and Monet, acquired some of their recent works, but
the British failed to respond to any of his promotions.

At the same time Durand-Ruel was shipping paintings to New York, 1866, the influential
Dudley Gallery first opened, in Piccadilly, London. Its policy was to promote younger painters
and the strategy was to sell works by promising artists and sell it cheaply before they became
famous, a tenet for all speculators. During the Victorian era, this city district, around Bond
Street, became the centre for fine-art auctions, picture galleries and prestige craft and jewellery
shops. Ernst Gambart, originally Goupil’s agent in London, ran The German Gallery on Bond
Street and the French Gallery on nearby Pall Mall. His speculations in art generated huge price
rises and profits, for example, his well-publicised dealings with Rosa Bonheur between 1854-68
made her 284,000 francs, from twenty-one pictures, an astonishing amount for any living painter, but
especially for a 46 yrs. old woman. However, Gambart, by comparison, sold these on for over
one million francs.

Hague School works were in huge demand by the last quarter of the century. In 1885, a
standard Neuhuys or Mauve landscape might expect to reach f1,500. Over the next decade this
figure doubled, then, after 1900, it doubled yet again to approximately f7,000. Hotelier Jan
Hamdorff was pleasantly surprised when the Neuhuys picture he took to London for auction
resulted in a sale ten times more than he had calculated, confirming for him yet another new
entrepreneurial direction. This mania for Holland was seen most acutely in North America,
where in 1906 one landscape work by Mauve sold for $42,250, or f105,625. Significantly,
this sale was neither in Holland nor did the fee go to the artist. The painting, The Return of the
Herd, had originally been bought in 1892 for only $2,500, so that it represents a remarkably
high return on the investment and more than comparable with most stock-market speculations. It
was not only in Britain and the U.S.A. that fashion dictated the purchase of Dutch contemporary
art, but in Canada: “Dutch pictures became a symbol of social position and wealth. It was also
whispered that they were a sound investment. They collected them like cigaretcards [sic]. You
had to complete your set. One would say to another, ‘Oh, I see you have not a De Bock yet’. ‘No
– have you your Blommers.’ The houses bulged with cows, old women peeling potatoes, and
windmills...If you were poor and had only half a million, there were Dutchmen to cater to your
humbler circumstances. Art in Canada meant a cow and a windmill.”

This new international trading network was itself open to corruption and there was a
degree of market manipulation by some agents and clients, where, for example, one might order
certain subjects, get more or less sheep in a composition, or rustic shepherds, bucolic waders,
kitchen interiors, beached sailing-boats, cathedral facades and haystacks. One of Larensche
Kunshandel’s biggest transatlantic clients was the firm of Vose of Boston, Massachusetts. A
letter in the gallery’s archives states: “In the autumn we shall be in the market for a few interiors
by such men as Pieters, De Hoog and Gart....” but ”... we never buy pictures of mothers
nursing....” Another letter, offers further advice: ”We note that you have accepted our offer for
the painting by Mr.Gart. Please see that he finishes it carefully and has it bright and sunny....If he

642 Roger-Miles, 1900, (no pagination).
643 Pol, 1984, pp. 60-64.
645 Pol, 1984, p. 64. Joseph Jeffersen had originally bought Mauve’s painting from the collector Wijnkoop in 1892
then sold it to Scott, Fowler & Co of New York, at a sale organised by The Art Association of New York, the same
dealers who had originally bought The Angelus at the Secretan auction.
cares to paint us a picture the same size as this one, viz. 18 x 14 inches, for the same price (350 fl.), the same little girl in the same pink dress, spinning, we will take it." 647

Artists’ colonies coincided with this strengthening of the market generally, but also the specific demand for genre and landscape realism. Some recent writers, such as Nicholas Green, promote the notion that the modern image of the countryside was somehow the result of artistic collaboration, but the evidence from this coast indicates they both fed the market and reinforced stereotypes. It is far from clear what the market wanted, judging by auction and gallery sales. For example, Realism was in fashion as a value, yet nothing like the level of sentiment, pathos or moral tone in most narrative paintings, which was overwhelmingly popular in the public at large and amongst the wealthiest patrons, as seen by the purchase of so many works by Jozef Israëls, Julius Exner, Rosa Bonheur or Franz Winterhalter. At Newlyn, Langley’s attempts to inject more Social-realism into his genre were flatly rejected by his rich Birmingham patrons and dealers. He was in the unenviable and not unusual financial trap of having to supply them with the subjects they dictated.

One other consequence of a rising art market is that previously marginalised works or techniques become reappraised. For example, when it became too expensive to invest in Israëls’ paintings one might turn to his watercolours as the cheaper option, and when their price also rose, one still had his etchings and prints. When Durand-Ruel bought the whole contents of Rousseau’s studio, just before the artist’s death in 1867, it included not only his oil paintings but also his watercolours, studies and drawings.648 The dealer found a ready market for these, which statistically gave him more profit. Only in the new art market of the late nineteenth century did this notion, of contemporary art as an investment, spread broadly and find new collectors. This material was attractive because of the low cost of entry by collectors, buying almost any scrap of paper from a known artist, just as dealer van Gogh had predicted with his backroom sketches.

In Holland, it took many years for collectors to take a real interest in works of art on paper, despite the organisation of watercolour and etching societies. In Germany, with its long tradition of printing, this was slightly different. Yet, given the financial restrictions on his institution, it was realistic of curator Gustav Pauli to invest in all kinds of works of art on paper from the budding Worpswede group. Before his purchases of French Impressionism he had acquired a fascinating cross-section of graphic works, including drawings, inks, pastels, crayon and chalk studies.649 The nature of how, what and why certain collectors buy fine-art is as fascinating as it is complex, yet in some countries they are in a position to alter the whole character of the art market, careers and movements. Their demands raised interest in certain artist’s work, not for reasons of monetary gain but cultural profit. For example, the largest single collector of nineteenth century painting and sculpture in Denmark was the tobacco millionaire Heinrich Hirschsprung. In 1902, he and his wife, Pauline, bequeathed their art collection to the nation and it was housed in a stylish building, now a major museum art museum, in central Copenhagen. This kind of private endowment of what became national institutions is not untypical in many western countries. The inclusion of his wife in this process is also characteristic, for although he was genuinely interested in art, unlike some major collectors, the role of his wife in shaping the collection was of paramount importance. Pauline Hirschsprung (1845-1912) was friends with a number of contemporary painters, who often donated and dedicated works to her. For example, August Jerndorf (1846-1906), a rather conservative
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academician, gave her one of his travel paintings of Venice, as early as 1879. They already owned several paintings by him, the earliest being *A River bank near Aarhus*, 1873.\(^{650}\) Similarly, the landscape painter Godfred Christensen (1845-1928) presented her with his *View of the Pyrenees* in 1880. The Hirschsprungs acquired approximately 460 works before 1902, mostly oil paintings. However, of all the many contemporary artists they supported, P.S. Krøyer stands out as a beneficiary, a worthwhile talent to invest in and as a genuine friend of the family. The Hirschsprungs owned 74 paintings and pastels by him, of which 46 were acquired before 1902. The earliest purchases were in 1875, two compositions from the fishing village of Hornbæk, when the artist was only twenty-four years of age. He was soon commissioned to paint their portraits, individually and collectively and they became his first major patron.

Not all the works in the Hirschsprung collection were purchased directly from the artist or purchased in their life-times, but the pattern of acquisition may be established from those early purchases: a base of Danish ‘Golden Age’ paintings, mostly before 1850, including many landscapes by C.W. Eckersberg (21) and his followers, and there are representative works by a selection of later nineteenth century painters, especially the popular National-Romantic peasant-genre scenes, from J.J. Exner (8), F. Vermehren (6) and C. Dalsgaard (11). However, the vast majority of works purchased before 1902 are by the new modernists, almost all of whom are associated with Skagen artists’ colony. The Hirschsprungs support for Skagen and its artists included visiting it, which they did for the first time in 1893. Their enthusiasm gave the Skagen modernists not only financial encouragement, but it also helped boost their confidence and strengthen their sense of purpose.

**Conclusions**

Money matters informed the lives and careers of all artists increasingly throughout the century. Tensions started to accumulate initially because of the perceived failures of the traditional selling mechanism, the Academy-Salon system (26:4). Enterprising print shops and dealers provided alternative methods of trading and commercial publishing proved advantageous. Irrespective of style, technique, training or provenance, painters sought greater self-determination, rather than accepting the traditional restrictive practises. Problems began to emerge when the traditional patronage declined and states reduced sponsorships, or at least failed to keep pace with the huge growth in the number of professional painters. The old system worked best on a small scale, where a few connoisseurs swapped Old Masters, but this structure greatly disadvantaged the young, the unknowns and the innovators. However, the new buying public, both the growing numbers of the middle classes and the new rich industrialists, were not necessarily educated in the finer points of art history and traditional trade, and were inclined to develop their own separate tastes for fine art, especially for simple, atmospheric, topographical pictures.

The *nouveaux riches* influenced the new art market and were themselves fashioned by the new media, not only through the purposeful Dealer-Critic system, but, more broadly, through an invigorated, independent free-press. By mid-century, the rapid rise of commercial printing became a potent industry and began to effect art, design and culture. Publishing firms also provided many new opportunities for temporary contracts and long-term financial security for artists. This new potential allowed illustrators, etchers and lithographers to live and work in villages, as one can see increasingly from Barbizon to Katwijk, so that when Volendam, for
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example, was ‘discovered’, quite late in the century, it became a sudden magnet for artists working for American, British, Dutch, French and German publishers.

However, the increase in the number of artists was self-evident; it was seen in the ever-larger exhibitions. This was also aggravated by the easy international mobility of labour. More and more artists were in competition, fighting for visibility and a share of the market. Born out of these deepening financial frustrations with the traditional mechanism of selling art came the view that more independent group action was necessary. In spite of the creation of some new, semi-official, art societies, such as *Pulchri Studio*, whose primary purpose was to sell members’ work, and the phenomenal success of some individual painters, particularly the Hague School masters, many financial restrictions still remained to pressure artists. Only when the old guard were replaced as chairmen and committee members were these problems addressed satisfactorily.

The critical moment, when modernists clashed with traditionalists, came to a head in most countries during the second half of the century, early in France and later in Germany, dependent upon how developed their private sector art markets were. Increased mobility, after completion of the international railway networks, meant that contemporary art could be produced and exhibited further afield, irrespective of local regional or national economies. Modern art sold as easily to buyers in Paris, London and New York, as in their home art academies with their monopolistic salons. The huge annual art exhibitions and their award systems, common in all countries, were not effective enough for most painters, especially the modernisers, and greatly advantaged the traditionalists and conservative elites. Sales figures show that the traditional official selling processes did not reflect what either most modern artists wanted to produce or what the new collectors wanted to purchase. The rise of a new art market, known as the Dealer-Critic system, pointed the way ahead, for it proved more flexible, more in touch and more complementary to all concerned. Once new art dealers and galleries were established in every city they provided a practical rallying point for modern art lovers, although, like the famous Durand-Ruel, who went bankrupt several times promoting contemporary painters, the transition was not smooth. However it was relentless. As the market became better organised and the demand grew so did the prices. Financial speculation in contemporary artwork also altered the traditional balance between artist and collector.

Without the independent galleries and printer-publishers progressive art had a much-reduced probability of selling itself. The avant-garde learnt quickly from these new galleries, so that a society such as *Les XX* in Brussels nurtured a whole generation of international artists. Leading modernists, such as Krøyer, Tuxen, Toorop and Mondriaan, all adapted their experiences with the new art dealers to their own campaigns for better modern art exhibitions, including the development of artists’ colonies. There are many clear connections between the participants in rural artists’ colonies and their urban counterparts; together with city-centred marketing initiatives and the new art dealers. Denmark, for one, provides us with a clear example of this link with the rise of its modern movement in the 1880s. Tuxen and Krøyer helped fashion the success of Skagen as an artists’ colony and at the same time they made an impact in training techniques with their *Frie Studieskole*, the first modern art school in Scandinavia. They were also
part of group who championed *Den Frie Udstilling*, the artists’ own exhibition hall in the centre of Copenhagen. In this context, rural artists’ colonies were no longer places of retreat and rustication, but bound up closely with the growing self-confidence modern artists needed to sell themselves and their more innovative work.

Before 1900, it was less common amongst the pioneers of rural artists’ colonies to unite into commercial cooperatives. The Lanham Gallery existed in St. Ives as early as 1887, but it was started by a local businessman, although in co-operation with artist friends. After 1900, a greater sense of commercialism is visible, in Katwijk’s huge fishery and art exhibition of 1902 and subsequently in 1906, when its artists formed their own gallery to sell directly to the public. Amongst the Laren artists, from 1903, the group called *De Tien* formed the better to organise their sales in The Netherlands and then internationally. Their first group exhibition was nearby in van Herper’s gallery in Hilversum in 1905, the same year that the *Larensche Kunsthandel* started in the village. The most stylish and well-publicised artists’ exhibition hall in a village was erected in Domburg in 1911, and formed the central feature and purpose of this colony.

There is no doubt that artists regarded working and living in the countryside as cheaper than the cities, but the real savings only came when painters settled in the territory. There had to be inexpensive housing available in the village to allow artists’ colonies space to develop; to settle long-term; or, an hotel that was not entirely seduced by easy tourist money. Before, during and after working in a village involved financial decisions. For painters to work in the countryside, even for one season, there had to be simple capital investment, for transport, lodgings, materials and equipment. For those artists who settled more permanently there had to be a degree of financial security, through either the selling of the occasional large salon-piece or the ability to produce smaller ‘pot-boilers.’ Traditional patronage was much less common amongst these groups, although Krøyer is one notable exception, yet this was off-set by the emergence of regular contracts with art dealers or from printers and publishers, such as those made with colonists Willy Sluiter, Phil May, Auguste Hanicotte, Jan Toorop and Ferdinand Hart-Nibbrig, amongst many others.

The new potential to sell work, or have it sold for them by dealers, was crucial to their ability to work and live away from the city for extended periods of time. Art historians seem to have overlooked the financial imperative when reasoning the decisions artists took when selecting the career option of painting the countryside. The move towards topographical subjects, folk-costume and genre, was as much an economic strategy as an aesthetic one. After the undoubted success of Millet then Israëls, with the subjects of farm labourers and fisher folk, then imitators were bound to follow. ‘Holland Mania’ became self-perpetuating profitable line of interest, that had broad appeal internationally and was reason enough for so many artists to go to villages, such as Katwijk, Laren and Volendam. The avant-garde took elements to their extremes yet still needed to sell their works. From the art dealer’s point of view, simple geographical identifications, specialisations, works in series and group reputations all helped promote the paintings and satisfy the collectors’ demands.

---

651 Stott, 1998. This book describes the many American painters attracted to The Netherlands, yet its conclusions compare closely with the many other nationalities congregating at the same time in its countryside.