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Preface

On the one hand, this collection of Albert Bloch’s photographic “Record Books” represents, a unique chronicle of Bloch’s personal artistic career during a most active period. On the other hand, it indirectly reflects and documents the dramatic evolution of modern art in the early twentieth century. The “Record Books” provide a detailed log of paintings over the crucial decade of that development. Because of the age and crowded arrangement of Bloch’s photographs in the “Record Books,” it was necessary to reproduce the images individually. Decisions were based on tonality, contrast, and sharpness, to show these versions of vintage works in open tones and readable contrasts. This had to be done without altering the atmosphere and mood of the original art. Despite a wide range of problems with the prints pasted into the “Record Books,” the quality and detail of the original paintings is often amazingly clear and true. The sizes of the original photographs were maintained as closely as possible to give the impact Bloch intended in the original albums. Because his photographs are only black and white, we have decided to add a few color plates that the artist painted in the Munich period of his career. A few of these plates were in his studio, but he did not photograph them. Since Bloch was able to use only black and white film, it is useful to have a few examples that allow us to see how he employed color in his early works. The “Record Books” consist of two albums: I (1911–1917) and II (1916–1919).* The covers of both albums have identical titles: Albert-Bloch / Ascona, Ticino / Casa Perruchi.

As early as May 1919, Bloch was planning his return to the United States, but before his return, he resided in Ascona, Switzerland, near the home of his friends Gordon and Xenia McCouch, who had arranged accommodations for him. In “Record Book II” he included a painting with a view of Ascona landscape as his the final photograph. (See From My
Window, Ascona, Fig. 140). The first album contains titles only in German, perhaps prepared during one of his early visits. The second album has titles only in English, which suggests that Bloch assembled pictures in this album as he was preparing to return to the United States.

Special thanks is also due to Scott Heffley, Travis Fischer, and Carolyn Swift of the Albert Bloch Foundation for generously granting permission to reproduce works of the Albert Bloch Foundation. For editing expertise, we relied on Betty Baron; for essential publication support, on the generosity of Graham Kreicker. Pam LeRow, Andrew Foat, Paula Courtney, and Rachel Barnes assisted in getting the manuscript into a proper form.

Anna Francis Bloch, the artist’s widow, supported this project since its inception. She made available her superbly organized archival resources. Her dedication to her husband’s legacy was an inspiration, and, in a real sense, this book is her book.

Frank Baron and Jon Blumb

* The following sample page from the Record Books reflects Bloch’s effort to preserve a precise record of his paintings:
Introduction

Frank Baron

The exhibition of the Blue Rider (*Der Blaue Reiter*), which opened in Munich on December 18, 1911, contributed substantially to the shape of modern cultural and art history. Albert Bloch, represented in that exhibition with six paintings, shared in the excitement of this revolutionary show. Munich’s Lenbachhaus, the famous museum of the revolutionary art of Wassily Kandinsky, Franz Marc, and Gabrielle Münter, is the established guardian of the narrative by which the dramatic origins of the Blue Rider phenomenon have become known. Other artists who took part in this historic effort have received relatively little attention. If Bloch’s voice and relevant correspondence were part of the narrative, the notable story of the Blue Rider and the origins of modernism could become more complete and precise.1

Many of Albert Bloch’s Munich years has been irrevocably lost. When Bloch returned to the United States from Europe in 1921, he had only a few of his of works. He had sold numerous paintings, a number of which are in museums. Many were unaccounted for, among them those that were subsequently lost in the bombings of World War II. Others were not thought worth photographing. Often dissatisfied with his paintings, Bloch destroyed many. Although fragments of correspondence are sources of important information, the most valuable resources for Bloch’s participation in the Blue Rider venture and the extraordinary evolution of his artistic career in Munich are two albums of photographs. Although they do not show all his paintings from those years, these two “Record Books” of black-and-white photographs, with which Bloch created an efficient showcase of his oil paintings, provide a fragile, and yet significant, insight into his Munich years.

Born in 1882 of German-Bohemian ancestry, Albert Bloch grew up in St. Louis. His parents permitted him to leave high school to attend the art school at Washington University, but he was disappointed with academic training and soon abandoned it. He worked, instead, as a free-lance draftsman for several newspapers in St. Louis and New York. Bloch developed his own version of comics for the *St. Louis Post* and the *St. Louis Star*. It was not long before Bloch’s work caught the eye of William Marion Reedy, editor of the *Mirror*, a St. Louis-based political and literary weekly with an international audience. His journal provided a challenging forum for Bloch, who helped to shape a new image for the *Mirror* with his covers and his numerous “Kindly Caricatures” of prominent St. Louis citizens. Bloch’s caricatures appeared on a regular basis along with Reedy’s prose texts.

With Reedy’s financial aid, Bloch, his wife Hortense, and infant son departed for Europe, arriving in Germany and settling in Munich in early 1909. He did not study at an art academy, however, as Reedy had expected he would do. Instead, Bloch visited museums and immersed himself fully in independent study, which included a trip to Paris. His drawings, prints, and paintings of the first two years in Munich indicate that he spent much time in Munich’s Schwabing quarter, observing and sketching people in the streets. His early art

works in Munich depicts the night life in poor neighborhoods; they bear such titles as beggar, blind man, prostitute, and derelict. See exhibit brochure.

In the general literature about the Blue Rider the focus of most narratives is on Kandinsky’s and Franz Marc’s the dramatic exit from the Blue Rider’s immediate predecessor, the *Neue Künstlervereinigung München*, the NKVM [New Artists’ Society of Munich]. The Lenbachhaus Website lends credibility to this event and its significance.

To make the narrative more complete and precise, it would be important to take note of Albert Bloch’s involvement, which is reflected in recollections and correspondence involving Albert Bloch, Marc, Kandinsky, and the NKVM. These letters shed light on the events of 1911. They supply previously overlooked details about the political tensions within the NKVM, thus helping to show how Kandinsky’s and Marc’s break with that association occurred. In this revised account of events, the vision of an international community emerges as a constant and a catalyst.

Albert Bloch met Kandinsky and Marc only after a second exhibition of the NKVM. He described his personal experience of this first encounter:

... while I was away in Paris that first time, I missed an event of the greatest importance that had taken place in Munich, and which was to have a very marked effect upon the painting of many of the younger men throughout Germany as well as in other countries. This was the [second] exhibition of the... New [Artists’] Society of Munich, whose leading spirit was Wassily Kandinsky, although he was not nominally the head of the organization. When presently I saw an illustrated catalogue of this exhibition, I was immediately interested, and regretted that I had not been in town to see the show; for I recognized, even from the inadequate little black-and-white reproductions, that here were a few people—Germans, Russians, Frenchmen, Italians—some of whom were striking out in a direction which seemed entirely sympathetic to the zigzag development which I was then undergoing myself, and that there was a certain kinship between some of this work and the groping experiments I was making independently and without previous knowledge of the existence of these others.

Whereas the German press attacked the excessive reliance on foreign ideas for inspiration, Marc and Bloch valued the new stirrings that were evident in all parts of Europe. Marc wrote, “Do people not realize that all over Europe the same, new creative spirit is active, defiantly and consciously?” From the beginning Marc saw as a source of strength the fact that the aims of artists in different nations were essentially the same. This international dimension, however, appeared as a distinct disadvantage in the eyes of many.

Letters reveal that the members of the society met on March 23, 1911, when they made a fateful decision to limit the next exhibition to the work of members only. The new chairman, Adolf Erbslöh, insisted that this was only a temporary measure, to be valid during the current year, and that therefore the policy was “absolutely no violation of our principle to invite guests.” This policy was clearly directed against excessive international participation. Kandinsky tried in vain to prevent this retreat from the possibility of a genuine international exhibit, and in this effort his close partner was Franz Marc. Because of the stiff opposition, they had to proceed in secret.

During the summer months of 1911 Kandinsky and Marc began to forge plans for the programmatic *Blue Rider Almanac*. This work proceeded in secret.
Kandinsky and Marc corresponded about contributions with painters as well as musicians in Germany, Russia, Austria, and France. They welcomed such diverse subjects as theater, dance, and architecture. Kandinsky wrote: “We have to show that there is something going on everywhere.” About this time, Kandinsky and Marc made an effort to bring Albert Bloch into the NKVM. In his lecture in Denver, Bloch described the events leading to the break:

About a year later [that is, in the fall of 1911] a visitor to my studio suggested that I invite Kandinsky and his associates to have a look at my work. … As it turned out, Kandinsky was glad to come, and when he did come—well, the upshot was that I was invited to cast my lot with him and his friends. However, this was not the immediate result. The immediate result, as I learned much later, was that quite innocently and unwittingly I was indirectly responsible for the breaking up of the New Society of Munich.

Kandinsky’s approval of Bloch’s work did not necessarily mean approval by the NKVM. Bloch recalled that other members of the society came to visit him, but soon whether Bloch should be admitted as a member became an issue. “But here the one faction was determined not to have me, while the other was quite as determined that I should be admitted. . . .” Admission to the NKVM was, in Bloch’s view, “one of those convenient, though fundamentally unimportant bones of contention which are so often made the excuse for a decisive squabble and the ultimate showdown.”

A postcard of November 4 from Marc to Kandinsky reveals that there was a secret plan for an independent exhibition. Marc wrote: “We have received space for an exhibition at Thannhauser for the second half of December, and the two of us can show whatever we like. Let’s get started with all seriousness.” In a note to the letter Marc included in his own “program” Burljuk, Campendonk, Macke, Marc, Schönberg, Bloch, Delaunay, and Rousseau. Marc added a closing remark: “This has to be something special.” For the history of the Blue Rider, this postcard, its context, and the precise conditions of its origins are of great significance. It is evident that Marc and Kandinsky were making secret preparations for independent actions weeks before their dramatic break with the NKVM.2

Scholars have suggested that the dating of this postcard may be erroneous (suggesting that December 4 was its correct date). Klaus Lankheit conclusively proved, however, that such speculations are without basis. The examination of Marc’s message to Kandinsky and the clearly legible date on the stamp allow only one conclusion, which is confirmed by Kandinsky’s retrospective description of the events: “Since we were expecting a clash, we had been preparing our own exhibition.” From the outset, Albert Bloch was part of these secret preparations.

The showdown in the NKVM occurred at a dramatic meeting on December 2. At this meeting, conservative members led the campaign against Kandinsky’s abstract Komposition V, the rejection of which provoked Kandinsky and Marc to walk out.30 Bloch saw the conflict between reactionaries (“compromisers” or “backsliders”) and radicals (artists of “uncompromising independence and honesty”). If we review the problems that Kandinsky

---

2 The present Lenbachhaus Website oversimplifies these facts: “The tensions within the NKVM proved irreconcilable in December 1911, when the jury of the group’s third exhibition rejected an almost completely abstract painting by Kandinsky. He, Marc, and Münter resigned from the NKVM and quickly organized their own show, remembered today as the legendary first exhibition of the ‘Blauer Reiter.’” The initial organization of the Blue Rider show actually took place about a month earlier, at the beginning of November, and the inclusion of Münter was not part of Marc’s first proposal to Kandinsky.
encountered within the NKVM, this contrast is important. Kandinsky was by far the most radical member of the group. At this time, his increasingly abstract art caused consternation. Bloch identified the cause of the breakup with the radicalism of Kandinsky and relegated the issue of his participation as “one of those convenient, but fundamentally unimportant bones of contention.” This modesty should not cover up the fact that Bloch helped Kandinsky and Marc to realize that their idea of a progressive and international circle of artists was impossible to achieve within the NKVM.

After the dramatic break with the NKVM, Kandinsky had a chance to visit Bloch and bring him the exciting news. Then Kandinsky wrote to Marc about Bloch’s amazement upon hearing the story (“Große Augen gemacht”). Bloch said that this turn of events was not entirely unexpected (“Ganz unerwartet ist es nicht”). It was no surprise then that Kandinsky could inform Marc that Bloch was also committed to the Blue Rider alliance (“Tut mit uns”).

The first exhibition of the Blue Rider, which opened on December 18, and in which Bloch was represented with six paintings, was a big step in the realization of their vision. Bloch’s contributions to this show were: Harlekinade [Harlequinade] (Fig. 8), Häuser und Schornsteine [Houses and Chimneys, but also referred to as View of a Factory], Kreuztragung [Procession of the Cross] (Fig. 7), Eine Hamletkomposition [A Hamlet Composition] (cf. Fig. 33), Die drei Pierrots Nr. 2 [The Three Pierrots No 2], Kopf [Head (of Christ)]. In “Record Book I” only two of the six paintings are represented. When Bloch assembled his photographs, A Hamlet Composition was not available to photograph. In 1921, however, he painted a picture he titled simply Hamlet, which depicts Hamlet remembering Yorick, whose skull he holds. The photograph of Bloch in his Munich studio shows the paintings of this period. The Harlekinade [Harlequinade] (Fig. 8) is prominent on the easel. A photograph of Bloch in his studio has survived from that visit, and many of the pictures on the walls are among the first that were included in the first pages of his “Record Books.” In less than two years Bloch was able to display a collection of paintings to impress the outstanding leader of modernism. It was an amazing accomplishment for a newcomer to the world of art.

[Albert Bloch in His Munich Studio], 1912

---

3 Fig. 6 is designated as Fabrik, Dachau and the color plate Houses Dachau, in possession of the Albert Bloch Foundation, are undoubtedly related to Häuser und Schornsteine of the Blue Rider exhibition. The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Kansas City is the home of Die Drei Pierrots Nr. 2. The Albert Bloch Foundation owns Kopf and the Hamlet of 1921.

4 Courtesy of the Albert Bloch Foundation.
Bloch took part in a celebration that took place after the exhibition’s opening and probably drew the caricature on the postcard the artists sent to Robert Delaunay, who was unable to be present for the opening. The first Blue Rider exhibition excited serious interest in avant-garde circles, and a succession of exhibitions followed. A second Blue Rider exhibition (advertised as “black-and-white”) was organized by Hans Goltz in Munich, at which Bloch showed eight numbered drawings, “Studies.” Numerous exhibitions followed, primarily in Berlin at the Sturm Gallery but also in Cologne, Dresden, Braunschweig, Frankfurt, Jena, Munich, and Chicago.

The later fame of the Blue Rider phenomenon tends to suppress the divided reactions to the new artwork during its initial appearance. The diary of Erich Mühsam opens a window on the resistance that the artists of the modernist movement must have confronted. In the person of Mühsam (1878–1934), the famous anarchist and revolutionary activist, the Blue Rider artists could count on Mühsam to defend them in face of hostile critics. But even Mühsam was tentative in defense of modernism:

We talked much about art, but especially the Goltz Gallery [the second] exhibition of the Blue Rider, which treated cubists and futurists, whom I defended because, despite all the exaggerations and even tasteless antics, they appeared to display considerable seriousness in their aims and evident talent. Steinbrück, who happens to practice painting on the side, has expressed to me his disdain for these recent movements. Let’s see what will come of them. I believe that in this case a new kind of lively style is becoming apparent in the form of immature experiments. In such a case the ridicule of the majority is understandable—perhaps also for the sake of balance—useful.5

In 1934, when Bloch wrote about the years of the Blue Rider, he singled out Kandinsky, Macke, Marc, and Klee for close scrutiny, but for him “the deepest spirit of them all and beyond dispute the greatest that German painting has produced in many generations” was Franz Marc. Understandably, in speaking about Marc’s achievements Bloch stressed his art and not his political views. The art was far removed from the real world. Bloch said, “The finest and most typical work of Franz Marc takes the beholder back deep into the hushed green depths of the German forest of German fairyland.” To Maria Marc he wrote that her husband had been the “painter of the uncorrupted world, the painter of our lost innocence.”6 The great yellow cow, the birds in treetops, and the cats playing quietly in the corner of a room made up a symbolic world and what Bloch calls a “romance of colors.”7 Bloch’s admiration of Marc’s achievements reveals, indirectly, those aspects that he hoped people would discover in his own works.

Bloch kept several paintings of these early days but did not deem them worthy of being photographed. The Portrait of the Man with Hat (1909) and Still Life, Bananas and Apples (1911) demonstrate his first, cautious experimentation with color. Because of the limitations of Bloch’s black-and-white photographs in the “Record Books,” these examples of his paintings in color show a significant shift in his artistic work, immediately evident after his return from Paris.

What shocked Reedy most about the art Bloch sent to St. Louis was his radical use of color. “Are you crazy?” he asked in response to Bloch’s submissions, and later elaborated: “All I can trust myself to say is [t]hat the great majority of people don’t see in colors and would not be able to understand what you are trying to do.” The most distinctive and consistent feature of Bloch’s work during the Munich years, nevertheless, was color. This is evident in the evolution of Bloch’s drawing and painting of the archway in Munich’s Sparkassenstrasse.

The unusual architectural design of the arch over the street is still visible and fundamentally unchanged. Bloch retained the bare outline, the essentials. The addition of color was the continuation of the process of transforming the material object into its spiritual counterpart. In attempting to do this, Bloch was true to the frequently stated goal of the Blue Rider artists.

The method with which Bloch experimented here is analogous to that which Lyonel Feininger perfected in subsequent years. Feininger exhibited with Bloch in Berlin, and after his exile from Nazi Germany became a close friend in the United States. In the 1940s Feininger and Bloch met frequently in their adjacent summer residences in Falls Church, Connecticut. Bloch’s drawing of another Munich street view is the result of a similar experiment.

Visitors in Bloch’s studio undoubtedly noted that Bloch was an experienced and talented painter of individual faces. The Blue Rider artists generally focused on landscapes and avoided portraits. Their human figures lacked the realism and precision that Bloch still found important and refused to abandon. In the first phase of his Munich years, portraits featured prominently in his work. The two portraits of Xenia S. McCouch, one in color (see plate xx), undated, and one captured in a photograph of 1913 (Fig. 19 in “Record Book I”), provide an insight into an important aspect of Bloch during those years.

A significant event in the history of the Blue Rider phenomenon was the immediate recognition in Berlin of its importance. Herwarth Walden opened his famous Sturm gallery in

---

8 Courtesy of the Albert Bloch Foundation.
9 Courtesy of the Albert Bloch Foundation.
March 1912 with an exhibition of Blue Rider artists. When Bloch returned from Berlin to Munich in the following year, after the Herbstsalon and the opening of his solo exhibition, he wrote to Walden and thanked him for the festivities and praised the music connected with the exhibit. The music made a strong impression on him. He concluded his letter by referring to Gordon McCouch (1885–1956), a contributor to the Herbstsalon, who was sending greetings from Munich to Walden.10

Albert Bloch, *Gordon M. McCouch*11

Bloch’s drypoint portrait of Mac, Gordon M. McCouch, completed on February 18, 1910, depicts Bloch’s life-long friend from Philadelphia, with whom he shared his studio in Munich. The two artists often worked side by side. Their collaboration left artistic traces in the scene of a duel in McCouch’s cubist representation of two dueling men and in Bloch’s portrayal of the resulting death and consternation. See Fig. 16 *Duell* [Duel] of 1912. Bloch’s early experimentation with cubism appears in his *Boxkampf* [Prize Fight] of 1912–1913, Fig. 36.

In a poem of twenty couplets, Bloch later remembered the times when he and McCouch conducted their frequent debates, intensified by wine. Their clash of views resulted in a closer friendship.

Throughout the night we wrangle as we drink,
Our very difference welds a stronger link. . . .

You press your point; my tenets I rehearse.
There is no riddle of the universe!

And so we sit. Our talk soars up and on.
The lamplight pales before the paler dawn.

Well then, to sleep. We stand. A final pledge.


11 Bloch’s drypoint of McCouch is reprinted with the courtesy of the Albert Bloch Foundation. See the letter of June 10, 1948, in the Albert Bloch archives at the Max Kade Center for German-American Studies, University of Kansas.
Have we what you would call ‘a gentle edge’?

If that be sin, then far in sin we’re sunk,
what though not wine, but vision makes us drunk.12

Bloch presented the friendly debates between the two artists, in combination with wine, as a means to an end, where ideas finally join to form a vision. At first glance, the poem seems to focus on the strong bond of friendship. At the same time, Bloch assigns to the wine the potential for achieving a spiritual goal. This secondary consideration was consistent with a prominent theme of that day: transforming the material world into a nonmaterial state. This could not be a sin. The “drunkenness” was a vision Bloch and McCouch “share[d] with every holy saint.”

Despite years of separation following Bloch’s return to the United States, the friendship remained firm. Others who belonged to Bloch’s Munich artist circle were Lascăr Vorel (1879–1918), Heinrich Gollob (1886–1917), Hanns Bolz (1885–1918), and Meta Speier (1888–1939). Gollob gave Bloch a portrait of McCouch, which refers to “our good friend Mac.” Bloch valued this portrait and kept it framed on the wall of his study.

When Bloch received a message that Gollob, suffering from a deep, unrelenting depression (“without her, life is hell”), was considering suicide, he traveled to Vienna to prevent it. Although on this occasion Bloch succeeded in dissuading Gollob from the extreme step, years later the friend “still was not well“ and he took his life.


Then came the final word – out of the blue:
You had just sent a bullet through your heart.

Bloch memorialized his friend with a charcoal drawing.

In the form of sonnets, Bloch looked back to a circle of artist friends to whom he felt close during his time in Munich. Reflecting on their lives and their relationship to Bloch opened up previously unnoticed aspects of his Munich years.

When Bloch arrived in Germany, profound changes were taking place in art, literature, music, and the nascent film industry. It was a shift from the outside material world to the inner, spiritualized world. The precise rendering of the real world of naturalism was no longer the goal. Colors and shapes were the artistic tools to access the nonmaterial, psychological reality. It made sense for Kandinsky and Marc to seek alliances among all disciplines, a goal they articulated in the Blue Rider Almanac. Wilhelm Worringer wrote in 1919:

> The exciting element of expressionism, seen within the history of artistic development, was that—within the narrow, post-medieval European framework—it made the first completely consistent attempt to carry through the experiment of a complete spiritualization of expression.\(^\text{15}\)

It was a time of innovation. In Prague, Franz Kafka made his breakthrough into a surrealistic style with Das Urteil [The Judgment]. In the realm of cinema, Der Student von Prag [The Student of Prague], the first German feature film, explored the human psyche in a new dimension. Kandinsky collaborated with Arnold Schönberg, who was creating radically new music. Marcel Duchamp, appeared in Munich, where he developed his revolutionary conceptual art.\(^\text{16}\) Also here, Thomas Mann completed his radical masterpiece, Der Tod in Venedig [Death in Venice]. The Schwabing art district, where Bloch resided, presented the opportunity to observe and meet those who contributed to innovations in art and literature. In the Café Stefanie (sometimes also referred to sarcastically as Café Größenwahn [Café

\(^{14}\) The charcoal drawing of Gollob. Courtesy of the Albert Bloch Foundation.

\(^{15}\) Worringer in Abstraktion und Einfühlung, the text translated in Peter Selz, German Expressionist Painting (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957), p. 9.

\(^{16}\) Rudolf Herz, Marcel Duchamp [in Munich]: Le Mystère de Munich (Munich: Mosel Verlag, 2012), p. 93 ff.
Megalomania]) he was in touch not only with artists but also with writers actively participating in the experiments of that time. The lifestyle he encountered there was the bohemian underground of Munich.

As one of its leading figures, Erich Mühsam believed that this form of life had the primary aim of liberation, by seeking to overcome personal barriers and also, in a broader political context, by resisting the repressive strictures of society. It opposed governmental controls and censorship in all forms.17

Because the primary concern of the day was the individual’s inner life, the influence of psychoanalysis was apparent in all artistic and literary endeavors. Artists and writers were not immune to the discovery of the unconscious. Psychoanalysis became the popular religion of Munich’s bohemian lifestyle. Discovering sexual symbolism was a popular pastime.18 It was the common denominator that brought artists and writers together in the cafés to discuss its significance in the creative process. Bloch, who had ambitions in both art and literature, sensed the importance of those discussions. One of the most famous visitors to the Café Stefanie, Frank Wedekind (1864–1918), broke new ground by exploring repressed sexuality in drama. Wedekind represented a new form of liberation, which became part of the bohemian lifestyle. Bloch recognized Wedekind’s importance:

[Wedekind] is altogether too important a figure in the literature of today to be adequately dealt with in a paragraph—or in a volume for that matter: he is too near us, too present, to make anything like a proper estimation of his value possible. A century perhaps, but not now, he may be ready for cataloging.19

Among the excited artist friends in Munich’s cafés, it was easy to overlook the fact that the outside world was not prepared for their cutting-edge experiments. This was especially true in the United States. In January 1913, McCouch traveled to his native Philadelphia and offered to show Bloch’s drawings at the local Sketch Club, of which he was a member. For the Philadelphia Inquirer this small “radical” show was a “first glimpse of [the] new movement” in anticipation of New York’s international Armory Show that was to open in the following month. The newspaper noted that the new movements were “in the air” and that they were “cropping up everywhere.” The reporter for the Inquirer observed:

The sketches do not amount to very much, either for Mr. Bloch or for the movement. Better things are hidden away right here in Philadelphia, but what is admirable is that the Sketch Club, hating these pictures with a good old fashioned hatred, should yet be broad-minded enough to offer to young Mr. Bloch a forum—to give him, as it were, a hearing.20

There was considerable resistance to Bloch’s art, even in his native St. Louis. Although Reedy, Bloch’s generous benefactor, supported Bloch’s efforts to gain recognition, Reedy was not happy about the contributions Bloch was sending for his papers. Reedy disagreed with Bloch on the ability of art to express the essence of music. This was a direct provocation to Bloch, whose frequent

19 “German Writers in Caricature,” International 9 (September 1913): 264.
20 Philadelphia Inquirer, January 12, 1913.
use of the harlequin figure clearly intended to convey movement and, through movement, music. In 1913, Bloch challenged Reedy by sending him a cover featuring Beethoven’s Symphony No. 5. This was simply a variation of Bloch’s *Harlekinade* [Harlequinade] of 1911. (Fig. 8).

![Image of Albert Bloch's cover for Beethoven's Symphony No. 5]

Albert Bloch, *Beethoven's Symphony No. 5*

Later, Bloch composed the poem “Apologia” in which he exhorted the painter:

Sing the song of color,
Paint your pictures, painter,
Ere your soul grow duller,
Ere the light grow fainter.

The interdependence of poetry, music, and painting was a matter of profound conviction and commitment.

Acting on Reedy’s suggestion, Bloch tried to gain some extra income by working for satirical journals in Germany. He sold twelve cartoons to the Berlin weekly *Lustige Blätter*, to which Lyonel Feininger and Georg Grosz also contributed. He had more success with a Munich satirical journal, *Der Komet*, for which prominent playwright Frank Wedekind was for a time the coeditor. The favorite meeting place of these *Komet* contributors was the Café Stefanie. Albert Bloch, Lascăr Vorel and Hanns Bolz probably met there to discuss possible topics; all three were frequent contributors throughout the paper’s short existence from 1910 to 1912. Bloch submitted about thirty cartoons.

Vorel had begun his studies as a painter and sculptor at the Munich Academy of Arts in 1900, and he knew the art scene of the city well. One of only two artists who are known to have had contacts with Duchamp during his short, portentous visit in Munich was Vorel. Rudolf Herz’s detective work shed light on Duchamp’s mysterious Munich stay. Vorel’s name appears as one of Duchamp’s few Munich contacts. Herz was able to locate Duchamp’s residence close to where Vorel lived. He uncovered the potential objects and contexts in which Duchamp might have developed his revolutionary ideas about art. Bloch met Vorel

---

21 Copies of the *Mirror* are in the St. Louis Public Library.
22 “Ventures in Verse, I.”
24 Vorel resided in the Blütenstrasse 17, around the corner from Barerstrasse 65, where Duchamp shared an apartment, and also close to Bloch, who lived at Kurfürstenstrasse 59/IV. The artist Max Bergmann invited...
often in the Café Stefanie; whether he also met Duchamp on one of these occasions is a matter of speculation.

After the outbreak of the war, McCouch moved to Switzerland, and Bloch and Vorel became friends. They visited each other’s studios and exchanged ideas about painting. They advised and supported each other. They made portraits of each other. Bloch helped Vorel prepare his exhibit in Goltz’s gallery in 1916.

In 1917, Bloch began to share Vorel’s studio, which became a frequent meeting place for the same crowd that frequented the Café Stefanie. A copy of Vorel’s painting, Vedere din Ateljer shows an open window of the studio on the top floor of the garden house.

Bloch valued Vorel as a friend. With sadness and regret, he concluded his sonnet dedicated to Vorel.

. . . Then you withdrew. Without farewell or warning

Duchamp to Munich. Bergmann knew Vorel, and Duchamp listed both Bergmann and Vorel as persons he knew in Munich. According to Herz, Bergmann introduced Duchamp to Vorel. The favorite meeting place, Café Stefanie, was at the nearby corner of Amalien- and Theresien-Strassen. Cf. note 34 below.

25 Identification of Bloch’s friend is possible because of its remarkable similarity to Max Bergmann’s Vorel portrait. See Herz, Marcel Duchamp [in Munich], p. 95. Bloch’s drawing of Vorel is reprinted with the Courtesy of the Albert Bloch Foundation.

26 Bloch wrote to Herwarth Walden on June 17, 1917 that his mailing address was residence now also Blütenstrasse 17, Ill, Gartenhaus. His regular home address remained Kürfürstenstrasse 59/IV. Valentin Ciucă, Lăscăr Vorel (Bucharest: Editura Meridiane, 1982). The Albert Bloch Archives have receipts to show that from April through November 1918, Bloch lived at Konradstrasse 5/1.

27 Petru Comarnescu, Lăscăr Vorel (Bucharest: Editura Meridiane, 1968), illustration no. 16.
you closed your eyes and turned to the wall. 
Aloof you died upon a winter morning 
as you had lived aloof among us all. 
You let yourself die. Had you no misgiving 
That, given a chance, life had been worth your living?

Bloch acquired a number of works by Vorel, one of which showed the iconic Frauenkirche [Church of Our Lady], as seen from the Schwabing environment of the artists.  

Lascăr Vorel, [Munich]

Vorel died of a kidney ailment in 1918. A museum in Piatra Neamt in Romania preserves his legacy.

Another member of Bloch’s small circle of artist friends was Hanns Bolz, to whom Bloch also dedicated a sonnet. Bolz was an artist of extraordinary talent, Bloch admitted, but he was not reliable as a friend. “What charm, what talent!” Bloch exclaimed, and although he recognized him as an able painter, he also observed a dark side of his personality:

What virtue was it that made so attractive 
Those qualities which equally repelled?

Richard Seewald, another talented artist in the crowd that frequented the Café Stefanie, shared Bloch’s insight into the ambivalence of Bolz’s character. Bloch distrusted Bolz because of his brutal treatment of women. He also suspected that, despite his obvious artistic talent, Bolz plagiarized. His suspicions were confirmed in an article.  

Bolz was on the editorial board of the Komet and, with his sharp wit, played a prominent role that his foreign-born friends could not match. Like Bloch, he had the support of Franz Marc to become a member of the NKVM. Later he also exhibited at the Sonderbund exhibition in Cologne, in 1912, and in the following year, in the first Deutscher

---

28 This Vorel painting is reprinted with the courtesy of the Spencer Museum of Art, University of Kansas. Kansas.
29 Seewald, Der Mann von gegenüber. Spiegelbild eines Lebens (Munich: List, 1963), pp. 164–5 und Richard Seewald, Die Zeit befehlt es, wir sind ihr untertan. Lebenserinnerungen, p. 76. Bloch and Bolz evidently shared models. Bolz’s painting of the Woman in Pink, ca. 1913, plate no. 6 (Albert Bloch Foundation) is clearly related to Frau mit Hut, ca. 1909–1911, a painting by Bolz, which appears in Matthias Forschelen, Hanns Bolz (1885–1918). Ein Künstler des Expressionismus und Kubismus (Aachen: Suermondt-Ludwig Museum, 1985), p. 17. Another frequent presence in these art circles was Marianne von Werefkin. Bloch, who referred to her as “the Baroness,” had also unkind words for her personality, as in the case of Bolz, but he also had unkind words about her art. “She talked well, with a tongue that was a spear. . . She painted. Badly, but by her own rules.”
Herbstsalon of the *Sturm* gallery in Berlin. Before coming to Munich he had completed his art studies in Düsseldorf and spent some time in Paris. As a result of his Paris studies, his works displayed the influence of the cubist movement. He received fleeting international attention by showing four pictures at the Armory Show in New York and Chicago in 1913.

When the *Komet* folded, Bolz left Munich for Paris, but when the war broke out, he enlisted. This was his undoing; at the front he suffered gas poisoning, which resulted in partial blindness. He was released in 1917 and for a time was able to join Vorel and Bloch in their studio in the Blütenstrasse. But he never fully recovered from his war injuries. Like Vorel, Bolz died young, in the same year, 1918.

Erich Mühsam was the most prominent member of the *Komet* editorial board. As a close friend, Bolz felt comfortable presenting a caricature of Mühsam (and the waiter Arthur?) in the Café Stefanie.

![Hanns Bolz, [Caricature of Mühsam in the Komet]](image)

Bloch described Mühsam as an “anarchist and lyric poet.” Then he added: “Closely watched by the police and sedulously ignored by the press, both facts which he resents, but for which there seems to be no help.” Bloch identified especially with Mühsam’s battles with the press, but he also valued him as a fine writer:

His monthly paper, *Kain*, entirely written by himself, is one of the best publications of personal opinion and propaganda printed in the Empire. Mühsam is really a humorist of a high order and has at his command a caustic, succinct, withal flowing, German prose style, innocent of all frill, and whatever he may say, however one may disagree, has always the merit of arresting one’s interest.  

Political ideas seldom entered into the composition of Bloch’s art, but the association with Mühsam was an instance when Bloch’s sympathy for radical politics came to the fore. For a brief moment, radicalism in art coincided with radicalism in politics.

---

Through his detailed diaries, Mühsam brings the Café Stefanie to life. He appeared to be a magnet that attracted writers and artists. His life intersected with many lives, not only famous ones. Bloch’s circle of friends was part of that network. Mühsam played chess with Vorel. He noted meetings with Bloch, who could inform him about political matters. Mühsam wanted information from Bloch about the anarchist movement in the United States, specifically about Emma Goldman. Because Bolz served with him on the editorial board of the short-lived Komet, Mühsam often had business to discuss, but he and Bloch also shared an obsession for the opposite sex. Free spirits such as Mucki Berger (Mühsam wrote her name as Bergé), Emmy Hennings, and Grete Krüger were also frequent visitors at the Café Stefanie, and their intimate relations with one or another friend became a subject of Mühsam’s diary. Actress and popular singer at the nearby Simplicissimus, Mucki Berger was Vorel’s fiancée, but Emmy Hennings, a popular performer at the same cabaret, had numerous intimate friends in addition to Mühsam and Bolz.

Albert Bloch was also involved. In his diary Mühsam described Grete Krüger. Mucki Berger’s attractive young friend, who preferred marriage to a bohemian life, expected that Bloch, who left briefly in June 1912 for the U.S., would return for her. It is not known whether Bloch had given her reasonable grounds for such an expectation. As an alternate to Bloch, just in case of a miscalculation, Krüger also spoke to Mühsam of a commitment to marry a Greek friend. In the absence of these close friends and prospective husbands, Mühsam hoped to gain the favors of the calculating young woman. Krüger’s repeated excuses frustrated Mühsam. His diary does not reveal, however, what happened when Bloch returned from the States or whether Krüger’s plans for marriage to her Greek friend materialized. At any rate, Café Stefanie clearly provided Bloch an open door to the bohemian lifestyle of Munich.

Like Mühsam, the artist Richard Seewald was another observant historian of the Stefanie society. He recalled Mühsam playing chess, his pince nez being the “only thing distinguishable amid his chaotic black hair and equally chaotic reddish beard.” He observed Emmy Hennings with her “blond page-boy fringe,” flitting in and out, probably on her way to a singing engagement. He saw Bolz with a “bowler-hat on head, pulled down over his eyes, accompanied by a woman in a bowler, hers not so rakishly perched.” He saw Vorel, whom he described as “silent and gentle.” Seewald also recognized Bloch in this circle of frequent visitors.

Marcel Duchamp (1887–1968) resided in Munich for several months, from June to October 1912. If Mühsam and Seewald overlooked him, it is not surprising. The French artist became famous much later. He had only an elementary knowledge of German, but he lived very close to Café Stefanie, at Barerstrasse 65, and later recalled the artists’ cafés of the neighborhood. Vorel, his host and fellow chess player, undoubtedly brought him to Café Stefanie to play chess. Although his visit was brief, for Duchamp the stay in Munich also proved to be a decisive phase in his artistic development.

Cabaret performer Emmy Hennings (1885–1948) also became successful and famous only later, in the 1920s, as a talented poet and, with her husband Hugo Ball, as a leading participant of the Dada movement. In her time at the Stefanie, in 1911 and 1912, she had

33 Mühsam’s diaries have appeared printed only in fragments, but for the years in question the most complete record can be found on the Internet. See http://www.muehsam-tagebuch.de Bloch probably developed intimate relations with a Hilda Doerner in the Blütenstrasse. In the correspondence with Emmy Klinker her name appears as Dörning. She lived at Blütenstrasse 21. See Klinker correspondence: Letters of October 10, 1945, postcard from Doering on January 11, 1951, and from Klinker on January 6, 1956.
intimate relations with a number of men, many of whom frequented the same café. Mühsam saw her as “a genius of eroticism” (“ein erotisches Genie”). Bolz was also her lover. Writers Frank Wedekind, Georg Heym, Jakob van Hoddis, and Johannes R. Becher came under her spell. The poet Becher (1891–1958) remembered later reading his poetry to her in the Café Stefanie.

It was in Munich, in the Café Stefanie.
When to you, Emmi, I recited the poems,
Which I dared to present only to you . . . .

Emmy Hennings enjoyed the company of poets, and her intimate friends became her teachers. The extravagant lifestyle was at a cost. She and Becher were close companions for a time and shared a morphine addiction. They recovered, but Emmy endured a period of prostitution, hospitalization, and even prison.

Emmy Hennings, 1912

“das bin ich emmy hennings,” 1913

Mühsam's diary witnessed Emmy Hennings’s crisis years. As Mühsam and Bolz saw it, Emmy was struggling with profound emotional and religious issues. In addition, she lacked funds to care for her child. Although she was a popular singer at the Simplizissimus, the lack of a stable income and a risky lifestyle undermined her mental health. Bloch and

38 The digital library of Erich Mühsam’s diaries is an outstanding resource for this period of intellectual and art history. See http://www.muehsam-tagebuch.de/tb/index.php
Bolz probably shared models. It has been suggested that Bolz’s *Frau mit Hut* [Lady with a Hat] represented Emmy Hennings. There is no evidence that Bloch ever painted a portrait of Hennings.

Hennings later recalled that Bolz had painted her several times, and one such painting, which showed her “singing in a red velvet dress against the reddish light of the stage, was sold to a museum in the United States.” Thereafter she was in demand as a model and believed that she was helping other artists to achieve success.40

Mühlsam’s diary reveals more about the writer’s observant eye for attractive women than about his radical political activities, which certainly received his serious attention with the onset of World War I. On one occasion he noted a “fantastic looking young girl sitting in Stefanie.” He added: “I fell in love with her instantly. I inquired and learned that she is Miss von Bach, a student of Weisgerber.”41

The attractive art student Miss von Bach, whom Mühlsmann observed and to whom he was strongly attracted, did not escape Albert Bloch’s observant eyes. He found an opportunity to draw and paint her portrait.

---


Miss von Bach was probably identical with a young lady from Vienna, a Baroness von Bach, a member of a talented musical family. Miss von Bach’s teacher, Albert Weisgerber (1978–1915), was also a frequent guest at the Café Stefanie, a chess partner of Mühsam’s, and a contributor to the journal Jugend. He organized the artistic organization Münchener Neue Secession in 1913 and became its first president. Jawlensky, Erbtlöh, Kanoldt, and Klee were part of this group. The Nazis later declared Weisgerber’s art “degenerate.”

Meta Speier was also a Weisgerber student. She exhibited in Berlin, Cologne, Munich, and Weimar. In 1918, Bloch and Speier exhibited together with other expressionists at the salon of Ludwig Schames in Frankfurt. As Bloch recalled in a sonnet he dedicated to her, she was a “restless shy spirit.” Persecuted as a Jew by the Nazis, who

\[ \ldots \text{bent} \]

on making scapegoats for your country’s plight
of you and yours – with the shocked world’s consent.

Speier died in 1939 in the Warsaw Ghetto.43

A view of bohemian life in Munich would be incomplete without reference to the constant concern about the lack of money. Writers, actors, and artists were plentiful in Munich. To make a living was difficult. For Mühsam, despite considerable success as a controversial author, it was a persistent problem and, sometimes, a cause for despair. He was forced to help others, but many times he was the one who had to ask for help. Arthur, the reliable waiter in the Café Stefanie, remembered only by his first name, became a kind of banker, needing to keep accounts for those who could not pay.44 Bloch had come to Munich with his wife and child. A second son, Walter, was born in 1916. Bloch’s correspondence with Marc, Kandinsky, and Walden often focused on Bloch’s desperate need to sell his

---

43 Speier exhibited with Bloch at the Kunstsalon Ludwig Schames in Frankfurt in January and February 1918. Her paintings were: Damenbildnis, Bildnis Fräulein W., Herrenbildnis, Porträtskizze, Blaue Landschaft, Hügellandschaft, Allee, Kerzenstilleben, Einsamer Hügel, and Dorfstraße. Her death is reported at http://www.loebtree.com/esk8.html#4.22
44 Seewald, “In the Café Stefanie,” p. 81.
paintings. Despite the willingness of these friends to help, the income from the sale of art was sporadic and insufficient. When Reedy, Bloch’s patron in St. Louis, no longer sent monthly stipends, Bloch was forced to make a trip to St. Louis to seek help from relatives. In the long run, that effort in 1912 was not successful; Bloch continued to struggle bitterly throughout his Munich stay. This situation became even more desperate during the war years. Starting in 1914, the options for earning money narrowed drastically.

It is not surprising that the bohemian lifestyle and the closely related poverty were sometimes topics of Bloch’s contributions to periodicals such as the Mirror, Lustige Blätter, and Komet. His cartoon of the Café Stefanie for the Komet focuses on the lazy artist inside the café. It suggests that the kids standing around in the cold outside are being exploited.  

In response to the question what the kids are doing with their sled, the oldest child states that they are modeling for the artist inside the Café Stefanie. Bloch was in his element.

On February 14, 1909, Bloch had an opportunity to observe the premiere of Richard Strauss’s Elektra. His sketches of the composer and the accompanying report reflect the excitement he felt on this special occasion.

45 I am grateful to Dr. Rudolf Herz of Munich for drawing my attention to Bloch’s contributions to the Komet and his association with the Romanian artist Lascăr Vorel, who, along with Hanns Bolz, also contributed to the same journal.
47 City Archives, Munich
The Mirror reported:

At the performance of Elektra, described by Mr. Bloch, Dr. and Frau Strauss were present, though unknown to many, in a loge in the first tier. At the end of the performance, out of the uproar arose cries for “Strauss!” soon taken up by all. After bowing his acknowledgements from his place, the composer came before the curtain, between Frl. [Zdenka] Fassbender, the Elektra, and Miss [Maude] Fay, the Chrysothemis. There ensued a wild demonstration, amid which Mr. Bloch caught these caricature impressions of the composer—thick lips, deeply sunken eyes, high forehead, receding chin. Physiognomists may find in them some clue to the secret of Strauss’s genius. 48

For several years Bloch had been drawing such satirical caricatures for the St. Louis Mirror. In the following contribution he showed his St. Louis readers Munich’s obsession with newspapers. In the bottom right frame he depicted himself reading the Mirror.

48 The Mirror, 1909. St. Louis Public Library. Bloch was reporting on the February 14, 1909 Munich premiere of Elektra.
49 The undated photograph is in the Tucker Collection – New York Public Library
In an effort to achieve a degree of financial security, Bloch began to teach. In 1916 he began instruction for a talented student, Emmy Klinker (1891–1969). Under Bloch’s guidance Emmy Klinker was able to assemble a portfolio of paintings, which motivated Bloch to request from Herwarth Walden a joint exhibition in Berlin. Bloch wrote to Walden: “Klinker’s works are strong and very independent, and there is something tremendously self-sufficient about them.” The exhibition took place in 1918. Emmy’s father supported Bloch by purchasing his paintings. An intimate relationship developed between Bloch and his student. When he returned to Munich for a short period in 1920, he lived with Emmy Klinker in her apartment and worked in her studio. The painting Interieur originated here. Today it is

50 *The Mirror*, 1912. St. Louis Public Library.
displayed in the museum of the Blue Rider, the Lenbachhaus.\textsuperscript{52} Despite distance after Bloch’s permanent return to the United States, the close friendship remained unbroken through a correspondence extending over four decades.

For Bloch the relationship between art and literature was always essential. Although the first Blue Rider exhibition included a Hamlet composition, a work now lost, the “Record Book I” also shows Zum “Wahnsinn Learns” [For the Scene of Lear’s Insanity] 1913 (Fig. 33). The themes of Goethe’s Faust inspired Bloch throughout his life. One of his Mirror covers featured the devil, Mephisto, in April 1908. A drypoint of 1910 again featured Mephisto, perhaps the record of a Munich theater production. In a number of Munich paintings, the devil, the entire length of his body, stark red, or a hunchback with a hooked nose, appears as a prominent figure in Harlekinade [Harlequinade], 1911 (Fig. 8); Häuser bei Nacht [Houses at Night] (Fig. 12) 1911; Harlekinade, dritte Fassung [Harlequinade], 1915 (Fig. 9). The following paintings with the Faustian themes were not included in the “Record Books.” Höllenszene [Scenes of Hell] 1912, Das grüne Gewand [The Green Domino] 1913. Even if literary themes are not the dominating focus of a work, they are woven into a complex fabric of other themes. Years after his return to the United States, Bloch, a poet, described the intricate relationship between art and literature succinctly:

A picture that is not a poem is not a picture.
A poem that is not a picture is not a poem.\textsuperscript{53}

Closely related to literary themes is the prominence of clowns and the stock characters of the commedia dell’arte tradition, the melancholy and sensitive Pierrot and the agile and ever-moving Harlequin. In the first phase of Bloch’s stay in Munich, from 1909 to 1915, these figures appeared in about half of Bloch’s paintings. Why were they so pervasive? Why would Bloch present himself in the costume of a Harlequin, as he does, according to Janice McCullagh, in the drypoint self-portrait of 1913?\textsuperscript{54} These figures suffered from the same restriction as did art: They were forced to express movement, emotion, and music without the spoken word. The clowns, the Pierrots, and the Harlequins communicated a nonmaterial, inner world.

Despite his Jewish ancestry, Bloch gravitated toward Christian themes. Kreuztragung [Procession of the Cross] (Fig. 7) and the El-Greco-like Kopf [Head (of Christ)] in the first Blue Rider exhibition reflected a persistent interest in biblical stories.\textsuperscript{55} The Good Samaritan 1917 (Fig. 121) and Flight into Egypt 1917–1918 (Fig. 119) show evidence of a trend that intensified after his return to the United States.

After 1914 Bloch gradually turned to different ways to transform the material world into an inner, spiritual world. With Kandinsky’s recommendation, Bloch gained a patron, Arthur Jerome Eddy, a Chicago lawyer, who bought a number of Bloch’s paintings and organized a one-man show of twenty-five paintings in Chicago and St. Louis. Bloch wrote to Eddy, signaling that he had turned a corner in his development.

My last things (as well as I can judge) seem to mark a great advance over the ones immediately preceding them . . . I have half a dozen things in work at present deeper and stronger in vision than anything I have ever had under my hand.

\textsuperscript{52} Albert Bloch: The American Blue Rider, plate no. 30. See Emmy Klinker’s letter of August 19, 1949 to Albert Bloch in the Max Kade Center archives. The drawing that preceded the painting, Die schreckliche Nachricht, reflecting perhaps the news of a soldier’s death in World War I, is to be found in the Eutin Landesmuseum.

\textsuperscript{53} Albert Bloch: German Poetry in War and Peace, p. XII.

\textsuperscript{54} Artistic and Literary Perspectives, p. 47.

\textsuperscript{55} El Greco und die Moderne, ed. by Beat Wismer and Michael Scholz-Hänsel (Düsseldorf: Hatje Cantz, 2012).
Eddy wrote to Kandinsky on March 5, 1914, “I think that you made no mistake in so strongly recommending Bloch. His work is most interesting. It is exceedingly individual, and I find a great deal of pleasure in his very unusual use of color and also in the play of his imagination. I do not know what if anything I can do for him than purchase some of his pictures.” But then Eddy added, “I shall do whatever I can to aid him.” Eddy, who was a major factor in promoting modern art in the United States, devoted a noteworthy segment of his book, *Cubists and Post-Impressionism* (1919), to Bloch’s paintings. In March 1916, after the joint exhibition with Paul Klee, Bloch wrote to Herwarth Walden that he would like to withdraw his *Fries für ein Musikzimmer* [Frieze for a Music Room] (Fig. 24), which the Berlin critics had praised. Bloch believed that the painting represented a phase of his career that he had left behind. Although this work had cost him years of effort, the figures of the commedia dell’arte, which dominated this painting, were for him a thing of the past. Consequently, in the second half of his Munich decade, the clowns, harlequins and pierrots disappeared. The artistic expression of emotion and movement no longer presented an end in itself. Bloch no longer took time for portraits. An awareness of and concern about social issues became more emphatic in the second period of his Munich years.

How Bloch’s art changed through contacts to other artists is an important consideration. It was inevitable that through his common exhibitions in Berlin, he was in close touch with the leading German artists of the day. Starting in the summer of 1912, Walden’s Berlin gallery and the publication of *Der Sturm* became a welcome promotion of the Blue Rider artists. In addition to the inner circle of the Blue Rider, Wassily Kandinsky, Franz Marc, Gabriele Münter, Paul Klee, and Heinrich Campendonk, Bloch admired others such as Lyonel Feininger and Marc Chagall.

Annegret Hoberg observes: “The fact that Bloch was—alongside Chagall and Kokoschka—one of the most frequently exhibited artists in the *Sturm* circle has been largely forgotten today.” From September 20 to December 1, 1913, Bloch had an exhibition of his own with forty-two paintings at the Sturm Gallery. Walden also arranged a solo exhibition for him in Hamburg in 1914. Several joint Sturm exhibits followed, with Paul Klee, Heinrich Campendonk, and other Blue Rider artists in 1916. In the following year he exhibited with Harald Kauffmann. Bloch participated in his final Sturm exhibition of June 1918 together with his student Emmy Klinker. In March and April of 1918 he showed his works in Munich, first in the gallery Das Reich and, in July, in the gallery of Hans Goltz. At all these shows (at least forty in number) Bloch met and exchanged ideas with leading artists of modernism, and they became his teachers. Mutual borrowing of ideas and techniques was inevitable. Henry Adams and Annegret Hoberg have taken pains to show when and by whom Albert Bloch was influenced. As a result, Bloch receives little recognition for his originality. Yet even the

---

56 The Eddy correspondence is in the Germanisches Nationalmuseum, Nuremberg, Franz Marc Archives. Paintings that Eddy acquired from Bloch include figure numbers 9, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 44, 49, 52, 53, 54, and 61 of the “Record Book I.” In the record of pictures Bloch prepared for the years 1914 to 1930, his “Bilderlisten,” (a copy is in the Max Kade Center’s archives), there are titles and prices listed fourteen paintings and twenty-four etchings available to Eddy. Bloch noted that he had sold the following paintings to Eddy: *Night II, Burial I, Garden in May, Hillside, Mountain Village, and Figures on a Dark Ground*. Later, in his unpublished “Sonnets to the Dead,” Bloch dedicated a poem to Eddy and expressed resentment about unfavorable financial arrangements for his paintings.


58 Albert Bloch: The American Blue Rider, p. 66. Hoberg compares this painting to Klee’s *Marsh Legend* of 1919. In other words, the evidence presented suggests an influence in the reverse direction, something that no one has ever claimed.

59 Ibid., pp.17–18.
most persistent influence, that of Franz Marc, did not overwhelm Bloch’s individual works. He was fiercely independent and made sure that his paintings could not appear to be anyone else’s.

Among the artists with whom he exhibited, Bloch repeatedly singled out Paul Klee with admiration. This is most evident in the poem he wrote after Klee’s death.

The man is gone, the mate, companion, friend.
The spirit, whimsical yet lofty, lonely,
Shall remain, and not to us alone:
This to remember could bring comfort surely
In other, fairer days than these our own,
When men dared look on days to come securely.

Bloch wrote these lines in August 1940, a tragic low point in the world’s history, as war raged on.

Another gone, thus timely called away,
Who need not waken to the sunless day.

Hoberg noted an “overriding influence of Klee” in 1916 and 1917. She referred to the painting of Landscape with Two Men, Two Houses, and a Cow, Homage to Klee, preserved in the Kunstmuseum Bern and a similar painting, Deserted Village, 1917, Fig. 101. The events of 1916 included a joint exhibition with Klee. A certain degree of convergence of themes is noticeable. That was also the year of Franz Marc’s death, which affected Bloch profoundly. Other themes and influences become evident. Marc had been Bloch's closest friend and most reliable advisor. When the war broke out, Franz Marc immediately enlisted. Nationalistic fervor swept Germany. Marc believed that the war was actually a way to promote the aims of international cooperation envisioned in the experiment of the Blue Rider. In Munich, Albert Bloch also grappled daily with the oppressing issues of the war and his own pressing financial problems; his correspondence reflects inner conflicts similar to those of Marc. The destroyed painting Fahnenjubel [Flag Jubilation] of 1915–1916 may have been a critical commentary on the misplaced trust in excessive nationalism. Bloch admitted to Marc that he had been seized by the events and his "mind was so feverish" that he even wanted to enlist. The expectation of a quick end to the war was replaced by the reports of trench warfare and fatalities. Because Bloch respected Marc and appreciated the sacrifices he was making as a soldier at the front, he was dedicated to understanding Marc’s point of view and promoting it. Bloch translated Marc’s essay “Das geheime Europa” rendered by Bloch as "European Idea") a vision of a united Europe, inspired by the Blue Rider experience; he hoped that he could have it published in the United States. Still engaged in the correspondence with Bloch from the front, Marc was killed near Verdun on March 4, 1916. In the sonnet he dedicated to Marc, Bloch wrote that he and others had looked forward to Marc’s return from the German army:

. . . hell let loose, in which your life went under
while we, expectant, ever hopeful, waited
on your return and the long longed-for wonder
of color-revelation . . .

For Bloch, the death of Franz Marc at the front was a serious crisis. He wrote to Herwarth Walden, who had published a tribute to Marc in Sturm: “What do we do now? Where do we go from here? How long will this most atrocious scandal of senseless murder
continue? . . . The only thing that holds me upright when I think of Marc’s death is the fact that I still cannot comprehend it at all.” To Campendonk, Bloch spoke of Marc as the brother that he had lost. To remember his conversation on the occasion of the funeral services for Marc, Bloch made Campendonk a copy of his painting Klosterbild [View of the Monastery], (Fig. 92). Bloch also sent Campendonk copies of Strasse mit Trauerfahnen [Street with Flags of Mourning] (Fig. 81) and Schnitter in einer Waldlichtung [Reapers in a Forest Clearing (the green picture)] (Fig. 90). A pen-and-ink drawing with a reference to the date of Marc’s burial in its title emphasizes the impact that Franz Marc on the lives of both Campendonk and Bloch.60

Albert Bloch, Zum 3. April, 1917 (Reburial of Franz Marc) 61

The debt that Bloch and Campendonk felt they owed to Marc magnified their grief. Marc had done everything in his power to advance their artistic careers. The poet Else Lasker-Schüler (1869–1945) also felt indebted to Marc’s devotion as a friend. When Marc and Lasker-Schüler met in Berlin in 1912, the poet was in a desperate frame of mind, having been confronted, after nine years of marriage, by her husband’s, resolve to divorce her and marry a younger woman. In her depression, she had resorted to opium. Franz and Maria Marc offered her a chance to escape from Berlin and recover in their idyllic Sindelsdorf home. A pen drawing by Albert Bloch of himself on a bicycle, also depicted Marc painting outdoors. Lasker-Schüler’s hand, holding a cigarette, is visible on the far right.62 Franz Marc was attracted to Lasker-Schüler, eleven years his senior, because he admired her poetry and thus tolerated her eccentricities and occasional neurotic scenes. As his beautiful postcards to Lasker-Schüler amply demonstrate, the fantastic and fairytale realm of the poet inspired Marc to create corresponding dream images in vibrant colors. In that fantasy realm, which combined art and poetry, the “Blue Rider” (Marc) and “Prinz Jussuf” (Lasker-Schüler) became intimate friends. When Marc died, Lasker-Schuler wrote: “The Blue Rider has fallen, a great biblical hero, whose presence radiated the nearness of Eden. His blue shadow covered the landscape. He heard the animals speak and he transfigured their inscrutable souls.”63

60 Albert Bloch: Artistic and Literary Perspectives, p. 28.
61 Courtesy of the Albert Bloch Foundation.
62 Ibid., p. 29.
63 “Der blaue Reiter ist gefallen, ein Großbiblischer, und dem Duft Edens hing. Über die Landschaft warf er einen blauen Schatten. Er war der, welcher die Tiere noch reden hörte, und er verklärte ihre unverstandenen
Else Lasker-Schüler was most at home in the bohemian life of the Café Stefanie, but like others who congregated there, she lacked a reliable income and often depended on others. Franz Marc came to her rescue by organizing an auction of art works. Other works were by Heinrich Campendonk, Erich Heckel, Oskar Kokoschka, Alfred Kubin, and Marianne von Werefkin. Karl Kraus, her longstanding admirer and supporter, set up a bank account in Vienna, for the 1,600 DM that the auction totaled. Marc contributed the painting Der Traum [The Dream], today in Bern’s Kunstmuseum.

As a frequent visitor at the Café Stefanie, Lasker-Schüler had occasions to see Albert Bloch. Aware of his literary interests, Lasker-Schüler offered to introduce Bloch to Karl Kraus (1874–1936). When he received this offer for the first time, in 1912 or 1913, Bloch balked. At the time, he had not known much of Kraus and apparently lacked interest in meeting him. Soon thereafter, however, he became a fervent devotee of Kraus’s writings, Lasker-Schüler again offered Bloch the opportunity to meet Kraus. This time, however, timidity, caused by his excessive reverence, prevented him from taking advantage of the generous offer.

Next to Franz Marc, the influence of Karl Kraus, whose journal Fackel now became regular reading, forced Bloch to rethink his beliefs in a wide range of artistic, social, and political issues. Kraus engaged in the intense political and social criticism that his former mentor, William Marion Reedy, practiced on a smaller scale in St. Louis. Bloch discovered Kraus in 1914, and from then on his judgment on social and literary questions became increasingly important. Later, during his years in Kansas, Bloch undertook the task of translating many of Kraus’s poems into English, and by so doing played a pioneering role in promoting Kraus as a poet of international importance. Bloch translated segments of Kraus's antiwar drama Die letzten Tage der Menschheit [The Last Days of Mankind]. Although the thrust of Kraus’s influence asserted itself after Bloch's return to the United States, Kraus's writings provided a spiritual resource and point of orientation even during the Munich years when Bloch was forced to come to terms with Marc's death. Kraus represented the sphere of morality and social responsibility. For Bloch, he was "the most ardent ethical force at work in the world . . . ."

The paintings with a focus on night, such as Tageswende [Dawn] 1915–1916 (Fig. 60); Strasse mit Trauerfahnen [Street with Flags of Mourning] 1916 (Fig. 81); Fabrik Nachts [Factory at Night] 1916 (Fig. 85); Nacht V [Night V] 1917 (Fig. 91); and Blind Soldier and Butterflies 1918 (Fig. 131), reflect the darkness that settled on Europe during World War I. Night V suggests explosions and the destruction of trees.

In November 1918, the abdication of the emperor and the cease-fire in the war set into motion tumultuous events throughout Germany. Soon the revolutionary Spartacists ruled the streets of Berlin. In Munich, the Social Democrats, under Kurt Eisner took over the reign of government from the Bavarian king. The city was restless, and extremism was rampant. Returned to Munich, Hitler saw that citizens were ready for his brand of politics. On November 23, Bloch reported that the Free Folk Republic of Bavaria had been established,

64 February 17, 1913 Marc initiated an auction at the Neuer Kunstsalon (Ferdinand Schmidt and Paul Dietzel), Munich, the money to be collected would go to an account that Karl Kraus had set up in Vienna. Sigrid Bauschinger, Else Lasker-Schüler: Biographie (Frankfurt a. M.: Wallstein Verlag, 2004), p. 199.
66 Albert Bloch: German Poetry in War and Peace, p. xiii
and, because he could not focus on his work under the “hysterical” conditions, was planning to return to the United States. At first he intended to take his family to Switzerland. His days in Germany were numbered.

Bloch was disappointed in America's role in what he saw as the humiliation of Germany through the Versailles Treaty. The immersion in the writings of Karl Kraus, in combination with the disturbing developments of the war, signal a shift in Bloch’s art, which is also evident in the “Record Books.”

Hans Goltz (1873–1927), who had hosted the second Blue Rider exhibition in 1912, organized Bloch’s last one-man show of sixty-one paintings in his Munich gallery in 1919. In the face of the impending threat of disastrous peace conditions for Germany, Goltz undertook to protest against the politics of revenge, originating primarily in France. He turned to Bloch to supply images for the first issue of his printed pamphlet, Der Ararat. Bloch provided both the cover and the back page. The title conjured up the desperate need to be saved from an impending flood. On the other hand, the back page depicted the Germans weak and helpless in the grips of the Entente powers. In January 1919 Bloch sent his contributions to Goltz.

Albert Bloch
Die Arche landet [The Ark Arrives]

Albert Bloch
Die Hand der Entente [The Hand of the Entente]

The second issue of the Ararat also employed a cover by Bloch. It suggested that Germany take a strong stand against the intimidation by the victorious powers. After dedicating issues to Georg Grosz and Paul Klee, Goltz turned to Bloch to dedicate the entire December 1920 number to him and his art. He asked Bloch to supply an introductory text. Evidently discouraged by the need to withdraw from the European art world, Bloch responded negatively to this request from his temporary residence in Ascona. He expressed gratitude to Goltz for his interest, but he refused to write about himself, and to a question about the art scene in the United States, Bloch was reluctant to write anything, except to note that it was desolate. He provided Goltz with a series of aphorisms that reflected the bitter satire of Karl Kraus. Nevertheless, Goltz was generous in showing nine previously exhibited works by Bloch in the December 1920 issue of the Ararat.

68 Cf. http://sdrc.lib.uiowa.edu/dada/Ararat/
69 For example, at this time Bloch evidently internalized the bitterness and anger of Karl Kraus about newspapers. "Wer sagte doch, oder wo las ich’s einmal, daß der Zeitungskritiker ein Mensch sei, der erzogen werden muß? Erzogen? Warum ausgerechnet der? Andres Ungeziefer vertilgt man ja!" [Who said that, or where did I read, that the newspaper critic needed to be educated? Educated? Why just that guy? After all, we get rid of vermin!]
Why was Bloch so upset and angry? He had been part of a movement that had changed the face of the world of art; he himself had exhibits all over Germany, and his name began to be recognized. His student, Emmy Klinker, had participated in a major exhibit in the Sturm gallery and could expect a bright future. The war had changed all that. Kandinsky had left Germany, and his friend Marc was gone. The idealism and internationalism of the Blue Rider faded away. Now, after the humiliating defeat of Germany, Bloch had become an undesirable foreigner in the country he loved. He was upset to lose all that he had worked hard to achieve.

If conditions had allowed, Bloch would have remained in Germany. Hitler had begun to meet with his companions in the Schelling Salon in Schwabing, just a few blocks from the Café Stefanie. Strict restrictions did not allow renting residence to foreigners, and the usual financial difficulties only exacerbated the crisis.

A frequent form of escape for Bloch was the painting of still lifes (Stilleben). He generally assigned numerals to these paintings, of which the last appears in the “Record Books” as Still Life XII. The size of such paintings was relatively small. When Bloch returned to the United States, he lived with his family in St. Louis. In August 1920, however, Bloch returned to Europe alone, staying first in Ascona, but intending to return to Munich to take care of the paintings and household goods he had left behind. There he lived with Emmy Klinker. During this stay, when he painted Interieur, he also painted New Year 1920, which he dedicated to his St. Louis relatives, his sister, Frances, and his brother-in-law, Herbert Leimsdorf. This larger painting (16” x 22”) summarized a number of themes of his previous still-life work. The bird that had appeared in previous paintings appears to be singing a cheerful song, perhaps in anticipation of a happy year.70

Before traveling back to Switzerland and then making his final trip to the United States, he visited Vienna with Emmy Klinker. There they were able to see and hear Karl Kraus speak. A painting of March–April 1921, Souvenir, Ascona, indicates the location where Bloch completed the painting. Bloch made sure that the painting reflected all memorable aspects of that visit. Because he signed the painting not only with the customary AB but also as Peter (the name Klinker used in all her correspondence with him), the painting contained a coded message to Klinker.71 He showed a street scene in Vienna and, prominently, a poster for three speaking engagements of Karl Kraus. But there were additional posters that illustrated other experiences, for example,: musical events, such as Bruckner’s great mass at the royal chapel, and, on another occasion, a symphony concert with music of Schubert and Bruckner at the hall of the Musikverein. Wagner’s opera Der Meistersinger von Nürnberg was performed at the Volksoper. Bloch and Klinker also visited the Kunsthistorisches Museum to see the Breughel paintings of peasants.72

Upon his return to the States, Bloch made a brief attempt to support his family by selling his paintings. Finding that too difficult and, disenchanted with the commercialism of the American art world, he abandoned these efforts and turned to teaching. After working briefly at the Chicago Art Institute, he accepted a position teaching for art and art history at the University of Kansas in 1923. A totally new chapter in his life started. He continued to paint, but this new phase of his career and life removed him far from the center of modern art. He continued to paint in the relative isolation of his Alabama Street studio in Lawrence. He had to share painting with teaching, poetry, correspondence, and family. This phase of his life concluded with his death in 1961.

70 Pl. 8, private collection.
71 In her correspondence with Bloch, Klinker remembered the joint visit in Vienna.
72 Albert Bloch: The American Blue Rider, Pl. 33. On August 14, 1955 Klinker wrote to Bloch that she still possessed four works by him: Stammgäste; Interieur, 1921; Straße, 1921; and Häuschen im Garten, rot-grün
As Bloch was about to depart from Germany, Karl Kraus was becoming his primary guide, but for the entire span of his time in Munich, his artistic mentor was, in fact, Franz Marc. This artist’s influence cannot be explained simply in terms of technique or subject matter. Bloch admired in Marc a strict concentration on a transcending vision. In his Denver lectures of 1934, he remarked, “For this painter sought to create his God in the image of His creatures, so he might make himself worthy to have been created in God’s image.”

Marc’s approach was unique, and in this sense, Bloch did not try to emulate him. But his mission, seen on a more abstract level, was not unlike Marc’s. In view of his efforts to transcend the materials of his craft to express a spiritual reality, the evolution of Bloch’s art in the 1910s becomes more comprehensible. In this context, Lascăr Vorel’s observation of Bloch’s painting is instructive. Vorel observed in his diary on June 17, 1915: “I liked his work of a landscape. It was a large composition. He is going down an untrodden path: neo-fantastic with a mystic influence. The form remains primitive or, to put it another way, the linear discipline and the balance of colors are beyond a purely harmonized vision. He is a real talent without question.”

Vorel implied that the subject of Bloch’s painting evolved in the direction of myth making. A review following Bloch’s 1920 exhibition in Jena recognized this development:

What we experience with the works of Albert Bloch is the creation of myth, incredible inner life, power, but also gentleness, such as was once the first religion of our ancestors. The subject matter, to be sure, which lies at the source of many myths, has to do, above all, with our time: Red Village, Factory City, Suburb—such are the titles of the exhibited pictures. There is common to them, nevertheless, the realistic and unrealistic atmosphere that has always made up the essence of the fairy tale and which is expressed in the recent art works by means of anti-naturalistic colors and lines... At any rate, now that we have become acquainted with Bloch (for that we are greatly in debt to Dr. Dexel), we wish to see soon more of this master.

Later Bloch confided in his correspondence with Sidonie Nádherný von Borutin that his approach to painting had the aim of a “total spiritualization (vollkommene Vergeistigung) of matter...a total fusion of matter with spirit (Geist), blurring the remnants of the tangible object.” In this sense his art and its development during the Munich years were closely linked to the original artistic program of Franz Marc, Wassily Kandinsky, and the Blue Rider.

---

73 Albert Bloch: The American Blue Rider, p.204.
Because of constant financial crises and the intrusion of the world war, Bloch’s years in Munich were difficult. Yet during that time Bloch had gained access to the circle of Blue Rider artists and the bohemian intellectuals of the Café Stefanie. Discussions covered the latest in art, music, and literature. Friendships formed, for which Bloch’s poetry provided content and context. Innovation was in the air. Munich competed with Berlin and Paris for originality in all disciplines. Bloch’s art, evident in his photographic “Record Books,” responded to this environment and gained an impressive degree of success. His exhibitions took place throughout Germany. In the postwar years, Munich became hostile to foreign residents. Bloch was intent on rejoining his family in the United States, where he had to establish a secure financial base. For many reasons, it was painful to leave Munich. He had formed an intimate relationship with Emmy Klinker, which had to be relegated to correspondence. Above all, he was abandoning his promising European career at a time of vibrant developments in modern art history.
Record Book I

Fig. 1. *Ragtime* 1911

Fig. 2. *Klowns* [Clowns] 1911

Fig. 3. *Porträt* [Portrait, also designated as a long-haired man] 1911

Fig. 4. *Knabenbildnis* [Portrait of a Boy] 1911

Fig. 5. *Porträt, Frl. v. B.* [Portrait of Miss von Bach] 1911

Fig. 6. *Fabrik, Dachau* [Factory Buildings in Dachau] 1911

Fig. 7. *Kreuztragung* [Procession of the Cross, also known as Compositional Study] 1911

Fig. 8. *Harlekinade* [Harlequinade] 1911

Fig. 9. *Harlekinade*, dritte, letzte Fassung [Harlequinade, third and last version] completed in 1915

Fig. 10. *Seiltänzer*, erster Versuch [Tightrope Walker, also designated as Slack Wire, first version] 1911

Fig. 11. *Seiltänzer* [Tightrope Walker] completed in 1914–1915 [original destroyed]

Fig. 12. *Häuser bei Nacht* [Houses at Night] 1911

Fig. 13. *Flötender Pierrot* [Piping Pierrot] 1912

Fig. 14. *Impression Sollnhafen* [Sollnhofen Impression] 1912 [original destroyed]

Fig. 15. *Tanz* [Dance] 1911–1912 [original destroyed]

Fig. 16. *Duell* [Duel] 1912

Fig. 17. *Porträt, F. F. L. Birrell, Esqr.* [Portrait of F. F. L. Birrell, Esqr.] 1912

Fig. 18. *Ringkampf* [Wrestling Match] 1912

Fig. 19. *Porträt, X. S. McC.* [Porträt of X(enia).S. McC(ouch)] 1913

Fig. 20. *Zeichnung zur Komposition Der tote Pierrot* [Drawing for the Composition of the The Dead Pierrot] 1913

Fig. 21. *Porträt M. S.* [Portrait of M. S.] 1913 [original destroyed]
Fig. 22. *Porträt: R. G.* [Portrait of R(aimund) G(eiger)] 1913

Fig. 23. *Knabenbildnis* “Der Knabe Johanns” [Youth Image: The Boy Johannes] 1913

Fig. 24. *Fries für ein Musikzimmer* [Frieze for a Music Room] 1915 [First four versions destroyed]

Fig. 25. *Bäume* [Trees] 1913

Fig. 26. *Bernard* [Bernard, first son of Albert Bloch] 1913

Fig. 27. *Radfahrer* [Bicyclist]

Fig. 28. *Landschaft* [Landscape] 1913

Fig. 29. *Garten: Nachts* [Garden at Night] 1913, partly painted over and completed in 1915

Fig. 30. *Scherzo* [Scherzo] 1913

Fig. 31. *Harlekin* [Harlequin] 1912–1913

Fig. 32. *Klowns III* [Clowns III] 1913 [probably destroyed]

Fig. 33. *Zum „Wahnsinn Lears“* [For the Scene of Lear’s Insanity] 1913 [original destroyed]

Fig. 34. *Sommer Nacht* [Summer Night] 1913

Fig. 35. *Klagelied* [Lamentation] 1912–1913

Fig. 36. *Boxkampf* [Prize Fight] 1912–1913

Fig. 37. *Winter* [Winter] 1912–1914

Fig. 38. *Im Walde* [In the Forest] 1914

Fig. 39. *Liegende Gestalt* [Reclining Figure] 1914

Fig. 40. *Stilleben III* [Still Life III] 1914

Fig. 41. *Harlekin mit drei Pierrots* [Harlequin with Three Pierrots] 1913–1914

Fig. 42. *Die Höhen* [The Peaks] 1913–1914

Fig. 43. *Porträt des Karikaturisten R.M.* [Portrait of the Caricaturist R(obert) M(inor)] 1914

Fig. 44. *Begräbnis* [Burial] 1914

Fig. 45. *Abenddämmerung* [Twilight] 1914

Fig. 46. *Klowns IV* [Clowns IV] 1914 [original destroyed]

Fig. 47. *Knieende Gestalten* [Kneeling Figures] 1914
Fig. 48. *Nacht II* [Night II] 1914

Fig. 49. *Frühling* [Spring] 1912–1914

Fig. 50. *Winter* [Winter] 1914

Fig. 51. *Porträt des Herrn A. M.* [Portrait of Mr. A. M.] 1914–1915

Fig. 52. *Der Garten im Mai* [Garden in May] 1915

Fig. 53. *Mai: der grüne Hügel* [May: The Green Hill] 1915

Fig. 54. *Gebirgsdorf* [Mountain Village] 1915

Fig. 55. *Blumenstück* [Picture of Flowers] 1915

Fig. 56. *Knabenkopf* [Head of a Youth] 1915

Fig. 57. *Gelbes Bild* [Yellow Picture] 1915

Fig. 58. *Stilleben* [Still Life] 1915

Fig. 59. *Sterbezimmer* [Room of the Dying] 1915–1916

Fig. 60. *Tageswende* [Dawn] 1915–1916 [original destroyed]

Fig. 61. *Gestalten auf dunklem Grund* [Figures on a Dark Background] 1915–1916

Fig. 62. *Gethsemane—Studie* [Gethsemane—Study] 1912

Fig. 63. *Kleines Aprilbild* [Small Picture of April] 1915 [original destroyed]

Fig. 64. *Fahnenjubel* [Flag Jubilation] 1915–1916 [original destroyed]

Fig. 65. *Vision eines Winternachmittages* [Vision of a Winter Afternoon] 1915

Fig. 66. *Sommerlandschaft* [Summer Landscape] 1916 [original destroyed]

Fig. 67. *Nacht IV* [Night IV] 1915–1916

Fig. 68. *Häuserreihe* [Row of Houses] 1916 [original probably destroyed]

Fig. 69. *Wegbiegung* [Diverging Road] 1916 [original probably destroyed]

Fig. 70. *Fichtenhügel* [Hill with Spruce Trees] 1916

Fig. 71. *Stilleben V* [Still Life V] 1916

Fig. 72. *Rote Villa* [Red Villa] 1916

Fig. 73. *Blume Sonne Schmetterling* [Flower Sun Butterfly] 1916

Fig. 74. *Dorfkirche* [Village Church] 1916
Fig. 75. *Stilleben VII*, goldrot [Still Life VII, gold/red] 1916

Fig. 76. *Die Sonne im unseren Zimmer* [The Sun in Our Room] 1916 [destroyed]

Fig. 77. *Gebirgstunnel* [Mountain Tunnel] 1916

Fig. 78. *Gartenstudie* [Garden Study] 1916 [repainted in the summer of 1921]

Fig. 79. *Gebirg* [Mountain Range] 1916

Fig. 80. *Boote* [Boats] 1916

Fig. 81. *Strasse mit Trauerfahnen* [Street with Flags of Mourning] 1916 [original destroyed]

Fig. 82. *Landschaft mit Vogelscheuche* [Landscape with Scarecrow] 1916–1917 [a copy for Campendonk]

Fig. 83. *Häusergruppe* [Group of Houses] 1916 [repainted in 1925]

Fig. 84. *Judaskuss* [Judas Kiss] 1913–1917 [probably destroyed]

Fig. 85. *Fabrik Nachts* [Factory at Night] 1916

Fig. 86. *Lastträger* [Men Burdened with Heavy Load] 1916 [original destroyed]

Fig. 87. *Die toten Bäume* [The Dead Trees] 1916 [a copy made for Campendonk]

Fig. 88. *Prozession im Schnee* [Procession in Snow] 1917 [repainted in 1928]

Fig. 89. *Die heilige Familie* [The Holy Family] 1916

Fig. 90. *Schnitter in einer Waldlichtung* (das grüne Bild) [Reapers in a Forest Clearing (the green picture)] 1916–1917 [a copy made for Campendonk. Original destroyed]

Fig. 91. *Nacht V* [Night V] 1917

Fig. 92. *Klosterbild* [Image of the Monastery] 1916–1917 [a copy made for Campendonk]
Record Book II

Fig. 93. Melting Snow 1916
Fig. 94. Rocky Landscape 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 95. Back Street 1917
Fig. 96. Little Winter Picture 1917 [original probably destroyed]
Fig. 97. Village on the Hillside 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 98. Chickens 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 99. Garden Nook 1917 [repainted in summer 1921]
Fig. 100. Night in the Valley 1917
Fig. 101. Deserted Village 1917 [Original destroyed]
Fig. 102. Little Chapel under the Hill 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 103. Deserted Villa 1917
Fig. 104. A Good Friday Landscape 1917 [repainted in 1925]
Fig. 105. Hilly Landscape 1917
Fig. 106. In the Village 1917 [repainted in 1925]
Fig. 107. The Mill 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 108. Impromptu I 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 109. Still Life IX 1917
Fig. 110. Hills and River 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 111. The Suburb 1917
Fig. 112. Still Life X 1917
Fig. 113. Breakfast Table 1917
Fig. 114. Mountain Lake 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 115. Christmas Morning 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 116. Still Life XI 1917
Fig. 117. The Red Wine Drinkers 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 118. Wayfarers 1917–1918 [original destroyed]
Fig. 119. Flight into Egypt 1917–1918
Fig. 120. Peasants Sleeping 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 121. The Good Samaritan 1917 [original destroyed]
Fig. 122. Blind Beggar 1918
Fig. 123. Man with Flowers 1917–1918
Fig. 124. Bucolic Scene 1918
Fig. 125. Saturday Evening 1918 [original destroyed]
Fig. 126. Woodland Idyll 1918
Fig. 127. Factory Town 1918 [original destroyed]
Fig. 128. Still Life XII 1918
Fig. 129. Garden on the Lake 1918
Fig. 130. Adoration 1917–1918 [original destroyed]
Fig. 131. Blind Soldier and Butterflies 1918 [original destroyed]
Fig. 132. Lakeside 1918 [unfinished, original destroyed]
Fig. 133. Winter Morning 1918
Fig. 134. Sunday Afternoon 1918
Fig. 135. Man at Table 1918 [original destroyed]
Fig. 136. Winter 1918
Fig. 137. The Garden of Asses 1918
Fig. 138. The Witches 1918
Fig. 139. Somnambulist 1918
Fig. 140. From My Window. Ascona 1919
Color Plates

Albert Bloch Foundation Collection

Pl. 1. Porträt 1911
Pl. 2. Still Life, Bannanas & Apple 1911
Pl. 3. Self-Portrait 1911
Pl. 4. Knabenbildnis. Der Knabe Johannes May 30, 1912, “Record Book” date: 1913
Pl. 5. Portrait of Woman Reading [Xenia S. McCouch] 1912 or 1913
Pl. 6. Portrait of Woman in Pink ca. 1913
Pl. 7. Im Walde 1914

Private Collection

Pl. 8. Still Life, New Year 1920
Note from the authors:

Images of Albert Bloch’s paintings are included only in the printed edition of the book. The printed edition is available through Jayhawk Ink.
Appendix

Record of Exhibitions

1. *Berliner Sezession*, Twelfth Exhibition, *Ausstellungsraum*
   Kurfürstendamm, 1911.
   *Bildnis*

2. *Der Blaue Reiter*, Tannhauser Gallery, Munich, December 18, 1911 to January 1, 1912.
   *Harlekinade* (Fig. 8)
   *Häuser und Schornsteine*
   *Kreuztragung* (Fig. 7)
   *Eine Hamletkomposition*
   *Die drei Pierrots Nr. 2*
   *Kopf*

   *Studien I-VIII*

4. *Der Sturm, Der Blaue Reiter / Oskar Kokoschka*, First Exhibition (Herwarth Walden), Berlin, March–April 1912.

5.–15. Before the traveling Blue Rider exhibition traveled to Berlin, it was shown in Cologne, Gereonsklub (ca. 20–31 January 1912). Despite minor changes, the exhibition catalog of Munich was used, subsequently in Bremen, Vereinigte Werkstätten für Kunst im Handwerk (April 27 – end of May 1912); Hagen, Museum Folkwang (July 1912); Frankfurt, Kunstsalon Marcel Goldschmidt (August 28–middle of September 1912); Hamburg, Salon Louis Bock & Sohn (September 14–end of October); Budapest, Művész ház (May 1913); Oslo, Blomqvists kunstsalong (January 1914); Helsinki, Salon Strindberg (February 14–March 9, 1914); Trondheim, Kunstforening (April 1914); Göteborg, Olsens Konsthandel (June–July 1914). In Berlin, Bloch is reported to have shown seven pictures, of which three
were different from the ones shown originally in Munich. A letter of Gabrielle Münter indicates the prices of Bloch’s paintings to be exhibited in Hagen: *Harlekinade*–600 M; *Häuser und Schornsteine*–400 M; *Kreuzeilragung*–300 M; *Eine Hamletkomposition*–600 M; *Die drei Pierrots* – 300, *Kopf*–150 M. Christine Hopfengart, *Der Blaue Reiter* (Cologne: Dumont, 2000), pp. 49–82. I am grateful to Vivian Barnett for information about exhibitions in which Bloch took part.


*Duell*

(Other exhibiting artists: Van Gogh, Cézanne, Matisse, Gauguin, Picasso, Derain, Kokoschka, Munch, Barlach, Macke, Nolde, Bolz, et al.)

17. *Der Sturm, Expressionisten*. Fourth Exhibition (Herwarth Walden), Berlin, October 1912.*


*Ragtime*
*Porträt R. A.*
*Knabenbildnis*
*Karneval*
*Porträt P. L.*
*Knabe mit Apfelsine*
*Häuser*
*Porträt Frl. v. B.*
*Stilleben*
*Die Fabrik*
*Kleine Landschaft*
*Fabrik*
*Fabrikansicht*
*Häuser mit Turm*
*Kreuzeilragung*
*Pierrot*
*Kopf*
*Seiltänzer*
*Häuser bei Nacht*
*Porträt Frl. M.*
*Hamlet Komposition*
*Harlekinade*
*Aktstudien*
*Die drei Pierrots*
*Der Tänzer Sacharoff*
*Duell*
*Entwurf zur Komposition*
*Porträt Birrell*
Ringkampf
Pantomime
Stilleben [untitled]
Clowns
Toter Pierrot
Gethsemane, Studie
Damenbildnis
Das grüne Gewand
Porträt Murray Sheeban
Porträt R. Geiger


Stilleben [untitled]
Der tote Pierrot
Harlekin
Bildnisstudie [drawing]
Skizze zum Ringkampf [Sketch for the Prize Fight]

(Other exhibiting artists: Max Ernst, Lyonel Feininger, Marc Chagall, Alexei von Jawlensky, Wassily Kandinsky, Paul Klee, Alfred Kubin, Franz Marc, Marianne von Werefkin, Hans Arp, Hanns Bolz, Gordon M. McCouch [with the painting Gewitter], etc.)

20. Solo Exhibition, *Der Sturm*, Twentieth Exhibition (Herwarth Walden), Berlin, December 1913.

Ragtime
Porträt R. A.
Kanbenbildnis
Clownbild I (1911)
Porträt P. L.
Knabe mit Apfelsine
Porträt Frü. v. B.
Stilleben [untitled]
Die Fabrik
Kleine Landschaft
Fabrikansicht
Kreuztragung
Kopf
Seiltänzer
Häuser bei Nacht
Porträt Frü. M.
Duell
Porträt Mr. Birrell
Pantomine
Clownbild II (1912)
Gethsemane (Studie)
From the *Berliner Börsenkurier*, December 25, 1913: “Die zwanzigste Ausstellung des *Sturm* bringt vor allem eine größere Anzahl von Bildern des bisher unbekannten Malers Albert Bloch, dessen Namen man sich jedoch wird merken müssen. . . .” [The twentieth exhibition of the *Sturm* presents, above all, a large number of paintings of the previously unknown artist Albert Bloch, whose name will be one to remember. . . ] This exhibit also showed two works by Pablo Picasso and one by Franz Marc, next to those by Bloch.


*Boxkampf*
*Clownbild*

22. Exhibitions in Chicago and St. Louis, organized by Arthur Jerome Eddy in July 1915.

*Still Life*
*The Wrestlers*
*Boy with an Orange*
*Factories*
*Lamentation*
*Pantomime*
*Prize Fight*
*Clowns II*
*Kneeling Figures*
*Portrait: F. F. L. Birrell*
*Scherzo*
Harlequin
Portrait: Fräulein von B.
Summer Night
The Dancer Sach[a]roff
Landscape
Reclining Figure
Night II
Rocks: Song I
The Green Domino
Spring: Song II
Portrait: Robert Minor, American Illustrator
Night I
Three Pierrots and Harlequin
Peaks

In the catalogue to this exhibition Eddy commented on the paintings: About Night I (today in the Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco): “[It] is almost a pure creation of the imagination as well as a beautiful composition of line and color. It is, as a matter of fact, a synthesis of Bloch’s impressions of Munich by night, a summary of things he saw and felt during his wanderings about the city; it is vision on vision, dream on dream, a composite of hundred glimpses, the fusion of a hundred impressions; it represents no part of the city, but is the city by night.”

23. Der Sturm, Expressionismus, Thirty-sixth Exhibition (Herwarth Walden), Brandenburg-Havel, with Franz Marc, Gabriele Münter, Heinrich Campendonk, and others, December 1915.

Bildnis-Studie
Skizze zum Ringkampf
Stilleben
Aus einem Garten
Farbige Vorbereitung: Begräbnis
Zu den Klowns IV
Farbige Notiz zum “Frühling”: Der Hügel und der Baum
Zu einem “Klownbild”
Illustration
Harlekin
Der Boxkampf (Entwurf)


Fries zu einem Musikzimmer (1910–1915)
Garten: Nachts (1913)
Klowns IV (1914)
Winter (1914)
Vorbereitung zur Komposition: Begräbnis (1914)
Stilleben
Mai: Der Grüne Hügel (1914)
Der Garten im Mai (1915)
Gelbes Bild (1915)
Bloch wrote in a letter on March 1916 to Herwarth Walden: “Die Zeitungausschnitte sind heute angekommen. Ich danke Ihnen. Allerdings haben sie mir keine Freude gemacht. Würden Sie bereit sein, von mir eine Verwahrung gegen die Berliner Kritik im Sturm abzudrucken? Es ist mir unerträglich so im Gegensatz zu Paul Klee gelobt zu werden. Ich möchte mich dagegen öffentlich auflehnen.” [The newspaper clippings arrived today. Thank you. They did not make me happy, to be sure. Would you be willing to print my reservations about the Berlin reviews in Sturm? It is unbearable for me to be praised in contrast to Paul Klee in such a way. I would like to take exception in a public forum.]

Walden agreed to print Bloch’s letter, adding that Bloch’s paintings gave him the right to object; they were beyond the reach of the reviewer’s praise (“über jenes Lob erhaben.”)


Sterbezimmer
Gestalten auf dunklem Grund


Gebirgsdorf

27. Neue Sezession, Munich, 1916

Winter, 1914


Radfahrer / Fragment (1914)
Vision eines Winternachmittags (1915)

Works of 1916–1917:

Sommerlandschaft
Fichtenhügel
Kleines Aprilbild
Wegbiegung
Dorfkirche
Rote Villa
Gartenstudie
Landschaft mit Vogelscheuche
Die Sonne im weißen Zimmer
Blumen, Sonne, Schmetterling
Stilleben/Goldrot
Gebirgstunnel
Boote
Kleines Stilleben
Schneeschmelze
Gebirg
Dunkle Landschaft
Straße im Trauerfahren
Das Kloster
Heilige Familie
Schnittier in einer Waldlichtung
Lastträger
Prozession im Schnee
Nacht V
Notizen zu drei Nachtbildern

Aquarelle [watercolor]:

Häuser
Gebirge
Kirche auf dem Hügel
Häuser Nachts

30. Der Sturm, Fifty-third Exhibition, comprehensive retrospective (Herwarth Walden), Berlin, June 1917.

Kirche auf dem Hügel, Aquarell

31. Der Sturm, Corray Gallery, Basel (Herwarth Walden), February–March 1917.

Clown IV
Sterbezimmer

32. Kunstsalon Ludwig Schames, Frankfurt am Main, exhibition with Stanislaus Stückgold, July 1917.

Kleine Landschaft (1911)
Bahnviadukt (1913)
Landschaft (1913)
Radfahrer (Fragment) (1914)
Häuserstudie (1914)
Judaskuß (1914)
Vision eines Winternachmittags (1915)
Kleines Aprilbild (1915)
Sommerlandschaft (1916)
Fichtenhügel (1916)
Wegbiegung (1916)
Dorfkirche (1916)
Rote Villa (1916)
Gartenstudie (1916)
Landschaft mit Vogelscheuche (1916)
Die Sonne im weißen Zimmer (1916)
Stilleben (goldrot) (1916)
Gebirgstunnel (1916)
Boote (1916)
Vorstadthäuser (1916)
Fabrik Nachts (1916)
Stilleben mit Flasche (1916)
Kleines Stilleben (1916)
Schneeschmelze (1916)
Gebirg (1916)
Dunkle Landschaft (1916)
Strasse mit Trauerfahnen (1916)
Die toten Bäume (1916)
Heilige Familie (1917)
Schnitter in Waldlichtung (1917)
Lastträger (1917)
Prozession im Schnee (1917)
Nacht V (1917)
Kirche am Abhang (1917)
Sackgasse (1917)
Kirchhof im Gebirg (1917)


Häuser Nachts (watercolor)
Gebirge (watercolor)
Die Uhren (watercolor)
Notizen zu Nachtbildern (pen-and-ink drawing)
Garten im Mai (drawing)
Klosterbild (drawing)
Sonne, Schmetterling und Blumen (drawing)
Die toten Bäume (drawing)
Vorstadtbild I (drawing)
Nacht V (drawing)
Frühlingsblatt (drawing)
Hohe Mauer (drawing)
Petersturm (drawing)
Winterlandschaft (drawing)
Boskett (drawing)
Villenkolonie (drawing)
Eckhäuser (drawing)

34. Solo Exhibition, Kunsthaus, Das Reich, Munich, March 15–April 15, 1918.

Sommerlandschaft
Fichtenhügel
Gartenstudie
Landschaft mit Vogelscheuche
Die Sonne im weißen Zimmer
Blumen, Sonne, Schmetterling
Gebirgstunnel
Boote
Schneeschmelze
Gebirg
Dunkle Landschaft
Straße im Trauerfahnen
Schnitter in einer Waldlichtung
Prozession im Schnee
Kirche am Abhang
Kirchhof im Gebirge
Stilleben V (Flaschen)
Winterbildchen
Dorf am Abhang
Eine Karfreitaglandschaft
Stilleben IX (Pflanzen)
Fluss und Berge
Impromptu
Im Dorf
Brücke in einer Landschaft
Weihnachtstag
Vorstadtbild
Gebirgsee
Verlassenses Dorf
Gartenecke
Stilleben XI
Die beiden Trinker
Landstreicher
Flucht nach Ägypten
Barmherziger Samariter
Blumenmann
Schlafende Bauer
Blinder Bettler


*Clownarabeske IV (1914)*
*Kleines Aprilbild (1915)*
*Lastträger (1916)*
*Stilleben VII (goldrot) (1916)*
*Schnitter in der Waldlichtung (1916)*
*Straße mit Trauerfahnen (1916)*
*Gebirg (1916)*
*Stilleben V (Flaschen) (1916)*
*Wegbiegung (1916)*
*Blumen, Sonne, Schmetterling (1916)*
*Sonne im weißen Zimmer (1916)*
*Sommerlandschaft (1916)*
*Landschaft mit der Vogelscheuche (1916)*
*Fabrik Nachts (1916)*
*Gartenstudie (1916)*
*Fichtenhügel (1916)*
*Gartenecke (1916)*
*Boote (1916)*
*Gebirgstunnel (1916)*
*Prozession im Schnee (1916)*
*Kirchhof im Gebirg (1917)*
*Fluß und Berge (1917)*
*Kirche am Abhang (1917)*
*Brücke in einer Landschaft (1917)*
*Stilleben IX (Pflanzen) (1917)*
*Impromptu (1917)*
*Dorf am Abhang (1917)*
*Winterbildchen (1917)*
*Hühnerbild (1917)*
*Vorstadtbild (1917)*
*Im Dorf (1917)*
*Karfreitagslandschaft (1917)*
*Weihnachten (1917)*
*Verlassenes Dorf (1917)*
*Stilleben IX (Kakteen) (1917)*
*Landstreicher (1917/1918)*
*Die beiden Trinker (1917/1918)*
*Winter (1918)*
*Barmherziger Samariter (1918)*
*Schlaflende Bauern (1918)*
*Legende (1918)*
*Seeufer (1918)*
Sonntag (1918)
Mann am Tische (1918)
Der Eselgarten (1918)
Nachtwandlerin (1918)
Blinder Bettler (1918)
Fabrikstadt (1918)
Gebirgsee (1918)
Garten am See (1918)
Hexenbild (1918)
Feierabend (1918)
Blinder Soldat unter Schmetterlingen (1917/1918)
Felsen (1916)
Scheeschmelze (1915)
Anbetung (1917/1918)
Heilige Familie (1916)
Rote Villa (1916)
Judaskuß (1913/1916)
Am Teetisch (1917)
Stilleben XII mit dem Vogel (1918)

Aquarelle [watercolor]

Gebirg
Bauern
Die Uhren
Droschke
Fischer
Fabrikstadt
Zigeuner
Häuser Nachts
Harlekin
Eisenbahnbrücke und Häuser
Blinder Soldat unter Schmetterlingen
Blumenmann
Blinder Bettler
Rastende
Am Ofen

Federzeichnungen [pen drawings]

Federzeichnung zum “Tanz”
Feierabend
Nachtwandlerin
Invalid
Sonntag
Anbetung
Mann am Tisch
Garten im Mai
Nacht V
Clownarabeske IV*
Winterlandschaft
Frühlingsblatt
Stilleben
Klosterbild
Vorstadt V
Landschaft
Hohe Mauer
Die toten Bäume
Petersturm

Tuschzeichnungen [pen-and-ink drawings]

Faustkampf
Bildnisstudie
Skizze zum Ringkampf
Notizen zu drei Nachtbildern
Gestalt zwischen Häusern

Radierungen [etchings]

Drei Gestalten
Das Duell
Musik
Clownarabeske II

(Der Weg, February 1919: “Albert Bloch’s sensitive differentiation and complexity begins to reveal itself in works of unusual power. In the watercolor The Fisher he achieves a high degree of clarity, which this work shows effectively. Some of the work reflects play and a wavering, but, on the whole, the content of this torn and divided world, filled with fear, contradiction, and tortured brooding, there is an expectation and hope of a positive fulfillment.”* Cf. Fig. 46.


Gebirgsee
Die Nachtwandlerin


Legende

**Radierungen** [etchings]

*Musik*
*Clownarabeske II*

**Zeichnungen** [drawings]

*Stilleben*
*Vorstadt I*
*Petersturm*
*Winterlandschaft*
*Clownarabeske IV*
*Frühlingsblatt*
*Nacht*
*Die toten Bäume*
*Klosterbild*
*Bildnistudie*

**Aquarelle** [watercolor]

*Blumenmann*
*Blinder Soldat*
*Harlekin*
*Eisenbahnbrücke mit Hausern*

**Gemälde** [paintings]

*Blinder Soldat*
*Anbetung*
*Stilleben mit Flaschen*
*Im Dorf 1917*
*Stilleben XII mit dem Vogel*
*Sonne in weißem Zimmer*
*Schlafend Bauern*
*Rote Villa*
*Barmherziger Samariter*
*Kirche am Abhang (1917)*
*Mann am Tisch*
*Brücke in Landschaft (1917)*
*Gartenstudie (1916)*
*Blumen, Sonne, Schmetterling*
*Karfreitagslandschaft*
*Vorstadtbild (1917)*
*Heilige Familie*
*Am Teetisch*
Winterbildchen (1917)
Blinder Bettler
Hühnerbild (1917)
Schnitter in der Waldlichtung
Waldlegende
Feierabend
Sonntag
Landstreicher (1918)
Fabrikstadt
Seeufer
Kirchhof im Gebirge
Gebirgsee
Stilleben (1917)


Paintings:

*L’heure de la mort* [The Hour of Death]
*La nuit* [Night]

41. Solo Exhibition, Daniel Gallery, New York, November–December 1921.

*Saturday Evening* (1918)
*Factory Town* (1918)
*Blind Beggar* (1918)
*Man at Table* (1918)
*Sleeping Peasants* (1918)
*Still Life, No. 12* (1918)
*Winter Vision* (1918)
*Woodland Idyll* (1918)
*Night in the Garden* (1920)
*Doorway* (1920)
*On the Highway* (1920)
*Veranda* (1920)
*Motley* (1920)
*Summer Vision* (1916–1921)
*Cards* (1921)
*Rain* (1917–1921)
*Hamlet* (1921)
*White Cottage* (1921)
*Group of Three* (1921)
*Winter* (1921)
42. Exhibition of paintings from the Collection of the late Arthur Jerome Eddy, 1922.

Night I, 1913
Summer Night, 1913
Garden in May, 1915
Hillside, 1915
Factory Chimneys, 1911
Lamentation, 1912–1913
Three Pierrots and Harlequin, 1914
Index of Names
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Images of Albert Bloch’s paintings are included only in the printed edition of the book. The printed edition is available through Jayhawk Ink.
Melting Snow, 35, Fig. 93. Cf. Schneeschmelze
The Mill, Fig. 107
Motley, 208
Mountain Lake, 35, Fig. 114
Mountain Village, 23, 33
Musik, 7, 206, 207
Nacht II, 32, Fig. 48
Nacht IV, 33, Fig. 67
Nacht V, 26, 34, 201, 202, 205, Fig. 91
Nachtwanderin, 205, 206
Night II, 32, 33, 199. Cf. Nacht II
Night in the Garden, 208
Night in the Valley, 35, Fig. 100
Notizen zu drei Nachtbildern, 201, 206
On the Highway, 208
Pantomime, 197, 198
Peaks, 32, 199. Cf. Die Höhen
Peasants Sleeping, 36, Fig. 120. Cf.
Schlafende Bauern
Pierrot, 22, 31, 196
Porträt, 31, Fig. 3, Pl. 1
Porträt des Herrn A. M., Fig. 51
Porträt des Karikaturisten R. M., Fig. 43
Porträt E. W., 198
Porträt, F. F. L. Birrell, Esqr., 31, 196, 198, Fig. 17
Porträt Fr. M., 196, 197
Porträt Fr. v. B., 196, 18, 197, 199, Fig. 5
Porträt Murray Sheeban, 31, 197, 198, Fig 21
Porträt P. L., 196, 197
Porträt R. Geiger, 31, 197, 198, Fig. 22
Porträt R. A., 196, 197
Portrait of the Man with Hat, 6
Portrait of Woman in Pink, Pl. 6
Portrait of Woman Reading [Xenia S. McCouch], 21, 37, Fig. 19, Pl. 5
Portrait: Robert Minor, 199
Prize Fight, 7, 32, 197
Prozession im Schnee, 34, 201, 202, 203, 204, Fig. 88
Radfahrer (Fragment), 201
Radfahrer, 32, 198, 200, 201, Fig. 27
Ragtime, 31, 196, 197, Fig. 1
Rain, 208
Reclining Figure, 32, 199
Red Village, 29. Cf. Rote Villa
The Red Wine Drinkers, 35, Fig. 117
Ringkampf, 31, 197, Fig. 18. Cf. The Wrestlers
Rocks: Song I, 199
Rocky Landscape, Fig. 94
Rote Villa, 29, 33, 201, 202, 205, 207, Fig. 72. Cf. Red Village
Sackgasse, 202
Sach[...]roff. Cf. The Dancer Sach[...]roff, 199
Saturday Evening, 36, 208, Fig. 125
Scherzo, 32, 198, Fig. 30
Schlafende Bauern, 203, 204. Cf. Sleeping Peasants
Schneeschmelze, 201, 202, 203, 205. Cf Melting Snow
Schnitter in einer Waldlichtung, 25, 34, 201, 202, 203, 204, Fig. 90
Seeufer, 204, 208. Cf. Seeufer
Seiltänzer, 31, 196, 197, Fig. 11
Self-Portrait, 37, Pl. 3
Skizze zum Ringkampf, 197, 199, 206
Sleeping Peasants, 208. Cf. Schlafende Bauer
Sommerlandschaft, 33, 200, 202, 203, 204, Fig. 66
Sommernacht [Sommer Nacht], 32, 198, Fig. 34
Somnambulist, 36, Fig. 139
Sonne im weißen Zimmer, 201, 202, 203, 204, 207. Cf. Die Sonne im unseren Zimmer
Die Sonne im unseren Zimmer, 33, Fig. 76
Sonntag, 208. Cf. 205
Spring: Song II, 199
Sterbezimmer, 33, 200, 201, Fig. 59
Still Life, 6, 28, 196–208. Cf. Stilleben
Still Life IX, 35, Fig. 109
Still Life X, 35, Fig. 112
Still Life XI, 35, Fig. 116
Still Life XII, 28, 36, 208, Fig. 128
Still Life, Bananas & Apple, 37, Pl. 2
Still Life, New Year, 37, Pl. 8
Stilleben [untitled], 28, 33, 197, 198, Fig. 58
Stilleben (goldrot), 201, 202
Stilleben III, Fig. 40
Stilleben V, mit Flaschen, 33, 202, 203, 204, 207, Fig. 71
Stilleben VII (goldrot), 33, 204. Cf. Fig. 75
Stilleben IX (Kakteen), 204
Stilleben IX (Pflanzen), 203, 204
Stilleben XI, 203, 205, 207
Stilleben XII mit dem Vogel, 36, 205, 207
Stilleben, 196–208
Strasse mit Trauerfahnen, 25, 26, 34, 201–204, Fig. 81
Ströme im Wald, 198
Studien I-VIII, 195
The Suburb, 29, 35, Fig. 111. Cf. Vorstadt
Summer Night, 32, 199, 209. Cf. Sommernacht
Summer Vision, 208
Sunday Afternoon, 36, Fig. 134
Tageswende, 26, 33, 200, Fig. 60
Tanz, 31, Fig. 15
Der Tänzer Sacharoff, 196. Cf. The Dancer Sach[...]roff
Three Pierrots and Harlequin, 199, 209. Cf. Harlekin mit drei Pierrots
Der tote Pierrot, 31, 197
Die toten Bäume, 34, 202, 206, 207, Fig. 87
Veranda, 208
Verlassenes Dorf, 203, 204. Cf. Deserted Village
Village on the Hillside, 35, Fig. 97. Cf. Dorf am Abhang
Vision eines Winternachmittags, 33, 200, 202, Fig. 65
Vorstadt, 29, 206, 207. Cf. The Suburb
Vorstadtbild, 202, 203, 204, 207
Vorstadthäuser, 202
Der Wahnsinn Lears, 198. Cf. Zum „Wahnsinn Lears“, Waldlegende, 208
Wayfarers, 36, Fig. 118
Wegbiegung, 33, 201, 202, 204, Fig. 69
Weihnachten, 204
Weihnachtstag, 203. Cf. Christmas Morning
Winter, 32, 33, 35, 36, 199, 200, 204, 208, Fig. 37, Fig. 50, Fig. 136
White Cottage, 208
Winter Morning, 36, Fig. 133
Winter Vision, 208
Winterbildchen, 203, 204, 208
The Witches, 36, Fig. 138
Woodland Idyll, 36, 208, Fig. 126. Cf. Waldlegende
The Wrestlers, 198. Cf. Ringkampf
Zeichnung zur Komposition Der tote Pierrot, 31, Fig. 20
Zu den Klowns IV, 199
Zu einem Klownbild, 199
Zum „Wahnsinn Lears“, 22, 32, Fig. 33. Cf. Der Wahnsinn Lears