

Munch, Przybyszewski and *The Scream*

Abstract

‘The king of the Bohemia’, a Polish-German writer Stanisław Przybyszewski was the first to consistently promote the work of Edvard Munch. His article ‘Psychical Naturalism’ and his anthology *The Work by Edvard Munch* (1894) became implicitly the first theory of Expressionism and started research into Munch’s work. Przybyszewski’s novel *The Scream* (1917/18) and his memoirs *My Contemporaries* (1926), similar to his early essays on Munch’s masterpiece, build an important context toward its interpretation and open the epoch of its trans-medial popularisation in word and image.

Keywords

The Scream

Stanisław Przybyszewski

Edvard Munch

Expressionism

Synaesthesia

Lidia Głuchowska

ligl@wp.pl

*Munch recorded Stanisław Przybyszewski’s demonic physiognomy many times, not only in portraits but also in such figure compositions as In the Man’s Brain, Man’s Head in Woman’s Hair, Jealousy or Virgin Creeper. And not without reason; Przybyszewski was known in Berlin as the “king of Bohemia” and more ambiguously as the “German satanist” as well as (after Strindberg) “the ingenious Pole”.¹ His book from 1894 was also considered genial. It was the first monograph devoted to Munch, who at that time was appreciated by few.² Munch’s paintings and Przybyszewski’s monograph, which initiated the research on Munch, opened in 1893 the “expressionist epoch”, which was closed by Przybyszewski’s most distinguished novel – *The Scream* (1914–18) – and by his memoirs (1926), which contain a mythologized genesis of Munch’s most famous work and recount the writer’s visits to Norway.³ This article will present how during this epoch several (pre)expressionist works in word and image were created, which confirmed both the transmedial career of Munch’s *The Scream* and Przybyszewski’s writings concerning the Norwegian artist’s oeuvre.*

Manifestoes of pre-expressionism

In December 1893, in a letter to Franz Servaes, Przybyszewski wrote that he was engrossed in a text about Munch as a psychological problem. What he had in mind was his debut as an art critic – the “Psychical Naturalism”.⁴ This study should be viewed in the context of the “Munch Affair”, as it was dubbed, the scandal in 1892 in which Munch’s paintings were withdrawn from an exhibition at the Berlin Art Association (Berliner Kunstverein) after a week. In response, Munch organized an individual exhibition at the end of 1892 on the private premises of the Equitable-Palais and in 1893 the next one on 19 Unter den Linden Street. Przybyszewski’s article referred in particular to the 1893 exhibition, dur-



Ill. 1 Artur Maria Swinarski: *Portrait of Stanisław Przybyszewski*, c. 1918/1919. Woodcut, c. 14.5 x 15.5 cm. From *Zdrój*, 1919, vol. 8, cover of the issue 9/10. Courtesy S. Karol Kubicki (Berlin).

ing which Munch presented his first version of *The Scream (Doubt)* for the first time.⁵

The critical-aesthetic study contains elements of Przybyszewski's philosophical program exemplified by

subjective descriptions of Munch's paintings. It is an explanation of the "naked soul" theory described earlier in *On the Psychology of the Individual* (1892) and in *Requiem Mass* (1893), according to which unawa-



Ill. 2. Stefan Szmaj of Stanisław Przybyszewski, c. 1918. Linocut, 16.1 x 12 cm. Courtesy S. Karol Kubicki (Berlin).

renewal, irrationality and uncontrolled intuition constitute the correct sense of life and of artistic cognition.⁶ Przybyszewski questions here the criteria used in 1892 by the Berlin critics, who in their reviews described Munch's paintings as daubery ("Schmierereien"). Instead, "the ingenious Pole" saw in them painted specimens of the soul (of "états d'âmes") and an anticipation of expressionism. He later modified his article, and together with his own introduction and texts by Franz Servaes, Willy Pastor and Julius Meier-Graefe he published it in a book, *The Works of Edvard Munch*, in 1894. According to Przybyszewski's contemporaries, none of the other articles were comparable to his ingenious interpretation, in which he was the first to recognize the innovative style of Munch as revolutionary and to present the first consistently formal analysis of his works.⁷ In his apologetic study, Przybyszewski called the commonly criticized Norwegian painter an aristocrat of the spirit, a great visionary and a genius.

He was also the first to recognize the overall design of the series, and the coherent subject matter which was the germ of "The Frieze of Life", when he analyzed the paintings *The Voice*, *The Vampire*, *The Kiss*, *Madonna*, *Melancholy* and – what is of particular significance in this context – *The Scream*.⁸

Przybyszewski created a masterpiece of the empathic exegesis as he managed to present Munch's work in a synthetic way, describing all its painterly components: the topic, the mood and the form. He reached *à rebours* for the whole repertoire of categories to which other reviewers referred when they criticized the artist: fragmentarism, *non finito*, the lack of form, controversial subject matter, gaudy colors, an ambition to express the truth, the tabooing of beauty, and *novum* as the contemporary determinant of art.⁹ In that way he implicitly formulated the first theory of expressionism and recognized the direction towards which Munch's art would evolve in the years to follow.¹⁰ And Julius Hart, a representative of the Berlin Bohemia, stated that Przybyszewski himself "appeared as [...] one of the first pioneers of the expressionist art".¹¹

With unique intuition Przybyszewski also noticed the value of the subjective, anti-naturalist usage of color in Munch's paintings, and he used the formula of an "absolute correlate" to describe the central constructionist rule of his art, which is nowadays called substantial color ("Substanzfarbe")¹² – a mean of the direct, medium-less expression. He stated: "All previous painters were in effect painters of the external world. [...] Munch has broken utterly with this tradition. He attempts to present psychological phenomena immediately through colour. He paints in the way that only the naked 'individuality' can perceive once its eyes have turned away from the world of external appearances and peered instead within." He called Munch a naturalist of spiritual phenomena *par excellence*, who entered new areas of art, having neither predecessors nor tradition apart from that of literature. When Przybyszewski described Munch's paintings as "creative products of somnambular and transcendental consciousness", he also accentuated their fragmentary character.¹³ He did it even more vividly in his book *On the Paths of the Soul* (1897/1900), where he stated that Munch painted memories, visions, preparations of

moments in the state in which the brain's consciousness is substituted by another consciousness – the consciousness of the soul.¹⁴ In the first version of his essay, he pointed at the synthetism of his imaginative painting, in which thoughts and events are reproduced as memories of facts from years ago. It corresponded with the artist's famous self-appraisal, "I do not paint what I see but what I saw". In the second version of his text, however, Przybyszewski erased this passage to stress the quality of direct, spontaneous expression and to avoid associations with symbolism. That interpretation of Munch's art is sometimes regarded as anticipating Sigmund Freud's idea, as well as its relationship with the concepts of Max Stirner, Ernst Jung and Jacques Lacan.¹⁵ The concept of the "naked soul" ("nacktes Individuum") is highly significant in this text, as it is in all of the early writings by "the ingenious Pole". It pertains to the basic philosophies of his times – the ideas of Arthur Schopenhauer, Henri Bergson or Friedrich Nietzsche. But Przybyszewski reversed the rating scale, similar to Max Nordau – what was abnormal ("Entartung") was regarded as ingenious.¹⁶

In *On the Paths of the Soul*, Przybyszewski contrasted the creative method of Munch with that of Max Liebermann, who in his opinion painted nature *sans phrase*, careless of sensual expression and envoy. He reproached Liebermann (who represented in his opinion *Gehirnkunst* – art of the brain) for being a naturalist who grew up on technicist Americanism, a lack of ideas, haste and photography, who as a result does not surrender to ecstasy and imagination, but was just a substitute for him. On the other hand, Munch – who according to Przybyszewski represented next to Gustav Vigeland the art of the soul ("Seelenkunst") – painted fever and vision. He imagined nature forgetting about "objective" reality. He did not tend to create optical (mechanical) illusions but made transformations under the influence of certain emotional states.¹⁷ Przybyszewski saw the first version of *The Scream (Doubt)* as a visualization of a macrocosmic battle between the brain and sexuality, out of which the latter has won.¹⁸

Munch himself declared that Przybyszewski's article precisely discerned the impressionist-expressionist breakthrough in his oeuvre, acting as a kind of spark



Ill. 3 Artur Maria Swinarski: *Scream*, c. 1918. Linocut, c. 19 x 16.5 cm. From *Zdrój*, 1918, vol. IV, p. 169. Courtesy S. Karol Kubicki (Berlin).

for his painting career.¹⁹ Przybyszewski's study of Munch was issued eight times in various forms and in different countries, opening the way for the artist to Central and Eastern Europe,²⁰ so that contemporaries could describe the aura common to their art as "narcosis à la Munch and Przybyszewski".²¹

The mystified genesis of the picture

In 1926, when recalling the circumstances of the creation of the "Psychical Naturalism" essay (which was the origin of his monograph *The Works of Edvard Munch*), Przybyszewski (re)interpreted it in the following way:

When my study of Munch showed up, the whole literary fraternity was convinced that I'd lost my mind. Munch came up to me greatly moved: "I'm terrified that somebody is eavesdropping on me in my most secret, creative moments, but I've also

eavesdropped on you.” The next day he showed me his famous painting, which I now constantly see in books on futurism: *Skrig* – *The Scream*.

Przybyszewski thus described his friendship with Munch as a relationship in which they both considered each other as their *alter ego*.²² In another passage in his memoirs, he even suggested that his rhapsody from 1893 anticipated and inspired Munch’s painting: “I can’t imagine that you could transform a literary work in color in a more powerful way – in this case *Totenmesse* [Polish: *Requiem Aeternam*, Requiem Mass].”²³ Some connoisseurs of Munch’s oeuvre acknowledge that this work (similar to *A Madman Manifesto* by Strindberg) was supposed to be an inspiration of the expression in Munch’s art work.²⁴ Reinhold Heller states that the change of title from *Doubt* to *The Scream* happened thanks to Przybyszewski’s influence.²⁵ Taking a closer look at this issue, it should be noted that the rhapsody *Totenmesse*, published in the year *The Scream* was painted, contained a suggestive description of a scream, in fact just like the second part of Przybyszewski’s autobiographical novel *Homo sapiens – Overbord*. However, the enunciation of the literary picture, contrary to Munch’s work, had positive and vital connotations.²⁶ Moreover, in Munch research it is widely known that the first post-impressionist paintings heralding *The Scream* (according to some scholars – the product of Munch’s experiences of Ljabroveien) were created as early as in 1890–91, and the drawings created in the Berlin period known to Przybyszewski had the titles *Geschrei* and *Angst-gescherei* and did not correspond with the explosive literary description of Przybyszewski’s in *Totenmesse*.²⁷

On the other hand the impression that Przybyszewski’s inspiring role in the creation of one of the most famous paintings in the world and his “copy-right” on the motif of *The Scream* was supported by the fact that the writer published in Polish in 1917, and in German in 1918, a book whose final title was the same as Munch’s painting. It had been written since 1914, and its previous versions were called *The Meeting* and *The Street*.²⁸ Przybyszewski’s suggestions relatively uncritically influenced some art and literary historians, such as Władysława Jaworska and Jörg



Ill. 4 Artur Maria Swinarski: *Dunkard*, c. 1919. Linocut, 17 x 15,5 cm. From *Zdrój*, 1919, vol. 9, p. 11. Courtesy S. Karol Kubicki (Berlin).

Marx, even though Stanisław Sawicki denied the Polish writer’s primacy in popularizing the motif of the scream as far back as in 1934.²⁹ Not before 2003 was the deconstruction of the established biographic-scientific myth taken up by Walter Olma.³⁰

The picture and the novel

Despite the controversies related to Przybyszewski’s propagating the mystified genesis of Munch’s *The Scream* in his memoirs, many facts speak to the particular synesthetic dialog between the painter and the writer, a type of synergy, the culmination of which was the trans-medial discourse related to *The Scream*. Przybyszewski’s novel gets closer to the painting in terms of its message as well as its expression. Its protagonist, the painter Gasztowt, is like Munch an artist of the “metaword” proclaimed by Przybyszewski – “the out-scream of the soul”, manifesting a precognitive, authentic expression. One night on the bridge, Gasztowt rescues a prostitute from committing suicide. Her scream awakens in him the desire to paint a picture of the street emanating with that primitive, animalistic sound. He did not manage to remember the sound, so to hear it again he murders the woman and remains silent during her scream. Finally, in the last scene of the novel, he wants to liberate himself from his doppelganger who made him commit the crime, and he hears the desired scream in the street. He is not however able to paint it anymore.

At first the novel was supposed to be entitled *The Street*, maybe in correspondence with Munch's painting *Evening on Karl Johan*. The literary picture is the adequate synthesis of two central representations of anxiety in the Norwegian painter's work. On the other hand, it is also interesting that Munch in the painting *Anxiety* from 1894 moves the participants of his panicky vision to a street at night, to the inner story from the painting *The Scream* giving the sole male in the center Przybyszewski's features.³¹

In the novel, the description of various stages of painting the scream in the street – due to its expressive form and coloring – call to mind Munch's painting. It is significant that the person who reveals the epiphany, which is supposed to release the creative impulse, is a woman. The artist and his muse – “the apocalyptic whore”, who is to make him a “god” (the creator) – create only anandrogynic (unity), as was visible in *Totenmesse* and other works by Przybyszewski. Although many critics regard the central figure from

Munch's painting as androgynous, both Przybyszewski and Franz Servaes in their essays in *Das Werk des Edvard Munch* declared it was a woman. Przybyszewski identified her with an enormous male sexual organ, whereas in the novel, the line of her body echoes the line of the street.

In 1894 Przybyszewski acknowledged Munch's *The Scream* as a pre-expressionist work, and in 1917 Hermann Bahr (whom the Polish writer knew from correspondence) identified the scream as the symbol of the whole expressionist epoch.³² On the other hand, also Przybyszewski's novel was usually considered to be a product of the same stylistic formation³³ or – in a safer way – as containing expressionist elements.³⁴

Although Przybyszewski's novel has components of a crime or surrealist³⁵ novel, his language was usually characterized as expressionistic,³⁶ even though it was far from the coarse *staccato* of German expressionism, the *understatement* of which is commonly substituted in the Polish pre-expressionism by *overstatement* – towering epithets, the hyperbole of hallucinations, apocalyptic visions, infernal metaphors and anti-aestheticism. Because of its psychological construction and the adventures of the main protagonist, the book is definitely related to expressionism, although the work is slightly a hybrid in terms of style.³⁷

The oneiric character of the visions in the novel and its extreme subjectivity correspond to the characteristics of the syntheticism of Munch's painting formulated by Przybyszewski, as discussed above. The novel also contains a series of allusions to the painter's and the writer's biographies. Because of his mother's deathbed curse, Gasztowt, like Munch, does not get into a relationship with a woman – he was married to art. In the tavern “Under the Wild Lynx” (being a biographical allusion to the famous “Black Piglet” in Berlin), Gasztowt meets his doppelganger, who is surrounded by a charismatic aura. Gasztowt is nevertheless an “unsuccessful Munch”³⁸ – like Przybyszewski he can express the scream of existence in an ecstatic tavern concert, but is unable to paint it. That distinguishes him from the real painter, who was not at all a nonproductive or post-romantic character who hid his works and for whom the sale of which would be profane. *The Scream* materialized in a few versions,



Ill. 5 Margarete Kubicka: *Street*, 1917. Linocut, 21.5 x 16.5 cm. Courtesy S. Karol Kubicki (Berlin).

becoming an icon of pop-culture and of art *pars pro toto* entangled in the laws of commerce.

Expressionism or synesthesia?

Przybyszewski recalled that “Munch had a high degree of something rarely seen in painters, substantial literary culture”.³⁹ Munch treated the first commandment of the Kristiania Bohemia, to “write your life”, literally.⁴⁰ Not only did they create autobiographical paintings, they also broke the ancient rule of *tacet pictor*, that painters should be silent: hence, Munch “painted, drew and wrote, wrote, drew and was painting simultaneously”.⁴¹

Although Przybyszewski wanted to see his *Totenmesse* as the inspiration of Munch’s pre-expressionist painting *The Scream*, also others, among them Willem Krag, claimed to have given impulse for creation of the famous work by Munch. And according to Rolf Stenersen, Munch himself began to sketch *The Scream* after reading Sigbjørn Obstfelder’s poem “I look”.⁴² On the other hand, the painter also published the lithograph *The Scream*, together with his famous prose poem about a sunset which made him sense a cry through nature, in *La Revue Blanche* and in the New York magazine *M’lle* in January 1896, in which he himself was presented as a poet.⁴³ This text, which exists in several versions,⁴⁴ can be considered as an inspiration for the novel by Przybyszewski, even if the painter Gasztowt would like to paint not the scream of nature, but the “arrière fond” of the street.

In Munch’s oeuvre the narrative character is demonstrated not only in single paintings such as *The Scream*, but also in “The Frieze of Life”, in which the rhythm of the recurring motifs of the beach’s shoreline, the trees, the sea or the changing moods was accentuated by the use of various colors. Munch understood it as a symphony.⁴⁵ It is interesting that when he wrote about Przybyszewski in 1928, Munch expressed his admiration for his friend’s mesmeric hold over his audience when he played the piano:

He could suddenly leap up in ecstasy and rush to the piano in such haste as if following inner voices which called him. And during the deathly silence which followed, the immortal music of

Chopin resounded through the narrow room and transformed it suddenly into a radiant festival hall, a shrine of art. And he was so completely carried away, and he interpreted the wonderful paintings of his great compatriot with such mastery that he made us listen, breathless, fascinated, oblivious of time and space, until the last chord died away.⁴⁶

Munch described Przybyszewski’s interpretations of Chopin’s pieces as “wonderful paintings of his great compatriot”, leaving further proof of the fact that his reception of art was synesthetic. Other participants of the “Black Piglet” tavern feasts – German writer and painter Max Dauthendey, to name just one – were also greatly impressed by the writer’s charismatic performance.⁴⁷ But Przybyszewski himself, with false modesty, was surprised that his interpretations of Chopin’s works, these “thundering heroic processions, the pain of the soul stripped naked”, so fascinated everyone during that time in Berlin (and Cracow); years later he ascertained that there must have been “heroic suffering”, which was hidden from people behind a sophisticated smile, and when disclosed in a scream, it must have been a scream which tore heavens into strips, like in the painting by Munch entitled *The Scream*.⁴⁸

Przybyszewski’s book of the same title is also a realization of the synesthetic rule. The novel was characterized as expressionist among other things in relation to the theory of Walter Sockel, who stated that an expressionistic work is an autonomous work con-



Ill. 6. Władysław Skotarek: *Panic*, c. 1918. Linocut, c. 21 x 27 cm. Courtesy S. Karol Kubicki (Berlin).

structured according to the same rules as a musical piece with a recurring leitmotif – a symbol.⁴⁹ In Przybyszewski's novel *The Scream*, the phonic and visual layers are very rich, although similar to Munch's painting the scream alone is inaudible. The whole is constructed from the rules of the stage and scenic drama, which surrender to the laws of hallucinatory vision, evoked by filmic imagining⁵⁰ – the expressionist “montage of attractions”,⁵¹ that is, the interweaving of distant and close frames, amplifying the sense of disorientation and oneirism. Both Przybyszewski's novel and Munch's painting have then a pre-expressionist character. The artists of the Junges Theater Bremen noticed that fact when in 2002 they created a peculiar Gesamtkunstwerk which joined both works in the performance *Scream – Inspired by Paintings by Edvard Munch and Based on the Novel by Stanisław Przybyszewski*.⁵²

A scream, a street, a centipede

In his enthusiastic essays on Munch, Przybyszewski placed his achievements in the context of French and Belgian literature (Maeterlinck, Baudelaire, Barbey d'Aureville) and the fine arts of the expressionists *avant la lettre* or other painters, such as Jean Delville, James Ensor, Theo Wagner, Félicien Rops and Felix Vallaton.⁵³ Also in the novel *The Scream*, the artwork of the painter Gasztowt resembles the achievements of Grünewald, Rubens and Jordaens (actually Antoine Wiertz) and most of all the delirious visions of Bosch, phantasmagoria of Goya, grotesques by Daumier, hallucinations by Ensor, diaboliques by Rops and *Liberty Leading the People* by Delacroix.⁵⁴

At times the relationship with the fine arts of other artists which was indicated by Przybyszewski were only related to iconography and more seldom to a type of expression. Again in the context of the artwork of El Greco, Goya, Rops or Master Eckhart, Przybyszewski situated Munch's oeuvre (and Vigeland's) by formulating a manifesto of ahistorical expressionism, “The Returning Wave: Around Expressionism”, for the Poznań early modernist art magazine *Zdrój* [Source] from 1918. As in the article “Expressionism, Słowacki and the Genesis of the Spirit”, he contrasted expressionism with impressionism, depicting the everlasting fight of the spirit with materiality.⁵⁵



Ill. 7. Stanisław Kubicki: *Bunt* (Revolt), 1918. Linocut, c. 16 x 21 cm. From *Die Aktion* 1918, vol. 8, cover of the issue 21/22 ‘Polnische Kunst’ (Polish Art). Courtesy S. Karol Kubicki (Berlin).

Thanks to Przybyszewski, Munch's artwork inspired the works of many artists from Central and Eastern Europe.⁵⁶ Particularly interesting in the context of the publication of the novel *The Scream* and the manifesto “The Returning Wave: Around Expressionism” from 1914–18 are the drawings of the artists from the Poznań artistic group Bunt [Revolution].⁵⁷ Some of them Przybyszewski met before he started to cooperate with the Poznań expressionists in Munich and Berlin. A linocut by Artur Maria Swinarski, *The Scream*, corresponded directly to Przybyszewski's novel, was dedicated to the writer and was published as an illustration to his article “Expressionism, Słowacki and the Genesis of the Spirit”. Works such as *The Street* by Margarete Kubicka and Swinarski, as well as his *Drunkard*, were inspired by the same sources that had inspired Przybyszewski's novel. The spirit of war and revolution which is heard in the pages of the novel may also be found in Władysław Skotarek's *Panic*. The closest to Munch's works, however, are two model works by Stanisław Kubicki: *The Tower of Babel*, which decorated the poster of the first exhibition of the Poznań expressionists, and *Bunt* [Revolution], a linocut published on the cover of the Polish issue of the Berlin expressionist magazine *Die Aktion*. They both contain allusions to social and artistic revolution: *Bunt* depicts a member of the avant-garde swimming against the current, while *The Tower of Babel* resembles Munch's *The Scream* and *Anxiety*.

Like *Anxiety*, *The Tower of Babel* is a representation of a “one-hundred-foot” alienated or rebellious mob, which in the novel is symbolized by a monstrous centipede.⁵⁸ Aside from the scream of the street, the caterpillar is the novel’s most significant symbol – a symbol of existential and creative starvation. So far, all those who have interpreted the novel have regarded it as mysterious and fantastical (surrealist)⁵⁹, not noticing the allusions to Munch’s *Anxiety* and maybe even to Kubicki’s *The Tower of Babel*.

“God save Munch from his friends,” wrote the *Berliner Börsen-Courier*⁶⁰ in December 1893. The painter was considered “a victim of premature admiration”,⁶¹ because “for an artist at the threshold of his career, it’s always dangerous when he experiences the admiration of the literary milieu, as unusually talented humanists compensate for the insufficiencies of his art with their own ideas, letting him and themselves believe that he is an original genius”.⁶² Time has confirmed the power of both Munch’s paintings and Przybyszewski’s interpretation. Each in his own way, both the artist and his critic paved the way for the birth of expressionism, which is not only documented in the career of



Ill. 8. Stanisław Kubicki: *The Tower of Babel (Revolution)*, 1917, linocut, c. 24 x 25 cm. Courtesy Lidia Głuchowska (Berlin).

Munch’s *The Scream*, but also created within the context of Przybyszewski’s novel and writings.

NOTER

- 1 Julius Bab, “Die neuromantische Bohème”, *Das neue Magazin* 18, 1904, p. 3; Richard Dehmel, “Ein deutscher Sataniker”, *Freie Bühne* 4, 1893, p. 1363ff.; cf. Gabriela Matuszek (ed.), *Der geniale Pole? Stanisław Przybyszewski in Deutschland (1892–1992)*, Paderborn, 1996.
- 2 Stanisław Przybyszewski (ed.), *Das Werk des Edvard Munch*, Berlin, 1894.
- 3 For details, see Lidia Głuchowska, “Totenmesse, Lebensfries und Die Hölle. Przybyszewski, Munch, Vigeland und die protoexpressionistische Kunsttheorie”, *Deshima* 1, 2009, p. 93–130; Lidia Głuchowska, “Requiem aeternam, Fryz życia i Piekło. Przybyszewski, Munch, Vigeland i preekspresjonistyczna teoria sztuki”, *Quart* 1, 2010, p. 26–54.
- 4 Przybyszewski to Franz Servaes, Dec. 1893, in Stanisław Przybyszewski, *Listy*, ed. Stanisław Helsztyński, vol. I, Warsaw, 1937, no. 87; Stanisław Przybyszewski, “Psychischer Naturalismus”, *Die neue deutsche Rundschau (Freie Bühne)* 5, 1894, p. 150–156.
- 5 Walter Olma, “Stanisław Przybyszewski’s später Roman ‘Der Schrei’”, in Hartmut Vollmer (ed.), *Stanisław Przybyszewski. Kommentarband*, Paderborn, 2003, p. 121, 130.
- 6 Władysława Jaworska, “Munch i Przybyszewski”, in Łukasz Kossowski (ed.), *Totenmesse. Munch-Weiss-Przybyszewski*, Warsaw, 1995, p. 16.
- 7 Indina Kampf, “‘Ein enormes Ärgernis’ oder: Die Anarchie in der Malerei. Edvard Munch und die deutsche Kritik 1892–1902”, in Dorothea Hansen and Uwe M. Schneede (eds), *Munch und Deutschland*, Hamburg, 1994, p. 97; Ulrich Steltner, “Arlekin als Theoretiker. Stanisław Przybyszewski’s kritische und essayistische Schriften”, in Vollmer, *Kommentarband*, p. 197.
- 8 Przybyszewski, *Das Werk des Edvard Munch*, p. 150; cf. Uwe M. Schneede, “Munchs Lebensfries, zentrales Projekt der Moderne”, in Hansen, *Munch und Deutschland*, p. 21..
- 9 Cf. Monika Krisch, *Die Munch-Affäre – Rehabilitierung der Zeitungskritik*, Berlin, 1997.
- 10 Elisabeth Clegg, “Unterwegs. Stanisław Przybyszewski 1894–1898”, in Kossowski, *Totenmesse. Munch-Weiss-Przybyszewski*, p. 47.
- 11 Julius Hart, “Aus Przybyszewski’s Sturm- und Drangjahren”, *Pologne Littéraire* 27, 1928, p. 2.
- 12 Przybyszewski, *Das Werk des Edvard Munch*, p. 156.
- 13 *Ibid.*, p. 156–157, 151. Engl. transl. of excerpts in: Charles Harrison, Paul Wood and Jason Gaiger (eds), *Art in Theory 1815–1900*, Oxford, Cambridge, Blackwell Publishers 1998, p. 1049, 1045.
- 14 Stanisław Przybyszewski, “Auf den Wegen der Seele. Gustav Vigeland”, *Die Kritik* 83, 85, 86, 87, 1896, English translation in Agata Malodobry and Trine Otte Bak Nielsen (eds), *On the Paths of the Soul. Gustav Vigeland and Polish Sculpture around 1900*, Cracow, 2010, p. 252–273.

- 15 Steltner, "Arlekin als Theoretiker"; Jörg Marx, *Lebenspathos und "Seelenkunst" bei Stanislaw Przybyszewski. Interpretation des Gesamtwerkes unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der weltanschaulichen und kunsttheoretischen Positionen sowie Poetik*, Frankfurt am Main, 1990, p. 135; Gabriela Matuszek, *Stanisław Przybyszewski – Pisarz nowoczesny*, Cracow, 2008, p. 31.
- 16 Max Nordau, *Entartung*, Berlin, 1892/1893), vol. 2, p. 37; cf. Steltner, "Arlekin als Theoretiker", p. 198.
- 17 Przybyszewski, "Auf den Wegen der Seele", p. 18–19.
- 18 Przybyszewski, *Das Werk des Edvard Munch*, p. 151–153, 155.
- 19 Edvard Munch, "Mein Freund Przybyszewski", *Pologne Littéraire* 27, 1928, p. 2.
- 20 Jaworska, "Munch i Przybyszewski", p. 34.
- 21 Emil Goett to Richard Dehmel, October 29, 1896 (Dehmel Archiv, Hamburg Staats – und Universitätsbibliothek, G. 95); quoted in Friedrich W. Neumann, "Stanisław Przybyszewski und Richard Dehmel", in Erwin Koschmieder and Alois Schmaus (eds), *Münchener Beiträge zur Slawenkunde*, Munich, 1953, p. 259–277.
- 22 Stanisław Przybyszewski, *Moi współcześni. Wśród obcych*, Warsaw, 1959 [1926]], p. 185.
- 23 Przybyszewski, *Moi współcześni*, p. 185; cf. Olma, "Der Schrei", p. 116.
- 24 Carla Lathe (ed.), *Edvard Munch and His Literary Associates*, Norwich: University of East Anglia, 1979, p. 18.
- 25 Reinhold Heller, *The Scream*, New York, 1973; Reinhold Heller, *Munch. His Life and Work*, London, 1984, p. 83.
- 26 Olma, *op.cit.*, p. 116–117, 119.
- 27 *Ibid.*, p. 118–120, 130.
- 28 *Ibid.*, p. 114.
- 29 Jaworska, "Munch i Przybyszewski"; Marx, *Lebenspathos*, p. 13; Stanisław Sawicki, "Stanisław Przybyszewski und Norwegen", *Edda* 21, 1934, p. 14.
- 30 Olma, *op.cit.*, p. 134–135.
- 31 *Ibid.*, p. 132.
- 32 *Ibid.*, p. 123; Hermann Bahr, *Expressionismus*, Munich, 1920 [2nd ed.]), p. 111.
- 33 See for example Piotr E. Stasiewicz, "Krzyk Stanisława Przybyszewskiego jako powieść ekspresjonistyczna", in Jolanta Sztachelska (ed.), *W kręgu Młodej Polski*, Białystok, 1998, p. 191–206; Matuszek, *Stanisław Przybyszewski*, p. 345ff.
- 34 Ulrich Steltner, "Krzyk – 'Der Schrei'. Stanisław Przybyszewski und Edvard Munch", in Ulrich Steltner (ed.), *Literatur und Kunst. Festgabe für Gerhard Schaumann zum 70. Geburtstag*, Jena, 1997, p. 102; Józef M. Dynak, "Krzyk Stanisława Przybyszewskiego jako powieść sensacyjno-kryminalna", in Witold Nawrocki and Michał Waliński (eds), *Literatura popularna, folklor, język*, Katowice, 1981, p. 110.
- 35 Dynak, *op.cit.*, p. 103–122; Matuszek, *Stanisław Przybyszewski*.
- 36 Gabriela Matuszek, "Próba analizy stylu powieści Stanisława Przybyszewskiego (na przykładzie powieści 'Krzyk')", *Ruch Literacki* XX 2, 1979, p. 201–211; Olma, *op.cit.*, p. 124.
- 37 Lidia Głuchowska, *Avantgarde und Liebe*, Berlin, 2007, p. 169.
- 38 Wojciech Gutowski, *Konstelacja Przybyszewskiego*, Toruń, 2008, p. 101.
- 39 Przybyszewski, *Moi współcześni*, p. 185.
- 40 Published in *Impressionisten* 8, 1889; comp. Øystein Sjøstad, "Das Bild von Oda Krohg als 'eine wahre Bohème-Prinzessin'", in Verena Borgmann and Frank Laukötter (eds), *Oda Krohg – Malerin und Muse im Kreis um Edvard Munch*, Bremen, 2011, p. 25–27.
- 41 Poul E. Tøjner, *Munch in His Own Words*, Munich, 2003, p. 58; comp. Mai Britt Guleng (ed.), *eMunch.no – text and image*, Oslo, 2011.
- 42 Rolf E. Stenersen, *Edvard Munch. Close-up of a Genius*, ed. Hans Martin Frydenberg Flaatten, Oslo, 2013 [1944]], p. 183; Lathe, *Munch and His Literary Associates*, p. 2; cf. Corinna Höper, *Edvard Munch in Stuttgart. Vom ersten Kuss bis zum Todesschei*, Stuttgart, Staatsgalerie Stuttgart, Hirmer 2013, pp. 44–47.
- 43 Lathe, *op.cit.*, p. 9.
- 44 Cf. Øivind Storm Bjerke, "Scream as Part of the Art Historical Canon", in Ingebjørg Ydstie (ed.), *The Scream*, Oslo, 2008, p. 33, 34.
- 45 Edvard Munch to Jens Thiis, c. 1932, Oslo, quoted in Schneede, "Lebensfries", p. 21.
- 46 Munch, "Mein Freund Przybyszewski"; fragmentarily translated in Lathe, *Munch and His Literary Associates*, p. 21.
- 47 Dauthendey, *Gedankengut*, p. 137; cf. Bab, *Bohème*, p. 55n.
- 48 Przybyszewski, *Moi współcześni*, p. 106.
- 49 Walter Sockel, *The Writer in Extremis: Expressionism in Twentieth Century German Literature*, Stanford, 1959; Stasiewicz, "Krzyk Stanisława Przybyszewskiego".
- 50 Dynak, *op.cit.*, p. 118.
- 51 Sergei Eisenstein, *Towards a Theory of Montage*, London, 1994.
- 52 Olma, *op.cit.*, p. 137.
- 53 Przybyszewski, *Das Werk des Edvard Munch*; cf. Głuchowska, "Die protoexpressionistische Kunsttheorie", p. 87, 96; Bjerke, *op.cit.*, p. 28–30.
- 54 Dynak, *op.cit.*, p. 110–111.
- 55 Lidia Głuchowska, "Poznań and Łódź: National Modernism and International Avant-garde. Zdrój (1917–22); Yung-Yidish (1919); and Tel-Awiw (1919–21)", in Peter Brooker et al. (eds), *Modernist Magazines: A Critical and Cultural History*, vol. 3, Oxford, 2013, p. 1208–1209.
- 56 Głuchowska, "Totenmesse, Lebensfries...", *op. cit.*, p. 110–114.
- 57 Głuchowska, *Avantgarde und Liebe*, p. 35–42.
- 58 *Ibid.*, p. 24, 32, 44, 116, 118, 120.
- 59 Matuszek, *Stanisław Przybyszewski*, p. 342–344, Olma, *op.cit.*, p. 126–127, 136.
- 60 *Berliner Börsen-Courier*, 10 December, 1893.
- 61 M.O., *Magdeburgische Zeitung*, March 26, 1895.
- 62 Hans Rosenhagen, untitled, *Tägliche Rundschau*, March 10, 1895, quoted in Kampf, "Munch und die deutsche Kritik", p. 87.