NOTE TO USERS

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been scanned at the request of the author. They are available for consultation in the author's university library.

323-463

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI®

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FRANCIS DAVIS MILLET – THE EARLY YEARS OF "A COSMOPOLITAN YANKEE," 1846-1884

by

Gina M. D'Angelo

Volume I

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2004

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

UMI Number: 3144089

Copyright 2004 by
D'Angelo, Gina M.

All rights reserved.

INFORMATION TO USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleed-through, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI®

UMI Microform 3144089
Copyright 2004 by ProQuest Information and Learning Company.
All rights reserved. This microform edition is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.

ProQuest Information and Learning Company
300 North Zeeb Road
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

© 2004

GINA M. D'ANGELO

All rights reserved

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the Graduate Faculty in Art History in satisfaction of the dissertation requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

9/10/04
Date

Kevin D. Murphy
Chair of Examining Committee

9/10/04
Date

Patricia Mainardi
Executive Officer

Sally Webster

William H. Gerdts

Bruce Weber

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Acknowledgements

This dissertation could never have been realized without the generous help, support and encouragement of many individuals. My dissertation committee—Professor Kevin D. Murphy, Professor Sally Webster, Professor William H. Gerdts, and Dr. Bruce Weber—offered inspired counsel and extraordinary patience. I am especially grateful to Professor Murphy, Chairperson of my committee, for his willingness, despite his already full schedule, to step in as my advisor and first reader. He has been extraordinarily supportive, and I have benefited enormously from his careful reading of the dissertation, his structural and editorial comments, and his encouraging me to expand and clarify my thinking about Francis Davis Millet. I am also deeply indebted to Professor Webster, to Professor Gerdts, and to Bruce Weber for their attentive readings and many helpful suggestions and criticisms.

My debt to Professor Gerdts far exceeds the scope of this dissertation. For some fifteen years he has been a most generous teacher and advisor, who offered encouragement and inspiration, while serving as a model of high professional achievement and sound scholarship. His explorations of the internationalism of American art have influenced my own work, and to him is due credit for suggesting Francis Davis Millet as my dissertation topic. The initial stages of my research were conducted in his library, an invaluable and generously offered resource. I am especially grateful to Professor Gerdts and to Professor Rose-Carol Washton Long, former Executive Officer of the Ph.D. Program in Art History, for their unfailing

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

support through a very difficult period of personal and family crisis. Without their belief in me and my work, and their unstinting encouragement, this dissertation would never have been completed.

I also wish to thank Professors H. Barbara Weinberg, Marlene Park, Diane Kelder, Patricia Mainardi, and Linda Nochlin for their inspirational teaching. Professor Weinberg's classes, along with those of Professor Gerdts, introduced me to the broad and rich range of American art. Professor Weinberg's investigations into the cosmopolitan aspects of American art and early research on Francis Davis Millet have also informed my work. Professor Marlene Park extended my knowledge of American art into the twentieth century, and passed on her contagious enthusiasm for American mural painting. Professors Diane Kelder, Patricia Mainardi, and Linda Nochlin provided the solid grounding in European eighteenth- and nineteenth-century art to complement my American studies. Before I arrived at the Graduate Center, Professor Anne Gregory Terhune's undergraduate classes at the College of New Rochelle rekindled my interest in art history. Her enthusiasm and support led to my present endeavors, and she has continued to be a valued friend and advisor.

At the Graduate Center I also wish to thank Professor Elizabeth Tenenbaum, the director of two very helpful dissertation-writing workshops, for her encouragement and advice. Professor Tenenbaum and my fellow classmates read and commented on the early chapters of my work. Special appreciation is due also to Lauren Frederick-Bowen, the Assistant Program Officer in the Art History Department for her support and friendship throughout this long odyssey; to Carol Lees and the Visual Resources staff for their last-minute assistance with the most

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

troublesome of my illustrations; and to the entire staff of the Mina Rees Library. Beth Posner and the Interlibrary Loan personnel deserve special recognition for processing my numerous requests with efficiency, as does Michael Adams, for patiently guiding me through the intricacies of the latest online databases.

I extend special thanks to members of the Millet family on both sides of the Atlantic for their assistance and encouragement. They have borne my intrusion into their lives with consummate grace, hospitality and generosity. Of particular help and guidance in England was the late Joyce A. Scharpey-Schafer, the artist's granddaughter. Her willingness to share her knowledge of her grandfather's work has greatly aided my study. I also wish to thank Robert and Elizabeth Adlard, Edward and Sue Adlard, and Jason Gore. In America, Dr. J. Bradford Millet, the artist's grandson, and his wife Connie were unwavering in their support. "Brad" entertained my endless questions and repeated visits to Utica with enormous patience and good humor, and provided access to other family members. I am also grateful to Francis Davis Millet, II, the artist's grandson and namesake; to Helen Millet Flynn, the artist's late granddaughter; and to her husband Harry L. Flynn and her son David for their help with my research. I further acknowledge with gratitude the assistance of John and Roberta Millet; David and Christy Millet; Helen Millet (Mrs. Charles Sumner Millet, Jr.); David Millet Emerson; and Sarah Hoffman.

Many other individuals have significantly aided and encouraged my work. I owe profound thanks to Peter A. Engstrom of East Bridgewater, Massachusetts, who has recently completed a biography of Francis Davis Millet, for his willingness to share his extensive knowledge of Millet's life and work. I am especially grateful to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Peter and several colleagues and friends—Arlene Katz Nicholas, Cynthia H. Sanford, Ania Savage and Elaine M. Stainton—who read early drafts of this dissertation and contributed valuable suggestions. I am forever indebted to Professor Wijnie de Groot of Columbia University for her assistance with the Dutch translation. My thanks to Barbara Dayer Gallati and Jonathan P. Harding for paving the way for my London research, and to Professor Sura Levine of Hampshire College for her advice on conducting research in Belgium. In Antwerp special appreciation is due Jef van Gool, Research Librarian at the Nationaal Hoger Instituut en Koninklijke Academie voor Schone Kunsten, for expertly guiding me through the Academy archives. Raf De Smedt, Director of the Antwerp Academy, and Professors Arsène van Eeckhaute and Pat Harris also offered valuable assistance. At the Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten, I thank Peter Rogiest, Reference Librarian, for his assistance, and Dorine Cardyn, Scientific Director, for sharing her knowledge of Nicaise De Keyser with me. Other colleagues, friends, and family who have provided generous assistance in various ways include: Carrie Rebora Barratt; Gloria Maruffi Bertuzzi; Robert F. Brown; Virginia Clammer; Nadine Granoff; Andrea Husby; Giovanna Fiorino-Iannace; Sister A. Jean Iannone, SC; Alice Kane; Therese Lichtenstein; the late Deanna Masi; Fabienne Mitchell; the Town of Pelham Public Library; Sally Pierce; Mary Lou Putignano; David Smith; and Ann and Curtis Sundermeyer.

Museum professionals, curators, scholars, and librarians at institutions in the United States, Canada, and Europe have generously shown me works by Millet and/or his teachers, provided research information on their holdings, and answered my numerous queries by mail. I gratefully acknowledge their assistance and extend

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

thanks to each of them and their staffs: Jane A. Finlay, Susan M. Peterson and the East Bridgewater Public Library; Marlene Howell and the Old Bridgewater Historical Society; Theresa Coish and Maria Melo of the New Bedford Free Public Library; John Dorsey and Alice Kane of the Boston Public Library; John Clift of Trinity Church, Boston; Sally Pierce of the Boston Athenaeum; Erica E. Hirshler and Amy Beeaker in The Art of the Americas Department, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Leane Delgaizo and Catherine Maurer in the Conservation Department, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Kelly Cobble of the United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Adams National Historical Site, Quincy, Massachusetts; Wesley G. Balla and David Smolen of the New Hampshire Historical Society, Concord; National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.; Kenyon Fitzgerald, President of the Seventh Regiment Fund, Seventh Regiment Armory, New York; Kathryn Erickson, Eileen Giordano, and Katherine M. Poole of the U.S. General Services Administration; Nathalie Bondil, Danielle Blanchette and Marie-Claude Saia of the Montreal Museum of Fine Arts; Lisa Henry of the American Art Department, The Newark Museum; Ann Sundermeyer of the Hannibal Free Public Library, Hannibal, Missouri; Barbara Dayer Gallati of the Brooklyn Museum of Art; H. Barbara Weinberg, Carrie Rebora Barratt and the Department of American Paintings and Sculpture, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; Rosie Bass, Katy Westerman, Simon Faulkner, and Laura Whitton of the Tate Gallery, London; Jenny Reynaerts, Department of Paintings, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam; Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels; David B. Dearinger and Paula Pineda of the National Academy of Design; Sandra Grindlay of the University Portrait

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Collection, Harvard University Art Museums; Miriam Stewart of the Drawing Department, Fogg Art Museum; Tom Dunlay of The Guild of Boston Artists; Trinkett Clark and the Mead Art Museum, Amherst College; Ruta Marino of The Regina A. Quick Center for the Arts, St. Bonaventure University; Krista Nance of Vanderbilt University Fine Arts Gallery, Nashville; Timothy Burns of the Department of American Art, The Detroit Institute of Arts; Jonathan Boos and Cheryl M. Robledo of the Manoogian Collection; Nonie Gadsden, Liz Flaig and L. Elizabeth Schmoeger of the Milwaukee Art Museum; Deborah W. Ryan of the Munson-Williams-Proctor Arts Institute; Louise Lippincott and Amber E. Morgan of the Carnegie Museum of Art; Sue Levy of CIGNA Museum and Art Collection, Philadelphia; The Reverend Clifford R. Brown and Chris Trahan of St. Stephen's Church, Lynn, Massachusetts; The Reverend John Tarrant of St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Stockbridge, Massachusetts; Jonathan P. Harding of The Century Association; and Alfred Lawrence of the Union League Club.

Archivists, librarians, and staff members of the many research facilities that I consulted also greatly advanced my work. To each of them I extend my heartfelt thanks: Kathleen M. Kienholz and the American Academy of Arts and Letters; Nancy Malloy, Joy Weiner and the Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, New York office; Judy Throm and the Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. office; Beth Smith and the West Bridgewater Public Library; Diane Pachecho and the Brockton Public Library; Jean Lothrop, Carol Walsh and the Abington Public Library; Bette Roberts of the Mattapoisett Historical Society; The Fine Arts Department, Rare Books Division, and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Microfilm Department of the Boston Public Library; Sarah Melacoff of the School of the Museum of Fine Arts Boston; Maureen Melton of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston; Kim Nusco, Nicholas Graham and the Massachusetts Historical Society; Carolyn Davis and the Department of Special Collections, Syracuse University Library; the Maryland Historical Society; The Manuscripts Division, and Department of Prints, Photographs and Architectural Drawings of the New-York Historical Society; Wayne J. Furman, David Smith, and the Art and Architecture Division of the New York Public Library; Frick Art Reference Library; Tracey Schuster of the Special Collections and Visual Resources Reference Library, Getty Research Institute; Thomas J. Watson Library, The Metropolitan Museum of Art; Peter Blank and the Ryerson Library, Art Institute of Chicago; The Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts Reference Library; Kirsten Reoch and the Seventh Regiment Armory Conservancy; Amy Cooper and the Special Collections Library, The University of Iowa; Harvard University Archives, Pusey Library; Jennie Rathbun and the Houghton Library, Harvard University; Rauner Special Collections Library, Dartmouth College; Manuscript and Archives Division, Yale University Library; Diane Mallstrom, Rare Books Department, The Public Library of Cincinnati; John Hoffman and Ruth Davis of the Mark Twain Birthplace, Stoutsville, Missouri; Chris Edmonson, Bill Kennedy and the Cleveland Museum of Art Library; Carol Huge and the Fine Arts Division of the Cleveland Public Library; Carol Bellina and the Western Reserve Historical Society Archives—Library, Cleveland; Brian Szott and the Minnesota Historical Society; the Library of the Royal Academy, London; Uschi Payne and the Witt Library, Courtauld Institute of Art, London; Rozanne Peters and the National Art

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Library, Victoria and Albert Museum, London; The Manuscript Division, Library of Congress; Jonathan Thristan and the Tate Gallery Library and Archive, London; Archief en Museum voor het Vlaamse Cultuurleven, Antwerp; and Stad Antwerpen Bibliotheken.

I also wish to thank the many art dealers and members of their staff who provided information and/or opportunities to view works by Millet: Warren Adelson and Elizabeth Oustinoff of Adelson Galleries, Inc.; Mark Borghi of Mark Borghi Fine Art Inc.; Debra Force Fine Art, Inc.; Lisa Bush Hankin of Richard York Gallery; the late Vance Jordan, Gina Greer, and Kendall Scully of Vance Jordan Fine Art, Inc.; Arlene Katz Nichols and Zachary D. Ross of Hirschl & Adler Galleries, Inc.; The Vose Galleries, Boston; and Michael Worley of R. H. Love Galleries, Inc., Chicago.

My lengthy road through graduate school has been lightened by the collegiality of friends. I thank the members of my dissertation support groups—Elizabeth Clark, Kathy Doyle, Danielle Hughes, Andrea Husby, Giovanna Fiorino-Iannace, Kathy Kienholz, Laurel Lyman, and Cynthia Sanford—for their friendship, wise counsel, and sense of humor. I thank Kathy Kienholz for hosting our meetings in the hallowed halls of the National Arts Club. I thank Giovanna Fiorino-Iannace, my study partner for the Comps, First Exam and Orals, for her constant encouragement; and her family, for their warm hospitality and efforts to rescue my faltering Italian. I thank Deborah Solon for cheering me on long distance. I thank Arlene Nichols, with whom I began this program many years ago, for her prayer network and inspiring mentorship.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Lastly, I thank my family. My parents did not live to see this dissertation completed but were steadfast in their faith and encouragement. I thank my husband Ralph; my son Gregory and daughter-in-law Dayna; and my daughter Jennifer and son-in-law William Kircher for their love, support and understanding. To my husband goes my eternal gratitude. Part-time editor, research assistant, and enthusiastic coach, none of this would have been possible without his unwavering support. I dedicate this dissertation to my grandchildren—John, Elizabeth, and Harrison Kircher—whose unconditional love and high jinks have lifted my spirits and helped me keep a sense of perspective.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Volume I

Acknowledgements	iv
List of Illustrations	xiv
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Background, Education and Early Years in Boston (1846-1871)	21
Chapter 2: Academic Training in Antwerp and *Wanderjahre* in Europe (1871-1875)	51
Chapter 3: Early Career in Boston, Europe and New York (1875-1880)	121
Chapter 4: International Success in New York and London (1880-1884)	199
Epilogue	303

Volume II

Illustrations	323
Bibliography	364

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Chapter One

Figure 1.1 Francis Davis Millet, *Natural Bridge in Virginia*, 1868. Oil on board, 19 ½ x 13 ¾ inches, Private collection.

Figure 1.2 William Goodacre, *Natural Bridge, Virginia*, 1846. Engraving, 7 x 5 inches, Collection of Mr. and Mrs. Lloyd Bradford. Reproduction, Pamela H. Simpson, So Beautiful An Arch: Images of the Natural Bridge, 1787-1890, exhibition catalog (du Pont Gallery, Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Virginia, 1982), p. 72, fig. 18.

Figure 1.3 Francis Davis Millet, *Out of Reach*, c. 1869. Oil on canvas. In collection of D. T. Burrell, Brockton, Massachusetts, 1869. Reproduction, Francis Davis Millet Papers, American Academy of Arts and Letters, New York, New York.

Figure 1.4 Francis Davis Millet, *Signora Morlacchi*, c. 1870. Lithograph, 11 ½ x 9 ½ inches, Private collection. Photograph courtesy of Peter A. Engstrom.

Figure 1.5 Francis Davis Millet, *Beware*, c. 1870. Lithograph, 12 x 12 inches, Old Bridgewater Historical Society, West Bridgewater, Massachusetts. Reproduction, Judith A. Curtis, "The Easel Paintings of Francis Davis Millet," American Art Review 11, 2 (March – April 1999), p. 122.

Chapter Two

Figure 2.1 Académie Royale des Beaux-Art d'Anvers. Reproduction, Historiek Nationaal Hoger Instituut Voor Schone Kunsten 1663-1885/1945 (Antwerp: Nationaal Hoger Instituut en Koninklijke Academie voor Schone Kunsten, 1985), p. 35.

Figure 2.2 Nicaise De Keyser, *The Battle of the Golden Spurs*, 1836. Original destroyed during WWII. Oil study, 30 x 41 3/8 inches, Stedelijke Museum, Courtrai. Reproduction, Nicaise De Keyser, Antwerps Portret, exhibition catalog (Nationaal Hoger Instituut en Koninklijke Academie Voor Schone Kunsten in association with Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, 1987), p. 44.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 2.3 Nicaise De Keyser, *Christopher Columbus Viewed as Mad*, 1852. Oil on canvas, (location unknown). Watercolor, 1853, Koninklijk Museum Voor Shone Kunsten, Antwerp.

Figure 2.4 Nicaise De Keyser, *Marguerite in the Church*, 1864. Oil on canvas, 48 ¾ x 35 inches, Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp.

Figure 2.5 Nicaise De Keyser, *Jephthah's Daughter*, 1860. Oil on canvas, (location unknown). Reproduction, Frick Library Photograph Collection.

Figure 2.6 Nicaise De Keyser, *Portrait d'Italienne*, 1843. Oil on panel, 9 7/8 x 7 7/8 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, "Tableaux Modernes et Anciens," Hotel Des Ventes Sale, Brussels, November 17-25, 1990, Lot 139.

Figure 2.7 Nicaise De Keyser, *The Arab Chief*, 1847. Oil on canvas, (location unknown). Reproduction, Witt Library Photograph Collection, Courtauld Institute of Art, London.

Figure 2.8 Nicaise De Keyser, *Portrait of Madame De Caters*, 1855. Oil on canvas, 54 x 39 3/8 inches, Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels.

Figure 2.9 Nicaise De Keyser, *The Glory of the Antwerp School* (central panel of thirty-nine panel mural ensemble, depicting the Allegory of Antwerp surrounded by Gothic and Renaissance Masters), 1862-1872. Oil on canvas, 22 ½ x 63 ½ inches, formerly in Antwerp Academy Museum. Transferred in 1890 to De Keyser Hall, Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp. Reproduction, Tentoonstelling Dossier, Nicaise De Keyser 1, 2 (Antwerp: Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten, 2000), p. 14, fig. 5.

Figure 2.10 A life class at the Antwerp Academy. Reproduction, Alick P. F. Ritchie, "L'Académie Royale Des Beaux-Arts D'Anvers," The Studio 1 (1893), p. 141.

Figure 2.11 A life class at the Antwerp Academy working from costumed mother and child models. Dermond O'Brien (1845-1945), *The Fine Art Academy, Antwerp*, 1890. Oil on canvas, 31 ½ x 23 inches, Ulster Museum, Belfast. Reproduction, Julian Campbell, The Irish Impressionists: Irish Artists in France and Belgium, 1850-1914, exhibition catalog (The National Gallery of Ireland, Dublin, 1984), p. 231, catalog no. 88.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 2.12 Polydore Beaufaux, *Salome Watching the Beheading of St. John the Baptist*, 1873. Oil on canvas, 46 ½ x 30 ¾ inches. Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp.

Figure 2.13 Francis Davis Millet, *The Artist's Studio, Antwerp*, c. 1872. Oil on canvas, 17 1/8 x 14 3/8 inches, Private collection. Photograph courtesy of Mark Borghi Fine Art, Inc.

Figure 2.14 Francis Davis Millet, *A Handmaid*, 1886. Oil on canvas, 27 1/8 x 16 5/8 inches, Leven Collection. Reproduction, Richard Guy Wilson et al, The American Renaissance: 1876-1917, exhibition catalog (The Brooklyn Museum, New York, 1979), p. 158, fig. 126.

Figure 2.15 Francis Davis Millet, *Between Two Fires*, c. 1892. Oil on canvas, 29 1/8 x 36 inches, Tate Gallery, London. Presented by the Trustees of the Chantrey Bequest, 1892.

Figure 2.16 Josef Van Lerius, *Sacrifice of Lady Godiva*, 1870. Oil on canvas, 70 ½ x 48 ½ inches, Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp. Reproduction, Willem G. Flippo, Lexicon of the Belgian Romantic Painters (Antwerp: International Art Press, 2000).

Figure 2.17 Josef Van Lerius, *Cinderella*, 1858. Oil on canvas, 26 x 33 1/8 inches, Private collection. Reproduction, courtesy easyart.com.

Figure 2.18 Francis Davis Millet, *Flemish Girl with Red Cap and Apron*, c. 1872. Oil on canvas, 17 x 10 ½ inches, Private collection.

Figure 2.19 Francis Davis Millet, *The Artist's Kitchen*, c. 1872. Oil on canvas, 20 x 15 inches, Collection of Nancy and Michael Grogan. Reproduction, Judith A. Curtis, "The Easel Paintings of Francis Davis Millet," American Art Review 11, 2 (March-April 1999), p. 124.

Figure 2.20 Francis Davis Millet, *The Artist's Kitchen, Antwerp*, c. 1872. Oil on canvas, 19 ¾ x 16 inches, Private collection. Photograph courtesy of Mark Borghi Fine Art, Inc.

Figure 2.21 Francis Davis Millet, *Old Flemish Woman Threading a Needle*, c. 1872. Oil on canvas, 25 ¼ x 19 inches, Private collection.

Figure 2.22 Gerard Dou, *Old Woman with a Spool of Thread* (*The Lost Thread*), 1660-1665. Oil on canvas, 13 x 10 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, W. Martin, Gerard Dou (London: George Bell And Sons, 1902), p. 61, Plate 23.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 2.23 Francis Davis Millet, *Pan*, 1872. Oil on canvas, 19 x 16 ½ inches (sight size), Private collection.

Figure 2.24 Francis Davis Millet, *Alumni Entertainment*, 1875. Oil on burlap, 52 x 39 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, 19th and 20th Century American Paintings, Drawings, Watercolors and Sculpture Christie's East Sale, New York, November 20, 1990, Lot 18.

Figure 2.25 Francis Davis Millet, *Study of a Head*, c. 1872. Oil on board, 12 x 7 ¼ inches, Private collection.

Figure 2.26 Francis Davis Millet, *St. Michael's Mount*, 1872. Graphite on white paper, 6 ½ x 8 inches, Francis Davis Millet European Trip Sketchbook 1872-1873, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Figure 2.27 Francis Davis Millet, *Newlyn*, 1872. Graphite on white paper, 8 x 6 inches, Francis Davis Millet European Trip Sketchbook 1872-1873, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Figure 2.28 Francis Davis Millet, *St. Just*, 1872. Graphite on white paper, 6 ½ x 8 inches. Francis Davis Millet European Trip Sketchbook 1872-1873, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Figure 2.29 Francis Davis Millet, *Clovelly*, 1872. Graphite on white paper, 8 x 6 ½ inches, Francis Davis Millet European Trip Sketchbook 1872-1873, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Figure 2.30 Francis Davis Millet, *Anvers*, 1872. Graphite on white paper, 6 ¾ x 10 inches, Francis Davis Millet Sketchbook, European Trip, Summer 1873 and Anvers, Spring 1872, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Figure 2.31 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of Dr. Asa Millet*, c. 1873. Oil on board, 28 x 21 ½ inches, Private collection.

Figure 2.32 Francis Davis Millet, *Palatine from the Coliseum*, 1874. Graphite on white paper, 5 ¾ x 9 ½ inches, Francis Davis Millet European Trip Sketches, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Figure 2.33 Francis Davis Millet, *Pergola – Capri*, c. 1874. Oil on canvas, 13 ¾ x 7 inches, Private collection.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 2.34 Francis Davis Millet, *Palm Trees, Capri*, c. 1874. Oil on board, 11 ½ x 6 ½ inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, Visiting Enchantment: American Artists in Italy, exhibition brochure (Debra Force Fine Art, Inc, 1999).

Figure 2.35 Francis Davis Millet, *Voie des Tombeaux, Pompeii*, c. 1874. Oil on canvas, 12 x 7 ¼ inches, Private collection.

Figure 2.36 Francis Davis Millet, *Studio in Venice*, c. 1875. Oil on board, 18 x 22 inches, Private collection. Reproduction, Grogan & Company, Boston, Massachusetts, American and European Paintings, Drawings, Prints and Sculpture, April 7, 1995 Sale, Lot 163.

Figure 2.37 Francis Davis Millet, *Boys Fishing, Venice*, c. 1875. Oil on canvas, 30 x 36 inches, Private collection.

Figure 2.38 Francis Davis Millet, *Sailing in the Bay of Naples*, c. 1875. Oil on canvas, 51 x 77 inches, East Bridgewater Public Library, East Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

Figure 2.39 Francis Davis Millet, *A Turkish Water-Seller*, 1874. Oil on canvas, 40 x 28 inches, Private collection. Reproduction, Joyce A. Sharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune: F. D. Millet, 1846-1912 (Utica, New York, 1984), frontispiece.

Figure 2.40 Francis Davis Millet, *Fra Filippo Lippi and Lucretia Buti*. c. 1875. Oil on canvas, 28 ¼ x 20 ½ inches, Mead Art Museum, Amherst College, Amherst, Massachusetts.

Figure 2.41 Paul Delaroche, *Filippo Lippi Falling in Love with His Model*, 1822. Oil on canvas, 25 5/8 x 19 7/8 inches, Musée Magnin, Dijon, France. Reproduction, Stephen Bann, Paul Delaroche, History Painted (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), p. 138, fig. 65.

Figure 2.42 Nicaise De Keyser, *Raphael and the Fornarina*, 1842. Oil on canvas, dimensions unknown, Private collection, Antwerp. Reproduction, Dirk Pauwels, "History in Golden Measure: The Golden Means of Historical Genre," in Tentoonstelling Dossier, Nicaise De Keyser 1, 2 (Antwerp: Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten, 2000), p. 34, fig. 3.

Figure 2.43 Nicaise De Keyser, *Titian Sketching His Venus While Visited by His Friends*, 1843. Oil on canvas, 33 x 37 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, The Getty Research Institute, Photograph Study Collection.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 2.44 Pieter Van Laer (Il Bamboccio), *Farrier*, c. 1635. Oil on canvas, 18 ½ x 14 ½ inches, Collection Corrado Zingone, Rome. Reproduction, Julius S. Held and Donald Posner, 17th and 18th Century Art: Baroque Painting, Sculpture, Architecture (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1971), p. 87, fig. 94.

Figure 2.45 Nicaise De Keyser, *Italian Woman in Traditional Costume*, 1841. Oil on panel, 40 5/8 x 32 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, Witt Library Photograph Collection, Courtauld Institute, London.

Figure 2.46 Antonio Paoletti, *Venetian urchins on a bridge over the Grand Canal*. Oil on canvas, 21 ¾ x 31 ½ inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, Philip Hook and Mark Poltimore, Popular 19th Century Painting, A Dictionary of European Genre Painters (Suffolk, England: Antique Collectors' Club, 1987), p. 599.

Figure 2.47A Francis Davis Millet, *Turks, Constantinople Market*, 1873. Graphite on white paper 4 ½ x 6 ½ inches. Francis Davis Millet 1873 Sketchbook, Box 2, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Figure 2.47B Francis Davis Millet, *Turkish Water Sellers*, 1873. Graphite on white paper, 4 ½ x 6 ½ inches. Francis Davis Millet 1873 Sketchbook, Box 2, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Figure 2.48 Nicaise De Keyser, *Europe and Asia* (*L'Orient et l'Occident*), 1854. Oil on canvas, 65 ¾ x 39 3/8 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, The Getty Research Institute, Photograph Study Collection.

Figure 2.49 Jean-Léon Gérôme, *For Sale* (*The Slave Market*), 1866. Oil on canvas, 33 3/16 x 24 13/16 inches, Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williamstown, Massachusetts. Reproduction, Holly Edwards et al, Noble Dreams, Wicked Pleasures: Orientalism in America, 1870-1930, exhibition catalog (Williamstown, Massachusetts: Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute 2000), p. 129.

Chapter Three

Figure 3.1 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of Dr. Asa Millet*. 1875-1876. Oil on canvas, 29 x 24 ½ inches, Private collection.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 3.2 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of Huldah Byram Millet (Mrs. Asa Millet)*, c. 1876. Oil on canvas, 29 x 24 ½ inches, Private collection.

Figure 3.3 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of Josiah B. Millet*, c. 1876. Oil on canvas, (location unknown). Reproduction, Frick Library Photograph Collection.

Figure 3.4 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of a Lady in Costume of 1740*, c. 1876. Oil on canvas, 81 x 47 inches, Old Bridgewater Historical Society, West Bridgewater, Massachusetts. Photograph courtesy of Peter A. Engstrom.

Figure 3.5 Frederic Leighton, *Summer Moon*, c. 1872. Oil on canvas, 39 ½ x 50 ½ inches, Private collection. Reproduction, Richard Ormond et al, Frederic, Lord Leighton: Eminent Victorian Artist, exhibition catalog (Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1996), p. 33, fig. 18.

Figure 3.6 Lawrence Alma-Tadema, *The Vintage Festival*, 1870. Oil on canvas, 30 ¼ x 68 ½ inches, Hamburger Kunsthalle, Hamburg. Reproduction, Russell Ash, Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., Publishers, 1990), Plate 4.

Figure 3.7 Francis Davis Millet, *Thesmophoria*, c. 1894-1897. Oil on canvas, 25 x 50 ¼ inches (sight size, demi-lune), Private collection. Oil study for large lunette-shaped mural in main hall Bank of Pittsburgh (destroyed c. 1944). Reproduction, Joyce A. Sharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune: F. D. Millet, 1846-1912 (Utica, New York, 1984).

Figure 3.8 Francis Davis Millet, *Ox of Saint Luke*, 1876-1877. Encaustic, North wall, upper tower mural, Trinity Church, Boston. Reproduction, Goody, Clancy & Associates, Trinity Church in the City of Boston. Decorative Paint & Mural Assessment, February, 2001, p. III-42, Fig. 151.

Figure 3.9 Francis Davis Millet, *David*, 1876-1877. Encaustic, North tower spandrel mural, Trinity Church, Boston. Reproduction, Trinity Church in the City of Boston, Means of Grace, Hope of Glory (Boston: Vernon Press, Inc., 2001), p. 91.

Figure 3.10 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of Charles Francis Adams, Jr.*, 1876. Oil on canvas, 36 x 33 inches, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Adams National Historical Site, Quincy, Massachusetts.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 3.11 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of Samuel L. Clemens* (*Mark Twain*), 1877. Oil on canvas, 36 x 29 1/8 inches, Hannibal Missouri Public Library. Reproduction, Joyce A. Sharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune: F. D. Millet, 1846-1912 (Utica, New York, 1984).

Figure 3.12 Titian, *Pope Paul III*, 1543. Oil on canvas, 45 x 35 inches, Museo Nazionale, Naples (now Museo di Capodimonte). Reproduction, Frederick Hartt, History of Italian Renaissance Art (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 1979), p. 542, fig. 658.

Figure 3.13 Nicaise De Keyser, *Henry Leys*, 1834. Oil on canvas, 28 ¾ x 23 5/8 inches. Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp. Reproduction, J. F. Buyck, ed., Catalogus schilderijen 19de en 20ste eeuw (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, 1977), p. 231.

Figure 3.14 Nicaise De Keyser, *Portrait du Peintre Henri De Coene*, 1837. Oil on canvas, 29 ¼ x 23 5/8 inches, Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels. Reproduction, Catalogue Inventaire De La Peinture Moderne (Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, 1984), p. 335.

Figure 3.15 Francis Davis Millet, *Bachi-Bouzouk et Bulgare; épisode de la guerre en Turquie*, c. 1878. Oil on canvas, 52 x 28 ¼ inches, Private collection. Photograph courtesy of Mark Borghi Fine Art Inc.

Figure 3.16 Francis Davis Millet, *Philosophy in Summer*, 1878. Oil on canvas, 31 x 25 ¾ inches, Private collection. Photograph courtesy of Richard York Gallery, New York.

Figure 3.17 Alfred Stevens, *Trouville*, c. 1880-1885. Oil on canvas, 26 7/8 x 36 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, Robert L. Herbert, Impressionism: Art, Leisure, and Parisian Society (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1988), p. 266, fig. 269.

Figure 3.18 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of John Dudley Philbrick*, 1878. Oil on canvas, 36 3/8 x 28 7/8 inches, New Hampshire Historical Society, Concord, New Hampshire.

Figure 3.19 Francis Davis Millet, *A Bashi-Bazouk*, 1878. Oil on canvas, 39 x 29 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, Gerald M. Ackerman, American Orientalists (Paris: ACR Édition, 1994), p. 133.

Figure 3.20 Francis Davis Millet, *Medjideé*, 1873. Graphite on white paper, 4 ½ x 6 ½ inches. Francis Davis Millet 1873 Sketchbook, Box 2, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 3.21 Francis Davis Millet, *Bashi Bazouks*, c. 1878. Reproduction, Sketchbooks, Millet Family Papers, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1098, Frame 515.

Figure 3.22 Francis Davis Millet, *Chloé*, 1880. Engraving after the painting, from a sketch by the artist. Sketch and painting presently unlocated. Reproduction, Charles Parsons Lathrop, "II.—Exhibition of Works by Living American Artists at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston," American Art Review 2, First Division (1881), p. 67.

Figure 3.23 Thomas Eakins, *In Grandmother's Time*, 1876. Oil on canvas, 16 x 12 inches, Smith College Museum of Art, Northampton, Massachusetts. Reproduction, Linda Muehlig, editor, Masterworks of American Painting and Sculpture from the Smith College Museum of Art (New York: Hudson Hill Press, 1999), p. 266, fig. 11.

Figure 3.24 John Rogers, *Why Don't You Speak for Yourself John?*, 1885. Painted plaster, 22 x 17 inches, National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. Reproduction, William H. Truettner and Rober B. Stein et al, Picturing Old New England: Image and Memory, exhibition catalog (National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 1999), p. 47, fig. 37.

Figure 3.25 Nicholas Maes, *Old Woman Spinning*, 1655. Oil on panel, Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam. Reproduction, Web Gallery of Art.

Chapter Four

Figure 4.1 Veterans' Room, Seventh Regiment Armory, New York. Designed by Louis C. Tiffany and Company, Associated Artists, 1880-1881. Archival Photograph, Pach Bros. c. 1881, Collection of The New-York Historical Society. Reproduction, Landmarks Preservation Commission Report, July 19, 1994.

Figure 4.2 Veterans Room, Seventh Regiment Armory, New York. Designed by Louis C. Tiffany & Company, Associated Artists, 1880-1881. Reproduction, Doreen Bolger Burke et al, In Pursuit of Beauty: Americans and the Aesthetic Movement, exhibition catalog (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1986), p. 126, ill. 4-13.

Figure 4.3 Francis Davis Millet and Henry Yewell, American Civil War Scene, North Wall Veterans' Room Frieze, Seventh Regiment Armory, New York, 1880-1881.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 4.4 Francis Davis Millet and Henry Yewell, Neolithic Scene, North Wall, Veterans' Room Frieze, Seventh Regiment Armory, New York, 1880-1881.

Figure 4.5 Francis Davis Millet and Henry Yewell, Turkish War Scene, West Wall, Veterans' Room Frieze, Seventh Regiment Armory, New York, 1880-1881.

Figure 4.6 Francis Davis Millet, Russo-Turkish War Campaign Sketches, c. 1877-1878, Francis Davis Millet Papers, Sketchbooks, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Reel 1098, Frame 493.

Figure 4.7 Francis Davis Millet, *St. Stephen Preaching as a Child*, 1881. Stained Glass Window Design, West Nave, St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, Lynn, Massachusetts.

Figure 4.8 Francis Davis Millet. *St. Stephen Being Stoned to Death*, 1881. Stained Glass Window Design, West Nave, St. Stephen's Episcopal Church, Lynn, Massachusetts.

Figure 4.9 Francis Davis Millet, *A Christian Warrior*, 1885. Stained Glass Window Design, North Nave, St. Paul's Episcopal Church, Stockbridge, Massachusetts.

Figure 4.10 Francis Davis Millet, *The Student and Soldier Window*, 1889. Stained Glass Window Design, Memorial Hall, Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Reproduction, 1861-1892 Fifth Report Harvard College Class of 1861 (New York, 1892).

Figure 4.11 Francis Davis Millet, *General Joseph Warren and Reverend John Eliot Window*, 1889. Stained Glass Window Design, Memorial Hall, Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts. Reproduction, Harvard College Class of 1878 Fiftieth Anniversary Report 1878-1928 (Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1928).

Figure 4.12 Francis Davis Millet, *Embroidery*, c. 1881. Watercolor, 11 x 8 inches, Private collection.

Figure 4.13 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of a Woman in a Red Dress*, 1881. Oil on canvas, 35 x 26 inches, Private collection.

Figure 4.14 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of Miss Kate Field*, c. 1881. Engraving after the painting (60 x 72 inches), from a sketch by the artist. Reproduction, Charles M. Kurtz, ed., American Academy Notes (New York: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co., 1881), p. 43, No. 413.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 4.15 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of Miss Kate Field*, 1881-1887. Oil on canvas, 50 x 40 inches, Boston Public Library. Reproduction, David B. Dearinger, ed., Rave Reviews: American Art and its Critics, 1826-1925, exhibition catalog (National Academy of Design, 2000), p. 231, Plate 46.

Figure 4.16 Nicaise De Keyser, *Portrait of Madame Mols de Brialmont*, 1853. Oil on canvas, 59 7/8 x 41 3/8 inches, Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp. Reproduction, Frick Library Photograph Collection.

Figure 4.17 James McNeill Whistler, *Harmony in Yellow and Gold: The Gold Girl—Connie Gilchrist*, c. 1876. Oil on canvas, 85 ¾ x 43 1/8 inches, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York. Reproduction, Webshots, com.

Figure 4.18 Georges Clarin, *Portrait of Mlle. Sarah Bernhardt*, 1870. Oil on canvas, (location unknown). Reproduction, "Glimpses of Parisian Art, I," Scribner's Monthly 11, 2 (December 1880), p. 176.

Figure 4.19 Pierre Auguste Renoir, *Madame Charpentier and Her Children*, 1878. Oil on canvas, 60 ½ x 74 7/8 inches, The Metropolitan Museum of Art. Reproduction, Kathleen Howard, ed., The Metropolitan Museum of Art Guide (New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1983), p. 192, fig. 148

Figure 4.20 George Willoughby Maynard, *Francis Millet*, 1878. Oil on canvas, 59 ½ x 38 ¼ inches, National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. Reproduction, Carolyn Kinder Carr and Ellen G. Miles, A Brush with History: Paintings from The National Portrait Gallery, exhibition catalog (National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C., 2001), p. 134, Plate 38.

Figure 4.21 Francis Davis Millet, *Baby Worship*, 1880. Oil on canvas, 40 x 60 inches, Private collection. Reproduction, Sotheby's New York, American Paintings, Drawings and Sculpture, sale 6782, November 29, 1995, Lot 143.

Figure 4.22 Gerard Dou, *The Young Mother and Her Child*, 1658. Oil on panel, 28 7/8 x 21 7/8 inches, Royal Cabinet of Paintings, Mauritshuis, The Hague. Reproduction, Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., ed., Gerrit Dou 1613-1675: Master Painter in the Age of Rembrandt, exhibition catalog (Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 2000), p. 107, Plate 21.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 4.23 Mihàly Von Munkàcsy, *Visit to the Baby*, 1879. Oil on panel, 43 3/8 x 58 7/8 inches, Hungarian National Gallery, Budapest. Reproduction, "Munkacsy," Art Amateur 11, 2 (January 1880), p. 1.

Figure 4.24 Francis Davis Millet, *Self Portrait*, 1882. Oil on canvas, 28 x 24 inches, National Academy of Design, New York.

Figure 4.25 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of Mary Ogden Adams (Mrs. Charles Francis Adams, Jr.)*, 1876-1881. Oil on canvas, 29 ¼ x 24 ½ inches, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Adams National Historical Site, Quincy, Massachusetts.

Figure 4.26 Francis Davis Millet, *The Wineskin*, 1881. Oil on canvas, 14 ¼ x 11 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, Sotheby's New York, Americana: Paintings, Drawings, Watercolors, Sculpture and Prints, Sale 4532M, January 29, 1981, Lot 78.

Figure 4.27 Francis Davis Millet, *Roasting Apples*, 1881. Oil on canvas, 25 x 18 ¼ inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, R. H. Love Galleries, Inc., Ladies in The Home & Garden, exhibition brochure (Chicago: R. H. Love Galleries, Inc., 1993), frontispiece.

Figure 4.28 Francis Davis Millet, *Maternal Anxiety*, c. 1882. Watercolor, 12 x 19 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, Illustrated Catalogue Fifteenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society, 1882 (New York: 1882), p. 25, no. 444.

Figure 4.29 Francis Davis Millet, *A Koran Reader*, 1882. Oil on canvas, 52 x 39 ½ inches, Private collection. Photograph courtesy of Vance Jordan Fine Art, Inc., New York.

Figure 4.30 Francis Davis Millet, *Mosque of Sultan Ahmed I*, 1873. Graphite on white paper, 4 ½ x 6 ½ inches, Francis Davis Millet 1873 Sketchbook, Box 2, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Figure 4.31 Francis Davis Millet, *Portrait of Lawrence Barrett as Cassius*, 1882. Oil on canvas, (location unknown). Engraving after the painting reproduced in Laurence Hutton, "A Group of Players," Harper's New Monthly Magazine 96, 572 (January 1898), p. 203.

Figure 4.32 James McNeill Whistler, *Symphony in White, No. 1: The White Girl*, 1862. Oil on canvas, 84 ½ x 42 ½ inches, National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. Reproduction, Richard Dorment and Margaret F. MacDonald et al, James McNeill Whistler, exhibition catalog (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1995), p. 77, Plate 14.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 4.33 James McNeill Whistler, *Symphony in White No. 2: The Little White Girl*, 1864. Oil on canvas, 30 1/8 x 20 1/8 inches, Tate Gallery, London. Reproduction, Richard Dorment and Margaret F. MacDonald et al, James McNeill Whistler, exhibition catalog (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1995), p. 79, Plate 15.

Figure 4.34 Francis Davis Millet, *Swedish Kitchen*, c. 1882. Oil on canvas, 12 ¼ x 18 ¼ inches, Private collection. Photograph courtesy of Richard York Gallery, New York.

Figure 4.35 Francis Davis Millet, *Christmas Amenities*, 1882. Drawing (dimensions and location unknown), reproduced in Harper's Christmas, Pictures and Papers—Christmas 1882—Done by The Tile Club and its Literary Friends (New York: Harper Bros., 1882).

Figure 4.36 Francis Davis Millet, *Turkish Café*, c. 1882. Oil on canvas, 19 ½ x 15 ½ inches, Vanderbilt University Fine Arts Gallery Collection, Nashville, Tennessee.

Figure 4.37 Francis Davis Millet, *Lacing The Sandal* (*Lady Tying Her Sandal*), c. 1883. Watercolor, 11 x 8 ½ inches, Susan and Herbert Adler Collection. Reproduction, Bruce Weber, Drawn From Tradition: American Drawings and Watercolors from the Susan and Herbert Adler Collection, exhibition catalog (Norton Gallery of Art, West Palm Beach, 1989), p. 13, No. 46.

Figure 4.38 Francis Davis Millet, *Lacing Her Sandal*, c. 1883. Oil on canvas, 12 x 8 ½ inches, Private collection. Reproduction, Carolyn Kinder Carr et al, Revisiting the White City: American Art at the 1893 World's Fair, exhibition catalog (National Museum of American Art, Washington, D.C., 1993), p. 164, Plate 58.

Figure 4.39 Albert Moore, *Azaleas*, 1868. Oil on canvas, 78 x 39 ½ inches, Hugh Lane Municipal Gallery of Modern Art, Dublin. Reproduction, Christopher Wood, Victorian Painting (Boston: Bulfinch Press, 1999), p. 218, No. 266.

Figure 4.40 *Nike Fastening her Sandal*, from the parapet of the Temple of Athena Nike, Acropolis, Athens, c. 410 B.C. Marble, approx. 42 inches high, Acropolis Museum, Athens. Reproduction, Horst de la Croix & Richard G. Tansey, Gardner's Art Through The Ages (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1975), p. 163, No. 5.52.

Figure 4.41 Francis Davis Millet, *A Classical Figure*, c. 1883. Graphite on paper, 7 ½ x 5 inches (sight size), Private collection.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 4.42 Francis Davis Millet, *Classical Repose*, 1883. Oil on canvas, 9 ½ x 16 inches, Private collection.

Figure 4.43 Francis Davis Millet, *Mother and Child*, c. 1883. Graphite on white paper, 6 ¾ x 10 ½ inches, Francis Davis Millet Sketchbook pages, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Figure 4.44 Francis Davis Millet, *Lolla*, 1883. Oil on canvas, (location unknown). Reproduction, Illustrated Catalogue of the Art Department. Eleventh Cincinnati Industrial Exposition, 1883, p. 70, No. 51.

Figure 4.45 Francis Davis Millet, *Reading the Story of Oenone*, c. 1883. Oil on canvas, 30 x 57 7/8 inches, The Detroit Institute of Arts. Detroit Museum of Art Purchase, Art Loan Fund and Popular Subscription Fund.

Figure 4.46 *Three Goddesses*, from the east pediment of the Parthenon, c. 438-432 B.C. Marble, over life-size, British Museum. Reproduction, Horst de la Croix & Richard G. Tansey, Gardner's Art Through The Ages (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc., 1975), p. 157, No. 5.42.

Figure 4.47 Lawrence Alma-Tadema, *Sappho*, 1881. Oil on canvas, 26 x 48 inches, The Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore. Reproduction, Jennifer Gordon Lovett et al, Empires Restored, Elysium Revisited: The Art of Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema, exhibition catalog (Sterling and Francine Clark Art Museum, Williamstown, Massachusetts, 1992), p. 79, Plate 26.

Figure 4.48 Albert Moore, *Dreamers*, 1879-1882. Oil on canvas, 27 x 46 7/8 inches, Birmingham Museums and Art Gallery, Birmingham, England. Reproduction, R. J. Barrow, Lawrence Alma-Tadema (London: Phaidon Press Limited, 2001), p. 141, No. 141.

Figure 4.49 James McNeill Whistler, *Symphony in White, No. 3*, 1865-1867. Oil on canvas, 20 ¼ x 30 1/8 inches, The Barber Institute of Art, The University of Birmingham, Birmingham, England. Reproduction: Richard Dorment and Margaret F. MacDonald et al, James McNeill Whistler, exhibition catalog (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1995), p. 80, Plate 16.

Figure 4.50 Thomas Wilmer Dewing, *Prelude*, 1883. Oil on canvas, (location unknown). From a photograph of the painting in Dewing's studio, c. 1883. Reproduction, Susan A. Hobbs, The Art of Thomas Wilmer Dewing: Beauty Reconfigured, exhibition catalog (The Brooklyn Museum, New York, 1996), p. 55, fig. 33.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 4.51 Francis Davis Millet, *Seacoast*, c. 1883. Oil on canvas mounted on masonite, 8 3/8 x 13 ¼ inches, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.

Figure 4.52 Francis Davis Millet, *The Window Seat*, c. 1883. Oil on canvas, 20 1/8 x 30 ¼ inches, The Masco and Manoogian Collection.

Figure 4.53 Johannes Vermeer, *The Lacemaker*, c. 1669-1670. Oil on canvas, 9 1/8 x 8 ¼ inches, Musée du Louvre, Paris. Reproduction, Walter Liedtke et al, Vermeer and The Delft School, exhibition catalog (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 2001), p. 165, fig. 173.

Figure 4.54 Edmund C. Tarbell, *Girl Crocheting*, 1904. Oil on canvas, 30 x 25 inches, Canajoharie Library and Art Gallery, Canajoharie, New York. Reproduction, Trevor J. Fairbrother et al, The Bostonians: Painters of An Elegant Age, 1870-1930, exhibition catalog (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1986), p. 153, Plate 66.

Figure 4.55 Joseph DeCamp, *The Seamstress*, 1916. Oil on canvas, 36 ¼ x 28 inches, Collection of the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C. Reproduction, Laurene Buckley, Joseph DeCamp: Master Painter of the Boston School (Munich and New York: Prestel-Verlag, 1995), p. 118, Plate 33.

Figure. 4.56 Francis Davis Millet, *A Hymn*, c. 1884. Oil on canvas, 18 x 11 13/16 inches, Milwaukee Art Museum, Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Figure 4.57 Francis Davis Millet, *Prosperina Gathering Flowers* (*The Poppy Field*), 1884. Oil on panel, 16 ¼ x 9 ¾ inches, Private collection. Photograph courtesy of Richard York Gallery, New York.

Figure 4.58 Nicaise De Keyser, *Rebecca at the Well*, 1860. Oil on canvas, 50 3/8 x 33 1/8 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, Frick Library Photograph Collection.

Figure 4.59 Francis Davis Millet, Sketch of *Primavera*, wall painting, Stabiae, first century A.D., Museo Nazionale, Naples (now Museo di Capodimonte). Francis Davis Millet Papers, Sketchbooks, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Reel 1098, Frame 629.

Figure 4.60 Francis Davis Millet, *Cymbal Player*, c. 1884. Watercolor, 10 x 14 inches, (location unknown). Reproduction, Illustrated Catalogue. Seventeenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society (National Academy of Design, New York, 1884), fig. 378.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 4.61 Francis Davis Millet, *Regina Convivii (Queen of the Feast)*, 1884. Oil on canvas, 60 ¼ x 28 7/8 inches, National Academy of Design, New York.

Figure 4.62 Francis Davis Millet, *The Cottage Garden*, c. 1883. Oil on canvas, (location unknown). Reproduction, photograph, Francis Davis Millet Papers, American Academy of Arts and Letters, New York.

Figure 4.63 Francis Davis Millet, *A Spring Offering*, 1884. Oil on canvas, (location unknown). Reproduction, from a photograph, Commercial Advertiser, 31 May 1884. Francis Davis Millet Papers, Scrapbook I, American Academy of Arts and Letters, New York.

Epilogue

Figure 5.1 Francis Davis Millet at work on *The Triumph of Juno*, a decoration for the ceiling of the New York State Building at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition. Reproduction, James Hunt, "Millet At Work, A Chronicle of Friendship," Art and Progress 4, 11 (September 1913), p. 1091.

Figure 5.2 Francis Davis Millet, Study for mural, *Treaty of the Traverse Des Sioux*, in Governor's Reception Room, Minnesota State Capitol, St. Paul, Minnesota, 1904. Oil on canvas, 27 x 42 ½ inches, Private collection. Reproduction, Antiques Magazine (May 2001), p. 714.

Figure 5.3 Francis Davis Millet, *Fourth Minnesota Regiment Entering Vicksburg*, 1905. Mural panel, oil on canvas, 74 x 96 inches, Governor's Reception Room, Minnesota State Capitol, St. Paul, Minnesota. Reproduction, Minnesota Historical Society Brochure.

Figure 5.4 Francis Davis Millet, *Entering the Harbor*, 1908. Ceiling mural for *Evolution of Navigation*, 30 x 63 feet, Call Room, United States Custom House, Baltimore, Maryland. Photograph courtesy of U. S. General Services Administration.

Figure 5.5 Francis Davis Millet, *Evolution of Navigation*, 1908. Detail of cove murals and decorative borders in the Call Room, United States Custom House, Baltimore Maryland. Twenty-eight cove panels illustrate history of shipping from 1000 B.C. to 1905. Photographs courtesy of U. S. General Services Administration.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 5.6 Francis Davis Millet, *The Foreman of the Grand Jury Rebuking the Chief Justice of New Jersey, 1774*, 1908. Mural panel, 6 ½ x 16 feet, in Grand Jury Room, Essex County Court House, Newark, New Jersey. Reproduction, Cynthia H. Sanford, Heroes in the Fight for Beauty: The Muralists of the Hudson County Court House, exhibition catalog (Jersey City Museum, 1986), p. 67, Fig. 77.

Figure 5.7 Francis Davis Millet, *The History of the Settlement of Ohio*, 1908. Two of 13 mural panels illustrating the development of civilization in the Midwest—*The Pioneers* and *Ideals*—each panel approximately 5 x 16 feet, The Cleveland Trust Company, Cleveland, Ohio. Reproduction, A Series of Famous Paintings Depicting The Development of Civilization in the Middle West (Cleveland: The Cleveland Trust Company, 1909).

Figure 5.8 Francis Davis Millet, *The Collection and Delivery of the Mails All Over the World*, 1910-1911. Mural panels—*The Postman in England* and *Carrying Mail in North China*—two of 35 panels in Postman's Room and alcove, United States Post Office, Cleveland, Ohio. Reproduction, C. Matlack Price, "The Late Francis Davis Millet—Notes on the Decorative Panels in the Cleveland Post Office," International Studio 48, 190 (December 1912), p. xxxv.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

INTRODUCTION

> Being A Massachusetts Yankee He can Do Everything but Fly. . . . One of the cleverest all-round men I know is Mr. F. D. Millet, the artist . . . . When everybody else loses his head and confounds confusion, Frank Millet keeps cool and restores order. . . . There's nothing he can't do with his hands, while his head gravitates as naturally to literature as to art. . . . Mr. Millet has lived a century in 40 years, and has yet to attain his zenith. . . . If I were asked what man ought to be exhibited at our World's Fair as the best specimen of an American from all points of view, I should answer, "Frank Millet of Bridgewater, Mass.—a cosmopolitan Yankee." Kate Field, "Clever Frank Millet," Boston Globe, 16 December 1892

These words written by the journalist Kate Field on the eve of the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition capture well the multifaceted gifts of Francis Davis Millet (1846-1912): his mastery of his art; his breadth of vision; his calm, analytical intelligence; his Yankee ingenuity; and his openness to cultures, customs and ideas other than those of his native land, especially his close affiliation with European artistic attitudes. In an era when American artists looked to European training, art, and culture to create an art of international stature, Millet was one of the most tenacious advocates of cosmopolitanism.[1] He shared the belief of many of his contemporaries that American art should not be culturally isolated from the rest of the world, that it was heir to the same storehouse of western civilization as Europe, and that it could benefit from full participation and competition in the international cultural arena. At a time when America was emerging as an industrial, technological and financial leader in world markets, the aspiration of her artists for parity with their European counterparts seemed a desirable goal. After seeking European training,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Millet readily assimilated European subjects, styles and cultural attitudes, and sought to redefine American art and create American art institutions based on European precedents. Articulating the internationalist sentiment of his time, Millet would declare: "purely national schools of art are now no longer possible, because the advance of modern science has harmonized the many differences which formerly were distinctive features of the art of various nations. Good art is cosmopolitan."[2]

Throughout America's history her artists traveled abroad to study or work, to learn from the examples of old masters and contemporary European art, and to absorb the ambience of foreign locales. Indeed most American art of the eighteenth- and early-nineteenth century, as art historian Michael Quick has pointed out, can be seen as a regional school response to European stylistic influence.[3] By the third decade of the nineteenth century, however, American artists were transforming their European models into indigenous paintings of the American landscape and its inhabitants that complemented the values and concerns of the developing nation. The Civil War and the ensuing Industrial Age—the latter characterized by an accumulation of vast wealth and recurring cycles of recession and depression—triggered dramatic changes in American life and American art. In art these years marked a transition from a concern with native landscape and genre painting rendered in a relatively descriptive manner that spoke to the uniqueness of the American experience to an interest in the culture that America shared with Europe. The poet William Cullen Bryant's (1794-1878) nationalistic admonition to the American landscape painter Thomas Cole (1801-1848) on his departure for Europe in 1829 to "keep that earlier, wilder image bright," lest he be led astray by Europe's fair scenes struck the keynote for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

independence from European art and culture that characterized the antebellum period. Thirty-five years later the admonition to American artists was quite the opposite. In 1864 the critic James Jackson Jarves (1818-1888) urged American artists to adopt a worldview that would define American art in the years after the Civil War. Writing in his book The Art-Idea, Jarves counseled:

> . . . if America elects to develop her art wholly out of herself, without reference to the accumulated experience of older civilizations, she will make a mistake and protract her improvement. There is a set of men among us who talk loftily of the independent, indigenous growth of American art . . . . Nevertheless it would be a great waste of time to adopt such a system, and possibly it might fail . . .We have not time to invent and study everything anew. . . . No one dreams of it in science, ethics, or physics. Why then propose it in art? We are a composite people. Our knowledge is eclectic. . . . . For some time to come, Europe must do for us all that we are in too much of a hurry to do for ourselves. It remains, then, for us to be as eclectic in our art as in the rest of our civilization. To get artistic riches by virtue of assimilated examples, knowledge, and ideas, drawn from all sources, and made national and homogeneous by a solidarity of our own, is our right pathway to consummate art.[4]

The critic Samuel G. W. Benjamin (1837-1914) writing in 1877 in his book Contemporary Art in Europe, echoed Jarves' comments: "As one of many means for achieving our art destiny, it behooves us, therefore, to study the arts of other ages and races, for the better apprehension of the principles which underlie art growth."[5]

Growing up in the environs of Boston also offered Millet an impressive old world legacy for his cosmopolitan leanings. Washington Allston (1779-1843), the most highly-praised and patronized American artist of his day, after studying in Rome and London, settled in Boston in 1818.[6] His sophisticated, European-inspired style and subjects—history paintings, poetic landscape compositions and figural pieces—helped develop a taste in that city for European art. His example may have influenced another Boston artist, William Morris Hunt (1824-1879), to look to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Europe for artistic inspiration. After studying with Thomas Couture (1815-1879) and Jean-Francois Millet (1814-1875), Hunt worked in Boston from 1862 to 1866, and settled there permanently in 1868.[7] During his long Boston career, he was an influential teacher and tastemaker. He introduced French Barbizon painting to Boston, and joined with Millet and others to launch the School of Drawing and Painting of the Museum of Fine Arts.[8] Interestingly, when Hunt was accused of infiltrating Boston with contemporary French art, his reply espoused internationalist sentiments very similar to those of Millet: "to hold that art was confined to a school or a people was as silly as to maintain that art criticism could only be written with a quill from the great bald headed American eagle."[9]

Throughout the 1880s, critics continued to praise the new generation of foreign-trained artists and the cosmopolitan quality of American art. Three lavishly-illustrated books published during that decade—Mariana Griswold Van Rensselaer's (1851-1934) Book of the American Figure Painters (1886), Alfred Trumble's (1844-1897) Representative Works of Contemporary American Artists (c. 1887), and George William Sheldon's (1843-1914) Recent Ideals in American Art (c. 1888)—all reveal the era's high regard for European art.[10] Sheldon's comments are typical: "the most truly original artists of the present day are those who have made themselves proficient in the science of the schools. We hail with pleasure the Americans who, like Ridgway Knight, Charles Sprague Pearce, E. L. Weeks, and F. A. Bridgman, are sending home the masterpieces which they have painted abroad. These masterpieces are as truly American as the most cherished products of our Hudson River School."[11]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The shift toward cosmopolitanism in American art also paralleled the taste of American patrons. Increased wealth, the ease of international travel, the influx of European art dealers, and a sophisticated art press intensified the demand for European art. The overwhelming preference of American patrons for contemporary European painting rather than works by American artists is well documented in Edward Strahan's (1838-1886) three-volume compendium, The Art Treasures of America, published between 1879 and 1882.[12] This survey of 116 collections in fifteen cities included few American paintings, and none of them were illustrated.[13]

Millet's career developed and matured during this period of cosmopolitan striving, when, as art historian H. Barbara Weinberg noted, what was American about American art was "its lack of American-ness."[14] During his lifetime, Millet was an important American artist with an international reputation that to some degree was based on his mastery of European techniques and adoption of European subject matter. He also can be regarded as a "Renaissance man," a wholly European concept. Millet produced more than 200 easel paintings, eleven mural ensembles, numerous watercolors and illustrations, and designed cartoons for stained glass, costumes for dramatic productions and military medals. In addition, he was a working journalist who covered the art scene, a distinguished war correspondent, a writer of fiction and travel essays, and a translator of Tolstoy. Millet also found time to serve as an advisor on artistic affairs to Presidents Theodore Roosevelt (1858-1919) and William Howard Taft (1857-1930), and to make his mark as a consummate arts administrator and advocate of professional standards in American art education. His cosmopolitanism extended beyond his artistic work and included his efforts to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

translate many facets of the European cultural infrastructure to America. Millet helped launch both the School of Drawing and Painting of the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, and the American Academy in Rome. He also organized many international fairs and supervised the mural program at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition that helped bring new energy to the mural movement in America. After establishing residences on both sides of the Atlantic in the late 1880s, Millet was a catalyst for the artists' colony in the English village of Broadway, Worcestershire. A critic writing in 1881 called Millet "one of the most versatile men of his time. He is a cosmopolitan. He belongs in New York as much as anywhere."[15] A few years later, his friend Henry James (1843-1916) called him "very modern, in the sense of having tried many things and availed himself of all the facilities of his time."[16] When he died tragically on the sinking of the Titanic on April 14, 1912, newspapers and journals mourned his passing and hailed him as a "servant of American Art."[17]

Although Millet's accomplishments as an artist and his dedicated public service were recognized by his contemporaries, he remains a relatively obscure figure in the history of American art. The decline in Millet's reputation is due to a complex set of circumstances, all tied to the tarnishing of the Gilded Age and to a shift in American attitudes toward European culture.[18] Late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth century writers on American art such as Mariana Griswold Van Rensselaer,[19] George William Sheldon,[20] Samuel Isham (1855-1914),[21] and Charles H. Caffin (1854-1918)[22] believed in art as a civilizing agent and in America's ability to benefit from participation in the international cultural arena. They gave Millet substantial attention and wrote enthusiastically about his work, often comparing him favorably to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

European artists. By the second decade of the twentieth century, however, a general reaction against aesthetic idealism and cosmopolitan subjects and styles had crystallized in the writings of the philosopher and poet George Santayana (1863-1952), who condemned the "genteel tradition" as effete, feminine, and divorced from the vitality of American life.[23] Reinforced by a concurrent modernist disdain of European academic painting, cultural nationalist critics and historians of American art writing between World War I and World War II, such as Lewis Mumford (1895-1990) in The Brown Decades of 1931, championed more distinctly "American" artists such as Homer, Eakins and Ryder, and ignored the praise and popularity that Millet and other cosmopolites had enjoyed in their own time.[24] By 1949, Oliver W. Larkin (1896--1970) in his survey Art and Life in America dismissed Millet's Baltimore Courthouse murals for their "vacuity" and "pretty color."[25] Millet received more favorable mention in two surveys published in the 1950s—Virgil Barker's (1889-1865) American Painting (1950) and Edgar P. Richardson's (1902-1985) Painting in America (1956)—but soon thereafter his name disappeared from history books, the promise of 1881 and the international reputation of 1912 long forgotten.[26]

Revisionist scholars investigating the American Renaissance period have alluded to the importance of Millet's work, and I am indebted to their contributions. The best overview of Millet's career is a 1977 article by H. Barbara Weinberg.[27] Weinberg concentrated on the artist's easel and mural paintings and noted the need for a comprehensive study of his work. Millet's granddaughter, Joyce A. Sharpey-Schafer, complemented Weinberg's work with a biography, Soldier of Fortune: F. D.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Millet, 1846-1912 (1984).[28] This study, however, provides no historical investigation of his art.

A discussion of aspects of Millet's work has been included in thematic studies and exhibition catalogs. The most provocative have been the writings of David C. Huntington, Cynthia H. Sanford, and Bailey Van Hook. Huntington's essay in The Quest for Unity: American Art Between World's Fairs, 1876-1893 (1983) situated Millet in the sea of cultural change between the 1876 Centennial and the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition, when American artists moved away from a moralistic, Puritan "Hebraism" to a more secular and more cosmopolitan "Hellenism"—a shift from message art to art-for-art's sake.[29] Although he only referred to two of Millet's paintings, Huntington's study has been particularly helpful, suggesting the complexity of Millet's paintings—their ability to accommodate narrative while assimilating the tenets of Aestheticism and the visual brilliance of Vermeer. Cynthia H. Sanford included a discussion of Millet's murals in her exhibition catalog Heroes in the Fight for Beauty: The Muralists of the Hudson Country Court House (1985).[30] Sanford located Millet in the nationalist and cosmopolitan discourse of the American Renaissance mural movement. Bailey Van Hook included Millet in her thematic study of idealized female imagery during the Gilded Age, Angels of Art: Women and Art in American Society, 1876-1914 (1996).[31] Van Hook emphasized the multifaceted nature of these images, linking them to the artist's European training and to cultural attitudes about art and beauty that were analogous to the social construction of the feminine gender. Most recently, Van Hook discussed Millet's work in her study of the historical, political and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

economic events that shaped the American Beaux-Arts Mural Movement, The Virgin and the Dynamo: Public Murals in American Architecture 1893-1917.[32]

Millet's involvement with the artists' colony in the English village of Broadway has received the most attention, and is well documented in Marc Alfred Simpson's 1993 Ph.D. dissertation.[33] Simpson focused on Millet, Edwin Austin Abbey (1852-1911), John Singer Sargent (1856-1925) and Alfred Parsons (1847-1920) as key figures in the Anglo-American community in Broadway. He covered a five-year period in Millet's career, concentrating on the genre pictures he painted there.

The studies noted above, and others listed in the bibliography, have given varying degrees of recognition to Millet's mature work. This dissertation focuses instead on the early years of Millet's life and work. It is during this little-known but very productive period that Millet formulated his approach to the making of art, consolidated his reputation, and commenced his service to the advancement of art and art training in America. Intrigued by Kate Field's criticism, I have sought to understand the development of the cosmopolitan artist who, she believed, was the ideal person to represent the United States at the 1893 World's Fair. I was curious to know what had informed Millet's artistic philosophy, his global perspective, and his vision of public service on behalf of American art.

Careful consideration of Millet's early career is necessary to understand his subsequent development. For example, an analysis of his formative work, which is rich in experimentation, reveals his devotion to a wide range of subjects, to traditional and modern international styles, and to an idealistic and subjective aesthetic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

philosophy that sought a symbiotic unity between significant content and form, concerns that preoccupied him throughout his life. Also apparent in a survey of Millet's early years is his experimentation in various media, especially mural painting, and his administrative efforts to enhance American art appreciation and training. His early work as a muralist and art administrator were accomplishments that would culminate in his supervision of the mural program at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition—long recognized as having contributed to the revival of monumental mural painting in America—in Millet's subsequent career as a muralist, and in his directorship of the American Academy in Rome in 1912.

More than a prologue to his later accomplishments, however, Millet's early years are themselves rich with achievement, during which he created distinctive works of art that entered major American public and private collections. Moreover, a close look at Millet's early work and career reveals the complexities of the American art world during an important transitional period, as artists moved away from predominantly nativist themes to an embrace of the full range of Western art. To better understand this formative process, I have reviewed the artist's early years, paying particular attention to documenting and interpreting his easel paintings, murals and other creative work, while assessing his contributions to American culture. This is a study of the complex interweave of American and international crosscurrents, influences and experiences that shaped Millet's contributions to American art and cultural life. I have framed my analysis within the international climate of the late nineteenth century, concentrating on the aesthetic, cultural, historical and critical context in which Millet's work was produced and discussed. It is my hope that this

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

study will provide the basic foundation for a long overdue evaluation of Millet's entire oeuvre.

Throughout this study I have looked carefully at the works themselves and at what Millet said and wrote about them. I have also investigated his early life, education and training in Boston; his training at the Antwerp Royal Academy and the work of the Belgian academicians with whom he studied; other works he would have known in collections, exhibitions, and reproductions in America and Europe; European mural programs he would have been familiar with; his friendships and relationships with patrons and fellow artists; his exhibition venues and the critical reception of his work, and, briefly, the market for American art during this period. Until now, neither Millet's formative period of study in Boston with the Belgian lithographer Dominique C. Fabronius (d. after 1888) and at the Drawing School of the Lowell Institute, nor his formal training at the Antwerp Royal Academy with Polydore Beaufaux (1829-1904), Nicaise De Keyser (1813-1887) and Josef Van Lerius (1823-1876), nor his extended period of self-education in Europe have been studied. Millet's work in Boston and New York during the 1870s and early 1880s has similarly received little attention. I have relied on the Francis Davis Millet and Millet Family Papers on deposit at the Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution in New York City and Washington, D. C. and on the Francis Davis Millet Papers at the American Academy of Arts and Letters in New York City. The Archives of American Art papers contain Millet's diaries, sketchbooks, journals, correspondence, photographs and three unpublished Millet biographical sketches by family members. The American Academy holdings include a number of scrapbooks, photographs,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

memorabilia, and correspondence assembled by James Hunt, who worked for Millet during the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition. These materials were used to detail the early years, and are discussed and analyzed in the dissertation, which also includes interviews and comments of several Millet descendants. The Millet archival material is supplemented with exhibition records, press reviews, periodical literature, biographies, and art, political, and social histories from this period. Manuscripts and published works were used to define Millet's contributions to mural programs, international fairs and American art institutions where he played a major administrative role. I also consulted archives for information on Millet's most important correspondents. I examined Millet's paintings and murals in public and private collections, as well as related archival material.

This study is organized chronologically into four chapters and an epilogue. Chapter One provides basic biographical information, and discusses Millet's activities up to 1871 when he left Boston to study at the Antwerp Royal Academy. It begins in Massachusetts where Millet was born and grew up. He was an energetic and hard-working youth, whose penchant for public service was instilled by his parents, who were descendents of early Massachusetts and Plymouth Bay Colony settlers. As a youth Millet developed a keen interest in history combined with an ardent patriotism. Service during the Civil War provided experiences that later found artistic expression in his mural painting *the Fourth Minnesota Regiment Entering Vicksburg* for the Minnesota State Capitol. A Harvard education and fluency in several languages broadened his worldview and enabled him to move with ease in the international community, while the cosmopolitan art of Boston nourished his artistic leanings.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

After graduation in 1869 he supported himself as a journalist while studying at the Drawing School of the Lowell Institute and with the Belgian lithographer Dominique C. Fabronius.

Chapter Two focuses on Millet's academic training at Antwerp and his subsequent travel and early work. This is the first comprehensive study of an American artist who studied at Antwerp. Millet's tenure at the Antwerp Royal Academy informed his ideas about art and provided the academic armature for his subsequent work. There he learned that art was an activity that engaged both the intellect and the imagination, and absorbed the techniques necessary for history and figure painting—strong draftsmanship from the nude and clothed model; facile paint handling and rich color; exposure to the examples of classical art and old master painting; and careful attention to compositional arrangements, costumes and properties, and light effects. Millet's teachers were masters of thematic versatility, moving easily from Romantic history painting to contemporary and historical genre paintings and portraiture. The Academy's director Nicaise De Keyser also produced illustrations for books and major mural ensembles.

Enhancing Millet's formal education was access to great art from the past and modern Europe—paintings and monumental fresco cycles that he saw in Antwerp, as well as in Holland, Germany, England and France. Later his work with the Massachusetts Board of Commissioners to the Vienna 1873 Universal Exposition gave him unprecedented exposure to a wide variety of European art, and began his direct and vital involvement with major international exhibitions. Following this, an

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

extended *wanderjahre* in Europe provided the opportunity to study more closely the art and culture of Eastern Europe, Turkey, Greece, and Italy.

Millet's travels in Italy familiarized him with major Renaissance and Baroque mural cycles, further demonstrating the possibilities for collaborative decorative programs. During this period Millet painted popular cosmopolitan subjects—picturesque Flemish and Italian figure and genre images, landscapes and seascapes, and exotic Near Eastern scenes. His painting style evolved from the heavily impastoed manner of his Antwerp student days toward a more fluid style in which he sought to reconcile his academic training, the examples of the Italian Renaissance masters, and more modern concerns with formal values and experiments in plein-air painting.

Chapter Three examines Millet's early working years in Boston and Paris before he moved to New York in 1880. Energized by his cosmopolitan experience, Millet returned to the United States in 1875 and established himself in Boston, where he quickly gained recognition as a portrait painter. Like many artists who returned from European training, he found it difficult to make a living by his art alone, and supplemented his income by writing for newspapers and journals. His participation as an exhibitor and his press coverage of the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial expanded his knowledge of modern European and Asian art. That same year he undertook two important assignments that would have a major impact on his later work. Millet received his first decorative commission, assisting John La Farge (1835-1910) in the decoration of Boston's new Trinity Church in Copley Square, a project that would pave the way for his major mural commissions of the 1890s and 1900s. He also

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

helped to launch the Drawing and Painting School of the Museum of Fine Arts, the first of his efforts to professionalize American art education.

In 1877 Millet returned to Europe to continue his studies in Paris, but when war broke out between Russia and Turkey, he went to the front as a correspondent. Returning to Paris after the war, Millet served on the jury for the 1878 Paris Universal Exposition and joined the American colony of artists and writers who had gathered in the city, painting portraits, near Eastern subjects and contemporary genre and seascapes. He married Elizabeth Greeley Merrill (1853-1932) in Paris in 1879, and a honeymoon trip to London gave him the opportunity to meet some of the English artists whose works he had admired earlier at the 1876 Centennial Exposition, and to familiarize himself with contemporary British painting. During this period Millet exhibited his figure paintings at major international shows, including the 1878 Brussels Exposition, and the 1879 Paris Salon and Royal Academy exhibitions, which helped establish his reputation abroad.

Millet returned to Boston in 1879, devoting much of his attention to the Museum of Fine Arts and its School of Drawing and Painting and to the exhibition programs of the St. Botolph Club, of which he was a charter member. He continued to paint portraits and more international subjects—Near Eastern images, picturesque Italian motifs, fashionable contemporary genre, poetic seascapes—experimented with American colonial themes, and made his first forays into costume design. Without abandoning his academic realist armature and idealistic artistic philosophy, in response to the progressive artists of the British Aesthetic movement, Millet became increasingly concerned with formal issues, and reinvigorated his search for aesthetic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

unity in his work. He supplemented his income by writing for the Boston Daily Advertiser and prominent art journals, and by lecturing on his war experiences and on ancient costume.

Chapter Four considers the period 1880 to 1884 when Millet lived in New York and frequently traveled in Europe, before establishing a second home in the English village of Broadway, Worcestershire. In these years Millet attained artistic maturity, came to the forefront of the New York art establishment and achieved international recognition. This was a period of intense creative activity during which he responded to a second mural commission—participating in the decoration of the Veterans' Room of the Second Regiment Armory in New York—experimented with secondary media, designed cartoons for stained glass, and became increasingly involved with costume design. His easel paintings continued to explore a wide range of subjects, while turning to classical motifs and scenes of genteel domesticity. His thematic versatility was matched by a stylistic versatility, as he responded to the formal harmonies of British aestheticism and Whistler, seventeenth-century Dutch genre painting, and at times, the Impressionists' concern with light. During these years Millet also became a more engaged public figure and a spokesperson for his fellow artists, leading the fight to eliminate tariffs on imported artwork, and serving on the Executive Committees of the Munich International, the Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibitions, and as a member of numerous art societies and philanthropic commissions in support of American art. At the same time, he solidified his international reputation and saw his first works enter American museum collections.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

An Epilogue considers Millet's work beyond these formative years, including a cluster of idealized genre paintings of contemporary and historical English and early American life that he produced during the late 1880s and into the next decade. A shift in artistic priorities toward more American subjects characterized the 1890s and 1900s, during which Millet responded to nationalistic sensibilities, while increasingly turning his attention to monumental mural decoration. Even as his major mural programs moved away from allegorical and classical subjects to complement American historical and/or local concerns, they remained deeply indebted to his European sources. He also worked tirelessly to create American artistic institutions comparable to those of Europe, an artistic establishment that he admired and wanted to see flourish on American soil.

Like many painters of his day, Millet had a diversified practice that included portraiture, expressive figure and genre painting, occasional landscapes and coastal views, and decorative projects. He worked in varied media, including oil, watercolor, pen and ink, and graphite. His major early paintings present portraits and fashionable European and American subjects—including picturesque Italian genre scenes, exotic Near Eastern subjects, American colonial themes, classical subjects, and scenes of genteel domesticity, which he depicted in a manner that synthesized his academic training and idealistic philosophy, old master traditions and modernist experimentation. His early murals prefigure his role in the monumental mural movement in America during the 1890s and 1900s. From the pictures and murals he painted, to the venues where he exhibited, to his efforts to bring American art into full participation in the international area, Millet was on the cutting edge of the new

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

aesthetic sensibilities that were changing American art in the 1870s and 1880s. Millet's work is eclectic in both subject and style, but always grounded in significant content and a desire to convey his idea or emotional response to a subject in an artful symbiosis of content and means. His fashionable subjects are also informed by the exigencies of earning a livelihood. Millet was not independently wealthy, and had to sell his artwork to support himself and his family. Hardworking and industrious from an early age, he frequently turned to writing, lecturing and illustration to supplement the income generated by his artistic productions, finding that critical acclaim did not easily translate into patronage. His artistic philosophy and his public service on behalf of American art were shaped by his upbringing and education, by his training at an esteemed academy, and by the benefits of study and travel abroad. His familiarity with international art movements convinced him that progress in American art was best served by its full participation in the international arena.

The words of Kate Field and the other contemporaneous commentators are telling. In many ways, Francis Davis Millet was the quintessential cosmopolitan American of his day. Hardworking, energetic, idealistic, cultivated, and gifted with rare diplomatic skills, this proponent of artistic internationalism, in his creative work and in his administrative work with art organizations and international exhibition committees, would help bring American art and American art education into the cosmopolitan milieu of the world's leading nations of the West.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Endnotes to Introduction

[1] For a discussion of cosmopolitanism and the impact of foreign training on American artists see H. Barbara Weinberg, The Lure of Paris: Nineteenth-Century American Painters and Their French Teachers (New York: Abbeville Press, 1991); idem, "Cosmopolitan Attitudes: The Coming of Age of American Art," in Annette Blaugrund et al, Paris 1889: American Artists at the Universal Exposition, exhibition catalog (Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, 1989), pp. 33-51; idem, "Late-Nineteenth-Century Painting: Cosmopolitan Concerns and Critical Controversies," Archives of American Art Journal 23, 4 (1983), pp. 19-26; Michael Quick, American Expatriate Painters of the Late Nineteenth Century, exhibition catalog (Dayton Art Institute, 1976); and Lois Marie Fink, "The Role of France in American Art, 1850-1870," (Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1970).

[2] F. D. Millet, "The Watts Exhibition," Harper's Monthly Magazine 71, 421 (June 1885), p. 101.

[3] Quick, p. 13.

[4] James Jackson Jarves, The Art-Idea (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960) [1864], pp. 166-167.

[5] Samuel G. W. Benjamin, Contemporary Art In Europe (New York: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1877, repr. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976), pp. 7-8.

[6] For an excellent discussion of the career of Washington Allston see William H. Gerdts & Theodore E. Stebbins, Jr., "A Man of Genius": The Art of Washington Allston (1779-1843), exhibition catalog (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1979).

[7] For an excellent discussion of the career of William Morris Hunt see Sally Webster, William Morris Hunt, 1824-1879 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

[8] Museum of Fine Arts, School of Drawing And Painting. First Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1877), pp. 14-15. The twelve members of the Permanent Committee of the Museum School listed in the First Anuual Report are the three principal officers and trustees of the museum, Martin Brimmer, C. C. Perkins and Charles G. Loring; the architects, Edward C. Cabot, Robert S. Peabody and William R. Ware; five painters, William Morris Hunt, John La Farge, Francis William Loring, Francis D. Millet and Frank Hill Smith; and Edward W. Hooper, Treasurer of Harvard College.

[9] Quoted in Martha A. S. Shannon, Boston Days of William Morris Hunt (Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1923), p. 89.

[10] M[ariana] G[riswold] Van Rensselaer, Book of American Figure Painters (Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott Company, 1886); Alfred Trumble, Representative Works of Contemporary American Artists (New York: c. 1887, repr. New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977); and George William Sheldon, Recent Ideals in American Art (New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, c. 1888, repr., New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1977).

[11] Sheldon, Recent Ideals, p. 38.

[12] Edward Strahan [Earl Shinn], The Art Treasures of America (Philadelphia: George Barrie Publisher, [1879-1882], repr., New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 3 vols.

[13] Frederick Baekeland, "Collectors of American Painting, 1813 to 1913," American Art Review 3, 6 (November-December 1976), pp 120-166.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[14] Weinberg, "Cosmopolitan Concerns," p. 25.

[15] Unidentified newspaper clipping, (June 30, 1881), AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[16] Henry James, Picture and Text (New York, 1893), p. 10.

[17] "Millet—Servant of American Art," New York Herald Magazine Section, 12 May 1912, pp. 1-2.

[18] For a discussion of the reassessment of the Gilded Age see Neil Harris, "The Gilded Age Reconsidered Once Again," Archives of American Art Journal 23, 4 (1983), pp. 8-18.

[19] Van Rensselaer, Book of American Figure Painters.

[20] Sheldon, Recent Ideals, pp. 35-36, 54, 82, 90.

[21] Samuel Isham, The History of American Painting (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936 [1905]), pp. 36-37, 384-387, 418-420, 544-547.

[22] Charles H. Caffin, The Story of American Painting: The Evolution of Painting in America from Colonial Times to the Present (New York and London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1970 [1907]), pp. 163-164, 326.

[23] Douglas L. Wilson, ed., The Genteel Tradition: Nine Essays by George Santayana (Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1967), pp. 1-25.

[24] Lewis Mumford, The Brown Decades: A Study of the Arts in America 1865-1895 (New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, c. 1931).

[25] Oliver W. Larkin, Art and Life in America (New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1949), p. 322.

[26] Virgil Barker, American Painting: History and Interpretation (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950), pp. 451-453; and E. P. Richardson, Painting in America (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1956), p. 355.

[27] H. Barbara Weinberg, "The Career of Francis Davis Millet," Archives of American Art Journal 17, 1 (1977), pp. 2-18.

[28] Joyce A. Sharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune: F. D. Millet, 1846-1912 (privately printed, 1984).

[29] David C. Huntington, "The Quest for Unity: American Art Between World's Fairs 1876-1893," in David C. Huntington and Kathleen Pyne, The Quest For Unity: American Art Between World's Fairs 1876-1893, exhibition catalog (The Detroit Institute of Arts. 1983), p. 26

[30] Cynthia H. Sanford, Heroes In The Fight For Beauty: The Muralists of the Hudson County Court House, exhibition catalog (Jersey City Museum, 1986), pp. 9-35, 61-67, 89, 95-96.

[31] Bailey Van Hook, Angels of Art: Women and Art in American Society, 1876-1914 (University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996), pp. 3, 38-39, 72, 77, 96.

[32] Van Hook, The Virgin & the Dynamo: Public Murals in American Architecture 1893-1917 (Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2003), pp. 6, 11, 55-57, 97, 142-145, 174.

[33] Marc Alfred Simpson, "Reconstructing The Golden Age: American Artists in Broadway, Worcestershire, 1885 to 1889," (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1993).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 1

BACKGROUND, EDUCATION AND EARLY YEARS IN BOSTON (1846-1871)

Francis Davis Millet's internationalist outlook, which combined a fierce American chauvinism with an admiration of European culture, was grounded in the circumstances of his birth, education and early training in Boston. Born into an old New England family that traced its roots back to the descendants of the early Massachusetts and Plymouth Bay colonies, Millet grew up with a keen appreciation of the nation's democratic experience that was enhanced by his service with the Union Army during the Civil War. The son of a country doctor, he passed his youth in comfortable surroundings that encouraged a broad liberal education, civic duty, and an interest in cultural pursuits. His parents supported his early interest in art, and later, his mature decision to pursue a career as a professional artist. Millet attended Harvard College, where he attained a classical education and a proficiency in foreign languages, accomplishments that broadened his world-view and would later allow him to move with ease in the international community of Europe. During his four years at Harvard, he became increasingly interested in art, and after graduation he sought to develop his artistic abilities in Boston. The city's cosmopolitan art community nourished his artistic leanings; however, its paucity of serious training opportunities in the fine arts left him frustrated. Ultimately, in the spring of 1871 he would leave Boston to further his art education in Europe.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Francis Davis Millet was born November 3, 1846 at Mattapoisett, Massachusetts, a seaport town on Buzzard's Bay in the southwestern corner of Plymouth County.[1] The second of five children born to Asa Millet (1813-1893) and Huldah Allen Byram (1818-1907), the eldest being his sister Susan Byram born in 1844, he was descended from a long line of New Englanders on both his paternal and maternal sides.[2] Millet was proud of his Yankee heritage, so much so that in later years he was a member of the New York Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.[3] His father Asa Millet was born in Leeds, Maine to Zebulon Parsons Millet (1773-1856) and Deliverance Rich (1779-1854), attended Waterville College, and received his medical degree from Bowdoin Medical School in Brunswick, Maine.[4] After settling in Mattapoisett in 1842, Asa became an esteemed and public-spirited country doctor. Millet's paternal grandfather Zebulon Parsons Millet was the son of Thomas Millet (1737-1823), a patriot in the Continental Army, and Eunice Parsons (1739-1820) of Gloucester, Massachusetts, and the great-great grandson of Thomas Millet (1605-1676) and Mary Greenaway (c. 1606-1682) who came from Chertsey in Surrey, England on the ship *Elizabeth* in 1635. They lived in Dorchester, Massachusetts, before settling in Gloucester in 1655. Beyond this, records in America and England trace the Millet family to fifteenth-century England and one John Myllet of Redwood, in the county of Hereford.

The artist's mother Huldah Allen Byram (1818-1907) also boasted a substantial New England heritage.[5] The daughter of Captain Branch Byram (1780-1860), a prominent farmer and landowner in East Bridgewater, Massachusetts, and his wife Anna Washburn (1781-1858), Huldah was born and raised in the town where

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

her family had lived since the seventeenth century. Genealogical records reveal that she was descended on her mother's side from the Mayflower Pilgrims John and Priscilla Alden, and on her father's side from Nicholas Byram of England and Ireland. His son, "Captain" Nicholas Byram, settled in present-day East Bridgewater in 1662, and owned a large tract of land by a grant from the Massachusetts Bay Colony.[6] Huldah's maternal ancestor Isaac Alden, a grandson of John Alden, moved from nearby Plymouth Colony to East Bridgewater about 1685, and, in time, also amassed extensive land holdings.[7] After her marriage to Asa Millet in 1843, Huldah moved to Mattapoisett, where her husband had established a medical practice.[8] In a rambling wooden house on Water Street, which is still extant, the young Francis Davis Millet, known to his family and friends as Frank, began his life.[9]

In November 1847, soon after Frank's first birthday, the Millets moved to East Bridgewater, the inland agricultural and industrial center that was his mother's ancestral home, living first at Bedford Street, and later at Central Street.[10] Dr. Millet involved himself in local politics and the Temperance movement, and in 1848 was a leading candidate for Massachusetts State Senator.[11] His political connections would later prove beneficial to his eldest son. Two younger children were born in East Bridgewater, Lucia Allen in 1851 and Josiah Byram in 1853, and Frank and his older sister Susan attended the local school there.[12] The family remained in East Bridgewater until December 1854 when they moved to Abington, another rural community approximately ten miles north, where Dr. Millet hoped to find a more lucrative practice. He built a large house on Walnut Street to accommodate his growing family and again was active in civic affairs, serving on the Abington School

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Board and the Plymouth County Medical Society.[13] The youngest of the Millet children, Charles Sumner, was born in the Walnut Street house in 1858.[14] It was in Abington, the Millet home for the next eight years, that Frank Millet spent a large portion of his childhood and adolescence.

Millet's recollections of this period are detailed in a diary that he kept for the first six months of 1858 when he was eleven years old.[15] They reveal the idyllic boyhood of an industrious and energetic youth, and hint at his future career as an artist. Millet grew up in comfortable circumstances on a New England farm, where his days were filled with an ample measure of chores, schooling, games, sports, religion, and cultural pursuits. By his own account, he rose early, tended to such routine tasks as chopping wood or gathering eggs from the barn, and helped with the younger children before leaving for school. His schooling was broad and varied. The curriculum included arithmetic, reading, geography, Latin grammar, physiology, and bookkeeping, among other subjects. An excellent student, Millet was described by one of his teachers as "an India rubber boy. I can never give him a lesson that he will not learn. He can be stretched to any dimensions."[16] After school and on Saturdays there were additional chores. Like the other children in the neighborhood, Millet helped feed the livestock and plow the fields, but he also found time for recreation. Depending on the season, he went sledding or skating, played in the woods along the old Indian trails, or rowed a twenty-foot skiff he had built himself down the nearby rivers to Plymouth Harbor. Boating would become a lifelong passion. In the evenings he prepared his lessons and read such boyhood fare as The Spy (1821),

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The Pilot (1823) and Red Rover (1827) by James Fenimore Cooper (1789-1851). Sundays were taken up with endless church-going. The Millets were Congregationalists, but practiced a rather ecumenical Protestantism, and it was not unusal for Millet to attend a Swedenborgian service in the morning, a Universalist service in the afternoon, and the Congregational Sabbath school later in the day. Still, there was plenty of time in his weekly schedule for attending lectures at the local meeting house, for piano lessons, for playing his fiddle, and for painting and drawing. Millet's artistic interests developed early, and he regularly recorded in his diary that he was "painting pictures," "painting on tile," "drawing on my panorama," or reading in the "museums."[17] His mother Huldah Millet was a gifted needlework designer and amateur watercolor artist, who specialized in painting native flowers.[18] Surely, she encouraged her eldest son's artistic pursuits.

The Civil War intruded on this pleasurable New England world. As early as March 17, 1858 young Frank muses in the diary about the impending national tragedy. "This evening," wrote Millet, "I went up to the Lyceum, the question was as follows. 'Is war justified under any circumstances?'"[19] When war finally erupted with the attack on Fort Sumter on April 12, 1861, the Millets supported the Union cause. Dr. Millet volunteered his medical services to Massachusetts Governor John A. Andrew, and later served on the Governor's Council of Advisors.[20] As war casualties mounted, he went to the front several times, serving as a contract surgeon with General McClellan's Army of the Potomac at White House, Virginia in 1862, and with General Burnside at Fredericksburg, Virginia in 1863 and 1864.[21] Frank Millet accompanied his father on the latter trip and witnessed war for the first time.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Eager to join the regular army, on July 8,1864 at the age of seventeen, he enlisted in the 60th Regiment of the Massachusetts Volunteer Militia, serving first as a drummer boy and later as a guard.[22] The 60th Regiment was one of five militia regiments organized in the summer of 1864 for one hundred days' service.[23] These units were typically employed for guard and garrison duty, thus releasing the more experienced soldiers for service at the front. Millet's company first went to Baltimore, Maryland, and on August 8, 1864 was ordered to garrison duty at Indianapolis, Indiana, where he spent the last four months of his service guarding a stockade containing five thousand Confederate prisoners.[24]

The Civil War made a lasting impression on Millet. The "thousands of wounded coming in from the front"; the amputations and wound dressings with which he assisted his father; the troop movements, dress parades, drills and court martials; and the ride through the picturesque Allegheny mountains on the way to Indianapolis, are all described vividly on the pages of a diary he kept from May 12, 1864 to May 29, 1865.[25] He would later draw on his Civil War experience for one of the murals he painted for the State Capitol at St. Paul, Minnesota in 1905-1907—*The Fourth Minnesota Regiment Entering Vicksburg*.[26]

His active service over, Millet was discharged from his regiment on November 30, 1864 and he returned to Bridgewater, where his family had moved in 1862.[27] His diary relates that he resumed his normal activities—for example, his share of farm chores, as well as more pleasurable pursuits such as sailing, fishing, and socializing. Millet, apparently, also found time for visiting the local art shops, for on February 22, 1865 he reports, "Today Mary & I & Sue . . . went over to Sloan's

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

picture gallery."[28] Millet's primary concerns in the mid-1860s, however, were directed to his own education, and his army discharge certificate confirms this, describing him as "18 years of age 5 feet 6 inches high, light complexion, Hazle [*sic*] eyes Leight [*sic*] hair, and by occupation when enrolled, a student."[29]

In December 1864 Millet began studying with John Shaw, a Bridgewater tutor, to prepare for matriculation at Harvard College in September 1865.[30] At Harvard, he received a broad classical education, with an emphasis on languages, and his college years were marked by continued academic success. He placed in the top quarter of his class, and graduated in 1869 with honors in Modern Languages and Literature.[31] During these years Millet's interest in art began to crystallize. Several accounts note that he was designing posters for college theatrical productions, working as an amateur photographer, and doing "various odd painting jobs," including sign painting during one summer vacation.[32] In the summer of 1866, a painter who had been decorating the facade of the Eagle Cotton Gins establishment in Bridgewater was taken ill, and Millet was asked to complete the job. In addition to lettering the large sign, he elaborated on the project, adding a handsome painted eagle. On seeing Millet's work, the older man is said to have told several people that "this Millet boy has done my job much better than I could."[33] However, sign painting, poster illustration and photography were not Millet's only artistic interests—he also was simultaneously producing some of his earliest easel paintings.

His first known signed and dated work, a small landscape of native American scenery entitled *Natural Bridge in Virginia*, (1868, Fig. 1.1), dates from his college years.[34] Millet painted this view of the famous rock bridge formation near

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Lexington, Virginia on a cupboard door in his dormitory during his junior year at Harvard. Created through the centuries by the erosion of Cedar Creek on the limestone strata, Natural Bridge had captured the imagination of artists and travelers since the eighteenth century. Although Millet had visited Virginia on two occasions during the Civil War, he never went far enough West in the state to see this scenic wonder.[35] It is possible that he was inspired by an earlier nineteenth-century engraving or painting of the subject by such prominent Hudson River School artists as Frederic Church (1826-1900) and David Johnson (1827-1908), who had painted in the Lexington area in the 1850s and early 1860s—for example, Church's *The Natural Bridge, Virginia* (1852, Bayly Art Museum at the University of Virginia, Charlottesville) or Johnson's *The Natural Bridge of Virginia* (1860, Collection of Jo Ann and Julian Ganz, Jr.). However, Millet's broad, subjective style is quite different from the precise naturalism of the Hudson River School landscapes and their allegiance to the "truth to nature" principles advocated by the English critic and artist John Ruskin (1819-1900) and the American Pre-Raphaelites. While it is tempting to interpret this experimental, early work as a demonstration of Millet's familiarity with the more poetic, expressive French Barbizon landscapes then popular in Boston art circles,[36] the awe-inspiring composition, with the void under the arch occupying a central position, and the dramatic contrasts of light and shadow suggest that the artist was responding to the older concept of the sublime defined by the British aesthetician Edmund Burke (1729-1797) in his Philosophical Enquiry into the Origins of Our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful of 1757. More germane to Millet's vision at this stage were, perhaps, the many serial landscape views eulogizing America's sublime

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and picturesque natural attractions that were printed in America and Europe. Millet's depiction is particularly close to the picture *Natural Bridge, Virginia* (Fig. 1.2) drawn by the New York artist William Goodacre (active New York 1829-1835), which was engraved for the 1846 Boston edition of John Howard Hinton's The History and Topography of the United States. The Goodacre version was one of the best-known images of Natural Bridge, and it was widely imitated by artists in both America and Europe.[37]

The unlocated painting entitled *Out of Reach* may also date to this period. Known today only from a photograph (Fig. 1.3) preserved in the Francis Davis Millet Papers at the American Academy of Arts and Letter, it depicts a horse leaning from his stall towards a barrel of feed, and is inscribed "Owned by D. T. Burrell, Brockton, Mass. 1869."[38]

It was during his Harvard years that Millet decided on an artistic career, according to one family source. "At the end of his Junior year," the artist's grandson and namesake Francis Davis Millet II writes, "he and his father decided that it should be his life work. They thought wisely enough, however, that he should finish his study at Harvard and have the background of a college education, should he fail as an artist."[39]

After his graduation from Harvard in 1869, Millet worked as a reporter for the Boston Daily Advertiser, and later became the city editor of the Courier and the Boston Saturday Evening Gazette, while he continued to nourish his interest in art.[40] To save money, he boarded with the family of Horatio Merrill in Cambridge, whose son Royal Whitman was a Harvard classmate, friend, and fellow journalist on the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Boston Daily Advertiser staff.[41] Later, in 1879, he would marry Royal's sister, Elizabeth Greeley, perhaps the fruition of a romance that began during this period. In his spare time Millet studied lithography with the well-known Boston practitioner of that medium, Dominique C. Fabronius (d. after 1888).[42] The son of a Belgian lithographer, Fabronius had received his artistic training in Paris, and emigrated to America in the 1850s. A successful watercolorist, crayon portraitist, and lithographer, he worked in several American cities before moving in 1861 to Boston, where he drew on stone for all the major firms, designed and printed his own work, and starting in 1869, offered lessons in his studio on School Street.[43] Although best known for his copies after the paintings of the acclaimed Boston artist William Morris Hunt (1824-1879), Fabronius was a celebrated portrait lithographer whose work is distinguished by a delicacy of handling and masterful tonal gradations.

Exactly what Millet learned from Fabronius and the extent of his involvement with the lithographic medium are unknown. In the last half of the nineteenth century it was not unusual for aspiring artists to take up lithography, particularly in locales where there were few opportunities for serious art education. Many young artists in Boston, like Winslow Homer (1836-1910), Joseph Foxcroft Cole (1837-1892) and Thomas Wilmer Dewing (1851-1938), began their artistic careers as apprentices in one of Boston's lithographic establishments before moving on to a more concentrated or formal study of fine art. Given the time constraints of his employment as a journalist, it is unlikely that Millet worked as an apprentice for one of the principal lithographic firms. More likely, after receiving some instruction from Fabronius, he operated as a freelance artist, occasionally drawing designs on stone for an

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

established lithographer printer. Only a few of Millet's lithographs survive, among them *Signora Morlacchi*, c. 1870 (Fig.1.4), a portrait of the celebrated dancer Guiseppina Morlacchi, whose ballet troupe performed in several Boston theaters in 1869 and 1870, and *Beware*, c.1870 (Fig. 1.5), a portrait of an unidentified sitter reported to have been largely copied from a Berlin photograph.[44] *Beware* was exhibited at the Williams & Everett gallery in Boston, where Millet's expertise in the medium was noted by the reviewer for the Boston Daily Advertiser, who termed it "a very neat and artistic lithograph."[45] Both works demonstrate that Millet, like his teacher, was a skilled monochrome lithographer, capable of achieving extraordinarily delicate drawing and velvety tonal effects. Two other lithographs that Millet produced at this time are presently unlocated—*Signor* (1870, formerly James Hunt collection) and *George Bryant Wood* (c. 1870), a portrait of the Shakespearian scholar and drama critic on the staff of the Boston Advertiser.[46]

In addition to experimenting with lithography, between 1869 and 1871 Millet participated in the life class of the Drawing School of the Lowell Institute. Boston's Lowell Institute, a forum for free public lectures on Christianity, philosophy, natural history, and the arts and sciences, had established a drawing school in 1850 offering free studio art classes, which emphasized drawing from actual objects rather than from engravings.[47] The school, under the directorship of William Hollingsworth, was located in the rear rooms of the Marlboro Hotel on Washington Street, where it continued uninterrupted until 1878. Classes were held in the evenings, and initially attracted amateurs, but by the 1860s had become a meeting place for young artists. A reviewer for the Art Journal described the merits and shortcomings of the class:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Ten years ago the place for art instruction in the city was the Free-Drawing School of the Lowell Institute, where the rudimentary principles of the art were taught in a routine way, the encouragement of the artistic spirit being scarcely thought of. Nevertheless, some of our noted American artists made their first beginnings in this school, and now doubtless, look back with tenderness on their evenings in the dingy old rooms of the Institute.[48]

The landscape painter and writer H. Winthrop Peirce (1850-1935), who had been one of the students in the class, offered a harsher assessment:

> The Drawing School of the Lowell Institute was curiously sterile and futile. Twice a week a class drew first a pile of boxes, then a plaster ball, then a white garden vase. An entire winter was devoted to each drawing, painfully elaborated with a sharp pointed crayon. There were a few casts about the room on which the pupil, if he still survived, could begin in his fourth year. This was the entire course.[49]

In 1866, frustrated by the lack of opportunity for serious art training in Boston, the students organized a life class.[50] The Institute provided the use of the room, heat and light, but offered no financial help. The class was run by the students themselves, who cooperatively hired the models and critiqued each other's work. By the time Millet was a participant, the life class had attracted a number of young Boston painters, including Benjamin Curtis Porter (1845-1918), George Munzig (1859-1908), Frederic Porter Vinton (1846-1911), James Wells Champney (1843-1903), Thomas Wilmer Dewing, Edwin Lord Weeks (1849-1903) and John Johnston (1847-1886), among others, and functioned as an ad hoc art academy. Unlike New York and Philadelphia, where the National Academy of Design and the Pennslyvania Academy of Fine Arts, respectively, offered regular classes in drawing and painting from the live model, Boston did not have an art academy. William Morris Hunt, Boston's most celebrated artist, offered instruction in charcoal drawing in his studio on Summer Street from 1868 to 1875, but there is no record that Millet studied with

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

him. Hunt's students were primarily young women of a certain social standing, and he was criticized in the press for spending his time "teaching a lot of women" and for giving "to school-girls what was meant for mankind."[51] The sculptor and painter Dr. William Rimmer (1816-1879), who had begun to give anatomy lectures at various institutions in the city in 1861 and occasionally offered private drawing classes, and who might have served as a mentor for Millet, was teaching at Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art in New York in 1869, returning to Boston late in 1870.[52] Between 1866 and 1876, except for a "Life School" that met sporadically in the cellar of the Boston Arts Club, the only life class available to painters on a regular basis was the one at the Lowell Drawing School.[53] This did not mean that Boston lacked interest in or appreciation of art, but that, as Peirce noted, "as a community, in questions of art education, Boston was still in the eighteenth century."[54] Millet, too, recalled with frustration the limited training opportunities in the city:

> Even Boston, large as it was, gave no better advantages to an art student than those afforded by the Lowell Institute, where a model posed one evening in the week for the young artists to draw from without instruction.[55]

It is not surprising, given this state of affairs, that in 1876 Millet would be one of the members of the Permanent Committee in charge of operations for the School of Drawing and Painting of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston—a committee dedicated to creating a rigorous and professional art education program modeled on the systems of the European academies.[56]

Despite the paucity of serious art training in the city, Boston was home to a vital and rapidly expanding art scene, and Millet was an eager participant in it. By late 1870 he had established himself in a studio in the new Studio Building at the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

corner of Tremont and Bromfield Streets and listed himself in the City Directory as an "Artist."[57] Built in 1862, the Studio Building fostered a sense of community, and in 1870 thirty artists were using it, including Joseph Foxcroft Cole, Thomas Hill (1829-1908) and Alfred Ordway (1821-1897).[58] Nearby streets like Washington and Summer contained other artists' studios, art suppliers, and prominent art dealers such as Williams & Everett, Hendrickson, Doll & Richards, A. A. Childs & Co., and De Vries, Ibarra & Co. At 48 Bromfield Street, across from the Studio Building, the Leonard & Co. firm did a brisk auction business in engravings and in fine and decorative art commodities. A few blocks away on Beacon Street the Boston Athenaeum, the city's oldest (founded in 1807) and principal cultural institution, functioned as an art museum and exhibition gallery, as well as a private library. In some sense, it can be considered the forerunner of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston.[59]

Millet's written impressions of the Boston art scene, if any, have not survived,[60] but during his four years at Harvard and two subsequent years in Boston, he had every opportunity to view the vast array of American and European paintings and prints, both contemporary works and old masterpieces, that were on display in the local galleries. Boston patrons and collectors were particularly responsive to European art, and exhibitions throughout the city reflected a cosmopolitan bias. The Boston Athenaeum set the standard at their annual exhibitions, where contemporary works by American and European artists were often showcased alongside the Athenaeum's own collection of American and European masters and pictures lent by local collectors. Between 1865 and 1871 annual exhibitions at the Boston

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Athenaeum included 368 artists, of which 188 (slightly more than half) were European. The largest single national school represented in this group was the French, which numbered forty-six painters. The French were followed by thirty-two Dutch school painters; thirty-one British; twenty-two German; twenty-one Italian; seventeen Flemish-Belgian; three each Spanish and Swiss; two each Austrian, Alsatian and Danish; and six of unknown nationality. The seventeen Flemish-Belgian artists included both old masters and contemporary painters, who exhibited a total of forty-five works (some of which were repeated from year to year). Three works were shown in 1865; four in 1866; five in 1867; three in 1868; ten in 1869; five in 1870 and fifteen in 1871.[61] Although the number of Flemish-Belgian works in the Athenaeum annuals is small, it increased in the seven-year period, and, given Millet's subsequent study at the Antwerp Royal Academy of Fine Arts, the presence of these works in Boston may have influenced his artistic goals.

The growing enthusiasm for European art was not lost on European entrepreneurs like the Belgian-born London art dealer Ernest Gambart (1816-1902) and Alfred Cadart (1828-1875) of the Paris firm of Cadart and Luguet. Gambart organized two exhibitions of contemporary French, English and Flemish art that he presented at the Studio Building in New York in 1866 and 1867.[62] Unlike his earlier exhibitions, the single-picture showing of *The Horse Fair* (1852, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York) by the French painter Rosa Bonheur (1822-1899) in 1857 and his exhibition of French and Flemish art in 1860, these events did not travel to Boston, but they received extensive press coverage, and Millet may have been aware of them. The 1866 exhibition consisted of 176 paintings.[63]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The 1867 exhibition was smaller and consisted of 118 pictures including Lawrence Alma-Tadema (1836-1912) *The Poet* (location unknown); *Gustave* de Jonghe (1829-1893) *The Careful Mother* (location unknown); Louis Gallait (1810-1887) *At The Prison Door* (location unknown); Jan Geeraerts (1819-1890) *Interior of St. Paul, Antwerp* (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp); Hendrik Leys (1815-1869) *The Proposal* (1856, Private collection); Alfred Stevens (1823-1906) *The Afternoon Conversation* (location unknown); Eugène Verboeckhoven (1798-1881) *Flemish Meadows, near Ostend* (location unknown) and Florent Willems (1823-1905) *The Toilette* (1862, Muséess royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels).[64] In addition to highlighting the work of the French, English, and Flemish school artists, the exhibitions also included works by other well-known continental artists such as the Dutch painter Jozef Israëls (1824-1911), and the Düsseldorf artist Andreas Achenbach (1815-1910). Gambart, who had operated a print shop in Courtrai, Belgium and in Paris before establishing himself in London in 1842 as one of the leading print publishers and art dealers of the time, had extensive pan-European connections and contributed to what the art critic John Durand termed "an inundation" of European paintings in America.[65] Public response to the paintings was generally favorable, with the critic for the Nation preferring the work of the Belgian painters of history and historical genre to the more market-driven, superficial and sensuous French offerings:

> It is in reaction against the school of fashion, of frivolity, and of vice that that strange Flemish army has taken the field of which Baron Wappers was, perhaps, the first soldier, and which Baron Henry Leys has long and gallantly lead. In its inception this enterprise, seems to have been a national one. . . . The school, though few in numbers, has been signally successful. There has been a power in it that has made itself felt throughout Europe. . . . It is difficult to say how much of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> the celebrity, influence, and importance of the school is due to the great abilities of Leys; but that much of it is so due, there can be no question . . . .The powerful and, on the whole, happy influence which he has exercised over his numerous pupils, and the real excellence displayed in the works of some of these seem to give promise of good art in Belgium to come as well as past. And there are others who have not been his pupils who yet are working in such concert with them as to help rather than hinder. Pictures painted in pursuance of the *doctrines aesthetiques* . . . for which the principal claim upon our gratitude is just the presence of the valuable works of MM. Alma-Tadema, Koller, Lagye, and De Brackeleer, painters whose works have been almost unknown in America before.[66]

A later article more specifically praised the history paintings and frescoes of the Belgian painter Hendrik Leys:

> Among those painters who have, with learning and sympathy painted the history of the past, Leys, as we have seen stands high. Nearly all his serious work has been unadorned relation of actual events, chapters from the history of the Netherlands correlative to Motley's chapters . . . . And his mission now seems to be to paint the whole history of Antwerp, page by page, on the walls of her town hall.[67]

In April 1866, midway between the two Gambart exhibitions, the Parisian dealer Cadart and Luguet brought an important collection of contemporary French art to Boston.[68] Alfred Cadart had founded the Société des Aquafortistes (French Etching Club) in 1863, and the exhibition included a large number of prints, together with what were then considered very avant-garde French paintings by such artists as Eugène Boudin (1824-1898), Jean-Baptiste-Camille Corot (1796-1875), Gustave Courbet (1819-1877), Johan Barthold Jongkind (1819-1891) and Claude Monet (1840-1926). The show debuted at the Derby Gallery in New York before traveling to the rooms of Leonard & Co. in Boston. If the critic for the New York Times was somewhat equivocal, declaring the prints "to be of absorbing interest," while dismissing the paintings as "eccentricities of Gallic genius," the reviewer for the Boston Daily Advertiser offered a decidedly sophisticated assessment of modern

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

French painting, describing the collection as "one of very rare and beautiful pictures."[69] The picture that generated the most interest was Courbet's *The Quarry* (1857, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), and the recently organized Allston Club, a group of Boston artists, collectors, and dealers formed under the leadership of William Morris Hunt to promote the work and more progressive aesthetic concerns of contemporary Boston artists, raised $5,000 to purchase the painting, the first work by the French realist to enter an American collection. The favorable response to French art in Boston convinced Cadart to hold a second exhibition later that year.[70]

The Boston Art Club, a group of professional artists and friends organized in 1854 to purportedly showcase the work of contemporary Boston artists, presented eclectic exhibitions which often included modern European painting, thereby also contributing to the international tenor of the Boston art world. In its April 1866 exhibition at Horticultural Hall a viewer could see works by such Boston artists as William Morris Hunt, John La Farge (1835-1910), William Babcock (1826-1899), Winckworth Allan Gay (1821-1910) and Alfred Copeland (1840-1909), alongside landscapes by prominent New York painters Frederic Church and Albert Bierstadt (1830-1902), and pictures by contemporary French artists Emile Lambinet (1815-1877) and Félix de Brissot (1818-1892). A reviewer for the Boston Daily Advertiser praised the "above the average" show, observing that the "two Lambinets, a Brissot, and some others less familiar, gave to the collection that direct and legitimate French element" which he saw reflected in the works of the various Boston artists.[71] By the time of the May 1870 exhibition, a reviewer for the same newspaper applauded the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"especial prominence being given to the works of foreign artists, although several very fine pictures of home production were shown."[72]

The short-lived Allston Club (1866-1867) brought the flavor of an international salon to Boston. Its inaugural exhibition in the Studio Building in the spring of 1866 included landscapes by some of the best-known contemporary French Barbizon artists such as Constant Troyon (1810-1865), Théodore Rousseau (1812-1867), Emile Lambinet, Jean-Baptiste-Camille Corot and Charles-Francois Daubigny (1817-1878); portraits by Rosa Bonheur; several works by Jean-Francois Millet (1814-1875), including *The Sower* (1850, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston) lent by William Morris Hunt; and the star of the club's own collection—Courbet's *The Quarry* (1857, MFAB). These pictures were exhibited alongside works by the French Romantic painters Eugène Delacroix (1798-1853) and Jean-Léon Gérôme (1824-1904); pictures by the contemporary Belgian artists Pierre Joseph Coomans (1816-1889), Johannes de Haas (d. 1908) and Gustave de Jonghe; and work by the Boston artists Hunt, Gay, Albion Bicknell (1837-1915), Thomas Robinson (1831-1888), Elihu Vedder (1836-1923), La Farge, Joseph Ames (1816-1872) and George Fuller (1822-1884), among others.[73]

Boston art dealers similarly reflected and encouraged the city's cosmopolitan taste, exhibiting and selling both European and American art. In 1869 one could see modern French paintings and the latest works by Boston and New York artists at De Vries & Ibarra; Alfred Bierstadt's single-picture-exhibition *Among The Sierra Nevada Mountains, California* (1868, National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.), on the first stop of its American tour, at

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Childs gallery; a "brilliant collection of pictures" at Williams & Everett, which included Gérôme's *The Arena* (location unknown), a *Fisher Girl* (location unknown) by William Bouguereau (1825-1905), James Tissot's (1836-1902) *Chinese Cabinet* (location unknown), a "small canvas" by the Belgian painter Verboeckhoven , the efforts of the Boston artist Henry Bacon (1834-1912) and landscapes by George Inness (1825-1894); as well as pictures by the French artist Anton Diffenbach (1831-1914) and new paintings by the Boston artists Hunt and Gay, among others, at the Doll & Richards gallery.[74] In light of Millet's subsequent study with the Antwerp history, genre and portrait painter Josef Henri Van Lerius (1823-1876), one can assume that he visited Van Lerius' painting of the gypsy girl *Esmeralda* (c. 1850, Musées de royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels), a subject from Victor Hugo's Hunchback of Notre Dame, which was attracting huge crowds at the Childs & Co. Gallery from December 1869 through January 1870.[75] Millet also would have had the opportunity to see Van Lerius' popular literary genre picture entitled *Cinderella* (see Fig. 2.17), which a reviewer for the Boston Saturday Evening Gazette mistakenly referred to as "A striking German [*sic*] painting," at the Williams & Everett gallery in May 1871[76]

The auction galleries offered a similar international display. In February 1869 Leonard & Co. auctioned the collection of Mr. L. P. Beaumont of New York—a collection that included paintings by the American artists Bierstadt, William Sidney Mount (1807-1868) and Eastman Johnson (1824-1906), and works by such European artists as Achenbach, de Jonghe, Verboeckhoven, Louis Robbe (1806-1887) and Alexandre-Marie Guillemin (1817-1880). In May, Leonard Bird & Co. auctioned a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

collection of modern European and American paintings consigned to Williams & Everett by Goupil & Co, including works by Bierstadt, Inness, Edouard Frère (1819-1886), Achenbach, Verboeckhoven, Lambinet, Raimundo de Madrazo (1841-1920), and Franz De Buel (19th century). This was followed by a June auction of the collection of Mr. D. Huyvetter of Antwerp—a collection of French, Belgian and Düsseldorf school artists.[77] For those who desired oil paintings, but had more modest budgets, galleries like Williams & Everett offered reams of individually engraved and chromolithographed prints and elaborately illustrated gift books with full-page plates after celebrated works by American and European painters, "chiefly of the English, French and Belgian schools."[78] In his assessment of the private collections in Boston, the art critic William Howe Downes (1854-1941) took note of their decidedly cosmopolitan flavor, stating:

> In the forty collections with which I have some acquaintance, there are less than one fourth which do not contain a respectable proportion of American works, though I have yet to hear of a collection made up exclusively of native productions, like that of Mr. Thomas H. Clarke's in New York. Why should a man who loves pictures and is able to gratify his taste confine his attention to the art of a single nation, even his own? Does one buy paintings from motives of patriotism?[79]

The lack of an opportunity for academic training and the proliferation of European paintings in Boston and their favorable reception surely fueled Millet's desire to continue his formal art schooling abroad. Although it is not certain why he chose to study in Antwerp over Paris or Munich, Paris being the pre-eminent destination for American art students seeking European training in the 1870s, one may presume that the political situation in Europe was a factor. Between July 15, 1870 and the signing of the Treaty of Frankfurt on May 10, 1871, France and Prussia were at war. This was followed by ten months of civil unrest in the French capital.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Belgium, an independent country since 1830, would have offered political stability during a time of intense volatility in Paris. Concerns about the situation in France were regularly discussed in the Boston press. The comments of a reporter for the Boston Daily Advertiser are fairly typical:

> Rumor still has the ear of Europe in everything relating to the Emperor of the French. One day he intends to abdicate; another he has decided to declare his son to be of age next year; then he was determined not to call the legislature together despite Mr. Keratry's threats; and the next morning he was going to consult M. de Beust as to the best way of fighting back Prussian aggression. For twelve hours there was a belief that he contemplated a second coup d'état, but the notion gave way to the bigger report that he had arranged finally with the Austrian Premier for a war against Prussia, the alleged designs of the latter upon Baden forming the aggravation.[80]

Conversely, as a writer for the Nation observed, "Belgium, since the revolution of 1851, which brought a Bonaparte to the French Empire, has remained an oasis of freedom between despotic and military governments; and no one can remain indifferent to the destinies of a nation which, since 1830, has proved capable of preserving its free institutions."[81]

Millet's study with the Belgian-born lithographer Fabronius may also have been a factor in his choosing to study in Antwerp. Fabronius may have directed him to the venerable Antwerp Royal Academy of Fine Arts. Founded in 1663 as the third oldest art school in Europe, after the Accademia di San Luca at Rome in 1478 and the Académie Royale de Peinture et de Sculpture at Paris in 1648, it offered students an opportunity to acquire technical skills in a highly professional atmosphere. In addition, the presence of Flemish old master paintings and modern Belgian pictures in Boston, as well as the avid commentary surrounding them in the press, would have attracted Millet to Antwerp where a fine collection of Flemish Primitive and Baroque

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

masterpieces and works by contemporary Belgian painters were housed in the Antwerp Academy museum. Antwerp's collection was sufficiently renowned to warrant mention as an exemplar for American public galleries in James Jackson Jarves' book on contemporary American art, The Art-Idea, published in 1864.[82] Finally, Antwerp offered a rich cultural environment where, as the critic for the Nation reminded his readers in 1866, life and art were intertwined:

> Thousands of men and women live in France and Belgium by the direct practice of fine art, as only a few score live in America; and the whole population, at least of the cities and town are brought face to face with the fine arts, and have them for a part of their daily life.[83]

The promise of a "rich cultural environment" where art and life were mutually supportive would have intrigued Millet, had he read this review. Millet's early years in America had given him a broad liberal education, an awareness of the cultural riches of Europe, and the bare rudiments of artistic training. They had helped shape his interest in and his knowledge of art. What they could not provide were the professional standards he sought for his development as a painter, the government-supported art schools, or the patronage that could be found in Europe. Daily life for an American artist in Boston in the early 1870s was a struggle. There was no art academy to offer instruction in drawing and painting from the live model, training opportunities were meager, and collectors tended to buy the work of European artists or American artists who treated European subjects and/or worked in European styles. While supporting himself with newspaper work, Millet had exhausted the local study resources. He now found it necessary to leave Boston to continue his art education in Europe. According to a family account, in the late spring of 1871 Millet "wound up his affairs with the newspapers, finished lithographs which were promised, and his

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

first two portraits [unlocated], closed his studio in Boston, and went home for a few weeks."[84] Then, on May 24, 1871, he sailed from New York for Antwerp.[85]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Endnotes to Chapter 1

[1] The richest primary sources of biographical information on Francis Davis Millet are the Francis Davis Millet and Millet Family Papers on deposit in the Archives of American Art. Smithsonian Institution in New York City and Washington, D. C., at the American Academy of Arts and Letters in New York City, and a biography by his granddaughter, Joyce A. Sharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune: F. D. Millet, 1846-1912 (Utica, New York: 1984). See especially Hilda Millet Booth and John Alfred Parsons Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," typescript, c. 1937, John Alfred Parsons Millet Papers, Archives of American Art, [hereafter, JAPM/AAA], Reel 1100, Frames 523-898; Francis Davis Millet II, "Frank Millet—A Sketch," typescript, c. 1940, Francis Davis Millet Papers, Archives of American Art [hereafter FDM/AAA], Reel 848, Frames 1-68; Francis Millet Rogers, "Frank Millet, American of Americans," typescript, c. 1945, Francis Millet Rogers Papers, Archives of American Art [hereafter FMR/AAA], Reel 1096, Frames 140-269; [Joyce A. Sharpey-Schafer], "In Search of an Ancestor," typescript, 1966, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100, Frames 434-522; and "Frank D. Millet: Artist, Journalist, Critic," Abington [Mass.] Herald, 20 March 1884, newspaper clipping in Millet Scrapbook I, np., the Francis Davis Millet Papers, American Academy of Arts and Letters [hereafter AAA&L].

[2] Information regarding Millet's paternal ancestry is contained in James Savage, A Genealogical Dictionary of The First Settlers of New England (Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co, Inc., 1990), 3: 212-213; Thomas Patrick Hughes and Frank Munsell, American ancestry: giving the name and descent, in the male line, of Americans whose ancestors settled in the United States previous to the Declaration of Independence, A.D. 1776 (Baltimore: Genealogical Pub. Co., 1968), 4: 9; Asa Millet Genealogy and Record Book, np., Millet Family Papers, East Bridgewater, Massachusetts Public Library [hereafter EBPL]; "Society of Descendants of Colonial Clergy," JAPM/AAA, Reel 1099, Frames 1171-1172; and letters dated 24 February 2002 and 16 March 2002 from David Millet Emerson, a great-nephew of the artist, to the author.

[3] Francis Millet Rogers, "Frank Millet, American of Americans," FMR/AAA, Reel 1096, Frame 145.

[4] Biographical information regarding Asa Millet is contained in Josiah B. Millet, "Recollections," typescript, 1932, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1099, Frame 1179; "Dr. Millet Dead," unidentified newspaper clipping in Mary Keith Scrapbook VIII, p. 39, EBPL and "The Millets," Abington [Mass.] Herald, 13 March 1884, newspaper clipping in Millet Scrapbook I, AAA&L.

[5] Information regarding Huldah Allen Byram's ancestry is contained in Savage, A Genealogical Dictionary, pp. 326-327; Nahum Mitchell, History of the Early Settlement of Bridgewater, in Plymouth County, Massachusetts, Including an Extensive Family Register (Boston: Kidder & Wright, 1940), pp. 126-129, 330; and "Society of Descendants of Colonial Clergy," JAPM/AAA, Reel 1099, Frames 1173-1174.

[6] "East Bridgewater" in The Bridgewater Book (Boston: George H. Ellis, Printer, 1899), np

[7] Ibid.

[8] Huldah and Asa Millet's marriage is recorded in Vital Records of East Bridgewater, Massachusetts to The Year 1850, (Boston: The New England Genealogical Society, 1917), pp. 179, 257.

[9] A bronze plaque on the house is inscribed: "Here was born November 3, 1846, Francis Davis Millet, Drummer Boy, War Correspondent, Author, Illustrator, Artist. He went down with the Titanic April 15, 1912."

[10] Plymouth County Deeds 224-265 and 245-249, EBPL.

[11] "The Millets," Abington Herald.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[12] Birth dates and locations for Lucia Allen Millet and Josiah Byram Millet have been provided by the Central Cemetery in East Bridgewater, Massachusetts, where the Millet family burial plot is located.

[13] Benjamin Hobart, History of the Town of Abington, Plymouth County, Massachusetts From Its First Settlement (Boston: T. H. Carter And Son, 1866), p. 139 notes that "Dr. Asa Millet came to Centre Abington from East Bridgewater, December 22, 1854."

[14] Charles Sumner Millet's birth date and location are recorded in Abington Vital Records, Births From 1850 Through 1963, Abington, Massachusetts: 1986, p. 102.

[15] Francis Davis Millet 1858 Diary, np., FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[16] "Frank D. Millet." Abington Herald.

[17] Francis Davis Millet 1858 Diary. See especially entries for 10, 30 January; 28 February; 16-24 April; 14 May; 10-11, 18 July 1858, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[18] Information regarding Huldah Millet's artistic pursuits is found in Booth & Millet, "Frank Millet, A Versatile American," Chapter 1, p. 4, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[19] Francis Davis Millet 1858 Diary, 17 March 1858, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[20] Dr. Asa Millet lost his right eye at the age of thirteen, an injury that precluded him from enlisting in the army. He assisted the Union cause by working as a member of the surgical aid corps, serving as an examining surgeon for recruits and draftees, and helping to organize the Physicians' Association for Plymouth County, an organization formed to provide free medical care to soldiers' families during the war. For a discussion of Dr. Millet's contribution see "The Millets," Abington Herald.

[21] Francis Davis Millet Civil War Diary, 16 May 1864, Private Collection.

[22] The Adjutant General, Massachusetts Soldiers, Sailors, And Marines In The Civil War (Norwood, Massachusetts: The Norwood Press, 1932), 5: 101.

[23] Ibid.

[24] Francis Davis Millet Civil War Diary, 8 August 1864, Private Collection.

[25] Ibid. See especially entries for 15, 16, 19 May; 9 August; and 3, 7 October 1864.

[26] For Gilbert letter authorizing commission see Cass Gilbert to F. D. Millet, 6 April 1905, The New-York Historical Society, Cass Gilbert Collection, Minnesota State Capitol, [hereafter NYHS/CGC/MSC] Correspondence Box 4, File 2; C. H. Carsley to Cass Gilbert, 28 March 1907, NYHS/CGC/MSC, Correspondence Box 5, File 1 reports, "I notice that Mr. Millet's painting has been received."

[27] Adjutant General, Massachusetts Soldiers, p. 101.

[28] Francis Davis Millet Civil War Diary, 22 February 1865, Private Collection

[29] Army Discharge Certificate, November 30, 1864, FDM/AAA, Reel 849, Frame 280.

[30] Francis Davis Millet Civil War Diary, 5 December 1864, Private Collection.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[31] Harvard Faculty Records, 1864-1872, Harvard University Archives, III 5.155 and 5.5, Pusey Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

[32] Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 2, pp. 15, 17-18, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100; and Francis Davis Millet II, "Frank Millet—A Sketch," p. 4, FDM/AAA, Reel 848.

[33] Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 2, p. 18, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[34] I am grateful to Peter A. Engstrom, who is writing a biography on Francis Davis Millet, for bringing this information to my attention.

[35] The Easel Paintings of Francis Davis Millet, exhibition catalog (The Guild of Boston Artists, Boston, Massachusetts, 1999), np., no. 29.

[36] For a discussion of the influence of French Barbizon landscape painting Boston and the role and importance of William Morris Hunt see Peter Bermingham, American Art in the Barbizon Mood, exhibition catalog (Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D. C., 1975), pp. 18-40.

[37] For a discussion of the images of Natural Bridge see Pamela H. Simpson, So Beautiful An Arch: Images of the Natural Bridge, 1787-1890, exhibition catalog (Washington and Lee University, Lexington, Virginia, 1982).

[38] Photographic Collection of Francis Davis Millet paintings, AAA&L.

[39] Francis Davis Millet II, "Frank Millet—A Sketch," p. 4, FDM/AAA, Reel 848.

[40] Glen Brown, editor, Francis Davis Millet Memorial Meeting (Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Arts, 1912), p. 27.

[41] The Cambridge Directory for 1870, p. 229.

[42] For Millet's studies with Fabronius, see Brown, Francis Davis Millet Memorial Meeting , p. 27. For Fabronius see Sally Pierce and Catharina Slautterback, Boston Lithography, 1825-1880: The Boston Athenaeum Collection (Boston: The Boston Athenaeum, 1991), pp. 171-172; and Harry T. Peters, America On Stone (New York: Doubleday, Doran And Company, Inc., 1931), p. 183. I am grateful to Sally Pierce, Curator of Prints and Photographs, The Boston Athenaeum, for sharing her extensive knowledge of Fabronius and of Boston lithography with me.

[43] Although Fabronius lived and worked in New York from 1865 to 1872, he returned to Boston in 1869 and leased a studio at 46 School Street, where, according to advertisements placed in the Boston newspapers, he offered instruction in "Painting, Chromography, Lithography and Drawing" to ladies and gentlemen. See Trow's New York City Directory for the years 1865-1870 and 1872-1873, pp. 301, 315, 321, 335, 348, 353, respectively; and Boston Daily Advertiser, 12 October 1869, p. 2; 15 October 1869, p. 2; 18 November 1869, p. 1; 20 November 1869, p. 3; and 23 November 1869, p. 2. There is no listing for Fabronius in The Boston Directory for the years 1865-1872. It is conceivable that Fabronius worked in both cities simultaneously, spending several days in each, and commuting between New York and Boston by rail.

[44] Boston Daily Advertiser, 16 August 1869, p. 1; 1 September 1869, p. 1; 11 November 1869, p.1; 29 November 1869, p. 1; and 17 June 1870, p. 1.

[45] Boston Daily Advertiser, 17 June 1870, p. 1.

[46] James Hunt, A List of Paintings, Drawings, Mural Decorations and Designs, Civil and Military Awards and Literary Works of Francis Davis Millet, c. 1920, unpaginated pamphlet, lists a lithograph

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

entitled *Signor*, signed and dated 1870, as being in the collection of James Hunt. Sylvester Baxter, "Francis Davis Millet, An Appreciation of the Man," Art And Progress 3, 9 (July 1912), pp. 636-637 notes that a lithograph portrait of "George Bryant Woods, of the *Advertiser* staff," hung for a long time on the walls of the newspaper office.

[47] Edward Weeks, The Lowells and Their Institute (Boston: Little, Brown And Company, 1966), pp. 11, 62; and Diana Korzenik, Drawn to Art: A Nineteenth-Century American Dream (Hanover and London: University Press of New England, 1985) p. 146.

[48] Sylvester Baxter, "The Art-Schools of Boston," Art Journal 40 (June 1878), p. 189.

[49] H. Winthrop Peirce, The History of The School of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1877-1927 (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1930), p. 12.

[50] Ibid.

[51] Quoted in Shannon, Boston Days of William Morris Hunt, p. 99.

[52] Jeffrey Weldman, "William Rimmer: Critical Catalogue Raisonne," Ph.D. dissertation, Indiana University, 1982, pp. 28, 47.

[53] Whitehill, Walter Muir, Museum of Fine Arts Boston, A Centennial History (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1970), 1: 42.

[54] Peirce, The History, p. 15.

[55] F. D. Millet, "What Are Americans Doing in Art?" Century Magazine 43, 1 (November 1891), p. 46.

[56] The Permanent Committee in charge of operating the school included Edward C. Cabot, Martin Brimmer, Edward W. Hooper, William M. Hunt, John La Farge, Charles G. Loring, Francis William Loring, Francis D. Millet, Robert S. Peabody, Charles C. Perkins, , Frank Hill Smith, and William R. Ware. See Museum of Fine Arts, School of Drawing and Painting, First Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of The School (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1877), pp. 5 and 20.

[57] The Cambridge Directory for 1871, p. 258. The entry reads, "Millet F. D. artist (Studio building, B), bds. 2 Ellery."

[58] The Boston Directory for 1870, pp. 804-805.

[59] Whitehill, Museum of Fine Arts Boston, p. 46. The Museum of Fine Arts Boston was incorporated in 1870 but did not open to the public until July 4, 1876, at which time the Boston Athenaeum transferred most of its art works to the new institution as permanent loans.

[60] Although Millet worked as a reporter and editor for several Boston newspapers, his byline does not appear in any of the papers during his early years of employment with them (approximately May 1869-May 1871), so the subjects of his writing at this time are unknown.

[61] The Flemish-Belgian artists and works represented were Charles Baugniet (1814-1886) *Revery*; Peter Boel (1622-1674) *Fruit and Flowers* and *Flowers*; Ferdinand de Braekeleer (1792-1883) *A Family Scene* and *The Quarrel*; Paul Brill (1554-1626) *Hunting Scene*; Adriaen Brouwer (1605-1638) *The Dutch Inn*; Xavier de Cock (1818-1896) *A Cloudy Morning*; Léon Dansaert (b. 1830) *The Argument*; Franz De Beul (19th century) *Sheperds Seeking Shelter*; Henri DePraetère (19th century) *The Staircase*; Anthony Van Dyck (1599-1641) Unknown; Jozef Geirnaert (1791-1859) *The Hungarian*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Doctor; Gustave Léonard de Jonghe (1829-1893) *The Toilet* and *The Proposal*; Willem Linning (1819-1885) *The Noonday Luncheon*; Jan Van Mechelen (b. 1587) *The Singing Party*; Henri Van Seben (1825-1913) *The Snowstorm*; Michel Joseph Speeckaert (1748-1838) *A Bouquet of Flowers*; and Eugène Verboeckhoven (1798-1881) *Sheep and Goats* and *Sheep*. These figures and names are based on the "Artist Index" in Robert F. Perkins, Jr. and William J. Gavin III, The Boston Athenaeum Art Exhibition Index, 1827-1874 (Boston: The Library of the Boston Athenaeum, 1980), pp. 15-146; and on the "Index to the Artists and Exhibitions" in Mabel Munson Swan, The Athenaeum Gallery, 1827-1873 (Boston: The Boston Athenaeum, 1940), pp. 195-290.

[62] For Gambart see Jeremy Maas, Gambart: Prince of the Victorian Art World (London, 1975).

[63] Fourth Exhibition in New-York of Pictures, The Contributions of Artists Of The French, English, And Flemish Schools, Studio Building, No. 15 Tenth Street, 1865-6. This exhibition included such paintings as Laurens Alma-Tadema (1836-1912) *Congregation Entering Church;* Henri De Braekeleer (1840-1888) *Interior of a Tailor's Shop Antwerp*; Edouard Frère (1819-1886) *The Breakfast*; William Frith (1819-1909) *A Dream of the Future*; Frederic Leighton (1830-1896) *In St. Mark's, Venice*; Hendrik Leys (1815-1869) *The Reception*; Jean-Leon Gérôme (1824-1904) *Muezzin Calling the Hour of Prayer*; Jean-Louis Meissonier (1815-1891) *Soldiers Playing at Cards in-the-Guard-Room*; John Everett Millais (1829-1896) *The Departure of the Crusaders*; Ary Scheffer (1795-1857) *The Three Marys*; Eugène Verboeckhoven *Flemish Sheep*; Gustave Wappers (1803-1874) *Italia* and Florent Willems (1823-1905) *The Convalescent*.

[64] Fifth Exhibition in New York, Pictures, the Contributions of Artists of the French, English and Flemish Schools, Studio Building, No 51 West Tenth Street, 1866.

[65] John Durand, The Life and Times of Asher B. Durand (New York: 1894), p. 193. Quoted in Lois Marie Fink, "French Art in the United States, 1850-1870, Three Dealers and Collectors," Gazette des Beaux-Arts 92 (September 1978), p. 88.

[66] Russell Sturgis, "French and Belgian Schools of Art," Nation 2 (25 January 1866), p. 122.

[67] "French and Belgium Pictures on Exhibition," Nation 2 (1 February 1866), p.152.

[68] Lois Marie Fink, "French Art in the United States, 1850-1870, Three Dealers and Collectors," Gazette des Beaux-Arts 92 (September 1978), p. 89; and First Exhibition in New York of Pictures, the Contributions of Artists of the French Etching Club (New York, 1866).

[69] "Fine Arts," New-York Times, 8 April 1866, p. 5; and Boston Daily Advertiser, 17 April 1866, p. 4.

[70] Fink, "French Art in the United States," p. 89.

[71] "The Second Reception of the Boston Art Club," Boston Daily Advertiser, 19 April 1866, p. 1.

[72] "Reception By The Boston Art Club," Boston Daily Advertiser, 9 May 1870, p. 1.

[73] Catalogue, Allston Club First Exhibition 1866, pp. 9-10, 12; "The Allston Club Exhibition," Boston Daily Advertiser, 1 May 1866, pp. 2-3; and Boston Daily Advertiser, 26 April 1866, p. 1.

[74] Boston Daily Advertiser, 15 January 1869, p. 2; "Art Matters," Boston Daily Advertiser, 2 October 1869, p. 1; Boston Daily Advertiser, 6 and 27 November1869, p. 1; and "Local Matters," Boston Daily Advertiser, 23 December 1869, p. 1.

[75] "Art Matters," Boston Daily Advertiser, 29 December 1869, p. 4; and 5 January 1870, p. 1. Possibly, in light of Millet's subsequent study, too, with the Antwerp painter and Director of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts d'Anvers Nicaise De Keyser, he was also aware of the De Keyser's paintings that were in New York collections. These included De Keyser's *The Invention of the Art of Design: The Daughter of Dibutantes and Her Lover* (c. 1863) and *Love's Young Dream*, in the Collection of John Wolfe; and *Marino Faliero* (1857) and a watercolor of *Milton Dictating Paradise Lost* (c. 1858) in the Collection of Mr. August Belmont. For De Keyser in American collections see Strahan, the Art Treasures of America 1: 64, 118.

[76] "Art Notes," Boston Saturday Evening Gazette, 6 May 1871, p. 2.

[77] Boston Daily Advertiser, 5 February 1869, p. 1; 7 June 1869, p. 3; and 12 May 1869, p. 3.

[78] Boston Daily Advertiser, 22 December 1869, p. 2; and Boston Daily Advertiser, 24 December 1869, p. 1.

[79] William Howe Downes, "Boston Painters and Paintings. VI. Private Collections," Atlantic Monthly 62 (December 1888), p. 785.

[80] "Summary of European News," Boston Daily Advertiser, 11 October 1869, p. 1.

[81] "The Unsettled State of Europe. Belgium," Nation 2, 27 (4 January 1866), p. 17.

[82] Jarves, The Art-Idea, p. 273.

[83] "French and Belgian Schools of Art," p. 121.

[84] Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 2, p. 21, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[85] Harvard College, Class of 1869. Triennial Report, No. 1. (Boston: Press of Rockwell & Churchill, 1872), p. 11.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 2

ACADEMIC TRAINING IN ANTWERP AND *WANDERJAHRE* IN EUROPE (1871-1875)

The early 1870s were a period of education and experimentation for Frank Millet as he sought to develop as an artist, and a number of his involvements in this period forecast his later activities. His difficulties in obtaining serious art training in Boston led him to travel to Antwerp in 1871 to attend the Royal Academy of Fine Arts, a move that would play a formative role in his career. Millet's studies in Antwerp shaped his ideas about art, established the methodological foundation upon which his eclectic style would evolve, and fostered his lifelong dedication to professionalizing the training and practice of American art and to creating a greater appreciation for art in this country. Millet's sojourn in Antwerp also facilitated his travel throughout Europe, where he was exposed to other artistic traditions and ideas.

Upon the completion of his studies at the Royal Academy, Millet was appointed Secretary to the Massachusetts Board of Commissioners to the Vienna 1873 Universal Exposition, a group that was headed by Charles Francis Adams, Jr. This assignment furthered Millet's exposure to European art, and introduced him to the administrative practices and behind-the-scenes politics of a major international exhibition. The experience sharpened his executive abilities and paved the way for his involvement not only with many late nineteenth-century fairs, but with numerous American art organizations. At the close of the Vienna Exposition, an extended *wanderjahre* in Europe ushered in a period of self education. Millet's writings, extant

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

works and sketchbooks reveal that he was open to every influence, both from the art historical past and the present. By 1875 he had been abroad for four years and was nearing the end of his limited resources. In August, Millet, having been nurtured in the European academic system and the cosmopolitan art and culture of Europe, returned to Boston to test his newly acquired skills in his homeland and to help redirect America's artistic vision.

After stops in Queenstown, Ireland and London, Millet arrived in Antwerp sometime in June 1871.[1] Although Paris and Munich were the more popular destinations for American art students seeking European training after the Civil War, those who did not go to Paris or Munich were likely, as the painter and art historian Samuel Isham noted, "to go to some place like Antwerp, where the instruction was excellent, the life quiet and simple, and the methods taught, if without the dash and brilliancy of Munich, yet richer in coloring and texture than in France."[2]

Antwerp had a long history as a distinguished center for art training. The Antwerp Academy was founded in 1663 by royal decree at the instigation of the artist David Teniers, Jr. (1610-1690) and the local St. Luke's Guild.[3] The third oldest art school in Europe, it was modeled on the famous schools in Italy and France. The founding documents explicitly speak of an "Académie . . . semblable à celles de Rome et de Paris," and the school in Antwerp was to serve the same goal of advancing the arts.[4] The original academy, which was housed on the second floor of the Merchants Exchange, encouraged the study of painting, sculpting, engraving and book printing, and introduced a new emphasis on life drawing.[5] Financial mismanagement and want of committed instructors, however, hampered the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

academy's effectiveness, and in 1746, during the War of Austrian Succession, classes were suspended.[6] Three years later, no longer able to underwrite the day-to-day operations of the academy, the guild relinquished control of the school and its art collection to the city of Antwerp.[7] In an effort to revive the arts, a reorganization begun in 1750 under Empress Maria Theresa of Austria (1717-1780) centralized all art instructional policy under the royal government in Brussels (although policy implementation remained in the hands of the individual city governments and the guilds).[8] In 1763 Andreas Cornelius Lens (1739-1822) was appointed director of the academy, and at his urging the visual artists were separated from the guild.[9] With the focus now on the "fine arts" versus the "artisan" tradition, the academy was re-instituted as the Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts d'Anvers, aligning the school more closely with the academy in France.[10] The program centered on painting and sculpture and the skills necessary to support the traditional hierarchy of subjects—with history painting at the top. By 1773 the academy had became the sole educational institution for aspiring artists in the southern Netherlands; admission was based on merit, and the concentration in painting, sculpture and engraving was broadened to include instruction in architecture.[11] During the French Revolution and the subsequent French occupation of present day Belgium, the Antwerp Academy was closed for several years, reopening in 1796 as the *École Spéciale de Peinture, Sculpture et Architecture d'Anvers*, under the direction of Simon-Pierre Dargonne (1749-1839), the Commissioner of the Republican Municipal Administration.[12]

In 1804, during the Consulate, the school was replaced by the *Académie de Peinture, Sculpture et Architecture de la Ville d'Anvers*, and the painter and former

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

instructor at the academy Willem Jacob Herreyns (1743-1827) was appointed director.[13] Although, as part of the French system, the academy sought its models in classical antiquity and religion, Herreyns, believing that art education should have its roots in local tradition, helped revive an interest in the Flemish old masters. During his tenure, as well, the curriculum was again expanded and courses in painting from the live model and in the decorative arts were added. In 1810, in a conciliatory gesture after he became Emperor, Napoleon granted the academy new quarters, and the school and its museum (the art collection it had inherited from the guild) were installed in the abandoned fifteenth-century monastery of the Minderbroeders (Franciscan Friars Minor) on Mutsaerstraat.[14]

After Napoleon's defeat in 1815, the Netherlands were briefly reunited under King William I of Holland. During the period of Dutch rule (1815-1830), the museum collection was enhanced by the return of artworks confiscated by the French troops in the 1790s from public buildings and suppressed monasteries and churches.[15] When Herreyns died in 1827 he was succeeded by Mathieu-Ignace Van Bree (1773-1839), an Antwerp history painter and portraitist, who continued the academy's classical orientation, and his predecessor's emphasis on the Flemish artistic tradition.[16] Van Bree remained as director of the academy after the southern Netherlands became the independent nation of Belgium in 1830; upon his death in 1839, he was succeeded by the history painter Gustave Wappers (1803-1874), the leader of the Belgian Romantic movement. Wappers was one of the first artists to revolt against the neoclassicism of Jacques-Louis David (1748-1825), which had lingered in Belgian painting into the nineteenth century.[17] Such paintings as his *The*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Patriotism of Burgomaster Van Der Werff at the Siege of Leyden (1830, Utrecht Museum) helped create a vogue for subjects that explored national history rather than the classical past. Wappers served as director until 1853. After a two-year hiatus, he was succeeded in 1855 by Nicaise De Keyser (1813-1887), another leading proponent of the Belgian Romantic movement. During the 1850s the academic program went through several additional modifications, their goal being to provide a more professional education in the arts of painting, sculpture, architecture and the decorative arts, as well as the humanities.[18] These arrangements remained in place until the late 1870s.

When Millet arrived in 1871, the academy's distinguished faculty, its professional curriculum, and its fine collection of Flemish Primitive, Baroque old masters, and modern Belgian paintings were attracting aspiring artists from America and Europe (Fig. 2.1). The school's director, Nicaise De Keyser, advocated a return to a romantic form of realism based on the Flemish masters.[19] After early training with the Antwerp painter Joseph Jacops (1808-1856), De Keyser had studied at the Antwerp Royal Academy of Fine Arts with its then director Mathieu-Ignace Van Bree, from whom he had learned the orthodox academic techniques necessary for history and figure painting. He had also absorbed his teacher's interest in the Flemish artistic tradition, especially the work of Peter Paul Rubens (1577-1640), Anthony Van Dyck (1599-1641), and other seventeenth-century masters.

An extremely prolific artist whose subjects manifest a broad curiosity,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

De Keyser began his career as a painter of religious subjects such as *Roman Charity* (location unknown), portraits, and genre scenes in the tradition of seventeenth-century Flemish art, as for example *Kermesse in the Village of Santvliet* of 1830 (location unknown).[20] He came to the attention of the critics at the 1834 Antwerp Salon with his Rubensian altarpiece *Calvary* (location unknown), and followed this success with such monumental, patriotic compositions as *The Battle of the Golden Spurs* (1836, Fig. 2.2) and *The Battle of Woeringen* (1839, Musées royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels.). When the taste for dramatic, national history paintings waned in the 1840s, he easily moved to historical, literary and religious genre pieces such as *Christopher Columbus Viewed as Mad* (1852, Fig. 2.3), *Marguerite in the Church* (1864, Fig. 2.4) and *Jephthah's Daughter* (1860, Fig. 2.5), and to aristocratic portraiture. De Keyser's travels in Italy in 1839-1840 and a trip to North Africa in the 1840s inspired a series of Italian genre and Near Eastern subjects, for example, *Portrait d'Italienne* (1843, Fig. 2.6) and *The Arab Chief* (1845, Fig. 2.7).[21] While continuing to paint these diverse historical and genre subjects, De Keyser earned high acclaim and patronage for his aristocratic portraits such as *Portrait of Madame De Caters* (1855, Fig. 2.8). His growing international reputation and fame brought commissions from royal courts and prominent families in Belgium and throughout Europe, and he was awarded every major medal to which a European painter might aspire. An extremely versatile artist, De Keyser, in addition to his easel paintings, also generated numerous illustrations for books, enjoyed a long teaching career, and produced several major decorative commissions.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

De Keyser's magnum opus, *The Glory of the Antwerp School* (1862-1872, Fig. 2.9), an ambitious thirty-nine-panel mural ensemble for the entrance hall of the Academy museum, was nearing completion when Millet arrived as a student. It must have made a lasting impression on him, as Millet's own interest in mural painting would surface four years later in his mural decorations for Trinity Church in Boston. Like his historicizing pictures, De Keyser's murals combine Romantic sentiment and realism, and his best known works are distinguished by a recognizable story with carefully drawn figures, historically accurate details, an exceptional grasp of composition and expressive use of light. Light was an important element in De Keyser's work. In his correspondence and in his advice to students, he repeatedly emphasized the importance of light in creating atmosphere and tonal harmony in a painting—how essential the highlights and reflections were, and the difficulty in depicting them perfectly.[22] De Keyser traveled widely and did extensive research in available pictorial and textual material, costumes and accessories to insure factual reportage in his work, a practice Millet would emulate throughout his career. Ultimately, De Keyser's thematic versatility and success in a wide range of artistic endeavors may have been the most enduring legacy that he passed on to Millet.

De Keyser was appointed a professor at the Antwerp Academy in 1848, and served as director from 1855 to 1879. During the course of his long teaching career, he directed his students and the academy toward what he termed "*une instruction complête*,"[23] which combined the methods of academic technique, studies in the humanities, and a respect for the student's individual style. The proponent of a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

broad-based academic education, De Keyser set forth his pedagogical philosophy in a speech to the Belgian Drawing Arts Education Congress in 1868:

> You all know as well as I do that individuality without science is worth nothing. It will show its weakness and its ignorance at every turn. The finest minds would get lost without the strong education that they need. . . . .
>
> The artist has to be armed from head to toe in order to be strong and solid. An artist must remember that the great artists of Greece were not only scientists but also philosophers . It was not ignorance that allowed the artists from Pericles' era to produce their wonderful masterpieces.
>
> Therefore a young artist must look for a complete education in the great academies. It is the teacher's duty to lead his or her education toward the feelings and the tendencies that he or she is showing. If he has received a strong education, if he is gifted, he will not be hampered by a teacher who would wrongfully try to impose his style.[24]

Millet would reveal his affinity with De Keyser's educational ideals after he accepted an appointment in 1876 to the Permanent Committee of the School of Drawing and Painting of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, a position he maintained until 1885. The School's annual reports, especially for the years that Millet was on the managing committee, evidence an open-minded respect for a student's individuality, a commitment to instruction in sound technique, and an increasing emphasis on a humanities-based curriculum reminiscent of De Keyser's.[25]

As the director of the Academy, De Keyser supervised a fifteen-member faculty who offered comprehensive courses in six general areas—painting and drawing; sculpture; architecture; landscape, marine and animal painting; figure and ornamental drawing; and industrial arts and engraving.[26] Instruction was free and open to male applicants of any nationality who showed promise of profiting from their study. In all the instructional areas students progressed from elementary to intermediate and superior-level classes through a graduated sequence of study.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Students who planned to make painting their profession enrolled in the painting and drawing division. Here they typically began by copying lithographs and drawings before moving to the intermediate *Antieken* class, where they drew from antique casts. Having perfected this skill, they advanced to the pinnacle of the curriculum, the *Natuur* class, where they drew and painted both from the nude and clothed model (Fig. 2.10). To accommodate students who were interested in genre paintings, costumed models had been introduced in the life class as early as 1843 (Fig. 2.11).[27] Time limits were imposed at various levels and on certain exercises. For example, a student had to complete the intermediate courses after two years of study or withdraw from the academy. Once admitted to the *Natuur* or life class, students had sixteen hours (two hours a day for eight days) to complete a drawing from the full-length model, and twenty hours (five hours a day for four days) to complete a painting from life. The result was that students moved quickly from drawing to painting, achieving strong draftsmanship, facile paint handling and an expertise in the use of color. In an effort to balance practice and theory, the classes in technique were supplemented by lecture courses in historical composition, art history, the history of costumes and antiquities, anatomy, perspective, the proportions of the human body, and geometry, all of which students attended according to their rank in the academy. De Keyser himself taught the course in historical composition. As British art historian Jeanne Sheehy has pointed out, this was one of the most important classes at the academy, and was mandated in both the intermediate and senior division.[28]

In addition to their course work, students were expected to familiarize themselves with the history of art by studying and copying paintings in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Academy's Museum and in other public and private collections in Antwerp. The school was open from October to August, and was divided into a winter (October through March) and a summer (May through August) term, with September and April reserved for vacation. Although American students were not eligible to compete for the travel scholarship (*prix de Rome*), all students were expected to participate in the annual February examination or *concours*, where the highest honors were awarded to student whose work best combined practice and theory. Contemporary commentators consistently remarked on the high merit of the academy. John Sparks, the Headmaster of the National Art Training School at South Kensington, London, who visited the Belgian and German art schools in the 1870s to examine their art-education programs, was among those who were favorably impressed with the Antwerp system. "I cannot speak too highly of the excellence of the drawings and paintings executed in this school," he wrote. "A great amount of power and handicraft is developed, but this is properly subservient to the thorough understanding of the model, and also to the student's individuality."[29]

Millet quickly settled into his new surroundings. Although he is not listed in the Academy student roster until the fall of 1871, he likely began his studies sometime in June of that year. In a letter dated July 21, 1871, the Boston artist Edwin Graves Champney (1842-1899), a fellow student at the academy during the years 1871-1875, mentions that while two of the recently arrived American students left the Academy to study with a private teacher, "Frank Millet the other one still sticks and is doing very well."[30] Champney also noted that Millet lost no time in taking

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

advantage of the Antwerp Museum collection and was busily "engaged in making studies."[31]

In early September Millet joined Champney and two fellow students, the American painter George W. Maynard (1843-1923) and the German painter Otto Grundmann (1844-1890), on a ten-day tour through the German Rhineland. Millet's diary from this period records his fascination with old and modern masters and with a number of mural cycles encountered during his travels. He particularly admired seventeenth- and nineteenth-century European paintings, the frescoes depicting the life of Charlemagne by the German Romantic painter Alfred Rethel (1816-1859) in the town hall in Aachen, and the Giottoesque biblical frescoes by the Düsseldorf painters Ernst Deger (1809-1885) and Andreas Muller (1811-1890) in the Church of St. Appolinarius in Remagen, Germany:

> In the hall where the 37 German Emperors were crowned we were much pleased with frescoes by Rethel and Kehren. They were all historical subjects and we found the four by Rethel much the superior . . . . We visited a private collection of paintings in Adelbert Street, where we saw a fine gallery of Rembrandts, Reubens, Murillos and a number of portraits by Knaus which were most beautifully executed. . . . By boat we went to Remagen . . . to see the famous church of St. Appolinarius. . . . The interior was a perfect gem of artistic merit. The walls are covered by beautiful frescoes by Degger [*sic*] and Miller [*sic*] illustrating bible subjects. They were to me the finest frescoes I had seen.[32]

These nineteenth-century German mural ensembles surely piqued Millet's interest in decorative painting, and the simple, dignified religiosity of the St. Appolinarius frescoes would have prepared him for his subsequent encounter with Giotto's frescoes in Italy.

By the time the winter term began in October 1871, Millet, having found lodging at 39 Koepoorstraat near the academy, officially registered as a student in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Antieken class.[33] Other American participants included Champney, Ernest [Elijah] Baxter (1849-1939), George Wetherbee (1851-1920) and Wilbur Woodward (19th century).[34] The class was taught by Polydore-Constantin Beaufaux (1829-1904) who had studied at the Antwerp Academy from 1844 to 1850, and excelled in Romantic history paintings and religious subjects—for example, *Salome Watching the Beheading of St. John the Baptist* (1873, Fig. 2.12) and *The Assumption of the Virgin* (1852, Musees royaux des Beaux-Arts de Belgique, Brussels)—in the manner of his teacher Nicaise De Keyser.[35] After winning the Prix de Rome in 1857, Beaufaux was in 1864 appointed Professor of Drawing from Life and from the Antique, a position he maintained until 1883. A typical work week for a student in the *Antieken* class included sketching from casts of antique sculpture from 9:00 A.M. to 3:00 P.M. and 6:00 P.M. to 8:00 P.M. in the winter and from 6:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M. and 1:30 P.M. to 4:30 P.M. in the summer, and attending weekly lectures from 5:00 P.M. to 6:00 P.M. in historical composition, anatomy, perspective, art history, and the history of costumes and antiquities.[36] Beaufaux was present in the class every day, demonstrating techniques and correcting students' drawings.

The English painter Thomas John Lucas (19th century), who studied at Antwerp in the late 1860s, described Beaufaux's emphasis on accurate outline and volumetric drawing techniques as the students progressed from working with bust- to life-size classical casts:

> [T]he class . . . was employed in freehand drawing from casts and busts of life-size from the antique. These were outlined first with charcoal (*fusain*), until the drawing was perfectly proportioned and correct, this being a *sine qua non* before proceeding further. The subject was then gradually shaded and worked up as far as the student could carry it, until, indeed, it had all the appearance of a fine engraving, if successful. When sufficiently experienced we were admitted into the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> night class for drawing, from the life-sized plaster cast. This was held in an amphitheatre in which rows of seats were arranged in a semicircle round a raised platform. Upon this platform the subject for study, the *Dying Gladiator*, the *Apollo, Venus of Milo, Laocoon*, or whatever it might be, which was selected, was placed and exposed to a strong gas-light, which threw the figure into high relief. Each student was supplied with a large drawing-board, and commenced by outlining his subject in charcoal, in the position in which it was presented to him.[37]

Lucas's remarks also suggest his high regard for Beaufaux's talents as a teacher and his generous commitment to his students:

> . . . . During this time Mons. Buffau [*sic*] was continually passing round the theatre, inspecting the drawings as they advanced into their different shapes, from outline to finish; correcting the outlines where he found them out of drawing, explaining the anatomical points occurring in the extension of the limbs or the principle and properties of light and shade, which, properly manipulated, gave the effect of positive color to the eye. And here I must say, in justice to Mons. Buffau [*sic*], most beautiful work was turned out.[38]

Champney likewise praised Beaufaux's instruction, noting the teacher's emphasis on both accurate draftsmanship and modeling:

> The professor tells us that one must use the stump and crayon in the same manner as brushes and colors. So while drawing we are at the same time learning to paint. He has generally been well satisfied with my outlines. It is in the shades that I have found the greatest difficulty. The same trouble would arise in painting and it is better to overcome it before commencing, for the substitution of coloring would only increase it."[39]

Champney's comments suggest that Beaufaux's aim was to have his students master their craft and to prepare them to paint the figure, rather than to achieve polished perfection. Several engravings of casts after antique statues, tools that Millet would have used at home to practice his drawings, are visible in *The Artist's Studio, Antwerp* (Fig. 2.13). This painting, executed while he attended the academy, was the first of many pictures in which his subject was the studio, the artist and his model, or the act of painting. While none of Millet's actual drawings from Beaufaux's *Antieken* class

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

have survived, the solidly drawn, volumetric figures of his subsequent work are, in part, a legacy of his study with the Antwerp drawing master.

Millet would also have attended the weekly roster of lecture classes by various instructors, most notably the class on historical composition taught by the director, Nicaise De Keyser. Every week students were assigned a topic, drawn almost exclusively from classical history, mythology or the Bible, from which they prepared compositional sketches at home. These sketches were then critiqued by De Keyser before the entire class, where faults in composition were pointed out and corrected. The exercises gave the students essential practice in manipulating groups of figures for historical and genre compositions. The solid grasp of compositional arrangements evident in Millet's genre paintings and in his large-scale mural decorations may be traced to lessons learned in De Keyser's class.

Millet's progress was rapid and dramatic. At the annual *concours*, which took place at the end of the winter term in February-March 1872, he garnered prizes in ten of the twelve categories for his technical skills and for his knowledge of the history of art and of costumes and antiquities, and won the silver medal of the Academy.[40] This was a formidable achievement for a foreign student, and Millet's success attracted the attention of the art press in both Antwerp and Boston. In the United States, the foreign correspondent for the Boston Daily Advertiser could not refrain from engaging in a little hometown boosterism, noting:

> In Antwerp, it was my pleasure to offer congratulations to the victor at the late academy competition, Mr. Frank D. Millett; long ere this you must have learned of his unparalleled success—a success which was in his case much more than the crown of laurel and the silver medal. . . . America has not for years sent so promising a student abroad. . . .[41]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In late March, 1872 after the *concours* ended, Millet joined Champney and Wetherbee on a ten-day study trip to Holland, a favored pilgrimage for artists from about 1860 through the turn of the century. The revival of interest in Dutch art in the late nineteenth century owed much to the writings of Wilhelm Bürger, the pseudonym of the French realist critic Théophile Thoré (1807-1869). Bürger published his two-volume Musées de la Holland in 1858 and a seminal article on Johannes Vermeer in 1866.[42] The French critic praised the Dutch old masters, especially the seemingly simple, everyday subject matter of Dutch seventeenth-century genre painting, for its originality, sentiment and *poésie*, preferring these to grandiose history paintings because they could be understood by all.[43] Bürger's writings inspired numerous European and American artists, including François Bonvin (1817-1887), Édouard Manet (1832-83), John Singer Sargent (1856-1925) and James McNeill Whistler (1834-1903) to take note of seventeenth-century Dutch art.

Like many of their colleagues, Millet, Champney and Wetherbee travelled to Holland to study the old master paintings in Dutch museums and in private collections. Adhering to the usual tourist route, the three artists visited Rotterdam, The Hague, Amsterdam, Haarlem, and Leyden, stopping in Delfthaven to visit the site from which the Pilgrims had sailed. Millet was dazzled by what he saw. After visiting the museum in the Trippenhuis in Amsterdam, he wrote in his diary:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Were I to speak of the wonderful pictures we saw or to attempt to describe any of them, I could have no room for anything else. I can only say that the *Night Watch* by Rembrandt, and the *Snydic* by the same, The *Supper in Celebration of the Peace of Munster* by Van der Helst were more than equal to our expectations. By these three we were more than repaid the visit to Amsterdam and fully felt when in their presence that we were looking on greater pictures than we had ever seen before. The paintings of Dou, Steen, Potter, Huysman and a score of others I could name were all perfect in their way and we only regretted our want of time to study more intimately all of these grand works.[44]

By the time Millet reached The Hague several days later, his admiration for Dutch painting had become even more intense. After spending several hours looking at pictures in the Museum, he observed:

> Paul Potter's celebrated *Bull*, the gem of the museum was wonderful—fully equal to our expectations. Rembrandt's *Anatomical Lesson* rather disappointed me after seeing his *Nightwatch* at Amsterdam. However at the Hague is his most perfect work, a little picture *The Presentation in the temple, Simon and the infant Jesus*. It was magnificent. There are also several heads by Rembrandt. Besides the names mentioned above there are masterpieces by Van Ostade, Van der Helst, Steen, Dou, Miers [*sic*], Rubens, Vandyck [*sic*], Murillo, Guido, Holbein, Durer, Salvator Rosa, Wouverman, etc. etc.[45]

The work of the seventeenth-century Dutch genre masters was to prove a lasting influence in Millet's work. Compositional echoes of Dutch seventeenth-century interiors; namely, rectilinear, box-like spaces, extended vistas through open doors and windows, and the picture within a picture motif appear in such of his genre paintings of the 1880s and 1890s as *Baby Worship* (see Fig. 4.21), *The Window Seat* (see Fig. 4.52), *A Handmaid* (Fig. 2.14) and *Between Two Fires* (Fig. 2.15). In addition, the subjects of some of his paintings—bourgeois scenes of genteel domesticity in which figures engage in needlecraft, music-making or reading letters; and more lively tavern scenes—as well as the traditional Dutch preoccupation with light, call to mind the interiors of Pieter de Hooch (1629-1684), Gerard ter Borch (1617-1681), Jan Steen (1626-1679), Gabriel Metsu (1629-1667), and Johannes

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Vermeer (1632-1675), a connection that was noted by Millet's critics in the 1880s and 1890s.

By April 8, 1872 Millet was back in Antwerp. According to his own account he was sorry to leave Holland. The country, he reported in his diary, was "one continuous picture gallery," and he "saw hundreds of masterpieces."[46] He only regretted that his small party had arrived at Haarlem "too late to visit the Stadhuis so we were obliged to leave for Leyden without seeing the paintings of Franz Hals."[47] Millet's diary also records his admiration of and identification with the Dutch people:

> The crowds we encountered . . . were more like Americans than any other people and I felt when among them that I should not be ashamed to be called a Dutchman . . . . I must disagree totally with a recent writer in the *Harper's Monthly* in his idea of Holland and the Dutchmen. He grossly caricatured them as Englishmen often caricature Yankees. They are more like Americans than any nation I have met yet. To be sure there are some slow, plethoric old duffers, but there are also the Yankees of the comic almanacs among us in New England. I find the Dutch a very intelligent, worthy people from whom the world has received a great deal and to whom we owe more than we confess.[48]

Given Millet's comments and his subsequent borrowings from seventeenth-century Dutch genre paintings, it is possible that the artist's strong identification with Holland conditioned his appreciation of Dutch art and, in some instances, a shared aesthetic response. Nineteenth-century and modern scholars have pointed out parallels between seventeenth-century Holland and nineteenth-century American history and cultural life, as for example the fact that both countries were democratic republics that had fought wars of liberation against monarchal powers, and espoused similar egalitarian ideals and middle-class values.[49]

When the summer term opened in May 1872, Millet's accomplishments during the previous semester had earned his admittance to the *Natuur* (Painting from

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Life) class.[50] Wilbur Woodward was the only other American taking the class. The instructor was Josef Van Lerius (1823-1876), who had studied at the Antwerp Academy with Gustave Wappers, and had achieved an international reputation as a genre, history and portrait painter.[51] Celebrated as a painter of women, he depicted them as historical personages in such works as *Jeanne d'arc at the Siege of Paris* (location unknown) and the *Sacrifice of Lady Godiva* (1870, Fig. 2.16); as mythological figures in the *Rape of Europa* (Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp); and as fashionable aristocrats and socialites in *Princess Herminie de Looz et Corswarem* (1860, Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp). *Cinderella* (1858, Fig. 2.17) and *Esmeralda* 1868, two of Van Lerius's literary genre paintings, had attracted much attention when they were exhibited in New York and Boston in the 1860s and early 1870s, and, as discussed earlier, may have had some bearing on Millet's decision to study at the Antwerp Academy. Van Lerius was appointed Professor of the Principles of Painting and Genre in 1854, a position he maintained until 1876.

According to contemporaneous accounts, Van Lerius, an acclaimed colorist in the manner of his teacher and the Flemish seventeenth-century tradition of Rubens, passed his preference for vigorous brushwork, rich color and impasto along to his students, while also encouraging them to work quickly. The English painter Felix Moscheles (1833-1917), who had studied at the Antwerp Academy with Van Lerius in the late 1850s recalled his teacher's indebtedness to the Rubensian tradition, as well as his very hands-on manner:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> The teaching was of a sound, practical nature, strongly imbued with the tendencies of the colourist school. Antwerp ever sought to uphold the traditions of a great past . . . . A peculiar kind of artistic kicks and cuffs were administered to the student by Van Lerius as he went his rounds. 'That is a charming bit of colour you have painted in that forehead,' he said to me on one occasion—'so delicate and refined. Do it again,' he added, as he took up my palette knife and scraped off the 'delicate bit.' 'Ah, you see, *savez vous*, you can't do it again; you got it by fluke, some stray tints off your palette, *savez vous*,' and taking the biggest brush I had, he swept over that palette and produced enough of the desired tints to have covered a dozen foreheads.[52]

Ten years later, another English art student, Thomas John Lucas, would observe that Van Lerius was still pursuing the same teaching methods:

> The first thing he generally did when he encountered a new pupil was to tell him to throw away his palette, and get one twice the size, so as to hold plenty of colour. 'Do you call this a palette?' he would say, taking an ordinary-sized palette out of the hands of the astonished pupil. His system was to heap on the colour, especially in the high lights. It was literally laid on with a trowel. I have seen a student holding up an empty tube in triumph, as if it were an evidence of high skill, and declaring that he had emptied it at one sitting upon his palette. Whatever might have been the merits of this thick impasto system, his pupils certainly produced very satisfactory work.[53]

Millet's surviving paintings from this period include *Flemish Girl with a Red Cap and Apron; The Artist's Kitchen; The Artist's Kitchen, Antwerp; The Artist's Studio, Antwerp; Old Flemish Woman Threading a Needle*; *Study of a Head*; and *Pan.* The unlocated *Street Corner, Antwerp* and *An Antwerp Kitchen*, listed in the 1914 Millet estate sale, may also have been painted during the artist's student years at Antwerp.[54] Stylistically, the extant works demonstrate the impact of Millet's study at the Antwerp Academy, particularly the influence of the painting master Van Lerius. In terms of subject matter, they fall into several thematic categories, from contemporary genre and domestic interiors, to a study head, and a figure from classical mythology—an eclectic range that prefigures aspects of Millet's mature work.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The largest group, representing contemporary Belgian genre and interior scenes—*Flemish Girl with Red Cap and Apron* (Fig. 2.18), *The Artist's Kitchen* (Fig. 2.19), *The Artist's Kitchen, Antwerp* (Fig. 2.20) and *The Artist's Studio, Antwerp* (Fig. 2.13)—all painted circa 1872, with their bravura brushwork, rich colorism and thick impastoed highlights, seem to provide a demonstration lesson of Van Lerius' methods as described above.[55] While the color in *Old Flemish Woman Threading a Needle* (Fig. 2.21) is darker in tonality, the vigorous paint handling, the pale yellow impastoed passages on her forehead, and the intense light from the right give the picture a certain liveliness that Van Lerius also championed in his classes. That said, it is not always easy to isolate the effect of Van Lerius on Millet's development from the influence of De Keyser, Beaufaux and the other artists to whom he was exposed during these years. While Millet's Rubensian paint handling in these early works may be attributed with some certainty to his study with Van Lerius, his solid draftsmanship, rich color, emphasis on descriptive qualities and characterization, and his careful arrangement of figures and objects in clearly defined interior spaces conform to the conventions of pictorial representation taught throughout the Antwerp Academy, and would have been reinforced by all his instructors.

Millet's humble subjects and domestic settings may be Flemish, but they also reveal his familiarity with seventeenth-century Dutch genre painting, which was enjoying a certain currency in artistic circles in the late nineteenth century. This was a tradition Millet knew first hand, both from examples housed in the Antwerp Academy museum collection and from his recent travels in Holland. Janus-faced, Millet's *Old Flemish Woman Threading a Needle* looks back to such prototypes as

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Gerard Dou's (1613-1675) *Old Woman with a Spool of Thread* (1660-1665, Fig. 2.22), a picture Millet would have seen in the Museum van der Hoop in Amsterdam, and forward to Millet's later paintings of women in interiors quietly performing common domestic tasks, as for example *The Window Seat* of 1883 (see Fig. 4.52).[56]

In the signed and dated painting of *Pan* (Fig. 2.23) playing his reed pipe, Millet moves away from scenes of contemporary Belgian life to classical mythology—an antiquarian world that anticipates his classical-subject pictures of the 1880s and 1890s. The bust-length study was probably painted according to academic precepts from a nude studio model in his *Natuur* class. Millet would later recycle the motif in his 1875 painting entitled *Alumni Entertainment* (Fig. 2.24) and in his 1897 mural *Thesmophoria* (see Fig. 3.7), which he painted for the main banking room of the Bank of Pittsburgh. The bravura handling, with heavy impasto passages visible in the hair, face and chest of *Pan,* and the rich green tonality of the background are typical of lessons absorbed under Van Lerius. The careful observation of Pan's physiognomy, which is depicted with unflattering realism; the emphasis on characterization; and the solid, three-dimensional modeling—qualities that would continue to define much of his work—also exemplify Millet's Antwerp manner.

Study of a Head (Fig. 2.25) depicts a strong-featured gentleman with a full beard and mustache in profile pose facing left. While the figure is painted in broad brushstrokes, the paint is more thinly applied than in Millet's other Antwerp pictures, with areas of bare canvas visible in the lower foreground. Perhaps this was one of the character heads, or *têtes d'expression*, that he would have produced at the academy. The careful attention to the emerald-green costume with a close-fitting narrow lace

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

collar reflects Millet's study of the history of costumes and antiquities with the Belgian antiquary Arthur Goemaere (1841-1902), and foreshadows his lifelong interest in costume design.

Millet continued to diversify his academic studies with travel. These trips offered opportunities to study art in European collections and to sketch in the galleries, as well as in the countryside. In late July, as the end of the summer term approached, Millet headed to London with fellow students Champney, Wetherbee, Grundman, Alfred Copeland (1840-1909) and D. Jerome Elwell (1847-1912). Champney made note of their activities in his correspondence. On August 20, 1872, a day after the group returned to Antwerp, he wrote his father:

> Everyday we're off from morning till late at night sightseeing. . . . There are so many things to see. So many Museums and exhibitions and places of interest in the vicinity of the city. For instance there is the International Exhibition at S. Kensington where there are all sorts of objects in all departments of science and art . . . then the S. Kensington Museum close by. We spent only one day in each of these places. The Bethanal [sic] Green Museum a branch of the S. Kensington one we visited twice. This was very interesting because it contained such a variety of pictures of all schools. Where you could compare Rubens, Murillo, Vandyke [*sic*], Teniers, Rembrandt, Canaletto, Dou, Reynolds, Greuse [*sic*], Gainsborough etc. with Decamps, Landseer, Corot, Meisonnier, Vernet, Delaroche, Scheffer, Bonheur, Gerome [*sic*], etc.[57]

In addition to the paintings of old and modern masters in the South Kensington Museum, Millet and his colleagues could hardly have missed seeing Whistler's (1834-1903) *Symphony in White, No. 2: The Little White Girl* (1864, Tate Gallery, London) which was prominently exhibited at the International Exhibition at the South Kensington Museum that year.[58] By 1872 Whistler was one of London's rising avant-garde artists, and had synthesized his realist interests with formal concerns about color, compositional arrangements and brushwork. That same year,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Whistler exhibited his *Arrangement of Grey and Black No. 1: Portrait of the Painter's Mother* (1871, Musée d'Orsay, Paris) at the Royal Academy.[59] In all probability Millet and his friends also had an opportunity to visit the Royal Academy exhibition. Like the seventeenth-century Dutch paintings that Millet admired, aspects of Whistler's work, as well as those of such modern French artists as Corot and Gérôme can be seen in his later paintings.

In addition, Champney reported that the group had spent a day each at Hampton Court, at the Crystal Palace at Sydenham, which was filled with models and casts of famous sculpture, and at the National Gallery, where they saw "some of the greatest works of Turner, Reynolds, Gainsborough, Wilkie, Constable, and also of Rubens, Rembrandt, Titian, Raphael, Correggio and many others."[60] A single day, however, afforded little opportunity to inspect the works thoroughly, and Millet would undertake a more serious study of Titian and the Renaissance masters during his sojourn in Italy in 1874-1875. The young art students also visited the large picture gallery in the British Museum and the Elgin Marbles. Although Champney reported that "[t]he Elgin Marbles did not please me so much as I had expected—they are very much mutilated,"[61] the fifth century B.C. sculptures would have a lasting influence on Millet's classical-subject paintings of the 1880s. For example, as art historian Mary Beth Kreiner has pointed out, Millet's picture *Reading the Story of Oenone* of 1881 is based in part on the Three Goddesses from the east pediment of the Parthenon frieze (see discussion in Chapter 4).[62]

Finally, Champney reported on their visit to Westminister Abbey, which was "much more solemn and impressive than the grand cathedrals of the continent,"[63] and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

promised to write about the group's travels to the western environs of London and to Shakespeare country, where on a clear day, one could see the Cotswolds and perhaps even the village of Broadway, the site of Millet's future home:

> In another letter I will tell you about our visit to Windsor Castle, Eton College, Richmond Hill and Park Zoological Gardens, and finally our trip to Warwickshire where we visited Stratford on Avon, Warwick and Coventry, Shakespeare's birthplace and the Church were he is buried, Anne Hathaway's cottage at Shottery -Warwick's Castle, the Beauchamp Chapel in St. Mary's Church, Warwick – the ruins of Kenilworth halfway between Warwick and Coventy.[64]

The group was back in Antwerp on August 19, 1872, leaving Millet in Coventry. From there, Champney reported that his friend had returned to London, before heading to the fishing village of Clovelly in Devonshire, where he spent most of his vacation "sketching from nature," although, "he was very often bothered and interrupted by the bad weather."[65] While Champney's comments suggest that Millet may have painted outdoors (and as an art student in Antwerp, he certainly would have been aware of the growing popularity of plein-air painting by 1872), the lack of visual evidence makes such an assessment difficult. Millet's known landscapes from this period, *Clovelly Sunset* (c. 1872) and *Clovelly* (c. 1872) (both of which were listed in the 1914 sale of the artist's estate), are presently unlocated, and his own correspondence, if any, from his travels through the English countryside has not survived. What has survived are a group of pencil drawings that he executed as he made his way from Penzance, at the tip of the Cornish peninsula, along the coast to Clovelly in the northwestern corner of Devonshire.[66] Most of them are dated and identified, suggesting that Millet intended them as a chronological pictorial record of his journey. Picturesque views of the monastery-crowned outcropping known as *St. Michael's Mount* (1872, Fig. 2.26), towering over Mount's Bay beyond Penzance,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and the coastal fishing villages of *Newlyn* (1872, Fig. 2.27),[67] *St. Just* (1872, Fig. 2.28), and *Clovelly* (1872, Fig. 2.29), these nature studies illustrate the artist's attention to detail and hint at his working methods. A comparison of the pencil drawing *Clovelly* (1872, Fig. 2.29)—which shows a vine-covered cottage set on a stone terrace and nestled under a high woodland—to the 1914 catalog description of the landscape painting *Clovelly Sunset* is instructive. In the catalog's words:

> Nestling under a high, deep-green hillside at the water's edge is a gray-white cottage on a low stone terrace, with boats hauled out beyond it and its lowly doorway banked with blossoming vines and flowers.[68]

The similarity of the two suggests that the drawing was a preliminary study from nature that Millet reworked as a segment of his finished landscape composition—a time-honored academic practice more familiar to work in the studio than to plein-air painting. What is perhaps more certain is that these English landscape studies, together with a group of contemporaneous landscape drawings that Millet did in Antwerp, for example *Anvers* (Fig. 2.30), served to expand his subject matter, and may have predisposed him to later plein-air experiments.[69] Although the Antwerp Academy offered classes in landscape and marine painting, Millet never participated in them (nor is he known to have completed paintings outdoors as did Champney and some of the other students), but instead pursued a course of academic training that prepared him to be a figure painter.[70] Nonetheless, he painted landscapes and seascapes throughout his career, often experimenting with them during his travels, and he emphasized outdoor settings in many of his easel paintings and mural work.

Millet remained at the Antwerp Academy another semester, through the winter of 1872-1873. On returning from his English travels in October 1872, he

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

again enrolled in the life class taught by Van Lerius.[71] Other American participants included the artist's friends Champney, Maynard, and Wetherbee. Millet continued to make notable progress, capping off his final semester by collecting nine of the total prizes in the annual March *concours* and winning the Academy's gold medal for excellence.[72] He was the first foreign student to achieve such a distinction.[73]

Coincident with Millet's completion of his academic studies in late March, 1873, Massachusetts Governor William Washburn appointed him to serve as Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Commissioners to the 1873 Vienna Universal Exposition, which was chaired by Charles Francis Adams, Jr., Boston attorney, Chairman of the Massachusetts Railroad Commission, and a member of the well-known Massachusetts family.[74] Under the direction of Baron Wilhelm von Schwarz-Sendborn, the Vienna 1873 Exposition was to be "a truly Universal exhibition that would embrace every field on which human intellect has been at work."[75] Since the Austro-Hungarian Empire had weathered a recent war with France and conflicts with Prussia, its leaders hoped that the fair would be a showcase for the empire's flourishing economy and modern metropolis, as well as an opportunity to present it as a political, cultural and industrial world leader, the equal of England and France. Millet's assignment, facilitated by his father's long-standing political connections, offered a first-rate opportunity for the recent Antwerp Academy graduate.[76] Ultimately, he would fare better than the tottering Austro-Hungarian Empire, which suffered a devastating stock market collapse barely a week after opening day, precipitating a depression and severe unemployment that dashed any hope for its emergence as a world leader. Millet's appointment, on the other hand,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

effectively honed his executive skills, launching his career as one of America's most able art administrators, reinforced his exposure to European art, and initiated a lifelong friendship with Adams. Many years later, Adams fondly recalled their first meeting:

> In 1873 . . . . Governor Washburn suddenly appointed me chairman of a commission provided for by the Massachusetts Legislature to attend the Vienna Exposition and report thereon. I went out in April and returned in September. My experience was pleasant enough, and in a way instructive, though I was generally quite unqualified for the task. . . . it was my supreme good fortune on this occasion to have associated with me one Frank D. Millet, who was appointed Secretary of the Commission, and met me as such in Vienna.[77]

Beset with problems occasioned by what he described as the United States' "complete mismanagement" of the 1873 Vienna Exposition, and preoccupied with family matters attending to the recent death in Paris of his father-in-law, Adams deferred to Millet's indefatigable industry and consummate managerial skills.[78] Returning early to Antwerp from a vacation in London and Paris with his father, Millet, at Adams request, headed to Vienna the week of April 20 to make preliminary arrangements for the Massachusetts Commission.[79] After securing a suite of rooms on Franzensbrückenstrasse to house the Commission's offices, he was back in Antwerp in time for the *concours* celebration on May 4, when King Leopold II of Belgium presented him with the Academy's prestigious gold medal. Millet's friends quickly organized their own celebration. Champney, who continued to report on the group's activities, noted. "The successful competitors for the Concours were serenaded this evening. A little party, principally Americans, was assembled in Millet's chambers."[80] Millet had little time to savor his success. Two days later a telegram from Adams obliged him to return immediately to Vienna.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

It must have been sometime during his father's visit, and before departing for Vienna, that Millet painted the likeness of his father, *Portrait of Dr. Asa Millet* (Fig. 2.31). The realistic, profile bust portrait exhibits the thick bravura brushstrokes, rich color, and impasto highlights that were part of his training with Van Lerius and the concern with characterization that would continue to define his work in this genre.

Although the Vienna 1873 world's fair had officially opened on May 1, 1873 with pomp and royal ceremony, neither the exhibits of the Massachusetts delegation, nor any of the American Department displays, were ready on opening day.[81] Congressional delay in authorizing American participation in the Vienna Exposition had made it difficult for the individual states to plan for the event in a timely fashion.[82] To make matters worse, General Thomas Van Buren, the Director of the American Department, had been accused of selling commissions.[83] On April 26, he and the United States Commissioners had been suspended by the authorities in Washington, and their successors had not yet been appointed. Thus, when Adams arrived in Vienna late on the evening of May 1, he found the inaugural festivities over with and the United States delegation in total disarray.[84] The State of Massachusetts's own belated participation in the exposition meant that Adams had no office staff, had not yet met with all his commissioners, and could do little to assist effectively the exhibitors from his home state. Adams later severely criticized the American display in his official report, stating: "The condition of affairs in the American department was disgraceful, ludicrous and mortifying. The confusion was apparently complete."[85] His frustration with the delays and mismanagement that had compromised his commission's usefulness is palpable:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> It only remained to hurry to Vienna, without the possibility of arriving there before every article should have been in its place. When we did arrive there, we found, it is true, nothing in place, and the Massachusetts expositors, in common with all of those from America, utterly paralyzed by the troubles in the United States Commission.[86]

Responding to Adams's urgent summons, Millet arrived in Vienna on May 7, 1873, and quickly tried to exercise some damage control. He purchased stationery and office furniture for the Massachusetts Commission; hired office personnel and writers to help with the sundry reports; assisted the Massachusetts exhibitors; oversaw the invitation lists for the various receptions; ran interference between Hamilton Hill, the Acting Massachusetts Commissioner, and the other commissioners; arranged housing accommodations for the jurors; and searched for a studio apartment for Adams.[87] The Massachusetts displays opened to the public on May 16. About two weeks later, on June 3, Millet, with characteristic modesty, wrote the now largely absentee Adams. "Now, Mr. Adams, I have effected very little because I have spent all my time in running after these Viennese. Last week I was one hour in the Exposition. You must not then expect to find too much accomplished when you return and inspect us."[88]

Such disclaimers notwithstanding, Millet continued to work tirelessly on behalf of the Massachusetts Commission through the summer months and into the fall. Although the exposition would not officially close until November 1, 1873, Adams departed from Vienna on August 10, three months' early, leaving Millet to take care of such "loose ends" as balancing the Commission's books, assisting the city of Vienna with a reception for the jurors, responding to the endless requests for perks demanded by the commissioners, and superintending the summary reports. In

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

addition to his work for the Massachusetts Commission, Millet also wrote articles on the exposition for the Boston Daily Advertiser, the Boston Daily Globe, and the New York Tribune.[89] His June 5, 1873 article for the Boston Daily Advertiser reveals his own disappointment with the state of affairs in the American Department, especially the Fine Arts display, a concern he would reiterate in his official report:

> Everyone comes to take a look at the American section, because the unfortunate scandal has advertised us infamously. Bare walls and spare displays as yet reward the curious visitor who has the courage to pass the "No Admittance" posted at the entrance. . . .
>
> The American department of fine arts is a failure. Bierstadt's landscapes will be hung and Elkins's "Mount Shasta," but it is probable that most of the remaining pictures will be shown among our manufactures, where they will fill a place suited to their merits. It is a sad sight to any one interested in American artists, the pictures now ranged around the walls of the catalogue office. The selections of subject and crudities of color are but two of the multitudinous defects they possess.[90]

Millet's myriad duties left him little time for painting. The only known works from this period are a *Portrait of Charles Francis Adams, Jr.* (unlocated) and a series of landscape sketches. Millet began the portrait of Adams in early August 1873, and labored over it after Adams' departure from Vienna.[91] Working largely from a photograph, it did not represent his best effort, and when the portrait arrived at the Adams home at Quincy, the sitter would write in his diary that it was "a failure."[92] Several years later Millet would redeem himself by painting another likeness of Adams. (This portrait will be discussed in Chapter 3).

In late August Millet took a break from work and went on a ten-day sketching tour through the Tyrol.[93] His itinerary took him from Hallstadt to Berchttesgaden, down to Mittersell, and over the snow-covered terrain between Gross Glockner and Gross Venediger, before returning to Vienna. Four days of rain impeded his progress.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

He voiced his disappointment with the countryside and his meager artistic production in a letter to Adams: "The country is grand, but not very picturesque and I made a score or two sketches only."[94] By the time Millet returned to Vienna on September 6, Commissioner Hill had also left the city. Millet forwarded the documents and records of the Massachusetts Commission to Adams, sublet the remainder of the lease on their suite of rooms, tended to some last-minute personal shopping that Adams had requested, and, on the latter's instruction, closed the office on October 8, 1873, five months after it was opened.[95]

Despite the often frustrating nature of his assignment, the Vienna World's Fair was a momentous experience for Millet. Not only did it provide him with a visual acquaintance with one of the largest international exhibitions of European art, it also helped launch the second half of what would be his dual career as an artist and arts administrator. With 3,192 paintings from twenty-one nations on display in the Fine Arts building, he had an opportunity to see pictures by Breton, Millet, Gérôme, Corot, Troyon, De Keyser, Stevens, Israels, Karl Von Piloty (1826-1886), Benjamin Vautier (1829-1898), Franz Von Lenbach (1836-1904), Milhály Von Munkácsy (1844-1900), Frederic Leighton (1830-1896), William Powell Frith (1819-1909), John Everett Millais (1829-1896), Domenico Induno (1815-1878), Alberto Pasini (1826-1899), Ilya Repin (1844-1930), and other leading European artists of the day. He also had a chance to see paintings by some of his American colleagues, including Bierstadt, Henry Mosler (1841-1920) and George Healy (1813-1894). The international artistic experience of the Vienna World's Fair, the sharing of ideas with artists from all over the world, was the first of many such events that Millet would participate in. Like his

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

academic training and his travels, these large international fairs would influence his artistic development.

Millet's remarks on the Fine Arts exhibition are detailed in the report, "Fine Arts of the Present Time," which he wrote for the Massachusetts Commission, his last official duty as a member of that delegation. Although Millet began his review by voicing a perennial complaint of observers of world fairs about the retrospective nature of the art, noting "that instead of an exhibition, we had a museum," he found much that was commendable in the modern pictures on display.[96] His views are instructive for what they reveal about his artistic philosophy at the time and his conception of American art:

> In the presence of as magnificent a collection of pictures as was shown in Vienna, it can hardly be denied that artists have gained in at least one direction, and that this progress, if continued . . . will result in a higher development of artistic culture, and in the production of works nobler and purer than any creations of the past two centuries. This progress is in the direction of expression; and in the refined subtleties of this quality of artistic power, it is clear to my mind that we of to-day are in advance of any age. . . .[T]he facility of comprehending and analyzing expression, and the facility of illustrating it, are much more widely spread among artists of the present day, than ever before. . . . The great triumph of art is to produce in the spectator feelings akin to those experienced by the artist . . . . Then, for an artist to succeed with a subject, he must be so thoroughly possessed with the idea he wishes to represent, that it penetrates every corner of his soul, and enters into every thought, until it becomes a presence not to be escaped, not to be avoided, until he has worked out its image on the canvas, or formed it in the clay.[97]

By "expression" Millet meant the ability of the artist to empathize so thoroughly with his subject that the rendering of his idea seizes his intellect and imagination, resulting in a personal (subjective) interpretation that invests both the artist and the spectator in the scene. Complementing the gains in "expression," Millet was encouraged by what he saw as advances in "truth of tone":

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Another tendency in art has a double signification. This is the admiration for truth of tone which is happily gaining ground among painters. In a material sense, truth of tone adds greatly to the value of the work as a mechanical production, and, in a higher sense, it is absolutely necessary to the perfect expression of an idea in painting. Examples of the perfect harmony of tone with the sentiment expressed will be found by no means rarely in the review which follows.[98]

Millet's emphasis on "expression" or sentiment in painting and his analogous concern for "truth of tone" (the symbiotic relationship of color, light, and subject to convey the artist's idea into a pictorial statement) aligns him with the more progressive American artists of the early 1870s, who were moving away from a literal to a more interpretative representation of nature, and toward a greater unity of idea and execution.

Critics, too, were expressing these opinions. As early as 1864 Jarves wrote in The Art-Idea: "Noble art is ideal [subjective] at root, and the idea should be so treated, in accordance with the requirements of beauty, as to absorb the spectator primarily in the subject. First, the thought; then, the thinker: such is the correct progress of artistic perception."[99] Millet's remarks also anticipate, in many respects, the comments of the art critic William Crary Brownell (1851-1928) written in 1880. Describing the influence of international art currents and foreign training on American artists, Brownell would proudly observe not only a new technical sophistication—"we are beginning to paint as other people paint," but a release from the notion that art was about accurately imitating natural forms.[100] "[W]hereas it used to be the main effort of American painters to emulate nature," he went on to say, "it is the main effort of the new men to express feeling. . . . Almost without exception, nature is to them a material rather than a model; they lean toward feeling rather than toward logic; toward beauty, or at least artistic impressiveness, rather than toward

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

literalness; toward illusion rather than toward representation."[101] According to Brownell, all that remained for effective picture-making, was to fuse this technique, idea, and structure into an organic unity.[102] This preference for a conceptual art that captures the spirit of one's subject and expresses emotions or ideas rather than literal realism, and a unity of idea and technical means—would be repeated in Millet's writings and in his work.

Millet lavished his highest praise on the art galleries of France, the Netherlands (as he refers to Belgium and Holland collectively), and Great Britain.[103] He singled out the French painters of peasant life Breton and Millet for commendation, terming their pictures "pastoral poems." He noted their harmonious rhythm of sentiment and execution; the "superior excellence" of the French landscapists as a group, from "the broad and free treatment of Corot to the minutely finished and somewhat formal realism of Robinet." He also praised the "Netherlanders" who in "execution, . . . in keen perception of the beauties of color, and in innate ability to represent fine distinctions of tone," are in advance of any school; the "masterpieces" of Israels, which "rise supreme above anything in the Dutch or Belgian departments, and find no parallels in the whole Exposition"; and the English pictures as a whole, which "are marked by a surpassing delicacy of sentiment, and the stories are told with a great deal of poetry."[104] Millet concluded his commentary with a scathing discussion of the American Fine Arts gallery—a collection of only seventeen paintings, which he found inadequate and aesthetically limited:

> I come now to speak of a collection that must have appealed to every American at least, our own display of pictures. Impressive these works certainly were, but,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> unfortunately, disagreeably so. Very limited in numbers the pictures represent art in America even in a less degree than our meager display in the Industrial Palace gave an idea of the industries and trade of America. Without entering upon the history of the formation of this collection—an experience it will be well to profit by in the future—a brief review of the pictures sent will satisfy those interested in art, not especially in American art, but in universal art with its acknowledged standard of merit, that it would have been far better for our artistic reputation if we had not figured in the Art Hall.[105]

In Millet's view, America was a nation whose artistic vision was behind the times. The emphasis of such American paintings as Bierstadt's *Emerald Pool* (1870, The Chrysler Museum, Norfolk, Virginia) and Mosler's *The Lost Cause* (1869, Private collection) on native themes, laborious technique, and the meticulous depiction of nature's details devoid of sentiment seemed provincial when compared to the cosmopolitan subjects, painterly modes, and evocative and artistic European pictures that Millet admired. He increasingly came to believe that American painting and sculpture should be aligned with the great traditions of Western art, and that the artist should exercise intelligent selection and imagination by seeking subjects that express the universality of human experience, and presenting them in a unified aesthetic statement. In a global world, where modern science had harmonized former differences, a "national art," Millet would declare, "was no longer possible . . . .Good art is cosmopolitan."[106] In his creative work, particularly in his easel paintings and mural ensembles, and in his subsequent administrative positions on world fair committees and art organization boards, he would consistently seek to raise the profile of American art by bringing it into accord with European artistic currents. Millet remained in touch with artists and movements abroad, and would become a fervent supporter of big international art exhibitions that helped to break down national boundaries in the second half of the nineteenth century.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

At the close of the Vienna Exposition, Millet decided to further his art education with an extended *wanderjahre* in Europe. His studies in Antwerp had given him a thorough education in the tradition of Western art, and his early travels on the continent had acquainted him with the art, history and culture of Belgium, Germany, Holland and England. The Vienna Exposition had reinforced and extended his familiarity with European art and culture. He now longed to travel, sketch and study more extensively. With the money he had earned from his work with the Massachusetts Commission and his writing, and with the prospect of future revenues from sales of his paintings and/or newspaper articles, he was able to finance such a tour.[107] On October 9, 1873, in the company of his friend George Maynard, Millet left Vienna on a three-month trip across Hungary and Transylvania, going as far east as Odessa on the Black Sea, then traveling south to Constantinople and other locales in Turkey and Greece, before proceeding to Italy, where he remained until the summer of 1875.[108] On this trip Millet filled several notebooks with small pencil sketches of the people he met, colorful national costumes, architecture and landscapes.[109] In addition, he made a number of larger, more formal drawings.[110] These studies he later reworked in such paintings as *A Turkish Water-Seller* (Fig. 2.39), and *Prosperina Gathering Flowers (The Poppy Field)* (see Fig. 4.57).

The paintings Millet produced in Italy during the twenty months in which he moved from Rome, to Capri, and, finally, to Venice, as well as his surviving correspondence, reveal a period of intense experimentation, and presage the eclecticism of his mature style. After a three-day sea voyage from Athens, Millet arrived in Brindisi on December 11, 1873. He stopped briefly in Naples, and then

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

proceeded to Rome, where he spent the winter. He wrote Adams that he had "begun the cartoon of a (4 ft. x 3 ft.) life-size picture with two figures," but it was portraits that were of particular interest to Millet during this period. He articulated this preference in his letter:

> Do you know that there is no young fellow of my acquaintance who will try and become a portrait painter. Why! The greatest delight I experience in a picture gallery is in seeing a head by Velazquez [*sic*] or Rembrandt, or a portrait by Rubens or Vandyck [*sic*]. There can be no higher art than that and for me, at least, the gems of the European art galleries are the grand portraits.[111]

He mentioned several prospects, among them the California poet Joaquin Miller (1837-1913), who frequented Millet's studio, and the American educator Henry Barnard (1811-1900), but if any portraits were finished, they seem to have been lost.[112]

A depressed worldwide economy may have dashed Millet's plans, for on February 8, 1874, the somewhat discouraged artist wrote Adams: "There is no American portrait painter here in Rome . . . no Americans are having their heads painted this year—the panic (of 1874) [actually1873] is the cause of dull business in every brand of art."[113] The state of the economy, the lack of mentors, and the convivial atmosphere of the American artist colony in Rome may have convinced Millet that the ancient city was not the place for serious work.[114] Several days later, Millet had decided to leave Rome:

> Rome is not altogether the place at present. I have made a great many friends but see no good modern work except rare examples in studios. I learn much from occasional frank criticisms and also much from the old masters. There are fine Titians and Velasquez[*sic*] here and beside these two the others hold for me a second place. Raphael is not colorist enough to excite my unqualified sympathy. Titian is greater every time I see one of his pictures. No one works in Rome. The studios are full of visitors every afternoon; parties and receptions are always the order of the day. I can't afford the time to go into society much, yet I must to get

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> portraits. The climate is not made to drudge in. Still I am not idle . . . . There is another lady here whom I hope to paint . . . Then I am going somewhere and study.[115]

Despite Millet's professed emphasis on portraiture, a landscape drawing entitled *Palatine from the Coliseum*, dated March 1, 1874, (Fig. 2.32) and a number of small pencil sketches are the only known work from Millet's sojourn in Rome.[116]

By May 1874, Millet had established himself on the island of Capri, where he remained for the summer, with occasional forays to Naples and the mainland. He wrote Adams that he had settled into "a little attic-like place with little furniture and as little rent to pay" high above the village.[117] The springtime beauty of the island refreshed his spirits:

> You have no idea how beautiful Capri is in the spring. All the leaves are now out and the sun is very warm, while there is always a cool breeze from the sea. From my roof I can see almost to Sicily and the Bay of Naples is under my feet, for I am almost up in the clouds. It is a great relief to be here after the noisy disagreeable cities and I don't wonder that so many artist live here always.[118]

In this idyllic setting Millet turned his attention to landscape and figure studies. Millet's 1914 estate sale catalog suggests that the artist may have painted at least six small landscapes or seascapes (and/or studies of same), and four figure pieces in the spring and summer of 1874: *Capri – Vesuvius in the Distance; Rocks off Capri – Vesuvius in the Distance; Wayside Shrine, Capri; Pergola – Capri; Palm Trees – Capri; Shrine on Capri Shore; Capri Fishermen – Study for a Large Picture; Gathering Grapes – Capri; A Capri Water-Carrier* and *A Girl of Capri.*[119] Given the close proximity of the island to Naples and Pompeii, Millet likely also painted the small landscape *Voie des Tombeaux, Pompeii* after one of his many visits to the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

mainland.[120] In addition, Millet's own correspondence intimates an even larger body of work, most of which, unfortunately, remains unlocated:

> I have been in a fever of work and it is literally true. Before sunrise every morning I am painting and do not stop until an hour before sunset. I have, of course, accomplished much work and have made several studies for the picture I am trying to make and beside two life-sized figures have a half dozen street scenes, etc. with small figures. I kept up my enthusiasm by varying the subject and carry away no less than five life-size studies and a dozen small ones.[121]

The extant landscapes—*Pergola – Capri* (Fig. 2.33), *Palm Trees, Capri* (Fig. 2.34), and *Voie des Tombeaux, Pompeii* (Fig. 2.35) illustrate an important change in the artist's work after he left Antwerp—a moving away from the rich colorism, and vigorous, heavily impastoed painting style of such works as *Flemish Girl with a Red Cap* (c. 1872, see Fig. 2.18) in favor of what he termed a more "refined" treatment of line and color.[122] The landscapes also suggest his early concern with representing the qualities of outdoor light. In *Pergola – Capri* (Fig. 2.33), Millet's subtle palette modulates between the white pavement, low walls and columns, and the clothesline in the distance—all shimmering with reflected sunlight—and passages of green foliage and blue sky. The paint handling is still fluid, but more delicate now, rather than coarse—the artist's formal means in concert with the peaceful charm of this quiet, uninhabited corner of his loggia, where he lived "almost up in the clouds." Across the bay from the bustling city of Naples, Capri still retained glimpses of traditional country life that by the end of the nineteenth century had disappeared from many parts of the mainland. Twenty years later, on a return visit to the island, Millet would observe that "most of the facets of this gem of the Mediterranean are still untarnished and flawless. . . undisturbed by the gleam of the white umbrella or the red flash of the Baedeker."[123] In his paintings from the summer of 1874, Millet eloquently conveyed

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

his sympathy for the unspoiled charm of Capri with the power of expression that he had admired in the best modern pictures in the Fine Arts galleries at the Vienna Exposition.

Millet's desire to move beyond his former Antwerp manner is a constant leitmotif in his ongoing correspondence with Adams in late 1873 and 1874. Fairly typical are the comments in his February 10, 1874 letter written from Rome:

> Refinement of line or color is the last thing sought for at Antwerp. We learn to make quick effective studies and no more. The Academy is not the place to finish and not the place to learn fine drawing . . . .They taught us always to follow Rubens. I find no fault with this. I can see no better course for a beginner. Strength gained in this way can never degenerate into wishy washy style of the modern Italians. The school is deficient in refinement and always will be. The sentiment and expression hold secondary places in it and only after outside practice can the students gain even a shade of this. Coarse models, coarse colors and coarse ideas—coarse but strong. There is virtue in strength, add refinement and you have the two elements of the most powerful art, the most perfect method. Now to be frank on my side, I know my work is strong and I know—at least I have come to know—that it is by no means refined.[124]

In Capri, where, he wrote Adams, "life is reduced to its simplest condition," Millet seemed to have found his way. Equally typical, but more hopeful of his eventual progress, are the remarks in his May 6, 1874 letter from Capri. "In Flanders all the models are coarse and brutal, here they are the reverse. In Flanders all art is realistic and realistic in the worst way. Here I am getting an antidote for the poison."[125] While Capri may have furnished the "antidote," the landscapes Millet produced on the island, with their generalized forms, fluid paint handling, and intimate passages of nature, also bear comparison with the poetic French Barbizon landscapes that Millet had admired at the 1873 Vienna Exposition, especially such works as Corot's *Lake Nemi* of 1843 (location unknown).[126]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

By July, Millet began to plan his departure from Capri. While he had enjoyed Capri's beautiful nature, the heat was becoming oppressive and there were "no pictures" on the island. As a student at the Antwerp Academy, Millet had learned to study the old masters, and he was determined, he wrote Adams, "not to leave Italy until I have made an acquaintance with the best pictures here and have derived something of use from them."[127] "I dislike to leave very much," he wrote Adams, but he was anxious to get at the Titians and Early Italian Renaissance masters:

> I intend, of course, to make some copies of Titian and to study as much as possible those masters whose influence I need the most—the primitive masters. I feel ripe now for an acquaintance with the Italian masters . . . . I think after this three months of feverish work I know what to look for in Titian and the rest. I expect to draw from him and from Giotto much nourishment and am anxious to prove to myself that I am right. Fresh from a diligent study of nature I can hope to understand their works and to learn from them to supply just the needs that I feel I have. . . .
>
> I shall probably write you next from Florence and speak of the Titians there and shall surely write when I arrive in Venice. I have rooms, gondola, etc. in the latter at my disposal. An artist friend has hired a house there for three years.[128]

Millet's study of the Italian masters would take him from Florence to Venice and throughout northern Italy. By early August 1874 he had settled in Venice, sharing a house at 262 Calle San Domenico in the southeastern part of the city facing the lagoon, in what was known as the Castello quarter, first with the American painter William Gedney Bunce (1840-1916), and later with the American author Charles Warren Stoddard (1843-1909).[129] Long a favorite spot on the eighteenth-century European grand tour, Venice, owing in part to Ruskin's writings, such as The Stones of Venice published in 1853, and the end of political hostilities with Austria, had attracted a sizable American colony of artists and writers by the early 1870s.[130] Millet had come to Venice to study the paintings of Titian and the Italian Renaissance

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

artists in the city's galleries, palaces and churches and in those of the neighboring Northern Italian towns. Once in the city, he also turned his attention to the landscape and images of modern Venetian life. It is significant that thirteen Venetian subjects were offered in Millet's 1914 estate sale—*Red Buoy, Venice; Bridge at Venice; Gray Day – Venice; Boats – Venice; At Venice; Boats – Venice; Venice – Men Sawing Wood; San Giorgio, Venice; San Giorgio and Santa Maria, Venice; Street in Venice; Garden in Venice; Venice; and Landing Steps, Venice*—all of them, unfortunately, unlocated today.[131] In addition, Millet painted a picture of his kitchen, *Kitchen in Venice* (c. 1874, Private collection),[132] and of his studio, both subjects that he had treated earlier in Antwerp, and to which he frequently returned. Devoid of figures, *Studio in Venice* (Fig. 2.36) depicts the open-air *atelier* that the artist constructed on the loggia of his house. A contemporaneous painting *Sailing in the Bay of Naples*, which will be discussed later in this chapter, is visible on the easel. Proud of his handiwork, Millet commented on the Venice studio in his diary:

> Today I have built a great awning of rush mats on the loggia to serve as a studio. For 25 francs' expense the whole immense structure rolling curtains and all was completed and now we have a studio better than the most fortunate artist.[133]

During his stay in Venice, Millet also began to concentrate on the paintings that he hoped to submit to major exhibitions— *Boys Fishing, Venice* (Fig. 2.37), *Sailing in the Bay of Naples* (Fig. 2.38), and *A Turkish Water-Seller* (Fig. 2.39).

By the fall of 1874 Millet had an established, if somewhat intensive, routine. "I work all day now out of the house," he wrote Adams:

> the forenoon in the Museum where I am making a couple of souvenirs of Titian and the afternoon in San Marco, from 6 to 8 P.M. I draw from life at the Academy, and so the weeks slip by very fast. . . . Never work less than eight hours oftener ten, always ten when the days are light.[134]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

As Millet struggled to resolve a predilection for "too much finish and too great attention to details," his enthusiasm for Titian increased. "I never found my master till I saw Titian in Venice," he wrote Adams. "He paints! Rubens is a schoolboy beside him—but a very active schoolboy."[135]

The other Renaissance master that Millet greatly admired was Giotto (c. 1267-1337), who after 1860 was accorded a special place in the history of Italian art.[136] At the end of January 1875, Millet went on a two-week tour of northern Italy with Stoddard. Their travels took them to Padua, Florence, Siena, and Pisa, among other locales, before they returned to Venice on February 16th.[137] Millet commented favorably on such Early Renaissance artists as Mantegna and Ghirlandaio, but his highest praise was reserved for Giotto's frescoes in the Arena Chapel in Padua:

> Giotto's frescoes . . . instructed and delighted me as I have rarely been before. Two sides and one end of this building are entirely covered with paintings (14th century) remarkably well-preserved for frescoes and quite fresh and unchanged in color. Among the multitude of fine compositions there was a deposition, a last supper, resurrection of Lazarus, and washing the disciples feet that interested me the most. It is impossible to put down my impressions of these gems of Italian art. In the little chapel is hidden the germ of all Italian painting and the frescoes are the best examples of art in its highest and noblest expression. The figures are so simple and dignified, there is so much honest purpose uninfluenced by the material, directed and induced by honest conviction and faith, that the pictures far excel any of the later artists[138]

Besides the simple dignity and spirituality of Giotto's naturalistic groups, even Titian's works temporarily paled:

> Titian's masterpieces, gigantic as they are in conception and execution, are but superficial, conventional and artificial. Giotto's wonderful naiveté and truth of expression not only facial but mental, his devotion to the spirit of the illustration and the scorn of trick and quiet confidence in the perfection of the characters as illustrated by the figures, is most enchanting. His old men are models of goodness, his figures are intimate in their relations and all brothers in the one great purpose of life and leave nothing to be wished for in the way of sentiment. It

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> never was so fully proven to me as today, the importance of the study of the primitive masters instead of the later ones.[139]

Millet's admiration of Giotto, Titian and the Italian Quattrocento painters can be seen as part of the interest in Italian Renaissance art fostered by the writings of James Jackson Jarves, Hippolyte Taine (1828-1893), and Joseph A. Crowe (1825-1896) and Giovanni B. Cavalcaselle (1821-1897). Jarves's Art Studies: The "Old Masters" of Italy, which was published in 1860, was the first thorough treatment of Renaissance art by an American author. Jarves considered Giotto, Masaccio and Fra Angelico the three great representatives of progress in early Renaissance art, who paved the way for Leonardo, Michelangelo and Raphael, another illustrious triad.[140] Crowe and Cavalcaselle's influential compendium, A History of Painting in Italy, was published in 1864. They, too, gave high marks to Giotto, "the most celebrated of early Italian painters," whose influence extended from Verona in the north to Naples in the south.[141] In 1875 a new edition of Taine's Lectures on Art appeared in English translation, and included a chapter on the Italian Renaissance. Taine termed the Italian Renaissance a "glorious epoch," and such artists as Leonardo, Raphael, Michelangelo and Titian, who were working in the last quarter of the fifteenth century and early sixteenth century, its greatest exponents.[142] These books were widely read and discussed, and helped create an interest in Italian Renaissance art. They likely renewed Millet's acquaintance with the Italian masters, an acquaintance that would have been nurtured during his training at the Antwerp Academy by his teachers De Keyser, Van Lerius and Beaufaux, all of whom had spent time in Italy and may have directed their students there, by his lecture classes in the history of art, and by Italian Renaissance pictures in the Antwerp Museum collection, as for example

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Giotto's *Saint Nicholas* (location unknown) and Titian's *Giovana Sforza, Bishop of Daphos, presented to Saint Peter by the Pope Alexander XI* (location unknown).[143] Adding to the diverse and overlapping levels of influence in Millet's work, the Rubensian tradition that was entrenched at the Antwerp Academy was itself informed by Rubens' studies in Italy and his admiration of Titian and Michelangelo.

Soon, Millet's admiration for Titian resurfaced. In March 1875, in the Church of Santa Maria Gloriosa dei Frari, he made a copy of the artist's great *Assumption of the Virgin* (Private collection), which Titian had painted for the high altar in 1516-18:

> I am just completing a sketch of the *Assumption* by Titian, three or four feet long; this with all my other sketches and studies will go home in the Spring. Beside my pictures I am making a study in San Marco which takes me about two afternoons each week and with various little things makes out to fill up chinks when the model does not come or the sun is hidden. You see with all my work I must make some progress. I know that I make even weekly advancement in drawing and can paint much easier and better than I did a year ago.[144]

Another work painted about this time—*Fra Filippo Lippi and Lucretia Buti* (Fig. 2.40)—while strikingly different thematically from the *Assumption of the Virgin*, is equally characteristic of Millet's greater ability in drawing the human figure and fluency in the use of oil paint. The picture depicts the well-known story of the Florentine Quattrocento painter Fra Filippo Lippi (c. 1406-1469) told in Giorgio Vasari's The Lives of the Artists, a book that Millet purchased on a trip to Ferrara in May 1875.[145] According to Vasari, Lippi, while painting the frescoes on the lives of St. Stephen and St. John the Baptist in the Church of Santa Margherita at Prato (1452-1464), fell in love with his model, the nun Lucretia Buti, and eventually abducted and seduced her.[146] Their scandalous liaison produced a son, who later became the accomplished painter Filippino Lippi (1457-1504). Vasari's colorful

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

story was popular in the Victorian era, inspiring artists and literary figures alike. The French artist Paul Delaroche (1797-1856), for example, painted in 1822 a canvas which he entitled *Filippo Lippi Falling in Love with His Model* (Fig. 2.41), and the English poet Robert Browning (1812-1889) loosely based one of his dramatic monologues, "Fra Lippo Lippi" of 1855, on the artist's life.

In Millet's painting the seduction scene takes place on the high altar beneath the crucifix and adjacent fresco panels. Lippi has abandoned his canvas and leans over, with his palette and brushes still in hand, and prepares to kiss a swooning Lucretia. The tale of illicit passion and seduction is transformed into a sentimental love scene that recalls the genrefied history painting (famous people engaged in everyday activities) by Millet's teacher Nicaise De Keyser depicting another intimate scene of an artist falling in love with his model—the story of *Raphael and the Fornarina* (1851, Fig. 2.42). Similarly reminiscent of De Keyser's picture are the graceful curving lines that unite the carefully modeled figures, the meticulous attention to details of costume, as for example the cut-velvet design of the friar's sleeve, and the expressive use of light. Millet's looser paint handling and more vibrant color suggest the recent influence of Titian and Venetian painting. If the aforementioned formal characteristics recall Millet's Antwerp training and his assimilation of the lessons of the Venetian Renaissance masters, his concern with recreating a scene from the historical past prefigures the historical genre themes (anonymous people in historical costume) that he would develop in his mature work, in which he frequently looked to classical antiquity, Colonial America, and Elizabethan England for his subjects.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Also germane to this discussion is the nineteenth-century fascination with the artist in his studio as a pictorial theme. This seventeenth-century convention, whose best-known examples are Johannes Vermeer's *The Allegory of Painting* (c. 1666-1667, Kunsthistorisches Museum, Vienna) and Diego Velázquez's (1599-1660) *Las Meninas* (1656, Museo del Prado, Madrid), enjoyed renewed popularity with nineteenth-century artists. Millet's picture thus identifies him with a venerable artistic tradition and places him in an international milieu whose more recent representations include Ingres' *Raphael and the Fornarina* (c. 1814, The Fogg Art Museum, Cambridge, Massachusetts), De Keyser's *Titian Sketching His Venus While Visited by His Friends* (1843, Fig. 2.43), Gustave Courbet's *The Painter's Studio* (1855, Musée d'Orsay, Paris), Alfred Stevens's *The Artist in His Studio* (1855, The Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore), Thomas Eakins's *William Rush Carving His Allegorical Figure of the Schuylkill* (1876-77, Philadelphia Museum of Art), as well as the numerous pictures of William Merritt Chase's Tenth Street studio, such as *Interior of the Artist's Studio* (1880, The Saint Louis Art Museum). Considered in this context, Millet's *Fra Filippo Lippi and Lucretia Buti* may well be the affirmation of an aesthetic philosophy that art, while it may be inspired by nature, is equally a product of the creative process that takes place in the artist's studio.[147]

It is the three large exhibition pieces Millet was preparing—*Boys Fishing, Venice* (Fig. 2.37); *Sailing in the Bay of Naples* (Fig. 2.38); and *A Turkish Water-Seller* (Fig. 2.39)—that most clearly demonstrate the progress he had made since his student days in Antwerp. They reveal his still experimental, but maturing, style as he looked to nature and the Italian Renaissance masters to help him refine form, color

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and light, and to express his ideas in a more harmonious pictorial statement. As a group they represent a synthesis of what he learned from his Antwerp training, his travels in Europe and the Near East, his study of Italian Renaissance art, and his investigations in pleinairism.

Boys Fishing, Venice (Fig. 2.37), a vignette of modern Venetian life, continues Millet's interest in contemporary genre subjects evinced in his earlier Antwerp work. The picture, which depicts three young boys fishing from a brick embankment, was underway by October 1874, when Millet mentioned the work in a letter to Adams—"when the sun comes again I shall continue work on my picture of three boys which is already on the canvas."[148] Aware of plein-air practices since his student days in Antwerp, and prompted now, perhaps, by his new, open-air studio and, if one may speculate, by the inaugural exhibition at Paris in April 1874 of the Société Anonyme des Artistes, Millet's primary concern here appears to be the plein-air investigation of light and color. Without abandoning the solid, three-dimensional forms of his Antwerp training, he used a combination of fluid and impastoed brushstrokes, and a daring red-ocher palette, to emphasize the effects of strong sunlight. The sun-drenched atmosphere gives a reddish tint to the boys' skin, and casts dark shadows on the wall surface, but the naturalistic effects seem incongruous with the contrived poses of the boys and the carefully plotted perspectival scheme in the background. Although Millet had intended this as an exhibition piece, a potential sale, as he explained to Adams, seems to have thwarted his plan:

> I told you I had an order for a small picture from an American gentleman. But I unfortunately showed him my cartoon of the boys, and he said 'I'd rather have that. Finish that and tell me your price and then we will see.' As he will not be able to see the picture before next July that little move has disappointed me on the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> money question. The picture in question is about 3 x 4 feet and if it is a success in the color it will be worth not less than 3000 francs. We shall see. I would prefer to let him have the one I made for him because it is a Capri study and not so much of an exhibition picture."[149]

Sailing in the Bay of Naples (Fig. 2.38), Millet's other contemporary Italian genre subject, was painted in the spring and summer of 1875, but he likely began preparations for the Naples market boat scene during his stay in Capri the previous summer. The picture represents eight figures, in a seemingly happened-upon moment of leisure and work, aboard an old market boat that is making its way across the Bay of Naples on a hazy summer day. The presently unlocated oil study *Capri Fishermen – Study For A Large Picture*, described in the 1914 estate sale catalog as "A bold sketch . . . depicting a number of fishers on their heavy, sturdy sailing craft, under way through an indigo sea with a far mountain shore," appears to have been a preliminary work for the finished picture.[150] Millet was still working on the painting in May 1875, as he made plans to return to the United States. In a May 9, 1875 letter to Adams, he remarked:

> I have begun and got the cartoon all made for a large picture, 2 metres x 1 ½ metres, and cannot possibly go away until the heads are painted as I cannot possibly get the models in America. If I can get the heads put in I shall bring all my draperies, etc. etc. home & try and finish the thing there . . . . It is a subject in which I am very much interested . . . a scene in the Bay of Naples and there are eight life-sized figures in it.[151]

By May 26, 1875, the picture had advanced sufficiently for Millet to write Stoddard that "I have been at work like a Trojan and have my big canvas covered up and in a fair way to be completed by July 1st."[152] The finished painting is visible on Millet's easel in *Studio in Venice* (Fig. 2.36). While Millet did not record the specifics of his working method, he likely posed his models outdoors, but completed the painting in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the studio. The small plaster maquette, which is visible on the side table in *Studio in Venice*, suggests Millet's commitment to traditional academic methods, at the same time that he was investigating more avant-garde, plein-air strategies. Facile brushstrokes and flecks of impasto capture the rays of sunlight breaking through the haze as they play upon the picturesque costumes and torn sail, and touch the figures with broad patches of warm light, while leaving the sea and Mt.Vesuvius enveloped in vaporous blue mist. As in *Boys Fishing, Venice*, Millet appears to be trying to achieve more naturalistic effects, rather than abandoning academic pictorial norms. His figures are solidly modeled and carefully finished. The painting recalls, particularly, the influence of De Keyser in its variety of figural types and individual expressions; in its attention to costume detail; and in many of its compositional strategies, including the elimination of a foreground plane, so that the viewer is a participant in the scene. Millet's ability to capture different facial expressions, a residue of his *téte d'expression* exercises at the Antwerp Academy, is informed now, as well, by the "truth of expression" that he found "most enchanting" in such fresco panels as Giotto's *Raising of Lazarus* (after 1310) in the Arena Chapel at Padua.

Sailing in the Bay of Naples and *Boys Fishing, Venice* are both part of a long tradition of Italian rural and urban low-life themes, beginning with the seventeenth-century realistic representations of Pieter Van Laer (1592/95-1642) and the Dutch "Bamboccianti" painters who worked in Italy, producing such pictures as Van Laer's *Farrier* (c. 1635 Fig. 2.44) for both Dutch and Italian markets.[153] They were given a new lease on life when the Swiss painter Léopold Robert (1794-1835) introduced his idealized paintings of Italian peasant life to the Paris Salon in 1822, and remained

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

popular throughout the nineteenth century. Millet's teachers Nicaise De Keyser and Polydore Beaufaux both essayed such themes, as for example *Italian Woman in Traditional Costume* (1841, Fig. 2.45) and *Young Girl in the Roman Campagna* (c. 1860, location unknown), respectively.[154] In addition, Millet may well have been acquainted with the works of the "Bamboccianti" painters in Dutch museums, and with contemporaneous revisions of this iconographic tradition by European painters working in Venice in the 1870s, as for example the Austrian painter Cecil Van Haanen (1844-1914); the British painters Luke Fildes (1844-1927) and Marcus Stone (1840-1921); and the Italian painters Antonio Rotta (1828-1903) and Antonio Paoletti (1834-1912), particularly the latter artist's (*Venetian urchins on a bridge over the Grand Canal*, Fig. 2.46).[155] Recent scholars have identified the mythic quality of these images. Art historian Margaretta Lovell has pointed out the bittersweet fascination of these glimpses of the Venetian and Italian past in a rapidly modernizing world (the once glorious past as well as a sense of the fall), and the market appeal of their foreign subject matter.[156] Art historian Erica Hirshler discussed the poetic quality of such representations—a quality that referenced the picturesque aspects of the city, transient light effects, and a timeless sense of freedom from the reality of contemporary life.[157]

Turkish Water-Seller (Fig. 2.39) is Millet's first known exploration of a Near Eastern subject, one of several themes that would occupy his attention for the next decade. In this painting he fuses elements of portraiture, genre and still life in the academic realist vocabulary he learned in Antwerp, while, simultaneously, moving toward a greater analysis of his subject's formal and decorative qualities. The

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

painting also draws on several of the small pencil sketches the artist made during his travels through the Near East in the fall of 1873, as for example (Fig. 2.47).[158] In Constantinople he had been impressed by the architecture, physiognomies and costumes of the people, and by the purity of the water. He wrote in his travel diary of the "Arabian Nights' atmosphere" of the city and the almost indescribable Grand Bazaar, "a city within a city, a town under one roof," where the shops were "full to overflowing," and everything was for sale. "Water is sold in the streets in various ways and . . . is very sweet and delicious and we drink it in preference to anything else."[159]

The architecture of the city's marketplace, bleached out by intense sunlight, establishes the background of the picture, while a brilliantly costumed and statuesque water seller, whose proud, self-confident demeanor seems more like that of a Nubian prince than a humble vendor, plies his trade in the shade of an overarching tent. Narrative vies for attention with Millet's formal concerns as he delights in the richness of the brilliant colors and textures, the qualities of light, and the materiality of paint. The water seller's distinctive facial features and translucent, black skin tones; the red silken coat; the tasseled headdress with its overlapping patterns in reds, yellow-oranges and greens; and the foreground still life of glass, silver and ceramic ware are all deftly handled with loose brushstrokes of rich, luxuriant paint. Millet is especially interested in the properties of light—how it falls on the figure, modeling form, highlighting flesh tones and the glistening passages of silk and intensifying their color; how it illuminates the embossed design on the green decanter, and is then finally reflected in impastoed strokes of red, black, green and yellow in the glasses

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and silver tray. The artist's masterful handing of paint, the brilliant coloration, the sense of light and the harmonious space all reveal the influence of Titian and Venetian painting, as well as his own experiments with plein-air painting. The vibrant color and light permeating the composition also suggest the picturesque exoticism and bright sunlight that captivated Millet and many contemporary artists who traveled to the Near East. Millet has marshaled a wealth of resources into a harmonious ensemble that enhances, but does not detract from, the individuality and dignity of his subject. *A Turkish Water-Seller* is the most successful of Millet's early attempts to move beyond his vigorous Antwerp manner in his search for a more refined and expressive style—a sophisticated mastery of technique (form, light, color, brushwork, composition) to complement and help elucidate his subject.

Millet's fascination with Orientalist subject matter can be understood in the context of the nineteenth-century interest in North Africa and the Near East that began with Napoleon's Egyptian campaign in 1798 and continued into the early twentieth-century.[160] Artists, writers, and tourists traveled there for more than a century, returning with sketches, photographs, diaries of their adventures, and trunks laden with treasures. Orientalist imagery was fairly ubiquitous in nineteenth-century Western art history and included such diverse images as Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres (1780-1867) *Grande Odalisque* (1814, The Louvre, Paris), Eugéne Delacroix's (1798-1863) *Death of Sardanapalas* (1827, Philadelphia Museum of Art) Gérôme's *Egyptian Recruits crossing the Desert* (1857, Private collection), Frederic Church's *Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives* (1870, The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Kansas City, Missouri), and Frederick Bridgman's *An Interesting Game* (1881,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Brooklyn Museum of Art). Nicaise De Keyser, inspired by his own travels in North Africa, depicted exotic figure studies such as *The Arab Chief* (1843, Fig. 2.7) and *Europe and Asia* (1864, Fig. 2.48), and may have influenced Millet's interest in the genre. Similar works by Gérôme and the English painter John Frederick Lewis (1805-1875) had been exhibited at the Vienna International Exposition in 1873, and were acknowledged by Millet in his review:

> With Gerome [*sic*], who was represented by some of his best works, size does not always remain a necessary attribute of his productions, but he is always best seen when his figures do not exceed a certain very small stature. His *Slave Market*, a life-size picture, a sort of studio combination of a naked girl, a crouching negro, a parrot and a few accessories, has little to recommend it. Then there were also shown one or two rather hideous subjects, where decapitated heads and cold-blooded guards told some story of Eastern barbarity. Finished with more than photographic nicety, the details are rendered with such exactness, that you are almost sure that there is a miniature *porte-monnaie* in the pocket of each of the diminutive personages. There is, nevertheless, a skill in composition, a knowledge of costume and antiquities, a considerable truth of expression and strength of color that pleases.
>
> . . . . Two oriental scenes by John F. Lewis, *The Suspicious Coin*, and *A Street in Cairo*, are exceptionally strong in color, but are a little glassy from their extreme finish. The camels, in the latter picture, appear covered with eel-skin, and the former, a Turkish bazaar, with its picturesque occupants and wealth of drapery, wonderfully vigorous and rich in color, loses from its almost metallic luster.[161]

Although Millet's comments were somewhat equivocal, the popularity of such paintings at the international fairs, Paris Salons and commercial art galleries during the 1870s would have insured that *A Turkish Water-Seller* would have instant critical and commercial appeal.[162]

Millet's Near Eastern subjects can also be understood in terms of the modern debates surrounding Orientalism. Some commentators, most notably the literary critic Edward Said, view all Orientalist images as aspects of cultural imperialism. In his1978 landmark book Orientalism, Said claimed that the notion of the East as an

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

exotic "Other" was a Western construction designed to legitimize and perpetuate European colonialism in the region.[163] He viewed Western representations of the East in literature and art as demeaning stereotypes—alternately sensual, corrupt, passive, vicious, and backward—that reinforced and legitimized the political domination of these lands. Art historian Linda Nochlin in a 1983 article entitled "The Imaginary Orient" extended Said's argument to depictions of Oriental women by French nineteenth-century artists.[164] Nochlin wrote that such images stereotyped Islamic women as sensual and exotic in order to indulge French male fantasies and to legitimize male power and domination over women's bodies. These views have been challenged by art historians MaryAnne Stevens and John M. MacKensie, both of whom addressed the complexity of such images. Stevens argued that such readings were too simplistic an interpretation of Western visitors' intentions and their artistic work.[165] MacKensie noted the positive borrowings from and representations of Orientalist culture by artists, architects, musicians, and others.[166] Most recently art historians Gerald Ackerman, Holly Edwards, and Brian T. Allen, investigating Orientalist images by American artists, acknowledged the enormous diversity of such depictions, from imperialism and denigration to celebration and nostalgia.[167]

These modern alternative views of nineteenth-century Orientalism reflect the opposing concepts of the images themselves. A comparison of Millet's *A Turkish Water-Seller* (1874, Fig. 2.39) and Gérôme's *For Sale (The Slave Market)* (1866, Fig. 2.49), while both are examples of academic virtuosity, may serve to point out the range of differences. Gérôme's picture suggests a voyeuristic reading, highlighting a theme of sexual slavery, an auction where men bartered for nude, native women by

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

checking their teeth. Conversely, Millet's painting is remarkably positive, almost celebratory. Ostensibly an image of work, although little actual work is going on, it is hardly pejorative. Rather, as Holly Edwards as pointed out, Millet's attractive image of a black man in the late nineteenth century may represent an alternative to the prevailing stereotypes of the era.[168] Millet would continue to explore Near Eastern themes into the 1880s, (these will be discussed in Chapters 3 and 4).

Millet made great progress during the winter, spring and summer of 1874-75. Two of his major exhibition pictures—*Sailing in the Bay of Naples* and *A Turkish Water-Seller*—were finished, and had been accepted for the Brussels 1875 Salon. On July 1, 1875 he left Venice and traveled to Brussels to deliver his canvases, stopping in Munich for a few days, where he paid a call at the studios of the American painters David Neal (1838-1915) and Toby Rosenthal (1848-1917).[169] After depositing his canvases in Brussels and securing a studio at 25 Rue de la Charité, Millet made a quick trip to Antwerp, returning to Brussels on July 11 to put the finishing touches on his pictures.[170] The following day he wrote Stoddard in London that his diminishing finances required a change in plans:

> Can I get a nest somewhere in your vicinity for a day or two? . . . I have miscalculated on expenses so shall not have enough to keep me here till the Exposition opens on the 15th of August. I must either go directly to America or else raise more money to stay. It is certain that I can't raise a cent here in Belgium and perhaps I can in London. I have got two hundred francs left besides my expenses home . . . .
>
> I'm sorry you could not have seen my pictures, but if I get money we will come out from London to see 'em. I am gratified to find that they rather astonish the chaps here and I am much praised for them both . . . . I have just come from a breakfast with Mr. De Winne the best Belgian portrait painter—painter to Royal family etc. etc.—and am in a good artistic circle, friends of Jules Breton whose dancing peasants you will remember at Paris Salon.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> If the large picture has success in the exposition as they seem to think it will I want to get it put in an illustrated paper and hope you may know some one who will help put it through. . . . Now please . . . write me a line directed to me at Hotel du Nouveau Jardin, Rue aux Lits, Antwerp, and I shall get it by Friday morning if you write at once. Tell me if I am to come to 11 Museum Street. At all events I shall come there and get you before I go looking for lodgings. So Saturday I am quite sure we shall meet.[171]

Presumably, Millet was unable to raise any money. On July 16 he left Antwerp for London on the start of his journey home.[172]

When Millet left Europe to return to America in late July 1875, he had been abroad for over four years. Although he was anxious to see his family, it was not without some reluctance that he headed home. He had hoped to travel to Spain to study the works of Velázquez and the Spanish school, but his funds had run out.[173] During this period he had achieved significant accomplishments. He had studied for two years at one of the best art schools in Europe, and had established the academic armature upon which his eclectic style would evolve. He had mastered figure painting, which would be an important component of his easel paintings and mural work during the following decade. He had been given an important international assignment by his government, and had made his debut at the Brussels Salon, a celebrated annual exhibition. He had traveled extensively in Europe and the Near East, acquainting himself with the great traditions of Western art, and had spent twenty months in Italy studying old master paintings and frescoes. Perhaps most important, he had developed a cosmopolitan point of view. Inspired by his European mentors and contemporaries Millet's artistic practices favored sophisticated painting and drawing techniques; an intellectual, imaginative, and interpretive approach to subject matter; a professionalism that would enable him to experiment with various

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

media, including decorative painting; a concern with thematic and aesthetic unity—with creating art rather than replicating nature; and an eclectic approach to style and content. His eclecticism was grounded in an encyclopedic knowledge of art and art history and would generate a wide range of subjects. The elaborate European cultural infrastructure, and the importance of public service to the arts, had also impressed Millet—the state-sponsored free, professional art educational systems; the public and private commitment to collaborative, architectural decorative projects; and the state-sponsored international expositions and salons. His academic training and early contact with European art and culture would continue to inform Millet's career. His years on the continent had shaped his ideas about art and broadened his intellectual and cultural preferences. In the following years, he would be committed to creating art and fostering an art atmosphere in America that aspired to European standards of quality.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Endnotes to Chapter 2

[1] Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 2, page 22, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[2] Isham, History of American Painting, p. 363.

[3] L. Theo Van Looij, "De Antwerpse Koninklijke Academie Voor Schone Kunsten," in Boschloo, Anton W. A. et al, Academies of Art Between Renaissance and Romanticism (S.-Gravenhage: Sdu Uitgeverij, 1989), p. 317; and Pevsner, Nikolaus, Academies of Art Past and Present (New York: Da Capo Press, 1973), p. 127.

[4] Pevsner, p. 127.

[5] Van Looij, p. 317 and Pevsner, p. 127.

[6] Van Looij, pp. 312-313.

[7] Ibid, p. 312.

[8] Ibid, p. 313.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Van Looij, pp. 313, 317 and Pevsner, p. 128.

[11] Van Looij, p. 313.

[12] Ibid, p. 317; and Jan Lampo, "Een Tempel Bouwen Voor De Muzen: Een korte geschiedenis van de Antwerpse Academie (1663-1995)," Periscoop (April 2000), p. 11.

[13] Biographical information on Herreyns is based on Lampo, pp. 11-12; Van Looij, "De Antwerpse Koninklijke Academie," p. 315; Theo van Looij, Een Eeuw Nationaal Hoger Instituut voor Schone Kunsten te Antwerpen: 1885/1985 (Antwerpen: Nationaal Hoger Instituut & Koninklijke Academie voor Schone Kunsten, 1985), p. 73; and Alick P. F. Ritchie, "L'Academie Royale Des Beaux-Arts d'Anvers," Studio 1 (1893), p. 141.

[14] Lampo, p. 12; and L. Theo van Looij, "De Antwerpse Koninklijke Academie, p. 315.

[15] Irene Smeets, The Royal Museum of Fine Arts, Antwerp (Ghent: Ludion, 1999), p. 7.

[16] Van Looij, Een Eeuw Nationaal Hoger Instituut, p. 40.

[17] Biographical information on Gustave Wappers is based on Willem G. Flippo, Lexicon of the Belgian Romantic Painters (Antwerp: International Art Press, 2000), n.p.; Richard Muther, The History of Modern Painting (London: J. M. Dent & Co., 1907), 1: 302-304; and Max Rooses, Art in Flanders (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909), pp. 301-302.

[18] Van Looij, Een Eeuw Nationaal Hoger Instituut, p. 77. Chief among the modifications was a series of masters' classes. After 1846, painters, sculptors, architects, etc. who had successfully completed the Academy program, could continue their studies in separate studios under the guidance of their former teachers. Information on these master classes is sketchy. The best discussion of these classes is provided in Lampo, p. 18.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[19] Biographical information on Nicaise De Keyser is based on Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen, Tentoonstelling Dossier, Nicaise De Keyser I, 2 (2000); Rooses, Art in Flanders, pp. 302-303; Muther, The History of Modern Painting, 1: 304-311; Henri Hymans, Notice sur la Vie et les Travaux de Nicaise De Keyser (Bruxelles: F. Hayex, 1889); and Zadel Barnes Gustafson, "Nicaise De Keyser," Harper's New Monthly Magazine 67 (October 1883), pp. 688-696.

[20] Hymans, Notice sur la Vie, p. 99.

[21] Ibid., pp. 42, 101-102.

[22] De Keyser is said to have repeatedly advised his students about the importance of light, as for example: "Vous savez que c'est dans le clair-obscur que réside la base de l'harmonie qui détermine en méme temps la force de la tonalité." Quoted in Dorine Cardyn-Oomen, "Nicaise De Keyser, een negentiende-eeuwse glorie," in Konklijk Museum, Tentoonstelling Dossier, Nicaise De Keyser, p. 25.

[23] Hymans, Notice sur la Vie, p. 62.

[24] De Keyser's address to The Drawing Arts Education Congress in 1868, quoted in Hymans, Notice sur la Vie, p. 62 states:

"Vous savez comme moi que l'individualité sans la science est nulle. Elle marquera sa faiblesse et son ignorance à chaque pas. Les plus belles intelligences se perdraient sans cette instruction solide qu'elles doivent posséder. C'est à l'ignorance qu'il faut attribuer certaines tendances, certain mauvais goût, qui sont aux arts ce que la corruption est aux moeurs.

L'artiste doit être armé de toutes pièces pour qu'il soit fort et solide. Il faut qu'il n'oublie pas que les grands artistes de la Grèce étaient non seulement des savants, mais des philosophes. Ce n'est pas l'ignorance qui a créé les artistes du siècle de Périclès et leur a permis de produire leurs merveilleux chefs-d'oeuvre.

C'est donc dans les grandes académies que le jeune artiste doit puiser une instruction complète. C'est au professeur de la diriger dans le sentiment et dans les tendances qu'il manifeste. Lorsqu'il se sera formé à un enseignement solide, s'il est bien doué, le professeur assez malavisé pour vouloir lui inspirer sa manière de voir ne l'arrêtera pas; malgré lui, l'artiste sautera le fossé. Il ne sera pas de ceux qui cherchent à marcher sur les pas de n'importe qui et consentent à jouer un rol secondaire."

[25] Museum of Fine Arts, School of Drawing and Painting, First Annual Report of the Permanent Committee In Charge of The School (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1877), pp. 7, 9.

[26] Unless otherwise indicated, information on the instructional program at the Antwerp Royal Academy of Fine Arts is based on the Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts d'Anvers Rapports Annuels, 1871-1872 & 1872-1873, and on the Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts d'Anvers, Registres d'Inscription 1870-1873.

[27] Antwerp Académie, Rapport Annual 1843-44, p. 27 states: "Among the students in the painting class there are some who plan to be genre painters; they have appealed to the President of the Administrative Council to ask for a class to be set up for drawing from the clothed model . . . the Council acceded to their demand."

[28] Jeanne Sheehy, "The Flight from South Kensington: British artists at the Antwerp Academy 1877-1885," Art History 20, 1 (March 1997) p. 128.

[29] John Sparkes, "Report of the Head Master of the National Art Training Schools, On His Visit to the Art Schools of Belgium and Dusseldorf," 1876, in Frank Waller, Report on Art Schools to the Art Students' League (New York: 1879), p. 34.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[30] Edwin Graves Champney to his sister Ellen Champney, 21 July 1871, Edwin Graves Champney Papers, Archives of American Art [hereafter EGCP/AAA], Reel 2898, Frame 40.

[31] Edwin Graves Champney Diary, entries for 19 August 1871 and 3 September 1871, EGCP/AAA, Reel 2899, Frames 49 and 56, respectively.

[32] Francis Davis Millet 1871 Diary, 11 September 1871, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[33] Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts d' Anvers, Registre D'Inscription, Année 1870-1871 à 1874-1875.

[34] Ibid.

[35]Biographical information on Polydore Beaufaux is based on Flippo, Lexicon of the Belgium Romantic Painters, n.p.; P. & V. Berko, Dictionary of Belgian Painters born between 1750 & 1875 (Brussels: Laconti, c. 1981), p. 36; Cercle Culturel et Artistique Polydore Beaufaux, Rétrospective Polydore Beaufaux exhibition catalog (Hôtel de Ville, Wavre, 1969), np.; Leon Maret, Le peintre Polydore Beaufaux, prix de Rome; and Catalogue Museum von Schone Kunsten (Antwerpen, 1939), n.p.

[36] Edwin Graves Champney to his sister Ellen Champney, 14 February, 1871, and 21 May 1871, EGCP/AAA, Reel 2898, Frames 14 and 30-35, respectively.

[37] Thomas John Lucas, "Art Life in Belgium," Portfolio 10 (1879), p. 179.

[38] Ibid.

[39] Edwin Graves Champney to his father, 19 June 1871, EGCP/AAA, Reel 2898, Frame 38.

[40] Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts d'Anvers, Concours de l'année académique 1871-1872, np.

[41] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[42] Wilhelm Bürger [Théophile Thoré], Musées de la Holland, 2 vols. (Paris: Jules Renouard, 1858-1860); idem, "Van der Meer de Delft," Gazette des Beaux-Arts 21 (1866), pp. 297-330, 458-470, 542-575. There is a vast contemporaneous literature on the renewed interest in Dutch seventeenth-century art during the nineteenth century including, among others, Charles Blanc's Histoire des peintres de toutes les écoles. École hollandaise (Paris: Jules Renouard, 1861), and H[ippolyte]Taine, Philosophy of Art in the Netherlands, trans. John Durand (New York: Leypold & Holt, 1871). For an excellent modern survey of the influence of Dutch seventeenth-century art on French painting circa 1830-1870, see Petra Ten Doesschate Chu, French Realism And The Dutch Masters (Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker & Gumbert, 1974). For the influence of Dutch old master painting on American artists working in Holland during the late-nineteenth and early-twentieth century see Annette Stott, "American Painters Who Worked In The Netherlands, 1880-1914," (Ph.D. diss., Boston University Graduate School, 1986), pp. 13-24. For the influence of seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish genre painting on American art circa 1800-1860, see H. Nichols B. Clark, "A Taste For The Netherlands: The Impact of Seventeenth-Century Dutch and Flemish Genre Painting on American Art 1800-1860," American Art Journal 14, 2 (Spring 1982), pp. 23-38.

[43] Bürger, Musées de la Holland , 2: xiii-xv, 323-326.

[44] Francis Davis Millet Holland Diary, March 1872, FDM/AAA, p. 31, not microfilmed.

[45] Ibid, p. 57.

[46] Ibid, p. 81.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[47] Ibid, p. 51.

[48] Ibid, pp. 28 and pp. 78-79.

[49] See for example John Lothrop Motley, A History of The Rise of the Dutch Republic, 3 vols. (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1856). Motley's writings framed the Dutch struggle for political, religious and economic freedom in terms of the American Revolution, helping to formulate the theory that Holland, rather than England, was the source of American civilization. Recently, art historian Annette Stott has pointed out that the theory that American identity originated in Holland was but one of a number of competing ethnic claims that engaged the American public, patrons and artists in the late nineteenth century. Fueled by the nationalism engendered by the American centennial and fear of new immigration from Europe, many Americans addressed their concerns about national identity by identifying with Holland's golden age. Between 1880 and 1920, the boom in the Dutch old master art market and rapidly expanding American market for contemporary fine art and popular Dutch images, contributed to a mania for "all things Dutch." See Annette Stott, Holland Mania: The Unknown Dutch Period in American Art and Culture (Woodstock, New York: The Overlook Press, 1998), pp. 1-12.

[50] Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts d'Anvers, Registre d'Inscription. Année 1870-1871 a 1874-1875.

[51] Biographical information on Joseph Van Lerius is based on Flippo, Lexicon, np; Berko, Dictionary of Belgian Painters , pp. 706-707; P.P., "Oud-Antwerpsche Portretten Galerie. Jozef Van Lerius (1823-1876)," Fonolagsvriend (27 October 1935), p. 194; "Joseph Van Lerius," The New York Times, 23 March 1876, p. 2; and William Bell Scott, Gems of Belgian Art (London: George Routledge And Sons, 1872), pp. 74-77.

[52] Felix Moscheles, In Bohemia with Du Maurier (New York: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1897), p. 22.

[53] Lucas, p. 180.

[54] Catalog of Finished Paintings, Drawings and Studies Left by the Late Francis Davis Millet, N.A. (New York: The American Art Association at the American Art Galleries, Public Sale - March 6, 1914), No. 49 *An Antwerp Kitchen*, and No. 52. *Street Corner, Antwerp*.

[55] Another work that exhibits the vigorous Rubensian handling and impastoed highlights that were part of Millet's early Antwerp manner is the unsigned and undated painting entitled *The Tired Watcher* in the Musée des beaux-arts de Montréal. The picture depicts an old man praying with rosary beads before a confessional. Previously assigned to Millet, the attribution has recently been questioned. In a 5 January 2004 letter to the author, museum Archivist Danielle Blanchette wrote: "We want to let you know that the grand-daughter of the artist, in a letter of 1983, was not quite sure that the *Tired Watcher* was the work of Francis Davis Millet."

[56] K. Baedeker. Belgium and Holland. Handbook for Travellers (Coblenz: Karl Baedeker, 1871), p. 267.

[57] Edwin Graves Champney to his father, 20 August 1872, EGCP/AAA Reel 2898, Frame102.

[58] Richard Dorment and Margaret F. MacDonald et al, James McNeill Whistler, exhibition catalog (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1995), p. 78 notes that *Symphony in White, No. 2: The Little White Girl* was shown at the London International Exhibition in 1872 (No. 260). See also Dr. Patricia de Montfort, Centre for Whistler Studies, University of Glasgow, 30 August 2004 to the author: "There are references to the exhibition of *Symphony in White No. 2* in Whistler's correspondence. . . . He intended to send the No. 1 but was unable to repair it in time."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[59] Ibid., p. 141.

[60] Edwin Graves Champney to his father, 20 August 1872, EGCP/AAA Reel 2898, Frames 101-106.

[61] Ibid.

[62] Mary Beth Kreiner, "Francis Davis Millet's Reading the Story of Oenone," Bulletin of the Detroit Institute of Arts 69 (1995), p. 18.

[63] Edwin Graves Champney to his father, 20 August 1872, EGCP/AAA Reel 2898, Frames 101-106.

[64] Ibid.

[65] Edwin Graves Champney to his sister Ellen Champney, 6 November 1872, EGCP/AAA Reel 2898, Frames 117-118.

[66] Francis Davis Millet European Trip Sketchbook, 1872-1873, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[67] The Cornish fishing village of Newlyn was a popular center for plein air painters from c. 1882 to c. 1930. If Millet did paint outdoors at Newlyn, he may have been one of the first artists to do so, predating the arrival of the Birmingham artists Walter Langley (1852-1922) and Edwin Harris (1855-1906), who settled in the village in 1882. For the Newlyn art colony see Michael Jacobs, The Good & Simple Life: Artist Colonies in Europe and America (Oxford: Phaida Press Limited, 1985), pp. 145-151.

[68] Paintings Drawings and Studies by the Late Francis Davis Millet, No. 41 *Clovelly Sunset*, No. 42 *Clovelly*.

[69] Francis Davis Millet European Trip Sketchbook, 1872-1873, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[70] Edwin Graves Champney to his father, 27 January 1873, mentions that he intends "to commence this week and make an attempt to paint a picture. I have a subject selected and shall do it all from nature and try and finish it as well as possible. I should have begun earlier (a week or two ago) but I have been waiting for Maynard to finish a picture which he has been making in the same place." EGCC/AAA, Reel 2898, Frames 128-129.

[71] Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts d'Anvers, Registre d'Inscription, Anvers 1870-1871 à 1874-1875.

[72] Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts à Anvers. Année Académique 1872-2873. Rapport Annuel et Distributin Solennelle des Prix, 4 Mai 1873 (Anvers: J. E. Buschmann, 1873), pp. 42-46. Two previous prize categories were eliminated in the 1873 *concours*, making Millet, with high scores in nine of the ten categories, the school champion.

[73] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[74] Charles Francis Adams, Jr. was the great-grandson of President John Adams, a grandson of President John Quincy Adams, the son of Charles Francis Adams, United States Ambassador to Great Britain during the Civil War, and the brother of the historian Henry Adams. Adams served as President of the Union Pacific Railroad from 1884-1890. Biographical information concerning him is based on his autobiography—Charles Francis Adams, [Jr.], Charles Francis Adams,[Jr.] 1835-1915, An Autobiography (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916); and on Edward Charles Kirkland, Charles Francis Adams, Jr. 1835-1915, The Patrician at Bay (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[75] Robert H. Thurston, ed., Reports of the Commissioners of the United States to the International Exhibition Held at Vienna, 1873 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1876), 1: 87.

[76] Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 3, p. 7, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100 claim that Millet's appointment came about through Dr. Asa Millet's friendship with Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Adams's own account disputes this (see Note 77). More likely, Dr. Millet's friendships with such Massachusetts legislators as Senators Parsons and Latham, Representative Osborne, and with former Massachusetts Governor John A. Andrew had some bearing on the appointment.

[77] Adams, An Autobiography p. 183.

[78] Charles Francis Adams, Jr., The Vienna Exposition and The Philadelphia Centennial. Report of Charles Francis Adams, Jr. (Boston: Estes & Lauriet, 1874), p. 6; and Adams, An Autobiography, p. 183.

[79] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 26 April 1873 and 1 May 1873, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 750-753 and 754-757, respectively.

[80] Edwin Graves Champney Diary, EGCP/AAA, Reel 2899, Frame 252.

[81] For the United States role at the Vienna 1873 Exposition see Thurston, Reports of the Commissioners, 4 vols. Modern scholarship concerning the exposition includes: John E. Findling, ed., Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions, 1851-1988 (New York: Greenwood Press, 1990, pp. 49-54; and John Allwood, The Great Exhibitions (London: Cassell & Collier Macmillan, c. 1977), pp. 49-51.

[82] Secretary of State Hamilton Fish, "Department of State" March 1876 Memorandum in Thurston, Reports of the Commissioners, 1: 3 notes that Congress passed such resolutions on June 1872 and February 1873, respectively. Findling, Historical Dictionary p. 51 also discusses the United States lack of preparedness for the 1873 Vienna Exposition.

[83] For a discussion of this scandal see Merle Curti, "America at the World Fairs, 1851-1893," American Historical Review 55 (July 1950), p. 847.

[84] Charles Francis Adams, Jr., The Vienna Exposition, p. 5.

[85] Ibid, pp. 13-14.

[86] Ibid.

[87] Edwin Graves Champney to his father, 13 May 1873, EGCP/AAA, Reel 2898, Frames 140-141; and Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 3 June 1873, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 758-759.

[88] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 3 June 1873, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 759.

[89] Clippings from these three newspapers are preserved in AAAA&L, Millet Scrapbook II. Only the clippings from the Boston Daily Advertiser are signed by Millet.

[90] F. D. M., "The World's Fair," Boston Daily Advertiser, 5 June 1873, unpaginated newspaper clipping in AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook II. Thurston, Reports of the Commissioners, 1: 193-194 lists the following exhibits in the American Gallery of Fine Arts: (616) Ames Van Wart, plaster statue, *Sleeping Beauty*; (617) J. Enthoffer, proof of chromo-chalcography; (618) Byron M. Brickett, portrait bust of *Prof. S. F. B. Morse*; (619) Albert Bierstadt, oil painting *The Emerald Pool*; (620) Mary Stevenson-Cassett, oil painting; (621) C. Granville Way, landscape painting; (622) Marcus Waterman,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

oil painting *Gulliver in Lilliput*; (623) William W. Whitteridge, oil painting *Landscape in Westphalia*; (624) E. T. Andrews, oil painting; (625) John R. Tait, oil painting *Solitude*; (626) Henry Mossler [*sic*], oil painting; (627) Thomas S. Noble, oil painting *John Brown*; (628) William E. Marshall, engraved portrait of *Abraham Lincoln*; (629) H. A. Elkins, oil painting *Mount Shasta, N. California, U.S.A.*; (630) A. Bierstadt, oil painting; and (631) J. A. Bailly, bronze portrait in alto-relieve of the Indian chief *Ogontz*. George Healy's *Portrait of Pius IX*, although not recorded in the catalog, is listed as having been awarded a medal (see page 209).

[91] Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Diary, 2, 4, 5-10 August 1873, Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston [hereafter CFAJ Papers/MHS], Reel 1, Vol. 8.

[92] Ibid, 18 January 1874, CFAJ Papers/MHS, Reel 1, Vol. 8.

[93] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 24 August 1873, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 761-762,

[94] Ibid, 8 September 1873, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 765.

[95] Adams, The Vienna Exposition, p. 6; and Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 9 October 1873, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 775-779.

[96] F. D. Millet, "Fine Arts of the Present Time," in Massachusetts Commission to the Vienna Exposition, Reports of the Massachusetts Commissioners to the Exposition at Vienna, 1873. With Special Reports Prepared For the Commission. Edited by Hamilton A. Hill, Associate Commissioner (Boston: Wright & Potter, State Printers, 1875), p. 157.

[97] Ibid, pp. 158-159.

[98] Ibid.

[99] Jarves, The Art-Idea, p. 206.

[100] William C. Brownell, "The Younger Painters of America. First Paper," Scribner's Monthly 20, 1 (May 1880), pp. 1, 7.

[101] Ibid., pp. 7-8.

[102] Ibid., p. 11.

[103] Millet, "Fine Arts of the Present Time," p. 210.

[104] Ibid, pp. 162, 169, 173, 178, 200.

[105] Ibid, p. 210. Insulted by the meager space that was to be allotted them in the Fine Arts display, many American artists had boycotted the Vienna Exposition. See New York Times 26 April 1873, quoted in Linda S. Ferber, "Albert Bierstadt: the History of a Reputation," in Nancy K. Anderson and Linda S. Ferber, Albert Bierstadt: Art & Enterprise, exhibition catalog (The Brooklyn Museum, 1991), pp. 58-59. Millet's comments suggest that he was aware of the boycott, but he, nonetheless, severely criticized the American display in the Centennial's official report.

[106] F. D. Millet, "The Watts Exhibition," Harper's Monthly Magazine 71, 421 (June 1885), p. 101.

[107] During his nineteen months in Europe, Millet wrote articles describing his travels, which were published in the Boston Courier, 22 November 1874, 29 November 1874, 13 December 1874. He also

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

wrote articles on art matters and life in post-unification Italy, which were published in the Boston Courier, 14 February 1875, and 23 May 23 1875; in the New York Herald, 10 April 1875, and in Le Precurseur of Antwerp, undated, unpaginated newspaper clippings in AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook II. Only the 1874 articles in the Boston Courier are signed by Millet.

[108] Francis Davis Millet, Post-1873 Exposition Diary, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[109] Francis Davis Millet, 1873 Sketchbooks, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed; see also Reel 1098, which includes voluminous, undated sketchbook pages.

[110] Francis Davis Millet, European Trip Sketchbook, 1872-1873, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed; and Reel 1098 include a number of these larger drawings. See especially Frames 425-509 and Frames 627-666.

[111] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 17 January 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 785-792.

[112] Ibid.

[113] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 8 February 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 796-798.

[114] Although the reverential attitude toward Italy and Rome that had persisted since the eighteenth century had changed by 1870, when the process of unification was completed, American artists and travelers continued to journey there in record numbers during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. In the early 1870s a large colony of painters was active in the city, including George Peter Healy, John Gadsby Chapman and his son John Linton Chapman, Elihu Vedder, Charles Caryl Coleman, George Henry Hall, George Inness, and William Stanley Haseltine. In addition, such American sculptors as William Wetmore Story, Randolph Rogers, Harriet Hosmer, William Henry Rinehart, and Augustus Saint Gaudens also worked in the city. For a discussion of the American painters and sculptors working in Rome at this time see Theodore E. Stebbins, Jr., "American Painters and the Lure of Italy," pp. 54-61 and William H. Gerdts, "Celebrities of the Grand Tour: The American Sculptors in Florence and Rome," pp. 89-91 in Theodore E. Stebbins, Jr. et al, The Lure of Italy: American Artist and The Italian Experience, 1760-1914, exhibition catalog (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1992).

[115] Ibid.

[116] Francis Davis Millet, European Trip Sketchbook, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[117] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., [6] May 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 827.

[118] Ibid.

[119] Paintings Drawings and Studies by the Late Francis Davis Millet, 1914.

[120] Ibid.

[121] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 12 July 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 834.

[122] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 10 February 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 805.

[123] Frank D. Millet, "Home of the Indolent. The Island of Capri," The Century Magazine 56

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(October 1898), p. 858.

[124] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 10 February 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 805.

[125] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 6 May 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 825.

[126] Corot exhibited ten paintings at the Vienna 1873 Exposition, including No. 155 *Lac De Nemi* and No. 156 *Souvenir d'Italie*. See Exposition Universelle de Vienne, 1873 (Paris: Oeuvres d'Art et Manufactures Nationales, 1873), pp. 100-111.

[127] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr.,[6] May 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 825.

[128] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 12 July 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 830.

[129] Augustus Saint Gaudens to Francis Davis Millet, 7 August 1874, Miscellaneous Manuscripts, Archives of American Art [hereafter MM/AAA], Reel 316, Frames 170-171.

[130] For an overview of the burgeoning American artist colony in Venice, see Erica E. Hirshler, "'Gondola Days': American Painters in Venice," in Stebbins et al, The Lure of Italy. pp. 112-127; and Margaret Armstrong, ed., Day Before Yesterday: Reminiscences of a Varied Life by Maitland Armstrong (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), pp. 240-257.

[131] Paintings, Drawings and Studies by the Late Francis Davis Millet, 1914.

[132] I am grateful to Peter A. Engstrom for bringing Millet's painting *Kitchen in Venice* to my attention.

[133] Francis Davis Millet Italian Diary, 1875, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed. Millet recorded these remarks on April 8, 1875.

[134] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., October, 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 840.

[135] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis, Adams, Jr., 12 October 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 852.

[136] James Jackson Jarves, The "Old Masters" of Italy: Painting (New York: Derby and Jackson, 1861), 2 vols. Jarves' study is an early example of interest in Italian Renaissance painting by an American author.

[137] Francis Davis Millet, Padua – Venice Diary, January-February 1875, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[138] Ibid.

[139] Ibid.

[140] Jarves, The "Old Masters" of Italy, 2: 376.

[141] J. A. Crowe and G. B. Cavalcaselle, A History of Painting in Italy (London: John Murray, 1923) 1: 83. Millet's familiarity with Crowe and Cavalcaselle is underscored in his "Benozzo Gozzoli," 1876 Manuscript, wherein he makes frequent reference to this publication. See FDM/AAA, Reel 1098, Frames 1189-1218.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[142] H[ippolyte] Taine, Lectures on Art , trans. John Durand (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1875; repr., New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1971), pp. 10-11. Taine's lectures on art at the École des Beaux-Arts had been available in English translation since 1865. See for example H. Taine, "The Philosophy of Art," trans. John Durand (London: H. Baillière, Publisher, 1865) and H. Taine, Philosophy of Art in the Netherlands, trans. John Durand (New York: Leypold & Holt, 1871). The 1875 edition was the first to include in English translation Taine's lectures regarding "Art in Italy." Millet, who was fluent in the French language, was likely familiar with Taine's writings in the original French, especially his Voyage in Italie (1866), which were available earlier.

[143] Catalogue du Musée d'Anvers (Anvers: Le Conseil d'Administration de l'Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts, 1874), pp. 182-183, 406-407.

[144] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 14 March [1875], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 817-822.

[145] Ibid. On May 6, 1875 Millet wrote, "Before breakfast I had bought Vasari's lives of the painters and Ariosto's complete works."

[146] Giorgio Vasari, The Lives of the Artist, translated by George Bull (Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1965), p. 216.

[147] For a discussion about the artist's studio in late nineteenth-century American art see Nicolai Cikovsky, Jr., "William Merritt Chase's Tenth Street Studio," Archives of American Art Journal 16 (1976), pp. 2-14.

[148] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., October 1874, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 840.

[149] Ibid.

[150] Paintings, Drawings and Studies by the Late Francis Davis Millet, 1914, No. 9. James Hunt's annotated copy of this catalog, includes the following comment concerning *Capri Fishermen—Study for A Large Picture*, No. 9: "Large picture of this in Library in East Bridgewater."

[151] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 9 May 1875, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 854.

[152] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, 26 May 1875, Charles Warren Stoddard Collection, Syracuse University Library [hereafter CWS/SUL]. The correspondence between Millet and Stoddard suggests that they shared an intimate relationship while living in Venice.

[153] For a discussion of the origins of Italian rural and urban low-life genre painting see Petra ten-Doesschate Chu, "From Bruegel to Bonvin, Three Hundred Years of European Genre Painting," in Gabriel P. Weisberg, Redefining Genre: French and American Painting 1850-1900, exhibition catalog (Dixon Gallery and Gardens, Memphis, Tennessee, 1995), pp. 18, 25-26.

[154] For De Keyser see Mak Van Waay Sale, Nienhuis Gallery, Amsterdam, October 30, 1973, Lot. No. 449. For Beaufaux see Cercle Culturel et Artistique, Rétrospective Polydore Beaufaux, No. 21, np.

[155] For Cecil Van Haanen see Artist File, New York Public Library; Philip Hook and Mark Poltimore, Popular 19th Century Painting: A Dictionary of European Genre Painters, (Woodbridge, Suffolk, England: Antique Collectors' Club, 1987), p. 594; and Muther, 3: 334; For Antonio Rotta see Hook and Poltimore, p. 594; and Muther, 3: 334. For Antonio Paoletti see Hook and Poltimore, pp, 594, 599. For Luke Fildes and Marcus Stone see Julian Halsby, Venice: The Artist's Vision, A Guide to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

British and American painters (London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1990), pp. 73-77. I am grateful to Dr. Giovanna Fiorino-Iannace, Manager, Antonio Ratti Textile Center, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, for sharing this research with me.

[156] Margaretta M. Lovell, A Visitable Past: Views of Venice by American Artists, 1860-1915 (Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1989), pp. 2, 75-77.

[157] Erica E. Hirshler, "'Gondola Days': American Painters in Venice," in Stebbins et al, The Lure of Italy, p. 127.

[158] Francis Davis Millet, 1873 Sketchbook, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[159] Francis Davis Millet, Post-1873 Exposition Diary, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[160] There is a vast body of literature on Orientalist imagery. See especially Holly Edwards et al, Noble Dreams, Wicked Pleasures: Orientalism In America, 1870-1930), exhibition catalog (Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 2000), John M. MacKenzie Orientalism: History, Theory and the Arts (New York: Manchester University Press, 1995); Gerald M. Ackerman, American Orientalists (Paris: ACR Édition, 1994); Linda Nochlin, "The Imaginary Orient," in idem, The Politics of Vision (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1989), pp. 33-57; MaryAnne Stevens, ed., The Orientalists: Delacroix to Matisse: European Painters in North Africa And The Near East, exhibition catalog (Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1984); and Edward Said, Orientalism (New York: Vintage, 1978).

[161] Millet, "Fine Arts of the Present Time," pp. 166 and 202.

[162] Gérôme & Goupil, Art and Enterprise, exhibition catalog (Bordeaux Musée Goupil, 2000), p. 36 notes that Gérôme's *For Sale* (*The Slave Market*) of 1866 had been purchased in 1873 by August Belmont, the New York banker and U. S. Minister to the Hague, from Goupil in Paris for 45,000 francs (approximately $10,000).

[163] Said, pp. 1-40.

[164] Nochlin, pp. 33-57.

[165] Stevens, pp. 15-23.

[166] MacKensie, pp. 1-42.

[167] Ackerman, pp. 6-12; Edwards, pp. 16-17; and Brian T. Allen, "'The garments of instruction from the wardrobe of pleasure': American Orientalist Painting in the 1870s and 1880s" in Edwards et al, pp. 59-75.

[168] Edwards, p. 168.

[169] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, July 3, 1875, CWS/SUL.

[170] Ibid., 10 July 1875.

[171] Ibid., Tuesday [12 July 1875].

[172] It is not known how long Millet remained in London, but judging from a letter to Charles Stoddard, he was back in Boston by early August. Francis Davis Millet to Charles Stoddard, Boston August 13 [1875], CWS/SUL. Millet writes: "Here I am all o.k. after a very smooth voyage and a long one considering the weather. Of course my first move was to see my parents. . . . I did not find the Commissioners in so I could not get my state money and consequently am quite as hard up as I ever

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

was before. I rushed in town today to get a check to send you and could raise but $45, for everybody was gone even in the magazine office. So I send along 8 [pounds] instead of 10 [pounds] as I had intended. Now I've got only six cents and two shillings English money but another installment coming in tomorrow pay [*sic*] for a magazine sketch."

[173] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 9 May, 1875, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 855. Millet writes Adams that "I cant [*sic*] of course be satisfied with my study of the old masters until I know the not-to-be-sneezed-at Spanish school."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 3

EARLY CAREER IN BOSTON, EUROPE AND NEW YORK (1875-1880)

Millet returned to Boston in August 1875 after having been abroad for four years to find American life and American art in a state of social transition and financial turbulence. Rapid technological progress after the Civil War was changing American society from a largely agricultural and rural nation to one that was industrial and increasingly urban. In Boston, migration from New England farms and European villages transformed a self-contained seaport city of 192,318 people in 1865 to a sprawling commercial metropolis with a population of 390,393 by 1875.[1] Improved transportation and communication networks linked the city with national and European markets, allowing a free flow of trade, travel and ideas. Rising prosperity stimulated cultural development. But, all this progress was not without disruption. The economic revolution spawned a host of social problems, and the vagaries of the free market system and political corruption fostered cycles of prosperity and depression. When a leading New York investment house failed in 1873, the resulting panic brought the post-war boom across America to a halt. In Boston, coming on the heels of the great fire of 1872, the Panic of 1873 devastated the city's economy, and hard times continued through the end of the decade.

A concurrent transitional period was also apparent in American art by the mid-1870s. The supremacy of the grandiose Hudson River School landscapes and moralizing history and genre pictures painted in a transcriptive style had long been challenged in Boston by the more poetic, suggestive French Barbizon paintings that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

William Morris Hunt had introduced there in the late 1850s.[2] Now, as Millet and a younger generation of American artists returned from study in Europe, and as improved communication and transatlantic travel made Americans more aware of European art, new, independent and, at times, interrelated cosmopolitan developments began to transform American art. Writing from the perspective of the 1875 National Academy of Design exhibition in New York, where many of the young, European-trained artists exhibited their work, the art critic Clarence Cook (1828-1900) remarked: "we are in the midst of an era of revolution."[3] The most important of these "revolutionary" international trends included academic painting and its emphasis on the figure; the technical virtuosity learned in European academies and ateliers; the British Aesthetic movement and its preoccupation with surface pattern, decoration and the formal elements of art; the growing enthusiasm for the history of art, and the resulting interest in such earlier artistic periods as Greek and Roman antiquity, the Italian Renaissance, and seventeenth-century Holland and Spain; and the influence of Japanese prints.[4] These sometimes, confluent artistic strategies resulted in works that represented an enormous variety of subjects, styles and media. Decorative painting and the techniques of watercolor, pastel and printmaking gained in popularity. New art institutions appeared, such as the Museum of Fine Arts, which was nearing completion in Copley Square. Established art societies reorganized and expanded. In 1873, for example, the Boston Art Club began a series of biannual exhibitions in its new clubhouse on Boylston Street.[5] At the same time newer organizations, such as the St. Botolph Club and the Paint and Clay Club, were being formed. In addition, artists working in Boston and its environs

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

continued to show their works in the city's many commercial art galleries, and to send their pictures to exhibitions in New York, Philadelphia and other major American cities, as well as to international expositions. This expansive activity in the arts fostered a corresponding increase in art writing. Boston newspapers and journals, such as the Atlantic Monthly, devoted more space to the arts and art exhibitions, and some visual artists moonlighted as art critics. The American Architect and Building News, one of the city's new art periodicals, would begin publication in 1876. The exuberant variety of Millet's artistic endeavors during the next five years—painting, mural decorations, costume design, arts administration, and art criticism—complements the protean spirit that characterized the art scene in Boston and America during the mid-1870s and early 1880s.

After Millet's return to the United States, he spent the rest of the 1870s and early 1880s establishing himself as one of the leaders of the new generation of American artists coming home from European training. He set up a studio adjacent to his family home in East Bridgewater, Massachusetts, and later at West Street in Boston, and became an important participant in the Boston art scene. Concentrating on portraits and ambitious figure paintings, Millet sent his work to major exhibitions in Boston, to the National Academy of Design in New York and to the 1876 Centennial Exposition in Philadelphia, where they received favorable critical notice. One of the few artists whose gift for writing equaled his skill as a painter, Millet also contributed articles to several newspaper and journal publications as a way of augmenting his earnings. His news coverage of the Philadelphia Centennial for the Boston Daily Advertiser and American Architect and Building News refreshed his

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

knowledge of artistic movements abroad. The next few years witnessed a number of important developments in his career, which would become major preoccupations at the end of the century. In 1876 Millet received an invitation from John La Farge to assist him with the mural decorations for the new Trinity Church in Boston designed by American architect Henry Hobson Richardson (1838-1886), an important project that would lay the foundation for Millet's major mural commissions of the 1890s and 1900s. That same year he was appointed to the Permanent Committee of the Museum of Fine Arts School of Drawing and Painting, and played an important role in launching the museum's new art school. This commitment presaged his later work as a charter member of the American Academy in Rome in 1905.

A trip to Europe reinforced the international spirit of Millet's work. In January 1877 he returned to Europe for two years and established himself in a studio in Paris; then, in May, he promptly left to cover the Russo-Turkish War as a correspondent for the New York Herald and the London Daily News. At the close of the war in the spring of 1878, Millet returned to his Montmartre studio. His service at the front had garnered him decorations from several European nations—Russia, Romania and Bulgaria—and furnished him with subjects for short stories and paintings of exotic themes. He exhibited his work in such major international venues as the 1878 Exposition des Beaux-Arts in Brussels, the 1879 Paris Salon and the Royal Academy in London, in addition to serving as a Fine Arts juror at the 1878 Paris International Exposition. The late 1870s and early 1880s witnessed new developments in Millet's personal and professional life. In March 1879 he married Elizabeth Greeley Merrill in Paris, and after a honeymoon in London, the couple

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

returned to the United States in August 1879. Millet settled into his East Bridgewater studio and reestablished himself in the Boston art community, again sending his paintings to the city's important contemporary art exhibitions, as well as to the National Academy of Design and Society of American Artists in New York. By the fall of 1880 Millet had taken a temporary studio in New York, and in the winter of 1880-1881 he assisted the American artist Louis Comfort Tiffany (1848-1933) and his "Associated Artists" with the decoration of the Veterans' Room in the Seventh Regiment Armory. By the end of 1880, although Millet would continue to work simultaneously in Boston and New York, painting, writing, lecturing and designing costumes for theatrical productions, he had shifted his allegiance to the latter city.

Millet's return to America was motivated by a desire to see his family and by the dwindling of his modest financial resources.[6] Having been completely captivated by the cultural atmosphere of Europe, the artist intended his stay in his native land to be a temporary affair, and he expected to quickly return to the Continent to resume his study of the old masters. His plan, as Millet had explained to Charles Francis Adams, Jr. on the eve of his departure for America, was:

> to be back the lst of December. If I imagined there was the slightest chance of my being obliged to stay in America I'd give up going home in a moment for I feel that I must stay here some time yet. I can't of course be satisfied with my study of the old masters until I know the not to be sneezed at Spanish school."[7]

By August 10, 1875 he had arrived in his hometown of East Bridgewater, Massachusetts.[8] Pleased as he was to be reunited with his family after an absence of four and a half years, Millet, like many of the new generation of artists returning from European training and the intense stimulation of international art centers, found the intellectual climate in America "stultifying." To make matters worse, the economic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

aftershocks of the severe depression that had gripped the nation in 1873 had left the art market particularly vulnerable. During the next year and a half, Millet often voiced his disillusionment with the American scene, his longing for the cosmopolitan ambience of Europe, and his financial concerns in a series of letters to Charles Warren Stoddard. On August 15, 1875, Millet wrote:

> If ever there was a soul killing place this is it . . . . I envy you in crowded old London with its exhausted atmosphere. As I wrote in my little note . . . no one in whom I have the slightest interest selfish or unselfish, is at home and money is awfully "scarce.". . .Came home on a newspaper pass. Now this worries me to death for I am chained up here. I don't want to touch the sum I have reserved to buy my return passage . . . . Now if I don't get to work I am a lost man.[9]

After assessing the situation, Millet set up a studio on the grounds of his family home at 48 Plymouth Street, where his parents had relocated in the fall of 1873, and quickly reinstated himself in the Boston art scene.[10] He supported himself by painting portraits, winning commissions from prominent Bostonians, but also continued to hone his skill by painting portraits of members of his family. By October 1875 Millet wrote Stoddard that he was "head over heels in portraits," and was "sure of money enough to return on if no more."[11] Money remained tight, however, and in November he complained that:

> People don't pay me and I get in debt . . . and am regularly engaged upon the Advertiser to produce so much weekly art stuff. Thus I live but don't get anything ahead. Meanwhile I am busy with my portraits two of which I depend upon to pay my way to Europe again and the others are in the family and consequently not coin producing.[12]

Ever resourceful, Millet had taken to writing "weekly art stuff" for the Boston Daily Advertiser. He would continue to supplement his income by supplying fiction and articles on art and travel to a number of newspapers and journals, including the Boston Courier, Appletons' Journal, Atlantic Monthly, and American Architect and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Building News.[13] By December it was clear that the dismal state of the economy, not to mention his obligation to finish work on portraits already in process, had dashed his hopes for a quick return to Europe. "So I have deliberately cast my anchors here until I can succeed in finishing what I have begun," the artist wrote Stoddard, "for having set out and spent a lot of time to start I would be a fool to give up and lose money and time too."[14] Millet's decision to temporarily "cast [his] anchors" in America must have impacted on his decision in 1876 to procure a studio in Boston. While he continued to maintain and utilize his East Bridgewater studio, according to the city directory of 1876, Millet listed himself as an artist, working at 12 West Street.[15]

Millet's six known portraits from this early period in the Boston community—*Portrait of a Little Girl*, *Portrait of a Young Boy*, *Portrait of Dr. Asa Millet* (Fig. 3.1), *Portrait of Huldah Byram Millet* (*Mrs. Asa Millet*), (Fig. 3.2), *Portrait of Josiah B. Millet* (Fig. 3.3) and *Portrait of a Lady in Costume of 1740* (Fig. 3.4)—were painted during the fall and winter of 1875-1876. As a group they continue to reflect his Antwerp training and the refinements of his Italian sojourn, while one, a *Portrait of a Lady in Costume of 1740*, also suggests his nascent interest in early American themes.[16] In all these portraits, firmly modeled and carefully finished forms; strong lighting effects; attention to details of physiognomy, clothing and accessories; rich color and fluid paint handling restate the techniques that Millet had used in his figural subjects. Millet sent four of the portraits to major exhibition venues in Boston, New York and Philadelphia, where their critical reception was generally favorable, with reviewers recognizing the artist's debt to his Antwerp

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teachers, as well as his originality and promise, and his increasing concern with pictorial issues.

In February 1876, the first three portraits mentioned above announced Millet's professional debut as a local painter with simultaneous exhibitions at Doll & Richards and Williams & Everett, two of Boston's premier commercial art galleries. *Portrait of a Little Girl* and *Portrait of a Young Boy*, which were on view at Doll & Richards, are presently unlocated. We have some idea of their general appearance from a description provided by the critic of the Boston Daily Advertiser:

> First in interest and importance are the two full-length portraits at Doll & Richards's Gallery. The largest of these represents a girl about eight years of age standing on a Turkish rug, with her hands clasped before her and looking at the spectator. She wears a black velvet dress, deep lace collar and cuffs, red sash and stockings, and holds in her hands some wild flowers, a few having fallen to the floor in front of her. Beside her is a small table covered with a figured cloth, on which rests an antique brass pitcher and salver. The background is a deep reddish brown, it may be paper, with dark figures. The picture is pitched in a pretty low key; the color is deep, warm and rich. It has proved a difficult theme, and does not appear to have been easily painted, but it is pretty successful, as a whole. It has what most portraits lack, the requisites of a picture. There is a perceptible idea of arrangement of lights and shadows. The light falls naturally upon the figure, which is brought into the right degree of relief, while the accessories are well subordinated, but yet made sufficiently interesting. The drawing is very good, while not being especially felicitous, and the painting generally broad and frank, though there are evidences of uncertainty and over-work.[17]

The reviewer preferred *Portrait of a Young Boy*, which he judged a more integrated, artistic treatment of subject and style:

> The other portrait is less ambitious, and, to our thinking much more successful. A schoolboy of perhaps ten or twelve years of age is sitting in an old "kitchen chair," the body merely in profile, and the face turned in full view. The left foot rests on the floor; the other is raised to the upper round of the chair. An open book rests in his lap, with one hand in the leaves, while a slate hangs against one leg of the chair. The boy has blue-black clothes, red stockings and necktie, and is painted against a gray background. One is first struck with the naturalness and ease of the attitude. He sits with a boy's unaffected carelessness, as if looking for a moment from his books, without any difficulty in tearing himself away. Here, again, we

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> have an artistic disposition of light, so that the portrait easily becomes a picture. This work is well understood and soundly constructed, and is much more easily and enjoyably painted than the other. The drawing here is particularly good . . . . The color is pure, strong and sweet, the tone vigorous and agreeable, the values well studied and the *ensemble* decidedly effective and happy.[18]

In both portraits, the astute critic noted Millet's sophisticated manipulation of light and shadow, rich colorism, careful drawing, and vigorous paint-handling—residues of his training at the Antwerp Academy—and his aesthetic concerns with picture-making, all distinguishing characteristics of his work during this period. These qualities, and an incisive portrayal of character, also inform the portrait of his father, *Portrait of Dr. Asa Millet* (Fig. 3.1), which was exhibited at the nearby Williams & Everett Gallery. The reviewer had less to say about this picture, but observed that it "is strong in character and very well painted, although the background seems to us too black, giving the face a rather forced relief."[19] Millet's position as one of the art commentators on the staff of the Boston Daily Advertiser must have insured that his work would be noticed and understood by his colleagues, and likely accounted for the rather lengthy complementary review. Indeed, all three portraits elicited praise in the newspaper, with the critic remarking:

> [T]he three portraits that Mr. Millet has just exposed are good enough in performance, to say nothing of what they promise, to secure him at once the respectful attention of an intelligent public. . . .We hail Mr. Millet as a young painter of much promise, who will do honor to American art.[20]

The reviewer for the rival Boston Evening Transcript was more concise and less effusive, yet, he, too, recognized the artist's talent. Limiting his remarks to the *Portrait of Dr. Asa Millet*, he commented: "F. D. Millet has a portrait at Williams & Everett's, which has attracted considerable attention from visitors. It represents an old man, with a gray beard, and exhibits a good deal of strength."[21]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Such early recognition must have encouraged Millet, and perhaps convinced him to submit *Portrait of a Little Girl* and *Portrait of a Young Man*, the latter now renamed *The Arithmetic Lesson – Portrait*—the two pictures that had captured the lion's share of critical attention when they were on display at the Doll & Richards gallery—for his debut at the National Academy of Design annual exhibition in the spring of 1876.[22] Fusing elements of portraiture and genre, *The Arithmetic Lesson – Portrait* also reflects the glorification of childhood that was popular with American artists and writers after the Civil War. Like the children portrayed by such authors as Louisa May Alcott (1832-1888) in Little Women (1869) and Mark Twain (1835-1910) in Tom Sawyer (1876), Millet's young boy tapped into the nostalgia for simpler, more innocent times and the view of the child as the promise of America's future. This romantic image of childhood that prevailed during the troubled Reconstruction era was aptly described by the art critic Henry T. Tuckerman (1813-1871), who termed it "a redeeming presence, a harmonizing and hopeful element, the token of what we were, and prophecy of what we may be."[23]

Millet's portraits met with critical acclaim when they were shown in New York, and he again was recognized as an up-and-coming young artist. The art critic Clarence Cook of the New York Tribune, who appears to have had some reservations about Millet's work, favorably concluded that the artist's reliance on European composition and color strategies did not compromise his originality and promise:

> Of Mr. Frank D. Millet's pictures we have not so much to say as we at first thought we should. They are strong, and have much the look of having come out of the man himself, while of course they have the European brand both in their composition and in their color. This is, however, inevitable, for Mr. Millet is still

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> a student, and every student's work that is worth anything shows the master's teaching. But Millet's work also reveals that he is trying to look at life with his own eyes, while he accepts for the time his master's methods of statement; and Mr. Millet's two pictures give promise enough that he will some day have his own methods as well...[24]

The Atlantic Monthly found the artist's two full-length portraits among "the most remarkable" contributions submitted by the "younger men."[25] Scribner's Monthly concurred, terming Millet's portraits "strong and serious works—the painter evidently caring more for characterization than for mere ornament. These are certainly the most important portraits by a young artist exhibited this year."[26]

With the nation's attention focused on Philadelphia in the spring of 1876, Millet sent *Portrait of a Lady in Costume of 1740* (Fig. 3.4) and the two subject pictures that he had painted in Venice the year before—*Sailing in the Bay of Naples* (see Fig. 2.38) and *A Turkish Water-Seller* (see Fig. 2.39)—to the Centennial Exposition. *Portrait of a Lady in Costume of 1740*, while ostensibly a portrait of Mrs. Edward S. Keith (Elizabeth Orr Keith Bliss, 1830-1905), the artist's East Bridgewater neighbor, also reveals Millet's interest in the Colonial Revival movement that was sparked by the nation's Centennial, and presages his later historical genre paintings of Colonial America, such as *Chloé* of 1881, which will be discussed later in this chapter.[27]

America's Colonial, Revolutionary and Federal periods captured the national imagination in the years leading up to and following the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exposition. Caught by the wave of nostalgia for a pre-industrial past and growing nationalism, Millet was one of many American artists who sent subjects from the nation's early history to the exposition; for example—George Boughton (1833-1905)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Pilgrims Going To Church (1867, The New-York Historical Society), Thomas Eakins (1844-1916) *In Grandmother's Time* (1876, Smith College Museum of Art, Northampton, Massachusetts), and Daniel Chester French (1850-1931) *The Minute Man* (1876, location unknown). Prior to their exhibition in Philadelphia, Millet's paintings were on display in Boston in April 1876 in the Massachusetts Centennial Art Exhibition, which was held at the galleries of the Boston Art Club.[28] *Portrait of a Lady in Costume of 1740* was also exhibited for a few days at the Williams & Everett gallery. The sitter, Elizabeth Orr Keith, was attired in the eighteenth-century wedding dress and jewelry that her great-grandmother, Mrs. Daniel McCarthy, had worn when she sat for her portrait by John Singleton Copley (1738-1815) in 1776. Millet's portrait references her colonial ancestry, and aligns the artist with America's preeminent old master portraitist.[29] Evidence of Millet's increasing interest in historical genre painting, *Portrait of a Lady in Costume of 1740* may also have been prompted by Millet's pride in his own Puritan heritage. The picture's illustrious pedigree did not go unnoticed by the reviewer for Atlantic Monthly. He began by commending Millet for his solid, three-dimensional modeling, vigorous paint handling, and careful attention to costume and textures:

> The portrait of a lady in antique costume, by Mr. F. D. Millet, which has recently been on exhibition in Boston and is to go to the Centennial, seems deserving of notice as an important figure-piece executed with a skill and knowledge not often seen among young American painters, and showing some tendencies that are new here. This is the first sizable result that we have seen from an American student who has chiefly formed himself, as Mr. Millet has done, in the Antwerp Academy; and the first thing in it which strikes us is the masterly modeling of the figure, in powerful lines that are felt through the garment, united with a fresh and vigorous way of reproducing the superficial aspect of the stuffs in which the lady is clothed. It would be unjust to say that the picture is solely a study of costume, because of this excellent trait; but certainly the antique toilet has been given with great vigor and niceness. [30]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The review was not entirely positive, yet the critic was impressed with the decorative quality of the work. He also noted that, while the portrait was a far cry from Copley's sophisticated realism, Millet shared the older artist's ability to sense, beneath the trappings of costume, individual human dignity:

> Considered as a picture in general terms, however, the work has a certain oddity not wholly to its advantage. Mr. Millet has tried the experiment of placing a light figure against a dark ground, and a curious lifelessness in the face has resulted; but if he has lost in this direction, he has gained in another, for the total effect is one of the most brilliantly decorative description. It is a singular coincidence that this wedding dress was painted, when worn by the bride for whom it was made, by Copley. Mr. Millet's treatment is very different from Copley's usual style, yet there is something in the dignity, polish, and sincerity of his work that reminds us not a little of that famous portrait-maker.[31]

The Philadelphia Centennial Exposition, the second major international fair to be held in America, opened on May 10, 1876 in Fairmont Park, about a month after the Boston exhibitions closed.[32] Timed to coincide with the centenary of the Declaration of Independence, it celebrated not only a hundred years of American independence, but also the country's recovery from the Civil War, and its emergence as an international industrial and economic power. The largest international fair to date, its 249 buildings covered an area almost 300 acres in size, and ten million visitors visited the works of 30,000 exhibitors before it closed on November 10, 1876. Millet was among those visitors. In addition to exhibiting at the Centennial, he also traveled to Philadelphia on numerous occasions to report on the exposition for the Boston Daily Advertiser and for the new Boston-based art journal, American Architect and Building News, which began publication in 1876.[33]

The major attractions were the Main Building, where the manufactured goods of many nations were displayed; Machinery Hall, where the famed Corliss engine and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

other inventions showcased American ingenuity; Memorial Hall and the neighboring Art Annex, a cluster of galleries dedicated to the fine arts; the Agricultural Building; and Horticultural Hall. These main buildings were surrounded by assorted state and foreign pavilions and other structures, of which the most notable were the Old New England kitchen that the State of Massachusetts installed in a log cabin annex, and the Japanese pavilion, which housed the first major display of Japanese decorative art in America. Millet visited virtually all the exhibits and commented on them in his articles, from his first view of the great exposition glimpsed as his train approached Philadelphia, to a detailed analysis of the fine arts display in Memorial Hall.

Like many visitors, Millet found the exposition architecturally unattractive. While he admired the utilitarian aspect of the main buildings and the general layout of the enormous complex, "It must be confessed," he wrote in the Boston Daily Advertiser on May 20, 1876, "that the sight of the buildings, as they are approached from the city is a disappointment."[34] His dissatisfaction in 1876 may have predisposed him, as Director of Decorations for the World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago in 1893, to readily concur with and implement the decision of Daniel Burnham (1846-1912), the Chicago architect and Director of Works for the fair, to spray-paint the buildings with a unifying coat of white wash.[35] The Beaux-Arts classicism of the architecture and its white coloration led many to dub it the "White City." Millet also took note of the impressive quality of the manufactured articles from Great Britain, the products of reforms in English design that had emerged in the 1830s and received new emphasis after the London Crystal Palace Exhibition of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1851. The latter exhibition had highlighted the inferiority of English manufactured goods, encouraged the British government to redefine the goals of its industrial training programs, and led to the foundation of the South Kensington Museum and School in 1857. By the 1860s these efforts had crystallized into a broad-based Aesthetic movement, which emphasized the importance of beauty and artistic workmanship in the design of everyday objects, as well as in the fine arts.[36] Millet singled out the high standard of the ceramic wares by A. B. Daniells & Co. and the *repoussé* silver crafted by Elkington & Co., and hoped that the Philadelphia fair might have a similar effect on American design.[37] "The Exhibition of 1851 did for England just what we may hope that the Centennial will do for us," he wrote, "it proved to her how far she was behind other nations in the development of art, and especially in the direction of art applied to industry."[38]

Millet naturally gravitated to the very popular fine arts display in Memorial Hall and the neighboring Art Annex, and devoted most of his attention to it in his writings. It gave him another opportunity to study the work of contemporary European and American artists. In only eight months the chief of the Bureau of Art, John Sartain (1808-1896), had assembled 3,646 works of art in many different media from twenty countries.[39] The largest collection of international art ever assembled in the United States, the exhibition gave Americans unprecedented exposure to the breadth and variety of the art of many nations. Commentators at the time credited the display with reawakening artistic appreciation in America. As a critic for Scribner's Monthly explained:

> One of the most notable facts connected with the Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia is the universal devotion to the art galleries. . . . The pictures have

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> formed the central, dominant point of attraction, every day, from the beginning to the end.
>
> Now, these facts mean a great deal with relation to the future of art in this country. They mean that there is an innate love of art—of the beautiful in picture and sculpture—in the average American, from which it only needs time and opportunity to reap grand harvests of achievement and appreciation.[40]

Given Millet's interest in international artistic currents, an analysis of his writings is instructive, for it summarizes his views about the state of European and American art, and encapsulates his emerging ideas of what constituted art.

Millet was particularly drawn to the fine arts collection of Great Britain. He expressed the opinion shared by many visitors and critics that the English art display was the finest and most representative of the foreign exhibits.[41] Among the pictures and artists that he singled out for praise were the social realist panorama of modern London life *Applicants for Admission to a Casual Ward* (1874, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham, Surrey) by Samuel Luke Fildes (1843-1927); such aestheticized, classical revival themes as *Summer Moon* (c. 1872, Fig. 3.5) by Frederic Leighton (1830-1896) and *The Vintage Festival* (1870, Fig. 3.6) by Lawrence Alma-Tadema; the strong character studies, *Portrait of Millais* (location unknown) and *Portrait of Leighton* (location unknown), by George Frederic Watts (1817-1904); and the historical genre and contemporary genre pictures by William Quiller Orchardson (1832-1910) and John Pettie (1839-1893). The works some of these artists exhibited in Philadelphia must have made a lasting impression on Millet, for their influence can be seen later in his own work. For example, Leighton and Alma-Tadema's interest in subjects from classical antiquity anticipate Millet's classical revival themes of the 1880s, and elements of Alma-Tadema's processional

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

picture *The Vintage Festival* of 1870 (Fig. 3.6) are evoked in Millet's *Thesmophoria* (Fig. 3.7), a lunette mural he painted for the Bank of Pittsburgh in 1897. Millet also admired the Dutch collection, although he termed it "far from satisfactory, not because the leading artists are not among the contributors, but because there are few specimens of the best work of these men."[42] He especially commended the poetic figure paintings of Dutch peasant life by Josef Israels and Christoffel Bisschop (1828-1904) for their sympathetic human interest and aesthetic qualities. In addition, Millet gave high marks to the immensely popular historicizing canvas *Venice Paying Homage to Catherine Cornaro* of 1872 (location unknown) by the Austrian artist Hans Makart (1840-1884), a decorative synthesis of Veronese-inspired composition and Titianesque color, which must have resonated with his own appreciation of Venetian painting. Elaborating further on artistic concerns that he had voiced in his criticism of the 1873 Vienna Exposition, Millet responded to the ability of the artists in the eclectic display of European paintings to express their ideas and emotions and to harmonize their formal means to their subjects. As before, Millet had high praise for the intellectually provocative cosmopolitan subjects, technical competence, and aesthetic integrity of the works by contemporary European artists. By comparison, he found the strong native bias and literal realism of American landscape and figure painting provincial and backward, likening the American collection "to a Paris salon with the important pictures left out."[43]

In his review of the English display, Millet wrote, "First of all, it is pure and high-minded and always full of sentiment"; in addition, there is "a notable predominance of the aesthetic over the material element . . . a distinguished aptness

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

for the selection of subjects, a direct and comprehensive way of telling a story, and a power of expression that is much deeper and better grounded than appears at first sight."[44] If the English artists lacked the technical virtuosity of their French colleagues, Millet noted that "whatever they have to say they succeed in saying with a sympathetic strength and earnestness that more than overbalances their prominent weaknesses, and thus fulfills the highest purposes of art."[45] His own work often sought a similar balance between thought provoking content and purely aesthetic concerns. Millet's admiration for English painting probably helped influence his decision in 1884 to live and work in England, at least for part of the year.

Millet's choices of the three works that he exhibited at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition—*Sailing in the Bay of Naples* (see Fig. 2.38), *A Turkish Water-Seller* (see Fig. 2.39), and *Portrait of a Lady in Costume of 1740* (Fig. 3.4)—hint at the diversity of artistic themes that would command his attention into the early 1880s, and throughout his career. These three disparate subjects—a picturesque Italian genre scene, an exotic Near Eastern figure study, and an historicized portrait with allusions to America's Colonial past—demonstrate his facility with popular cosmopolitan and American themes. The variety of subject choice, firmly modeled forms, careful attention to details of costume and physiognomy, and bravura, coloristic manner also invite comparison with works by Millet's Antwerp masters, De Keyser and Van Lerius. In addition, the emphasis on brilliant color harmonies and the materiality of paint in *A Turkish Water-Seller,* and on the interplay between decorative costume and background in *Portrait of a Lady in Costume of 1740* reveal

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

his increasing interest in the formal elements of picture-making, beyond simple storytelling.

Millet's works continued to attract favorable attention. The reviewer for the Aldine praised the artist's ability to reconcile his subject and formal means so as to capture the rustic character of Italian seafaring life in *Sailing in the Bay of Naples* and the nobility of *A Turkish Water-Seller*:

> I am exceedingly glad of the opportunity an examination of the Centennial pictures as a whole affords me of speaking unqualifiedly of two works of F. D. Millet . . . . Mr. Millet is represented among these pictures by two that are not only remarkable, but so remarkable that it is a matter of doubt whether we have an artist in the whole country who can do similar work so good in all its details. I have seen no work approaching so nearly to perfection of touch and choice of color, anticipated by grasp of idea. One of these is a study of figures in a boat, and is catalogued as "In the Bay of Naples." It is remarkable for a presentation of not only ideas but objects that are only suggested. Little of the boat that the figures are crowded into is seen beyond the lower part of the sails; but so cleverly is everything managed, that not only do we see the craft, but its gliding motion through the water before the breeze is manifest. It is a study of character by media of almost grotesque phases of humanity . . . . Here we have the sky and water, blue in the warm sunlight, and the indistinct land borrowing therefrom the same hue, quite lost in the delightful atmosphere—all this delicate and dreamy and delightful. In this the setting,--a study of an old man at the tiller . . . at the bow of the boat a young girl . . . seemingly paying less attention to what is said by a coarse-looking man who . . . leans back on his elbow, than does one in the shadow of the sail on the far side of the boat, who is evidently her sweetheart . . . another figure in the shadow, serving only as an aid to the composition; nearer the stern again, a man either drawing water, pulling in a fish, or engaged in some occupation requiring similar action; and in the center of the boat, shirtless . . . two boys are engaged in the game of "moro" . . . . This composition is stretched on the canvas with the confident enthusiasm of youth, and the virile confidence that middle life lends a successful artist's pencil. It is remarkably full of steady determination and conscientious love of truth . . . . Its lights and shades are subtile [*sic*], never tricky; its color sturdy and finely felt, not lurid or unnatural, as many an artist would have been tempted to give, beneath the intoxicating effect of an Italian sun shining down on the waters outlying Naples; and its motive, the presentation of a tableau of life and character in a sturdy, honest, masculine fashion. And it is an entire, unequivocal success . . . .
>
> Mr. Millet has another subject that is remarkable both in handling and color. It is a head of a 'Turkish Water-Seller,' as catalogued, and is the most pronounced

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> piece of blackness on canvas I ever saw . . . . And yet the color is remarkably clear and transparent, and we are even allowed to see the polish we often perceive on Nubian or Ethiopian faces. His arms are proudly folded; his bearing erect, imposing and dignified; and one can scarcely help thinking he is some African king smuggled for a season into servitude in Constantinople.[46]

Millet's manipulation of color, paint and composition to give expression to his subject also drew praise from the painter and art critic Earl Shinn (1838-1886), who remarked at length on *Sailing in the Bay of Naples* in his Masterpieces of the Centennial International Exhibition:

> We very decidedly like his *gondelied* [*sic*] in colors, entitled 'In the Bay of Naples,' and copied by us on page 28 from the original in the Centennial show. Who that has ever taken that primitive, antique sail from Naples to Capri in the old market-boat, would not warm to the picture of it, especially when executed with such freshness and wit? It is like a revived missing chapter from Pliny the Naturalist; behind our backs are the phenomena of that great volcano which cost the erudite Roman his life; before us the two-peaked outline of Capri lifting from the blue, and around us the peasant-life which has scarcely changed since the days of the ancients. Four of the mariners in this picture wear the Phrygian cap that Ulysses wore. They roll their arms and legs into the softest convolutions of the *dolce far niente*. They play with the handsome Anacapri girl on the seat that eternal game of dalliance and love that is never old. The bare-backed boys, opening and shutting their fingers like flashes of tawny lighting, play the immortal game of *Morra* which the Hebrew slaves played beneath the pyramids. So drifting and floating, and letting the wind take care of the dirty old sail, they sit with their feet in a bed of fish, and execute that delicious Capri-transit—the most luxurious bit of vagabondage, set in the loveliest scenery, that even Italian life affords.[47]

Although Millet continued to plan to return to Europe, Boston provided a number of professional opportunities in 1876-1877 that increasingly drew him into the local art scene. In the fall of 1876 he received his first decorative commission, joining a group of young artists assisting John La Farge in the decoration of Boston's new Trinity Church.[48] La Farge had achieved a reputation for his intimate easel paintings, and had produced some small-scale decorative pictures as well, when the American architect Henry Hobson Richardson (1838-1886) invited him to provide a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

scheme for the interior of Trinity Church, then under construction in Boston's Back Bay. La Farge engaged a number of artists to assist him in the figurative and ornamental work, including John Du Fais (1855-1935), Sidney L. Smith (1845-c. 1906), George Maynard, Francis Lathrop (1849-1909), Augustus Saint-Gaudens (1848-1907), and Edwin Champney.[49]

It is reasonable to suppose that Millet was chosen for his familiarity with European precedents, his knowledge of the encaustic technique, and his enthusiasm for decorative work. During Millet's student years at the Antwerp Academy, the school offered courses in figure and ornamental drawing and in the applied arts, two areas that trained artists for decorative painting projects.[50] While Millet did not enroll in any of these classes, the Antwerp program undoubtedly instilled an appreciation for decorative art. In addition, his teacher Nicaise De Keyser had executed several large-scale mural projects, most notably his thirty-nine panel *The Glory of the Antwerp School* of 1862-1872 (see Fig. 2.9) for the entrance hall of the Academy museum, and may have encouraged his students to follow his example. Millet's studies in Antwerp had in fact coincided with a revival of monumental mural ensembles in public and ecclesiastical buildings. In addition to De Keyser's work, the best-known examples are the decoration of the large foyer in the Antwerp City Hall with scenes of Belgian history by Henri Leys, a project that was left unfinished by his death in 1869, and the completion of the eighty-panel fresco cycle of the *Life of Christ* of 1859-1871 in St. Joris's Church by Godfried Guffens (1823-1901) and Jan Swerts (1820-1879).[51] Furthermore, during and subsequent to his Antwerp training, extensive travel on the continent had familiarized Millet with the major

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Renaissance, Baroque and nineteenth-century mural cycles. Moreover, he had studied encaustic painting (wax melted in turpentine, alcohol and Venice turpentine, then mixed with dry pigments and applied directly to the wall surface) in Naples in 1874, giving him a firsthand acquaintance with the technique that La Farge would employ for almost all of the figurative and ornamental painting at Trinity Church.[52]

The project at Trinity Church was a pioneering moment in the history of the American mural movement. As the perspicacious Pauline King put it, "In 1876, owing to John La Farge, mural painting in this country was elevated to the dignity of art."[53] The first large-scale decorative commission in America, where an American architect and an American painter and his assistants, inspired by traditional European artistic attitudes and practices, worked together to integrate art and architecture into a unified ensemble, it set in motion the efflorescence of mural painting that would adorn America's religious, domestic, commercial and civic architecture by the turn of the century. Millet's contributions in Trinity Church were a modest prelude to his later work as director of the mural program at the 1893 Columbian Exposition in Chicago, which brought new energy to the American mural movement, and greatly enhanced the stature of mural painting in the United States. (This will be discussed in the Epilogue). Moreover, Millet and many of the artists who worked on the decorative program at Trinity Church remained close friends through the years, forming a network of professionals who supported each other's work, and recommended each other for commissions at various times.

La Farge's pictorial program at Trinity Church, as art historian H. Barbara Weinberg has noted, was inspired by the art of the Early Christian period and sought

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to illustrate correspondences between Old and New Testament events through the general theme of salvation through faith.[54] The majority of the murals, with the exception of the two nave panels painted by La Farge—*Visit of Christ to Nicodemus* and *Christ and the Woman of Samaria* were located in the transept tower. In addition to contributing to the overall decorative scheme, Millet was responsible for one of the symbols of the four Evangelists, the *Ox of Saint Luke* (fig. 3.8), high up on the left-hand panel of the north wall of the tower,[55] and for one of the six prophets and apostles, the *David* (fig. 3.9), located in the left spandrel of the north wall of the tower, just above the crossing.[56] Millet's youthful and golden-haired David, garbed in a white tunic and blue cloak, is the most energetic of the spandrel figures. With his harp on his left shoulder and his shepherd's staff in his right hand, he confidently strides forward, gazing upward to the heavens. Contemporary critics, however, were not impressed with the spandrel murals, and took little notice of Millet's lively and harmonious design, which seemed to stand out from the more staid depictions of his colleagues. The architect Henry Van Brunt (1832-1903) wrote that "The six great figures of prophets and apostles, although conceived with learning and with a marked degree of religious feeling, although suggesting a certain grandeur of sentiment . . . are wanting in vigor and correctness of drawing."[57] Only Clarence Cook, who considered the spandrel murals a lifeless, disappointing and disjointed lot, acknowledged Millet's work, praising the architectural integrity of his figure::

> They all have a lack of purpose; they are not created, they are accepted, and give us no new thought of the persons they stand for . . . no one of these figures is born of any clear thinking on the artist's part as to the character of the person he has offered to represent. . . . Mr. La Farge . . . worked under the disadvantage of not being able to carry out with his own hands his own ideas. The artists who worked with him, Messrs, Millet and Maynard and Francis Lathrop, had also to work in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> the dark, carrying out Mr. La Farge's sketches in their own way, to be afterward retouched and mended by him, so that the result could not be satisfactory. Add that the treatment of the background gives the figures too much the look of being cut out of cardboard and laid upon the walls, in only one case, that of the "David," in which Mr. Millet has carried out Mr. La Farge's drawing literally, do we have a sense of unity; the others are all more or less uncertain.[58]

While painted from a design provided by La Farge, as were all the figures in the program, the *David*, in its pulsating muscularity and active, *Apollo Belvedere* pose, also recalls Millet's study of the Italian old masters, specifically, Michelangelo's colossal *David* of 1501-1504 in the Accademia di Belle Arti in Florence, a work Millet admired and had visited on a number of occasions.[59]

While contributing to the decorative program at Trinity Church in the fall and winter of 1876-1877, Millet was also actively engaged with the new art school of the Museum of Fine Arts, as well as with several portrait commissions. In a letter to Stoddard dated December 2, 1876, he detailed his activities:

> Since my last brief note great changes have taken place. I have been at work decorating the interior of a new church here which is more like an old romanesque Catholic church than an Episcopal "tabernacle." The romantic and picturesque details of this enterprise I shall take keen delight in elaborating to you when we meet. . . . I am all packed up to go to Europe and am daily expecting to take passage, only awaiting for three reasons. 1st the completion of the church which is to be dedicated on Xmas day; 2d a commission from the city to copy a portrait which must be done at the same time; 3d the arrival of our teacher for the new drawing school (He sailed yesterday from Liverpool).[60]

The Museum of Fine Arts had been founded by a group of Boston citizens in 1870 "for the preservation and exhibition of works of art, of making, maintaining, and establishing collections of such works, and of affording instruction in the Fine Arts."[61] Soon after opening day on July 4, 1876, the trustees, having learned that a number of gentlemen were prepared to undertake, through means of a subscription, the establishment of an art school on its premises, voted:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> That the executive committee be directed to grant the use of such rooms in the basement of the Museum Building, as they may find expedient, for a School of Drawing; any regulations agreed upon between the committee and the parties proposing to establish such a School to be submitted for the approval of the Trustees at the next quarterly meeting.[62]

Negotiations continued throughout the summer, and on September 13, 1876, with nearly $3,000 in hand, a Permanent Committee, comprising Millet, William Morris Hunt, John La Farge, and nine prominent Bostonians, was appointed to take charge of the proposed school.[63] Millet remained a member of this managing committee until 1885. Recalling his own difficulty in obtaining professional training in Boston, he must have wholeheartedly supported and helped formulate the committee's decision that the Museum School:

> shall be a school of the fine art as distinguished from a school of applied art, and that while the opportunities offered, particularly for the more elementary work, are intended to meet the wants of persons proposing to pursue the arts of design, or to become teachers of drawing, as well as of amateurs, the chief object of this undertaking is to give to persons who are proposing to become artists the means of serious professional study.[64]

According to H. Winthrop Peirce, a member of the inaugural class, Millet was the most experienced of the managing committee and played a crucial role in securing his former Antwerp classmate Otto Grundmann as the first head of the Museum School and in establishing an academic program based on European professional methods. Interestingly, Peirce's comments also suggest a link between Millet and Rubens, perhaps the quintessential "renaissance painter," whose intellectual eminence led his patrons to entrust him not only with cultural commissions, but with diplomatic assignments as well, a role that Millet would play at the behest of the Roosevelt and Taft administrations in the early 1900s:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> It was most fortunate for the School at its inception that Frank Millet was in Boston in 1876 and 1877, assisting La Farge in the decoration of Trinity Church. Fresh from Antwerp, then holding the place in the Art Student world held earlier by Rome, and later by Munich and Paris, he came fully competent to advise the committee, most of whom, though with the loftiest aspirations, had no experience in art schools. Young, handsome, gallant, and dashing, at the same time courageous and most diplomatic, equally ready with the brush or pen, he suggested a survival of the type of renaissance painters whose royal patrons considered them equally competent to paint their glories on their palace walls or to conduct a delicate foreign negotiation.. . . In the fall of 1876, at the suggestion of Frank Millet, Otto Grundmann was engaged as instructor.[65]

A native of Dresden, Grundmann had studied at the Dresden Academy, then worked under various masters in that city before entering the Antwerp Academy, where Millet had been a fellow student. After leaving Antwerp, he was a successful genre and portrait painter in Düsseldorf when Millet wrote him on September 30, 1876, encouraging him to accept the appointment at the Museum School. "Every day is valuable. Lose no time! Come at once!" Millet urged, "for we are waiting for you . . . . Do not fail to buy your passage ticket at once, and write me the steamer you will come in. They sail from Liverpool for Boston every Wednesday and get here Saturday. I will be on the dock to meet you when you arrive."[66] Millet met Grundmann on his arrival, found him lodging, introduced him to Boston cultural circles, and was on hand on January 2, 1877, the opening day of the Museum School and during the first weeks, to help the new director with organizing and instructing the classes.[67]

Although budgetary concerns necessarily mandated certain modifications, the program of instruction that was implemented and expanded during the years Millet served on the managing committee emulated in many respects the basic structure and philosophy of the Antwerp Royal Academy of Fine Arts under the direction of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Nicaise De Keyser. The curriculum offered a concentration in drawing and painting (and briefly in sculpture and the decorative arts), and was divided into elementary, intermediate and advanced sections.[68] Students began by drawing from lithographs, advanced to drawing from casts, and, finally, to painting from the live model, according to their individual merits and needs. In an effort to impart the rudiments of a liberal arts education, supplementary lectures were offered in anatomy, perspective, art history, mythology, ancient costume, figural composition, and color theory. The Museum collections, like those at the Antwerp Academy, served an important pedagogical function, providing an artistic milieu where students could familiarize themselves with the history of art by studying and copying paintings. Local art critics found much to praise in the new school. The comments of a writer in the Art Journal are typical:

> [W]hoever has watched the course of this school can easily see that its tendency is towards the establishment of an Art Academy of the highest character . . . . It is endeavoured to make the students feel the artistic atmosphere in which they work; they are surrounded by the best of influences, and in the collection of the museum they have excellent opportunities for observation and study. As opportunity offers, the scope of the school is extended. The instruction is of the best quality, it being desired that the instructors should be *artists* rather than schoolmasters. The tendency of the institution is more towards the academic freedom prevailing in the greater schools of the Continent, than the conventional rules and restrictions of the Royal Academy in London.[69]

The history of the Museum of Fine Arts School of Drawing and Painting is an important chapter in the professional education of American artists in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. The distinguished alumni of that first class that Grundmann and Millet set to work in 1877 include Ernest Fenellosa (1853-1908) and Willard Metcalf (1858-1925), among others.[70] Millet's efforts to provide professional

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

education for American artists would culminate in 1912 in his directorship of the American Academy in Rome. (This will be discussed in the Epilogue).

The energies that Millet devoted to the Museum School of Drawing and Painting and to the decorative program at Trinity Church in the fall and winter of 1876-1877 left little time for new works. No information has come to light about the "commission from the city to copy a portrait" that the artist mentioned in his letter to Stoddard. Millet, however, did complete several other portraits during this time.

The *Portrait of Charles Francis Adams, Jr.* of 1876 (Fig. 3.10) and the *Portrait of Samuel L. Clemens (Mark Twain)* of 1877 (Fig. 3.11) mark an increasing sophistication and complexity in Millet's academic realism. Compared to their immediate predecessors, such as the *Portrait of Dr. Asa Millet* (1875-1876, Fig. 3.1), both likenesses reveal a greater mastery of composition and light effects and a more dexterous handling of pigment and brushstroke. The *Portrait of Charles Francis Adams, Jr.* (Fig. 3.10), a sensitive rendering of a close friend, was painted at the Adams home at Quincy during July and August 1876.[71] The informal, seated pose and genial spirit of the portrait recall the likeness of the artist's father, but by placing the figure closer to the picture plane and exploiting the controlled studio lighting, Millet created a more imposing image. The mottled red background, fluent brushstrokes and cascade of highlights in glimmering passages of the white silk vest and in the red touches on the fingers, further enliven the composition. Adams stands out against the crimson background, his face illuminated by a strong side lighting that establishes the physical reality of his features, and reveals an introspective expression. Pleased with the portrait, Adams wrote in his dairy: "it is strongly

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

realistic and a tremendous likeness."[72] Millet began a portrait of Mrs. Adams at about the same time, but would not bring it to completion until 1881. (This will be discussed in Chapter 4).

The likeness of Samuel Langhorne Clemens (1835-1910) was painted in Hartford during a two-week period in January 1877. Anxious to return to Europe, Millet initially had declined the commission, when William Dean Howells (1837-1920), the American novelist, editor and critic, and a friend of both Clemens and Millet, intervened.[73] As Howells intimates in his letter of November 30, 1876 to Clemens, time was of the essence as Millet was on the point of departing:

> Here is Millet's letter, received to-day. His terms are reasonable, certainly; but he seems bound to go. I don't know when he means to come back. Perhaps you may think [it] worth while to write him.[74]

In terms of pictorial strategies, the *Portrait of Samuel L. Clemens (Mark Twain)* (Fig. 3.11) is a more ambitious work than the Adams likeness. The massing of the form to suggest an impressive bulk and the dramatic, off–center placement, energy and intensity of the figure, allowed Millet, without borrowing directly from Titian, to present his subject in a seated position that recalls the Italian Renaissance artist's portrait of *Pope Paul III* of 1543 (Fig. 3.12), a work Millet undoubtedly saw when he visited the Museum of Naples during his travels in Italy.[75] Similarly posed, with his upper body weight supported by the arm of a chair, a confident and decisive Clemens leans forward and engages the viewer with unflinching directness. The asymmetrical composition, strong studio lighting, bravura brushwork, and restrained palette enhance the dynamism of the up-and-coming man of letters. Fresh from his recent success with the publication of The Adventures of Tom Sawyer (1876), Clemens and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

his family were delighted with the portrait.[76] One senses their satisfaction in the letter Clemens wrote Millet on January 23, 1877:

> I wrote you a note the day you left, about Mrs. Clemens' gratitude to you for the portrait, but, as I left the "East" off the "Bridgewater," it is likely . . . [you] never received it.
>
> . . . . Mrs. Clemens has just come from Vorce's, where she left the picture, after selecting a frame for it exactly to her fancy. I'll not try to tell you how much she thanks you, for our English language is feeble, no matter what our spelling may be.[77]

The portrait commission was the beginning of an enduring friendship between Millet and Clemens, which lasted until the author died in 1910. In both the Clemens and Adams portraits the expressive use of light to draw attention to the face recalls De Keyser's "character portraits" of the painters *Henri Leys* (1834, Fig. 3.13) and *Henri De Coene* (1837, Fig. 3.14). The portraits also accord with Millet's professed preference for strong character portraits that are "quiet, intensely lifelike, decidedly artistic," and that one approaches as though meeting the sitter.[78]

Millet exhibited these two portraits in New York at the National Academy of Design Fifty-Second Annual Exhibition in the spring of 1877, an exhibition that many saw as indicative of a fresh, new direction in American art.[79] The inclusion of a large number of works by the younger European-trained artists prompted one reviewer to observe: "The visitor . . . will be almost instantaneously impressed with the novelty and fresh character of the collection. . . . This season it is as if some magician's wand had been waved over the scene, causing a sudden transformation of monotony into variety, of conventional caution into audacious daring."[80] Among the artists and works represented were Frank Duveneck's (1848-1919) *Turkish Page* (1876, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts), Walter Shirlaw's (1838-1909) *Sheep*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Shearing in the Bavarian Highlands (c. 1877, Private collection) and Will Hicok Low's (1853-1932) *Reverie* (location unknown). In this cosmopolitan milieu that accorded more than usual attention to evocative foreign subjects, European painterly techniques, a concern with picture-making, and artistic originality, Millet's portraits were acknowledged and admired. Clarence Cook 's remarks in the New York *Tribune* set the tone. The prescient critic recognized Millet's masterful paint handling, his uncanny ability to capture the personality of his sitter, and the organic unity of his work:

> Mr. Millet's work seems to me very strong. He has uncommon perception of character, is apparently not in the least mannered, and his pictures look as if they were painted for the pleasure the artist found in painting them. It is characteristic that his portrait of the younger *Charles Francis Adams* should look so much like a Copley as it does, without being in any way intended (as we take for granted) to look like one. On the other hand, the *Mark Twain* is the author of Innocents Abroad in every line. Only with such a hand could such a book have been written. Well, Mr. Millet, who has painted these portraits, who had made a name for himself in Boston, in circles where names are not easily made, before he was heard of in New York, . . . has now made himself a name in New York as well.[81]

On January 22, 1877, having completed his work on the Clemens portrait, Millet at last sailed for Europe to continue his studies in Paris. He departed on the Red Star line in the company of Mrs. Horatio Merrill (the mother of his Harvard classmate Royal Merrill), her daughters Kathleen and Elizabeth (Lily), and her son William. Mrs. Merrill was going abroad so that her younger daughter Kathleen, who was training as a singer, might continue her studies in Paris. Believing that Millet would be of assistance to her by reason of his familiarity with travel in Europe, she had asked him to accompany them. The addition of George Maynard and his two sisters, and the American artist Alfred Q. Collins (1855-1903), completed their

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

group.[82] The party spent a few days in Antwerp and Brussels, reaching Paris in mid-February.

Having recovered from the devastation of the Franco-Prussian War and the Commune, Paris in the late 1870s was quickly becoming the center of the international art world. The prestige of the École des Beaux-Arts, the fashionable new art schools such as the Académie Julian, the opportunity to study the old masters at the Louvre, and the possibility of exhibiting in the annual Salons attracted increasing numbers of artists from both America and Europe to the French capital. But Paris was not just a repository for traditional art; it was also a forum for such avant-garde French painters as Jules Bastien-Lepage (1848-1884), who was working in a naturalist manner, and a group of independent artists whose paintings were dubbed "impressionist" by the press. Known officially as the Société Anonyme des Artistes, the latter group in April 1877 held their third exhibition, which featured the works of Monet, Renoir, Caillebotte, Degas, Pissarro and Cézanne. Surprisingly, Millet left little documentation about his formal studies, if any; his response to the Parisian art world; or his interactions with the large American colony of artists and writers in the city. His surviving correspondence notes that he called at the studios of his compatriots, Abraham Archibald Anderson (1846-1940), Hiram Reynolds Bloomer (1845-1911) and William Gedney Bunce, and that his own work was slow to get started.[83] He had intended to prepare a picture for the Paris Salon, but the constant moving about as he and his friends sought suitable housing, living first in a hotel and then in a suite of furnished apartments, made it difficult for Millet to concentrate on painting. "I haven't a single artistic idea," he complained to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Stoddard.[84] "Such is the state of my mind that I cannot get it into the proper mood for composing a picture or selecting a subject."[85] By April 15 Millet and the Merrills were finally settled in a house at No. 8 Rue de l'Orient, in Montmartre, where the artist had a studio on the top floor.[86] Millet's new lodgings and studio rallied his spirits, and he looked forward to painting outdoors, although his correspondence suggests that worries about money were never far away:

> I haven't written for some time because I have been moving. And indeed I have been so everlasting mixed up that I am not sure whether I have described to you my celebrated hotel—you know that everybody who owns a whole house or occupies one calls it a hotel. Well it is on the top of Montmartre near the old windmills which you have probably seen. We have a fine little garden, two rooms on the ground floor where I have my carpenter's shop and on the first floor a kitchen, salon and dining room. The second story has three chambers where sleep Mrs. Merrill, the two girls and William. The third story has a fine studio, and the nicest little box of a chamber adjoining with W.C. and everything handy. . . . I have made all the furniture for the salon. . . . a great Turkish divan extends around the end of the room under the window and lots of cushions etc. make it comfortable enough. . . . By the way the greatest charm of the house is a splendid terrace on top whence you can overlook all Paris like from the arc de Triomphe. I am about to pose my models there and paint them in full sunlight. . . .
>
> Paris will soon be delightful and I hope to have leisure enough to enjoy some of it. It has cost me so much to fix the family here that probably I shall not be able to go away this summer. However I hope to go for a short trip to the island of S____ and Normandy . . . . But all depends, of course, on my expected remittances.[87]

Neither the pictures Millet hoped to paint *en plein air* nor his "expected remittances" appear to have materialized that spring, for in May he accepted an assignment to cover the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878 as a correspondent for the New York Herald and London Daily News.[88] Later, he also supplied battlefield sketches to the London Graphic. The Ottoman atrocities against the Slav peoples of the Balkan Peninsula had escalated the frictions between Russia and Turkey into a declared war in April 1877. On May 30 Millet left Paris for Bucharest on the first

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

leg of his journey, then accompanied the advancing Russian army through Romania and Bulgaria to the siege at Pleven. One of the first journalists to enter Pleven after the surrender, Millet was instrumental in getting food and medical supplies into the city. He then marched south with the Russian troops to Sofia and across the frozen mountain passes of the Balkans to Philippolis and Adrianople, and, finally, to San Stefano, where the peace treaty was signed on March 3, 1878.[89] He remained in the latter city and at Constantinople until two weeks after the signing of the peace. He then headed back to Paris by way of Sicily, taking his Greek manservant, whom he had reportedly rescued from prison, home with him. For bravery under fire and for his humanitarian services, he received the Iron Cross from Romania and the military crosses of St. Anne and St. Stanislas from the Czar of Russia, in addition to a war medal from Russia for his newspaper coverage.[90]

With his duties as a war correspondent ended, a physically and mentally exhausted Millet was back in Paris by mid-April 1878. His war dispatches and sketches, and news of his decorations, had received extensive press coverage in Paris, London and America, and had earned him a certain notoriety. Kathleen Merrill's April 21 letter from Paris to a friend in Boston gives a sense of the hero's welcome that greeted the artist:

> Frank has arrived home. He came a week ago Thursday at midnight, accompanied by his faithful servant Paolo the ugly man. Frank is quite fleshy and sunburnt but completely tired out mentally and rather worn with the crossing of the Balkans. He went through unheard of hardships, lack of food, fearful cold, and writing under all sorts of circumstances, and then the horrors he saw in Plevna unstrung him a great deal. He was very glad to get home, and you have no idea what a lion they make of him. The rumour of his two decorations for bravery and his articles which were copied into ever so many languages has preceded him and he finds himself famous. He has got to go to London to do some business there and intends to stay a week, but Mr. King a correspondent who was in the Orient

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> during the early part of the war, and who has just come from London, says he will have to spend a month there at least, for ever so many people are going to give him dinners and he is going to be feted to no end. The editor of the Daily News wishes him to be his guest while in London, but Frank has not accepted the invitation, for he has many friends in London with whom he would rather stay.[91]

After his return to Paris, Millet made a quick trip to London to supervise the publication of his war correspondence,[92] then reestablished himself in the Parisian art community, joining an illustrious contingency of American artists and writers who had gathered in the city in the spring and summer of 1878. There were old friends like George Maynard, Augustus Saint-Gaudens and David Maitland Armstrong (1836-1918), the painter and former American Consul to the Papal States, dating back to Millet's 1874 sojourn in Rome; and new acquaintances like the architects Charles Follen McKim (1847-1909) and Stanford White (1853-1905); the painters Will Hicok Low, John Singer Sargent (1856-1925) Kenyon Cox (1856-1919), James Carroll Beckwith (1852-1917) and Edwin Blashfield (1848-1936); Samuel Clemens; and the art critic Russell Sturgis (1836-1909).[93] The editor and writer Richard Watson Gilder (1844-1909), who was vacationing in London between jobs, was a frequent visitor, as were a host of artists such as Louis Comfort Tiffany (1848-1933), who had come to see the Paris Exposition.[94] Armstrong recalled that Millet's studio was a lively and exotic gathering place:

> With Saint-Gaudens I used often to go out to Frank Millet's place at Montmartre, where we were always sure of meeting Maynard or Bunce or some of the others in our little Paris circle. A queer and picturesque place it was and full of oddities, the accumulation of years of travel and adventure. There were innumerable divans and hanging lamps, while quantities of strange weapons and musical instruments cluttered the corners. Foremost I remember, and by no means indistinctly, the weird bashi-bazouk in gorgeous Oriental dress whom Mr. Millet stationed as a majordomo at his front door, thus succeeding in frightening nearly everyone who came to the house for the first time. He had picked him up somewhere during his travels in the East, and had brought him along with the rest

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of the collection when he returned to Paris.[95]

Not surprisingly, among the first canvases Millet produced were several that continued his interest in Near Eastern subjects, evidenced by his earlier *A Turkish Water-Seller* of 1874 (see Fig. 2.39), and that drew on his recent experience in the Russo-Turkish war. During the campaign, as in all his travels, Millet filled numerous small notebooks with sketches of everything from landscape scenes, and details of local architecture, to faithful depictions of costumes, ethnic physiognomy, and distinctive customs. He also collected local costumes, accessories and bric-a-brac, all of which furnished him with picturesque subjects for texts, illustrations and paintings.[96] Back in the studio, he now translated these sketches and props and his memories into artful constructions, such as *Bachi-Bouzouk et Bulgare; épisode de la guerre en Turquie* (Fig. 3.15) and the presently unlocated painting, *Marchand de tapis, à Stamboul.* Despite the journalistic account suggested by its lengthy, descriptive title and Millet's personal involvement in the Russo-Turkish campaign, *Bachi-Bouzouk et Bulgare; épisode de la guerre en Turquie* is a striking costume piece that suggests the interplay of reality and artifice, and the often theatrical nature of Millet's studio. We know something about the production of the painting, including the fact that Millet's manservant Paolo posed for the Bashi-Bazouk figure, from an account provided by a correspondent for the Boston Herald, who visited Millet's studio in 1880:

> Here may be seen at present a life study of Mr. Millet's devoted servant Paullo [*sic*], an Albanian, who accompanied him through most of the Turkish campaign, and afterward attended him in Paris . . . . he was painted at his particular request as in the act of preparing to murder a Bulgarian prisoner, who is bound and seated at his feet. The Albanian is attired in a rich costume of dark blue knee-breeches with yellow sash, crimson fez and jacket adorned with gold. He carries an armory

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> of pistols and sabres thrust through the waist sash in front, and is holding the drawn sabre between his teeth.[97]

A man of wide-ranging intellect whose writings evidence a respect for and understanding of indigenous cultures, Millet was also a savvy businessman who was very aware of his competition, most notably Jean- Léon Gérôme, whose own work in the genre was largely responsible for the popularity of Orientalist images. Wishing to distinguish his work from Gérôme's, and to emphasize his concern with historical accuracy, Millet explained:

> There is a nice point of etiquette, by the way, about the manner of wearing that sabre in the belt. When the thin edge of the scabbard, corresponding with the sharp edge of the blade, is turned outward, it means hostility. When it is turned inward toward the viewer, his intentions are peaceful. Some of the painters of Eastern subjects don't seem to understand this. I went to see some pictures of Gérôme, and among them was one with several Turks drinking coffee and smoking together amicably; but they had the sharp edge of the scabbard turned out.[98]

While perhaps more ethnographically accurate than Gérôme's picture, and surely based on Millet's wartime experiences, the painting is also a showpiece to demonstrate his academic virtuosity—his skill with rendering the human figure, color, light, and pigment—and his familiarity with fashionable cosmopolitan subjects. The stagy theatricality and mock danger of a studio set piece, are at variance with the sensitive war correspondent who was horrified by the merciless brutalities of the war.[99] While one would not impute Said's cultural agenda to Millet, his picture anticipates some of the fantasy Orientalist images of twentieth-century film. Millet's continued interest in painting Near Eastern subjects reflects his own experience and interest in the region, his academic training, and the international art market appeal of such images, while it reinforces the complexity and diversity of Orientalist

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

representations even within the oeuvre of a single artist. Millet sent both of his Near Eastern pictures to Brussels for the 1878 Exposition Générale des Beaux-Arts, the Belgian triennial Salon that alternated among that city, Antwerp, and Ghent, one of the many international exhibitions that he participated in.[100]

This same year Millet also sent *Shrine in St. Mark's Venice* (unlocated) to the Boston Art Club, and *Boys Fishing, Venice* of 1875 (see Fig. 2.37) to the inaugural exhibition of the Society of American Artists in New York, the first large-scale show of work by American artists who had trained in Europe. Both venues would continue to be outlets for the display of the artist's work. Recently organized, the Society of American Artists had been founded in 1877 to protest the conservative practices at the National Academy of Design toward the younger artists who were working in newer, European-inspired modes.[101] Saint-Gaudens, a founding member of the Society, was instrumental in getting Millet to join the group.[102] With his cosmopolitan subjects and artistically progressive styles, Millet was one of the artists who contributed to the international spirit that dominated the early exhibitions of the Society. Nonetheless, his *plein-air* attempt to render the effects of the strong Venetian sunlight in *Boys Fishing, Venice* was deemed by one critic as "not very successful. The picture," he remarked, "may be summed up as having a certain kind of crude force which indicates a strong native talent in the artist, but as being bad in drawing, bad in color, and bad in light and shade—that is, pretty bad all over."[103]

In addition to preparing his paintings for exhibitions in the United States, Millet again became involved in a major world's fair—this time serving as a Fine Arts juror for the Paris Exposition Universelle of 1878, which opened on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

May 1.[104] The exposition was the Third Republic's statement that France had not only survived the Franco-Prussian war and a civil revolution, but had regained its cultural and political hegemony. David Maitland Armstrong had been appointed Director of the United States Fine Arts section at the exposition, and had chosen Saint-Gaudens to assist him in selecting and hanging the American works submitted in Paris.[105] The two men were also responsible for appointing a juror to represent the United States on the International Board of Awards. Friendly with Millet since their early days in Rome in 1874, and admirers of his work and his diplomatic and organizational skills, Armstrong recalled that their task was an easy one:

> We had the naming of the juror for the United States on the International Board of Awards, and after some consideration it seemed to us that no man could be better fitted for the place than Frank D. Millet. We accordingly recommended him, and most acceptable he proved to the other jurors because of his engaging personality and varied talents.[106]

Also serving on the jury, as Chairman, was the British painter Frederick Leighton, whose work Millet had admired as early as the Philadelphia Exposition. Their work together on the jury was the beginning of a warm friendship.[107] Leighton's election to the presidency of the London Royal Academy of Arts in November, 1878 would give additional impetus to the classical revival movement and to Millet's works in that genre, as will be discussed in the next chapter.

The Exposition Universelle of 1878 offered Millet yet another opportunity to view the enormous panoply of international art, a pattern that by now had become familiar in world fair exhibitions.[108] As the critic for the Art Journal noted: "Every state in Europe, from Portugal to Russia, from Norway to Italy, and every country under the sun which has any pretensions to aesthetic culture, from China to Japan,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

from Persia to Peru, has its appropriate place in the world's show."[109] In terms of quantity and quality the French painting display was generally considered to be of the first rank, although some critics bemoaned the absence of any definite artistic direction.[110] Jean-Léon Gérôme, Jean-Louis-Ernest Meissonier and Lêon Bonnat (1833-1922) were the grand old guard of the French contingency, and Adolphe-William Bouguereau's polished religious and mythological scenes, along with Alexandre Cabanel's *Death of Francesca da Rimini and Paolo Malatesta* (1870, Musée de Picardie, Amiens, France), were the artistic stars of the day.[111] Equally popular were works by Jules Bastien-Lepage and Jules Breton, particularly the portrait of *M. Hayem* (location unknown) by the former and the peasant scene *La Sieste* (location unknown) by the latter. The English collection maintained the high reputation that it had secured at the Philadelphia Centennial two years earlier, but did not appear to make any advance. "Indeed," the critic Earl Shinn remarked, "it is very much the same thing. The tourist who has studied the former display feels at home again in recognizing . . . such important works as Fildes' *Casual Ward*, Frith's *Railway Station*, and Alma-Tadema's *Vintage Festival*—the latter, similar, but not identical, to the scene with the same title he had exhibited at Philadelphia."[112]

One of the most striking aspects of the Exposition was the burgeoning artistic internationalism, and the American Fine Arts Department's participation therein. In the words of one observer:

> the sharp division of schools which once characterized the different nations of Europe has become very much obliterated. The modern facilities of travel have tended to draw them all together into one great nationality of art. . . . If this be observable to a certain extent among all nations, more or less, nowhere was it more strongly marked than in the American department of painting in this Exposition. Here there was no nationality, no peculiarity of method, style, or

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> thought, distinguishing the works of America from those of the rest of the world.[113]

The American collection, which consisted of 127 oil paintings, garnered four medals.[114] Frederick Arthur Bridgman's (1847-1928) *The Funeral of a Mummy on the Nile* (1877, location unknown) and William W. P. Dana's (1833-1927) *Solitude* (location unknown) received second- and third-class medals, respectively; and John La Farge's *Paradise Valley, Newport* (location unknown) and Walter Shirlaw's (1838-1909) *Sheep–shearing in the Bavarian Highlands* (private collection) were awarded honorable mention.[115] The works of the American honorees contributed to the cosmopolitan tenor of the exhibition, an internationalist outlook that Millet would have shared.

With his duties as a juror completed, Millet spent the summer in the French countryside sketching. He went to Normandy, near the popular Parisian resort of Honfleur on the Channel coast, where he remained until November.[116] Of the various canvases he mentioned painting during this period, only *Philosophy in Summer* (1878, Fig. 3.16) is known today.[117] The inclusion of two landscapes—*Shore Between Honfleur and Trouville* and *Near Honfleur*—in Millet's 1914 estate sale catalog suggests that they may have been part his 1878 summer-fall painting campaign.[118] A visitor to Millet's Montmartre studio described *Philosophy in Summer* as "a girl dozing on a hammock, in full summer time, beneath the shade of leafy boughs."[119] A scene of contemporary leisure, it depicts a fashionably dressed Lily Merrill asleep in a hammock, the book she had been reading having fallen to the ground. The hammock is slung to the beams of a thatched-roofed porch, of the type common to the numerous seaside cottages in the area. Outdoor porches enjoyed

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

increasing popularity in both Europe and America as sites for leisure-class lounging and entertaining, or given a seaside locale such as Honfleur, for enjoying the ocean breezes, as seen in a contemporaneous picture of nearby *Trouville* (c. 1880-85, Fig. 3.17) by the Belgian painter Alfred Stevens (1823-1906).[120] Millet's leaf-shrouded arbor, however, effectively screens out any view of the sea, allowing the artist to take advantage of the shaded setting to display his skill in the depiction of diffused sunlight. In addition to the current vogue for the outdoor porch motif and Millet's continued experiments with rendering light, the picture also reflects the contentment of his personal life. The friendship between Frank Millet and Lily Merrill that had begun in Cambridge during his college years deepened in Paris and Honfleur. After a short engagement, they would marry the following spring.

Millet spent the winter of 1878-1879 in Paris, where, by his own account, he painted several portraits and two Near Eastern subjects.[121] Little information has yet come to light about the portraits from this period, other than the signed and dated *Portrait of John Dudley Philbrick* (Fig. 3.18). A prominent American educator and Superintendent of Schools in Boston, Philbrick (1818-1886) was the Massachusetts Commissioner to the United States Education Department exhibit at the Paris Exposition, a reprise of his role at the Vienna 1873 and Philadelphia 1876 expositions, where he had made Millet's acquaintance. The portrait's painterly realism with impasto highlights, solidly modeled form, strong studio lighting, and emphasis on characterization recall Millet's earlier likenesses of *Charles Francis Adams, Jr.* and *Samuel Clemens.* The Near Eastern subjects were most likely *Les Pacificateurs, à San Stefano*, presently unlocated, and *A Bashi Bazouk* (Fig. 3.19),

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

two of the paintings that captivated the Parisian correspondent for the New York World. Praising Millet's masterful handling of color and aesthetic harmony, he provided the following account of the pictures and of his visit to the artist's studio:

> Frank Millet lives at Montmartre . . . . He has a house on one of the transverse slopes of the steep hill called the Rue l'Orient, and most fittingly so, for our young artist is Eastern or nothing in his pictorial tastes . . . . You go up a winding stair to the studio, and on opening the door you find you have left Paris for Stamboul. All round about you you have Eastern stuffs, weapons, pipes, headgear, slippers. Frank Millet might give a masquerade for fifty, and rig his guests up on the premises. He is a powerful painter, very surely a man of the future, with an eye for rich, glowing color, the gift of gifts in the art. Any one of his pictures would prove this. Perhaps the one that proves it best is the study of the bashi-bazouk trying the edge of his sharpened sabre—a youthful comely fellow, yet with an eye full of mischief of the least pleasant sort. The characterization is capital, but the coloring is the great charm. The fellow is dressed in many-colored stuffs, and each color is but another victory for Mr. Millet. He has wrought them all into perfect harmony, and the whole picture has an air of subdued strength—strength not at all displayed—which is always one of the notes of a successful work of art. The yellows of the tunic sleeves must have given him great trouble; they have certainly given him a great victory. The sword is peculiar; its cutting edge is towards the holder, not away from him. . . . Another charming picture in the studio is . . . a Russian and Turk fraternizing during the truce.[122]

Les Pacificateurs, à San Stefano and *A Bashi-Bazouk* continue Millet's interest in Near Eastern subjects first seen in *A Turkish Water-Seller* (1874, Fig. 2.39), and more recently in *Bachi-Bouzouk et Bulgare; épisode de la guerre en Turquie* (Fig. 3.15) and *Marchand de tapis, à Stamboul*, and draw on the sketches made during his travels in the Balkans and Turkey during the Russo-Turkish War. *Les Pacificateurs,à San Stefano* was exhibited at the Paris Salon of 1879, and afterwards stolen. Unknown today, its title and the contemporaneous description suggest it was an historical scene depicting the peace treaty signed at San Stefano, Turkey on March 3, 1878, an event that Millet, as a war correspondent at the frontlines, had witnessed.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A Bashi-Bazouk (Fig. 3.19) is a more artful construction, fashioned like its predecessor—*Bachi-Bouzouk et Bulgare*—in the artist's studio from his numerous sketches, as for example (Figs. 3.20 and 3.21), his vast repertoire of costumes and props, and his creative imagination. Charting a delicate balance between realism and aestheticism, it is the most overt example in the late 1870s of the decorative aspects of Millet's work. A visually stunning painting of one of the Turkish irregular mercenaries, its strong decorative quality belies the fierce brutality of these warriors. Millet depicts a male figure, elegantly dressed in a traditional Bashi-Bazouk costume, examining a sword blade, with a veritable magazine of martial implements—daggers, pistols and swords—thrust into the sash at his waist. Stylistically similar to the late-1870s portraits of *Charles Francis Adams* and *Samuel Clemens* discussed earlier, Millet's figure study demonstrates the continued virtuosity of his academic realism. The firmly modeled three-dimensional form rendered with portrait-like fidelity; the authenticity of the costume and accessories; the skill in rendering textures (the dazzling yellow silk shirt, embroidered scarlet jacket, and glitter of the various metals); and the sophisticated, controlled light focusing attention on the Bashi-Bazouk's face and hands, but also permeating and harmonizing the composition, reveal how thoroughly Millet has absorbed De Keyser's teachings. The picture in fact is a stylistic and thematic counterpart to De Keyser's *The Arab Chief* of 1847 (see Fig. 2.7). Millet's realism, however, is distinguished by a more painterly manner and richer colorism—the brilliant red-green palette enlivened with yellow rehearses the fluid paint handling, color arrangements and formal concerns first noted in *A Turkish Water-Seller* of 1874 (see Fig. 2.39). The realism of the material world is

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

further balanced by the self-conscious design of the background, a geometrically divided and patterned wall surface, which enhances the decorative sensibility, and suggests that Millet has also synthesized some of the compositional structures of his American colleague Whistler.

Millet's careful arrangements of color and design can be seen in the context of the nascent American Aesthetic movement. Primarily a byproduct of British artistic reforms and Whistlerian principles, American aestheticism subscribed to the belief that beauty, harmoniously expressed through line, color and form, was an important objective in the fine and applied arts.[123] Millet had admired the English pictures at the Philadelphia Centennial for their "notable predominance of the aesthetic over the material element," and, while it is not known that he met Whistler in person, Whistler's work was well known in Paris and London, and Millet would have known both his paintings and his room ensembles. He may have had an opportunity to see *The Peacock Room* (1876-1877, Freer Gallery, Washington, D.C.) during his trip to London in the spring of 1878, and would certainly have seen *The Primrose Room*, which Whistler had decorated for his own home and exhibited at the Paris 1878 Exposition.[124] Millet could not have missed Whistler's *Symphony in White, No. 2: The Little White Girl* (1864, Tate Gallery, London) at the 1872 International Exposition at the South Kensington Museum, and probably also saw his *Arrangement in Grey and Black No. 1: Portrait of the Painter's Mother* (1871, Musée d'Orsay, Paris), which was simultaneously on view at the Royal Academy.[125] Whistler's art-for-art's sake philosophy was gaining increasing currency, and as recently as May

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1878, he had aired his views in an interview with a reporter for the London World, stating:

> The picture should have its own merit, and not depend upon dramatic or legendary, or local interest . . .should stand alone, and appeal to the artistic sense of eye or ear, without confounding this with emotions entirely foreign to it, as devotion, pity, love, patriotism, and the like.[126]

Although Millet never subscribes to the pure aestheticism of Whistler, his increasing attention to formal concerns in *A Bashi-Bazouk* and in his subsequent work likely received new impetus from Whistler's precepts. Millet sent *A Bashi-Bazouk* to the Royal Academy Exhibition in London in 1879, where it was accepted together with the previously mentioned *Philosophy in Summer.*[127]

Although not mentioned by Millet in his retrospective commentary about his work during this period, his 1878 Near Eastern picture entitled *A Turk* (unlocated) must also have been painted during his sojourn in Paris. The signed and dated picture was included in the 1914 Millet Estate Sale with the accompanying description:

> A turbaned, black-bearded man clad in dark green, white and rich red, is seated on a rug in front of a rug-draped wall, turned toward the right but with face three-quarters front, his hands clasped about his flexed knees.[128]

As the decade of the 1870s ended and the 1880s commenced, new developments marked Millet's personal and professional life. On March 11, 1879, with Augustus Saint-Gaudens and Samuel Clemens as witnesses, Millet married Elizabeth (Lily) Greeley Merrill in a simple civil ceremony in Paris.[129] The daughter of Sarah Whitman Merrill of Cambridge, Massachusetts, and the Reverend Horatio Merrill of Boston, Lily, like her husband, was a descendant of the Mayflower pilgrims John and Priscilla Alden.[130] An attractive and intelligent woman and a gracious hostess, she was also an accomplished musician and an artist in her own

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

right, who worked as an interior designer for many years. According to her granddaughter, Lily shared Frank's cosmopolitan worldview, and was equally at home in London, Paris, Boston or New York, though in later years she would spend most of her time at their home in Broadway, England.[131] After a wedding breakfast and reception, the couple left for an extended honeymoon in London, staying with their transplanted Boston friend, the American journalist, author, lecturer and actress, Mary Katherine (Kate) Field (1838-1896) at her house on Devonshire Street in the fashionable Regent's Park neighborhood.[132]

Unfortunately there is scant record of Millet's activities in the British metropolis, where, by his own account, he spent the spring and summer of 1879.[133] Surely he visited the Royal Academy exhibition where two of his paintings—*A Bashi-Bazouk* and *Philosophy in Summer*—were on view, alongside the works of such leaders of the English school as Millais, Leighton and Alma-Tadema.[134] Among the more prominent American artists represented were Boughton, who exhibited American Colonial subjects such as his *Priscilla* of 1879 (Edward J. Boughton III Collection, California) and Frederick Bridgman, who, like Millet, showed one of his Near Eastern themes—*A Royal Pastime in Nineveh* (1877, location unknown). This was an important exhibition for Millet because it brought his paintings to the attention of an English audience, which had previously known only his illustration work, and helped establish his growing reputation abroad. The artist must have been pleased with the review in the Art Journal:

> The name of F. D. Millet is not unknown in America. We should be sorry to learn that he is less known among his own countrymen than in Europe. It is rare to find a man so young possessed of talents so manifold . . . . His connection with English journalism, during the late Russo-Turkish War, gave him the opportunity of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> recording his Eastern experiences with the pen, and, being an artist, he illustrated them as well with the pencil. Some of his sketches found their way into the London *Graphic*. To the present exhibition of the Royal Academy he contributes an interesting and life-like portrait of 'A Bashi-Bazouk,' a Turk of the first water, in yellow-sleeved jacket, scarlet over-garment, and many-coloured turban, testing the edge of a yataghan . . . . There is a good deal of character exhibited in the portrait, and much skilful arrangement of colour. Mr. Millet's second contribution, which he entitles 'Philosophy in Summer,' is a pleasing little picture of a young lady in a lavender-coloured dress, with jet-black hair reclining in a hammock . . . .The lady (whose face, by-the-way, bears much resemblance to that of the artist's lately-wedded wife) is a charming exemplification of serene contentment.[135]

The Millets undoubtedly had a warm reception in London, and Frank must have renewed the acquaintances made on his previous trip and, through his friendship with Kate Field and Frederic Leighton, had the opportunity to meet many of the English artists whose works he had admired at the 1873 Vienna Exposition. Judging from his increasing attention to pictorial values and the pronounced aestheticism of some of the paintings completed after his return to the States, such as his 1881 *Portrait of Lawrence Barrett* (which will discussed in the next chapter), it seems plausible that Millet also visited the Grosvenor Gallery exhibition where works by Whistler and the artists associated with the British Aesthetic Movement were prominently displayed. Founded in 1877 as an alternative exhibition space to the more conservative Royal Academy, the Grosvenor Gallery was quickly becoming identified with the most progressive English and foreign artists of the day, notably Whistler, Edward Burne-Jones (1833-1898) and a host of other figures aligned with the tenets of Aestheticism. In addition, Leighton, who had recently assumed the presidency of the Royal Academy, and such rising Academy stars as Alma-Tadema, George Frederic Watts (1817-1904) and Edward Poynter (1836-1919), also exhibited there.[136] The third annual Grosvenor Gallery exhibition, which opened on May 1,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1879, included such works as *The Annunciation* (1862, Private collection), by Burne-Jones; *Topaz* (1879, Private collection), by Albert Moore; and *Harmony in Yellow and Gold—The Gold Girl—Portrait of Miss Connie Gilchrist* (c. 1876, The Metropolitan Museum of Art) by Whistler. The last of these, in fact, was the sensation of the English art season. Despite what he termed its "absurd" title, the critic for the Art Journal found it a "capital . . . common-sense and lifelike portrait" of a flaxen-haired girl of sixteen, "with neither hazy light nor incomprehensible misty effects."[137]

It was during his sojourn in London that Millet first met the American artist Edwin Austin Abbey (1852-1911), who would later be one of the principals in the Broadway artist colony (this will be discussed in the Epilogue). Abbey had recently arrived in the city on an assignment for Harper & Brothers to illustrate an article on Stratford-on-Avon and to prepare a series of drawings for the illustrated gift book—Selections from the Poetry of Robert Herrick (1882).[138] He and Millet quickly became close friends. In late May Abbey accompanied Millet to Paris to visit the 1879 Salon, where Millet's *Les Pacificateurs à San Stefano* was on display. While in the city they called at the studios of several colleagues, including the American painter Charles E. DuBois (1847-1885), who wrote J. Alden Weir:

> Abbey the artist & Frank Millet came to my studio today—Abbey seems to be a very charming fellow. I wish he staid (*sic*) in Paris longer; he is going back to London. Millet is going to America during the summer.[139]

As Millet made plans to return to America, Abbey provided an introduction to Charles Parsons (1821-1910), the art editor at Harper's Monthly Magazine, which resulted in a long and productive relationship between Millet and the magazine:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Frank Millet has two or three excellent short stories under consideration, if only he will write them . . . . He goes to America in August, and you are to be very fond of him indeed, because he is such a thoroughly good fellow, and because he is a dear friend of mine.[140]

In August 1879 Frank and Lily Millet sailed aboard the steamship *Denmark*, bound from London to Boston.[141] They lived for a while at the Millet homestead at 48 Plymouth Street in East Bridgewater.[142] With his father's help, Millet renovated his former studio on the family farm into separate living quarters for himself and Lily. It was here that their daughter Kate, christened Katharine Field after their friend Kate Field, was born on January 28, 1880.[143] Their extended household included the artist's parents, Dr. and Mrs. Asa Millet, his brothers—Josiah, a journalist, and Charles, a medical student at Harvard—and his sister Lucia, a gifted needlewoman, who often assisted him in the studio fashioning costumes for the models.

As he had in Paris, Millet transformed his new living quarters into a modish artistic environment, filling it with his paintings and a dazzling array of exotic objects, furnishings and costumes accumulated during his travels. Art historian Sarah Burns has written about the proliferation, beginning in the late 1870s, of these opulently decorated artists' studios, especially among the younger European-trained artists.[144] William Merritt's Chase's New York studio is perhaps the best known, but all were concerned with creating an art atmosphere that showcased the artist's erudition, taste, and creative work—marketing the producer and the product, as Burns noted, while seeming not to. Millet's studio was unusual in that, in addition to the standard travel souvenirs and exotic properties, he included American Colonial artifacts and furnishings, and English armor and weaponry. He went so far as to recreate a Colonial New England kitchen, incorporating the wood paneling and many

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

architectural features that he had salvaged from a neighboring seventeenth-century Plymouth Colony dwelling that was being demolished. Millet often used this reconstructed Colonial kitchen as a setting for his paintings of American historical subjects. Equal parts living space, workspace and marketing tool, Millet's artful habitat in the New England countryside quickly attracted the attention of the Boston and New York press. The critic for the Boston Herald provided the most detailed account of the studio:

> . . . . In the studio at East Bridgewater, [Millet] is found at work with many picturesque evidences of his foreign experiences about him, yet placed in typical New England surroundings, and interested above all in carrying out his purposes as an American, and in developing on canvas themes from American history and landscape.
>
> The studio . . . is situated on the artist's father's farm . . . .The interior space is well economized, but is crowded with old and effective adornments that cannot fail to meet the most exacting demands as to what is fitting in a painter's workroom. The long and spacious apartment with vaulted ceiling which one first enters is supplemented by a smaller one screened off by curtains at the back, which is fitted up with the utmost completeness in the style of a colonial New England kitchen. The entire woodwork of this room is extremely ancient, having been procured for the purpose from an old relic of Puritan architecture in the neighborhood recently pulled down. It is dark and mellow with age, and is composed of broad, beveled and groved [*sic*] pieces, which assume the form of panels above the jutting mantel. Under the latter is the fire-place, nine feet wide, in which bricks brought from the old house already mentioned, the date whereof—as an inscribed brick in the back of the chimney attests—was 1682. Here also hangs an iron kettle on a crane, while on the shelf above stands an ancient grease-lamp and other relics, under a flint rock musket suspended on a pair of deer's horns. A high-backed settle occupies the space in front of the hearth, with a tall clock nearby; from the kitchen rafters depend crooked-necked squashes, dried apples and herbs; and in one corner is seen an old buffet fitted into the rest of the woodwork, and decorated with glass and china. One of the windows of this unique interior is made with small diamond panes; the others contain those antiquarian's prizes, real "bull's-eye" glasses. Here, too, stands an antique flax-wheel, and in the garden outside is planted flax to be spun thereon.
>
> A ladder letting down from the kitchen ceiling provides means of ascent into a small sleeping chamber above . . . .

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

From the upper room a door opens on to a narrow gallery looking out into the long room mentioned above, which is the studio proper, provided with a dais for models to pose on, easels, a spinet or primitive piano, old chairs, a superb brass-handled desk, etc. The walls are hung with pictures, tapestries, rugs and sumptuous Eastern costumes, a further supply of the latter being stored in a big green Bulgarian chest of odd appearance. The most noticeable thing in the studio, perhaps, is a capacious divan arranged in one corner, with a canopy decorated in authentic Turkish patterns, a verse of the Koran inscribed on the frieze under this, and abundant woven hangings and hard cushions.

Innumerable mementoes of the Turkish campaign are scattered about. An Ottoman banner, marked with a dark blood stain, a Russian division flag, an elaborately illuminated copy of the Koran and a Koran reading stand of wood, inlaid with pearl, narghiles and a *mangal* or charcoal heater for lighting this kind of pipe, together with a copious assortment of swords and pistols, finely ornamented with ivory and silver . . . .

But the studio embellishments are not confined to Eastern traps. A large picture of Neapolitan fishermen in a boat, which will be remembered by many visitors to the art department of the centennial exhibition, hangs in the gallery, and behind this are some of the accoutrements which the artist wore in our late civil war. On another portion of the wall is an altar cloth from Verona, worked with the lion and ladder, which were the insignia of the great Scala family. A lobster-tailed helmet, inclosing a human skull, projects above a Roundhead gorget and breastplate, the latter carrying still a dent from some cavalier bullet. Here also is a buff coat, made after the Puritan pattern, for use in arraying a model, and an enormous flintlock gun some seven feet long, actually employed in King Phillips's war in 1665.

The country about the Bridgewaters is full of old houses, early traditions and associations with the . . . first Massachusetts plantations; and in these the subject of this article takes a great interest. Just beyond the boundaries of the farm lies an island in the placid little Setucket river . . . where Miles Standish and others negotiated with Indians a purchase of many square miles of the surrounding country. Traces of early roads and Indian paths may sometimes be detected in the extensive woods of the neighborhood, and a walk through the adjacent fields and groves revealed many charming glimpses for landscapes or backgrounds in out-door figure studies. "Our New England country is full of exquisite bits," said Mr. Millet to the writer, "as beautiful and as well adapted to make pictures of as anything the Frenchmen have." Indeed it appears as if, in this enviable situation here, the artist must be in possession of material with which to produce excellent work of a healthy native and representative character.[145]

Millet's reconstructed Colonial kitchen was part of a burgeoning fascination for the Colonial era, the antique, and the spirit of the past, that was characteristic of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the late 1870s as Americans became increasing interested in issues of national identity.[146] A complex phenomenon, the Colonial Revival comprised a nexus of different strands. Disillusionment with the Civil War and Reconstruction and worry about rapid industrialization, urbanization, and immigration provoked nostalgia for more innocent times. At the same time, centennial celebrations gave rise to patriotism and appreciation for American history. Some saw in the Colonial kitchen and furnishings exhibited at the Philadelphia Centennial Exposition the potential for design reform. The fact that Millet was a descendant of Mayflower pilgrims and other Massachusetts Bay Colony settlers undoubtedly contributed to his interest in the American Colonial period. One hesitates, however, to make too much of his Puritan heritage, because Millet's historicist interests would lead him to paint Near Eastern, classical revival, old English, Knickerbocker and early American subjects with equanimity, and with the same meticulous devotion to details of costume, accessories and setting. In fact, he would later recreate a number of authentic period rooms in several of his studios. For example, he incorporated a wainscoted Elizabethan room into his New York studio, and restored the Abbot's Grange, a fourteenth-century priory in Broadway, England, for use as several painting rooms.[147]

After settling himself and Lily into his family home in East Bridgewater, Millet resumed an active and vital role in the Boston art community. The Museum of Fine Arts and its School of Drawing and Painting continued to claim his attention. In addition to his ongoing work on the Permanent Committee of the museum school, Millet took on the responsibility of teaching a lecture class in Ancient Costume, which would occupy him through the fall of 1883.[148] During the next several years,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

he also worked closely with museum curator and chief executive Charles Greely (General) Loring (1828-1902), advising him on special exhibitions and securing loans, helping the museum assemble a costume collection, and serving on the Committee of Arrangements and on the jury for the annual exhibition of contemporary art that the museum presented from 1879 to 1885.[149]

A gregarious and engaging man who recognized the importance of professional and social relationships, Millet also lost no time in aligning himself with the city's newest art organizations. Already affiliated with the venerable Boston Art Club, in January 1880 he, along with such fellow artists as J. Foxcroft Cole, Frank Hill Smith and Henry Hobson Richardson, was a founding member of the St. Botolph Club—an art society that was established for "the promotion of social intercourse among authors and artists and other gentlemen connected with or interested in literature and art."[150] As a member of the club's Art and Library Committee, Millet played an important role in organizing the exhibitions held at the clubhouse. Later that year he joined the newly established Paint and Clay Club, an organization largely composed of artists, but including journalists and devotees of music.[151] Popular with the younger artists who, like Millet, had returned from European study, the St. Botolph clubhouse on Boylston Street and the Paint and Clay headquarters on nearby Washington Street quickly became favorite exhibition venues for the most progressive contemporary art.

In terms of his own work, Millet's correspondence and exhibition history reveal that he experimented with a variety of themes—portraits, figure studies, historical genre—and occasionally painted a few landscapes or seascapes. He sent

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

these works, as well as some of the canvases that he had painted in Europe, to the exhibition circuit in Boston and New York. Sales were slow, however, and contemporary accounts and Millet's correspondence suggest that he relied on his journalistic skills and lectures to supplement his earnings.[152] This often resulted in a frenetic work schedule. In a letter to the drama and music critic Howard Ticknor (1836-1905), Millet complained:

> I always have twenty things more to do than I have time for. Like an idiot I accept a heap of outside work that limits my painting time and worries my life out of me. The longer I live the more I find it difficult to get a living. How do people do it? – by people I mean men who do nothing but paint pictures.[153]

The pressures of relocating and earning a livelihood, along with the birth of his daughter, may have prevented Millet from finishing much new work by early 1880. As his submission to the annual spring exhibition of the National Academy of Design, which opened in March of that year, Millet sent an unidentified "small portrait," perhaps the *Portrait of John Dudley Philbrick* or one of the other portraits painted in Paris; his *A Bashi-Bazouk*; and *Mouth of the Seine* (unlocated)—the latter, most likely one of the seascapes painted at Honfleur during the summer of 1878.[154] Amidst the astonishing variety of subjects and styles on display, *A Bashi-Bazouk* (Fig. 3.19) continued to command attention, if with mixed results. The critic and painter Samuel G. W. Benjamin (1837-1914), who reviewed the exhibition for American Art Review and was generally sympathetic to foreign subjects, found much to praise, preferring Millet's Near Eastern scene to similar themes by Gérôme:

> In the *Bashi Bazouk*, or Turkish guerilla, Mr. Millet has given us a clever reminiscence of his experiences as correspondent in the late Russo-Turkish War. It is a very forcible and effective painting, so far as relates to details of costume and color, while in style it suggests no one school. It is superior to many similar subjects by Gérôme.[155]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Similarly complimentary were the comments offered by Sidney Hyde, the reviewer for the Boston Daily Advertiser and Millet's colleague, who wrote that "Millet's 'Bashi-Bazouk' [was] pronounced one of the best single pictures in the exhibition."[156] The reviewer for Art Amateur, however, dismissed Millet's Near Eastern scene as well as his portrait, remarking:

> Mr. Millet's study of a Bulgarian atrocity, showing a Bashi-Bazouk or some such unfeeling ruffian, proves that his pen has been busier than his pencil, to the latter's detriment . . . . Mr. Millet's small portrait, like his Bashi-Bazouk, is close, true and conscientious, but without magic or unusual good-luck—capable model-painting, and nothing more.[157]

Nonetheless, the artist, who had traveled to New York to see the exhibition, must have been pleased by the critical attention.[158] That Millet himself considered *A Bashi-Bazouk* an important painting, is confirmed by the $1,000 price tag he placed on the work. He must have been elated when it was purchased by the American financier John Jacob Astor (1822-1890) for his collection.[159] Millet's picture is one of a handful of paintings by American artists that was included in Edward Strahan's three-volume compendium of American art collections, The Art Treasures of America, published between 1879 and 1882, but like the majority of American works, it was neither discussed nor reproduced.[160]

A month later, in April 1880, Millet sent two figure subjects—*Neapolitan Fisher-Boy* (unlocated) and *Philosophy in Summer* 1878 (Fig. 3.16)—and a Venetian landscape, *Morning in Venice* (unlocated), to the spring exhibition of the Boston Art Club.[161] *Morning in Venice* is the first known example of Millet's work in the watercolor medium. All three works received qualified praise in American Art Review:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Two of Mr. F. D. Millet's three pieces were genre, but were to some extent disappointing. The *Morning in Venice* was extremely delicate. *The Neapolitan Fisher-Boy* offered a good theme, but was cramped in posture, and had too much the air of setting out to please. The immaculate white shirt and red cap and clean coil of rope, it must be said, were neither probable nor harmonious. *Philosophy of Summer* was very much better, introducing the graceful episode of a lady sleeping in a hammock. This composition altogether was exceedingly agreeable, notwithstanding that the painter has failed to give a glow to his scene which it needed, by leaving the sunlight outside the summer-house, and rendering it in a dull yellow at that.[162]

The reviewer for Art Amateur, however, appeared to have reversed himself, and was somewhat more generous, noting that: "F. D. Millet, shows that in his divided duty between brush and pen, the former has not lost its cunning."[163]

Millet, who was on the art and library committee of the St. Botolph Club, may have saved his new work for the society's inaugural exhibition, which opened in May 1880. A much anticipated event in the Boston art community, it was favorably reviewed by the local and New York press, prompting one critic to write "that no previous display in Boston this season has offered so rich a store of good work or a higher average excellence."[164] Another called it "the finest collection of American pictures seen in this city for many years."[165] The eclectic display featured works by such American Barbizon artists as George Inness and J. Foxcroft Cole; John Singer Sargent's portrait of his teacher, *Carolus-Duran*, of 1879 (Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williamstown, Massachusetts); and pictures by the New York painters Albert Pinkham Ryder (1847-1917), William Merritt Chase, and J. Alden Weir. Many of the works had been on view in March at the Society of American Artists exhibition at New York, another venue that showcased more avant-garde American art. The critic for American Art Review took note of the decorative quality of some of the work, applauding a stained-glass window by Frank Hill Smith,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and such paintings as Dewing's *The Spinner* (1880, Brigham Young University Art Museum, Salt Lake City, Utah) and Shirlaw's *Feeding the Doves* (location unknown).[166] Millet exhibited another of his Near Eastern subjects—*Café in Adrianople* (unlocated)—and, what may have been his first Colonial genre scene—*Sunday Morning* (unlocated) to a mixed reception. The same critic found the former-mentioned work "with its too American face under the turban, and rather cold use of richly tinted rugs," overshadowed by William Sartain's *Nubian Sheik* (c. 1880, Mairie de Villefranche, France), but admired *Sunday Morning*, commenting:

> *Sunday Morning* drew out willing testimony to its sweet and delicate feeling, and its sympathetic rendering of a Puritan theme. The accessory narcissuses [*sic*] on the table, though minute, were charmingly done.[167]

Millet must have welcomed the positive reception accorded his "Puritan theme," and it may have encouraged him to explore similar historical genre subjects reminiscent of America's past such as *Chloé* (unlocated) and *Baby Worship* (see Fig. 4.21), but it was only one of several thematic modes that the artist would essay.

The spring and summer of 1880 were a busy time for Millet. He prepared new pictures for the Museum of Fine Art's upcoming show of contemporary American art, served on the Committee of Arrangements for the exhibition, and as a member of the jury. The artist also struggled to finish several other paintings—*Baby Worship*, and the portrait of his friend Mary Ogden Adams (Mrs. Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 1843-1935), the latter a work he would not complete until the following fall. (Both of these paintings will be discussed in the next chapter). In addition, Millet continued to provide criticism to the Boston Daily Advertiser, and contributed articles to such prominent art journals as the Atlantic Monthly and American

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Architect and Building News.[168] He also lectured on his experiences in the Russo-Turkish War, illustrating his talks with sketches and authentic costumes from his own collection.[169] It was probably at this time, too, that Millet made his first foray into costume design, fashioning the Greek and Roman costumes for his forthcoming lecture series on Antique Costume at the School of Drawing and Painting, which would commence in November.[170] Millet's interest in historic costume carried over into his work at the Museum of Fine Arts. Writing to General Loring on June 28, 1880, Millet urged him to establish a costume collection:

> I desire to call your attention to a scheme which I believe will interest the Trustees of the Museum of Fine Arts, and to request you to present the same, provided you think it practicable, to the consideration of its Trustees at an early meeting.
>
> The scheme is, briefly, the establishment of a department of historical costume in the Museum of Fine Arts, in which department may be assembled for permanent exhibition, articles of clothing, objects of household use, arms, etc. which will illustrate the history of the country.[171]

Moreover, Millet began to make preparations to leave Boston.

Millet sent three figure paintings--*Chloé, Sweet Mistris Mercie* and *Corinna*—to the second annual Boston Museum of Fine Arts Exhibition of Works by Living American Artists, which opened on November 9, 1880.[172] These works remain unlocated. *Sweet Mistris Mercie* and *Corinna* are known mainly through exhibition reviews, and *Chloé* is known today from a photograph of a sketch (Fig. 3.22) provided by the artist. Despite the classical associations invoked by the title of the last-mentioned painting, *Chloé's* old-fashioned dress and spinning wheel reveal that Millet was continuing to explore themes from America's past.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Fueled by the patriotic fervor surrounding the nation's Centennial and dismay at the increasing urbanization, industrialization and immigration of the post-Civil War years, nostalgic, idealized representations of an earlier America such as the spinning *Chloé* were popular in the late nineteenth century. Such reassuring images recalled and reinforced the time-honored values and skills of a rural way of life and a more unified society.[173] The motif of a woman at her spinning wheel was in fact explored by a number of American artists, including Thomas Eakins' *In Grandmother's Time* (1876, Fig. 3.23) Elizabeth Gardner's (1837-1922) *Priscilla* (1880, location unknown), and the sculptor John Rogers' (1829-1904) *Why Don't You Speak for Yourself John?* (1885, Fig. 3.24). Many of these visual interpretations of spinning were likely inspired by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow's (1807-1882) poem, The Courtship of Miles Standish, first published in 1858, and in numerous reprints throughout the nineteenth century, that popularized the legend of the Plymouth Colony and its pivotal, romantic spinning scene with John Alden and Priscilla Mullins.[174] As mentioned earlier, Millet's direct descent from these early Pilgrims and the popularity of Colonial revival themes at the Centennial celebration surely encouraged his interest in America's past. The image of a woman in an interior engaged in a domestic task and the careful attention to costume and accessories recall Millet's *Old Flemish Woman Threading a Needle* (see Fig. 2.21), painted in Antwerp about 1872, and her numerous seventeenth-century Dutch prototypes which he had seen and admired during his visits to Dutch museums, as for example Nicholas Maes' *Old Woman Spinning* (1655, Fig. 3.25) and Gerard Dou's *Woman with a Spool of*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Thread (see Fig. 2.22).[175] The theme of women in domestic interiors is one that Millet would continue to develop in the 1880s and 1890s.

According to George Lathrop of the American Art Review, *Chloé* was among the more imposing figure paintings in an exhibition that included George Fuller's *Quadroon Girl* (1880, The Metropolitan Museum of Art) and Dewing's *Head of an Italian* (1880, location unknown). He praised all three of Millet's pictures for their careful handling and grasp of character, conventions that he associated with the artist's academic training, but faulted *Corinna* for its overpowering color:

> We will look first at the figure subjects, which, involving more than a simple pose or isolated action, extend to higher phases of composition . . . . We must mention here Mr. F. D. Millet's *Chloé*, a delicate and pleasing study of a young girl in white, busy with taper fingers at a flax-wheel . . . .The *Sweet Mistris Mercie* and *Corinna* of Mr. F. D. Millet are less praiseworthy than his *Chloé*, all three of these, by the way, showing a revival of his early Antwerp training. *Mistris Mercie*, like the others, is minutely painted, and is a good expression of meek character, but *Corinna* decidedly fails in color, the green silk dress extinguishing the face."[176]

Conversely, another reviewer lauded the artist's sense of aesthetic unity, remarking that "Millet has a wonderful power in bringing out pictures, coloring, dress and postures in perfect harmony."[177] Despite the favorable critical reception, sales were slow. By the time the press reactions to his work were published, Millet was commuting between Boston and New York.

Although he was an important participant in the Boston art world, Millet had begun to consider relocating to New York early in 1880. According to his friend Elihu Vedder, the artist traveled to New York sometime in the spring in search of a studio. Writing to the American landscape painter R. Swain Gifford (1840-1905) on July 6, 1880, Vedder broached the subject: "Have you seen Millet lately; Mrs. M.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

wrote me a couple of months ago that he had gone to New York to look for a studio. I haven't heard from him since."[178] On October 26, 1880 the Boston Evening Transcript reported that "Frank D. Millet will take possession of his New York studio in November."[179]

The initial impetus that drew Millet to New York was surely an invitation from the American painter recently turned interior decorator, Louis Comfort Tiffany, to assist with the decorative work at the Seventh Regiment Armory (see discussion in the next chapter). Millet, however, also must have sensed that the nation's art capital offered more opportunity than Boston to a young artist with high ambition and a family to support. Despite the tremendous growth in the Boston art community and Millet's early critical success, opportunities for selling his art remained meager. As early as January 23, 1880, a writer for the Boston Daily Advertiser bemoaned the lack of dealer support and patronage for American art, taking particular notice of the situation in Boston:

> The American picture dealer of the future will be the one who stimulates and encourages the native painters and is thoroughly acquainted with them and their productions . . . . The profits of the sale of foreign pictures are too tempting to the American dealer to leave him room for the attention to home productions. Abroad it is often the dealers who ferret out a man of talent and show him to the world. It is often the rule that the pictures by American artists are better appreciated abroad than at home. This is largely the fault of a mistaken prejudice among picture buyers, who will risk nothing on the probability of the successful future of an American painter. A superficial study of the picture market for the past few years is enough to show the gradual but continuous rise of American pictures in favor with the buyer. The number of successful artists in New York is nearly twice as large as it was ten years ago. Have the dealers on this account changed their habits? Possibly they will consent to exhibit a picture by a native artist . . . provided he purchases his frame in the establishment. But this is about all. The presence of a dealer in most Boston studios is so rare as to be traditional. The artists say, "as rare as dealers' visits" instead of "as rare as angels' visits."[180]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The inclusion of this unattributed newspaper clipping in Millet's scrapbook strongly suggests that he was the author.[181] Commenting on the lack of sales at Boston exhibitions, Millet's brother Josiah, a journalist who often covered the local art scene, was even more emphatic that the city needed to do more to encourage its artists:

> Boston is gaining a bad reputation as being one of the worst markets for pictures, and as artists must live, they cannot be expected to send their works to a place from which they are tolerably certain they will be returned.[182]

In contrast to the situation in Boston, following the close of the Fifty-fifth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design in New York on May 29, 1880, several commentators on the arts made note of its very successful season. The remarks of the writer for American Art Review are typical: "At the National Academy of Design, the attendance has been better than last year. The sales, up to the present writing, amount to $28,000, a greater sum than was ever reached before. The buyers are scattered from Bangor, Maine to Chicago, Illinois."[183] Although Millet would continue to use his studio in East Bridgewater for another year, and although he never relinquished his ties to Boston, by November of 1880 he had shifted his activities to New York.

By the time Millet relocated to New York in 1880, he had established himself as an important and influential member of the Boston art community who had made significant contributions to the advance of culture in the "Athens" of America. A leader of the new generation of American artists who had returned from European training, he had brought back with him new ideas about art and culture nourished by his academic training, his extensive travels throughout Europe and the Near East, and his direct involvement with several major international expositions. A return trip to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Europe and the Near East in 1877-1879 had refreshed his allegiance to cosmopolitan artistic ideals, and allowed him to participate in major international shows, including the 1878 Brussels Exposition, and the 1879 Paris Salon and Royal Academy exhibitions, which further enhanced his reputation abroad. The elaborate European cultural infrastructure, and the European view of the importance of public service to the arts, had also continued to impress Millet. His familiarity with Italian Renaissance and Baroque mural ensembles, and the revival of monumental mural painting in Antwerp, had informed his contribution to the decorative program at Trinity Church, Boston, and he had translated the high level of public and private commitment to art and art education that he had witnessed in Europe into a vital involvement in the Boston art community. Millet's professional association with the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston had resulted in a number of important contributions to that institution. He had played a major role in launching the museum's School of Drawing and Painting, where he also taught classes in ancient costume; fostered the establishment of the museum costume collection; and served on the Committee of Arrangements and the jury for the museum's annual exhibition of contemporary American art. Moreover, he had helped found the St. Botolph Club, one of Boston's most progressive exhibition forums, which catered to younger artists like Millet who were working in European-inspired modes.

During this period Millet produced portraits, expressive figure paintings, and occasional seascapes that continued to reflect his European training, his respect for old masters, his extensive travels, and his familiarity with a wide range of current cosmopolitan trends encountered at international exhibitions and salons. Without

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

abandoning his academic realist armature and idealistic artistic philosophy, Millet's work had become increasingly concerned with formal issues. Inspired primarily by the art of the British Aesthetic movement, Millet reinvigorated his search for aesthetic unity in his work. Millet's eclectic range of subjects—portraits and such international themes as exotic bashi-bazouks and other Near Eastern images, picturesque Italian motifs, fashionable contemporary genre, poetic seascapes, and Near Eastern and American Colonial historical scenes—reflect the impact of his foreign study, the cosmopolitan taste he had encountered at international exhibitions, his peripatetic travels and personal interests, as well as his search for subjects with viable art market appeal. Although the works that Millet sent to major exhibitions in Boston and New York, were greeted with critical acclaim, sales languished, especially in Boston. A stagnant national economy, and a seemingly inhospitable Boston art market for young American artists, had made it difficult for Millet to support himself by his art. In fact, he was forced to turn to journalism and lecturing to supplement his income. New York, as the art center of the nation, offered more opportunities for professional advancement and, he hoped, a more active art market. A new decorative commission, which generally paid more handsomely than easel painting, was not something that an ambitious artist with a young family to support could easily ignore. It also presented an opportunity to test the New York market, and perhaps evaluate a more permanent move.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Endnotes to Chapter 3

[1] Information on the effects of the industrial revolution in Massachusetts and Boston is based on Jack Tager, "Massachusetts and the Age of Economic Revolution," in Jack Tager and John W. Ifkovic, Editors, Massachusetts in the Gilded Age: selected essays (Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1985), pp. 3-28. Population statistics for the city of Boston are based on www.bpl.org/research/govdocs/boststats.htm, and are partly due to annexation.

[2] For a discussion of the decline of the Hudson River School see Doreen Bolger and Catherine Hoover Voorsanger, "The Hudson River School in Eclipse," in Kevin J. Avery et al, American Paradise: The World of the Hudson River School, exhibition catalog (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1987), pp. 71-98.

[3] [Clarence Cook],"Fine Arts. The National Academy of Design. Fiftieth Annual Exhibition. Third Notice," New York Tribune, 29 April 1875, p. 7.

[4] For a discussion of the complexity and protean nature of American art during this period see: Bolger and Voorsanger, "The Hudson River School in Eclipse," pp, 71-98; Weinberg, "Cosmopolitan Concerns and Critical Controversies," pp. 19-26; Huntington, "The Quest for Unity," pp. 11-46; and Doreen Bolger Burke, "Painters and Sculptors In A Decorative Age," in Doreen Bolger Burke et al, In Pursuit of Beauty, Americans and the Aesthetic Movement, exhibition catalog (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1987), pp. 294-338.

[5] Nancy Allyn Jarzombek, Boston Art Club, 1855-1950 (Boston: Vose Galleries of Boston, 2000), p. 1.

[6] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, 12 July 1875, CWS/SUL.

[7] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 9 May 1875, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 855.

[8] "Art and Artists," Boston Evening Transcript, 10 August 1875, p. 3 reported: "Mr. Frank Millet of this city arrived home in the Atlas on Saturday."

[9] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, 15 August 1875, CWS/SUL.

[10] Asa Millet's purchase of 48 Plymouth Street, East Bridgewater, Massachusetts is recorded in Plymouth County Deed 409-197.

[11] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, 19 October 1875, CWS/SUL

[12] Ibid. 15 November, [1875].

[13] See for example F. D. Millet, "An Hour in an Italian Amphitheatre," Appletons' Journal 14 (28 August 1875), pp. 273-274; idem, "A Fourth of July in San Marino," ibid., (20 November 1875), pp. 652-655; and idem, "The Fourth Waits," Atlantic Monthly 38 (November 1876), pp. 578-597. Clippings of fifty-seven unsigned articles on the Boston art scene that were published in the Boston Daily Advertiser between October 19, 1875 and May 18, 1880 are included in Millet Scrapbook II, AAA&L, suggesting his authorship. For Millet's articles on the Fine Arts at the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition, which were published in the Boston Daily Advertiser and American Architect and Building News, see Notes 33, 41-45, and 78 below.

[14] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, 8 December [1875], CWS/SUL.

[15] The Boston Directory (Boston: Sampson, Davenport, and Company, 1876), p. 629.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[16] The nostalgia and rising nationalism engendered by the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exposition sparked an interest in America's colonial history. Millet was one of many American and European artists who would experiment with American colonial themes. For a discussion of the Colonial Revival Movement in America see William H. Truettner and Roger B. Stein et al, Picturing Old New England: Image and Memory, exhibition catalogue (National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, 1999); Michael Kammen, Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture (New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1991), pp. 93-193; and Celia Betsky, "Inside the Past: The Interior and the Colonial Revival in American Art and Literature, 1860-1914," pp. 241-277 in Alan Axelrod, ed., The Colonial Revival in America (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1985).

[17] "Mr. F. D. Millet's Paintings," Boston Daily Advertiser, 3 February 1876, p. 2.

[18] Ibid.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Ibid. Millet subsequently was appointed art editor at the Boston Daily Advertiser, although the exact date remains unknown. See Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, 6 September, 1876, CWS/SUL, in which Millet reports that he still rattles "round in the chair of art editor" at the newspaper."

[21] Boston Evening Transcript, 25 February 1876, p. 6.

[22] Catalogue of the Fifty-First Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design, 1876 (New York: E. Wells Sacket & Bro., 1876), No. 108 *Portrait of a Little Girl* and No. 531 *Arithmetic Lesson – Portrait*. As the latter portrait is listed as owned by Millet's brother-in-law Nathan Dunphe, it is likely the portrait of his young nephew Carroll Smith Dunphe.

[23] Henry T. Tuckerman, "Children," Galaxy 4 (1868), pp. 318-320. Quoted in Patricia Hills, The Painters' America, Rural and Urban Life, 1810-1910 (New York: Praeger Publishers in Association with the Whitney Musuem of American Art, 1974), p. 74. Modern scholars such as Sarah Burns have viewed these nostalgic images of children as sentimentalized antidotes to the ills of Gilded Age society that ignored the social realities of urban and suburban childhood. See Sarah Burns: Pastoral Inventions: Rural Life in Nineteenth-Century American Art and Culture (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1989), pp. 299-313.

[24] [Clarence Cook], "Academy of Design. Fifty-First Annual Exhibition," New York Tribune, 6 May 1876, p. 2.

[25] "Art," Atlantic Monthly 37 (June 1876), 761.

[26] "The Old Cabinet," Scribner's Monthly 12, 2 (June 1876), p. 271.

[27] For a discussion of the Colonial Revival Movement in America see Note 16 above.

[28] Massachusetts Centennial Art Exhibition, At The Galleries Of The Boston Art Club. (Boston: April 1876), Nos. 4, 5 and 134.

[29] "The Fine Arts," Boston Daily Advertiser , 23 February 1876, p. 2; "Art," Atlantic Monthly 37 (May 1876), pp. 632-633; and East Bridgewater Public Library Typescript. Research efforts to locate the Copley portrait and corroborate these claims have thus far been unsuccessful. However, Mrs. Keith's open robe gown of imported Spitalfields silk, although worn improperly, is very similar to one worn by the woman known as Mrs. Richard Skinner painted by John Singleton Copley in 1772

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(Museum of Fine Arts, Boston). I am grateful to Dr. Carrie Rebora Barratt, Curator, American Paintings and Sculpture, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, for bringing this to my attention.

[30] Ibid., Atlantic Monthly, pp. 632-633.

[31] Ibid.

[32] For the Centennial Exhibition see John Maass, The Glorious Enterprise: The Centennial Exhibition of 1876 (Watkins Glen, New York: The American Life Foundation and Study Institute, 1973), Findling, Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs, pp. 59-61; Merle Curti, "America at the World Fairs, 1851-1893," American Historical Review 55 (July 1950), pp. 833-856.

[33] See the following newspaper clippings in AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook II. F. D. M., "The Exhibition. First Impressions of the Visitor After an Exterior View," Boston Daily Advertiser, 20 May 1876, p. 2; idem, "The Exhibition. A Comparison with the Vienna Weltaustellung," ibid., 22 May 1876, p. 2; idem, "The Exhibition. The Visit of the Commercial Club of Boston," ibid., 23 May 1876, p. 2; idem, "The Exhibition. Appearance of the Display in Memorial Hall," ibid., 24 May 1876, p. 4; idem, "The Exhibition. The Distribution of Space in the Grounds," ibid., 7 June 1876, p. 4; idem, "The Austrian Art-Department," ibid., 10 June 1876, p. 1; [F. D. M.], "German Exhibition of Fine Arts," ibid., 16 June, 1876, p. 4; idem, "The Exhibition. The English and French Ceramics," ibid., 21 June 1876, p. 1; idem, "The Exhibition. Metal and Enamel Work," ibid., 3 July 1876, p. 1; idem, "The Great Corliss Engine," ibid., 31 July 1876, p. 2. See also the following unsigned clippings in AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook II. [F. D. Millet], "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—I," American Architect and Building News 1 (July 1876), pp. 213-214; idem, "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—III," ibid., (15 July 1876), p. 229; idem, "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—IV," ibid., (22 July 1876), p. 236; idem, "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—V," ibid., (29 July 1876), p. 245; idem, "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—VI," ibid., (5 August 1876), p. 254; idem, "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—VII," ibid., (12 August 1876), pp. 261-262; and idem, "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—VIII," ibid., (19 August 1876), pp. 269-270.

[34] F. D. M., "The Exhibition. First Impressions of the Visitor," p. 2.

[35] Quoted in Charles Moore, Daniel H. Burnham, Architect, Planner of Cities (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1921), 1:50. Burnham recalled the events: "Frank Millet came in about three months after our first meeting. I had selected as Director of Color, William Pretyman . . . . He was to have charge of the decoration; and knowing that staff was to be used he had begun to work out a general coloring. He concluded that ivory would be the best color. The Eastern crowd came out when Beman's building was nearly finished. I was urging every one on, knowing it was an awful fight against time. We talked about colors, and finally the thought came, 'Let us make it all perfectly white.' I don't recall who made the suggestion. It might have been one of those ideas that occur to all minds at once . . . . At any rate, the decision was mine. At the time Pretyman was in the East, and I had Beman's building made cream white. When Pretyman came back he was outraged . . . . He then said he would get out, and he did. McKim and George Post recommended Frank Millet for the place. I had great faith in Post's judgment of men; so I went down to New York and met Frank at a dinner given at Delmonico's. . . . He organized the whitewash-gang. Turner of New York had devised a method of blowing paint on buildings, and this Frank adopted." F. D. Millet, "Report of the Director of Decoration & Functions," in Daniel H. Burnham, The Final Official Report of The Director of Works of The World's Columbian Exposition (June, 1894; repr., New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989), pp. 57, 58, 61,66. Millet detailed the mechanical painting in his report: "The mechanical side of the [painting] question naturally occupied my attention first . . . . I concluded within a very short time that the Exposition Company could . . . save from forty to sixty percent on mechanical painting by undertaking the work with its own force; and, at my request, the force of painters on the miscellaneous roll was turned over to me. On the 13th of June, 1892, Mr. C. Y. Turner was appointed as my Assistant, and in a few days we organized a force and started in with the interior painting of the dome of the Horticultural building, in order to find out, if possible, to what extent our

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

estimates coincided with the results of actual experience. It was soon proven to our satisfaction that these estimates were nearly enough correct to warrant the employment of a larger force and the organization of a more thorough system of work in a purely mechanical direction. From among the journeymen painters at work, I selected a general foreman—James Hunt . . . . In the middle of August 1892, Mr. E. D. Allen was employed as Superintendent of Painting, and the organization of the mechanical forces was thoroughly perfected and preparations were made to undertake the painting of the interiors of the great buildings . . . the calcimining of the Agricultural building was begun on September 3rd, 1892 . . . .I had been experimenting for a long time with a mechanical device for applying color to rough, uneven areas, with the co-operation of Mr. C. Y. Turner, my Assistant, and by the employment of a Turner rotary air compressor, we finally succeeded in perfecting a machine of simple construction, very much on the plan of the well known atomizer, which would convert the liquid paint . . . into a spray, so that the . . . work could be performed with much greater rapidity and ease . . . . As soon as the weather permitted, the exteriors of the buildings were attacked, and after brief experimentation, we decided upon a lime wash which was applied successfully, cheaply and expeditiously on the following buildings: Manufactures and Liberal Arts, Agricultural, Administration, Electricity, Mines and Mining, Horticultural, Woman's and Fisheries, in turn."

[36] For the British Aesthetic Movement see Roger B. Stein, "Artifact as Ideology: The Aesthetic Movement in Its American Cultural Context," in Doreen Bolger Burke et al, In Pursuit of Beauty: Americans and the Aesthetic Movement, exhibition catalog (Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1986), pp. 25-28.

[37] [F. D. M.], "The Exhibition. The English and French Ceramics," Boston Daily Advertiser, 21 June 1876, p. 1; and idem, ""The Exhibition. Metal and Enamel Work," Boston Daily Advertiser, 3 July 1876, p. 1, newspaper clippings, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook II.

[38] Ibid., "The English and French Ceramics."

[39] Susan Hobbs, 1876: American Art of the Centennial, exhibition catalog (National Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D. C., 1976), pp. 8-9.

[40] "American Art," Scribner's Monthly 13, 1 (November 1876), p. 126.

[41] Millet's views on the English fine arts collection at the Centennial are found in F. D. M., "The Exhibition. English Contributions To The Fine Art Department," Boston Daily Advertiser, 25 May 1876, p. 1; and [F. D. Millet], "The Fine Arts At The Centennial.—II," American Architect and Building News (8 July 1876), p. 221, newspaper clippings, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook II.

[42] [F. D. Millet], "The Fine Arts At The Centennial.—V. The Dutch Pictures," American Architect and Building News (29 July 1876), p. 245.

[43] [F. D. Millet], "The Fine Arts At The Centennial—VIII. The American Pictures," American Architect and Building News (19 August 1876), p. 269.

[44] [Millet], "The Fine Arts At The Centennial—II," p. 221.

[45] Ibid.

[46] Earl Marble, "Art in Boston. Centennial Pictures," Aldine 8, 6 (June 1876), pp. 191-192.

[47] Edward Strahan [Earl Shinn], The Masterpieces of the Centennial International Exhibition (Philadelphia: Gebbie & Barrie, 1876; reprint, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977), 1: 50-51.

[48] For a thorough discussion of La Farge's decorative program at Trinity Church, Boston see

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

H. Barbara Weinberg, "The Decorative Work of John La Farge," Ph.D. dissertation, Columbia University, 1972, pp. 72-144.

[49] Ibid, p. 98. notes that the names "of these men are recorded in the lower border of the decorative panel over the west arch in the tower" of Trinity Church, Boston.

[50] Rapport Annuel. Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts a Anvers. 1871-72, pp. 23-24; and Rapport Annuel. Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts a Anvers. 1872-73, p. 24.

[51] Siska Beele, "De Roem Van De Antwerpse Kunstschool," in Nicaise De Keyser Dossier. Tentoonstelling 1, 2 (Antwerp: Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten, 2000), p. 6.

[52] Frederic Crowninshield, Mural Painting, (Boston: Tichnor and Company, 1887), p. 38 notes Millet's expertise in the encaustic technique. See also George Maynard, "Francis Davis Millet—A Reminiscence," Art and Progress 3, 9 (July 1912), p. 654; and Booth and Millet, Chapter 4, pp. 3-4, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[53] Pauline King, American Mural Painting (Boston: Noyes, Platt & Company, 1902), p. 18.

[54] Weinberg, "The Decorative Work of John La Farge," p. 120.

[55] Ibid. , p. 102.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Henry Van Brunt, "The New Dispensation of Monumental Art," Atlantic Monthly 43 (May 1879), p. 637.

[58] Clarence Cook, "Recent Church Decoration," Scribner's Monthly 15, 4 (February 1878), p. 574.

[59] Francis Davis Millet Padua – Piacenza Diary, 1875, not microfilmed, FDM/AAA.

[60] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, 2 December [1876], CWS/SUL.

[61] Walter Muir Whitehill, Museum of Fine Arts Boston, A Centennial History (Cambridge: The Belknap Press, 1970), 1: 10.

[62] Museum of Fine Arts. School of Drawing And Painting. First Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1877), p. 3.

[63] Ibid., pp. 14-15. The twelve members of the Permanent Committee of the Museum School listed in the First Annual Report are the three principal officers and trustees of the museum, Martin Brimmer, C. C. Perkins and Charles G. Loring; the architects, Edward C. Cabot, Robert S. Peabody and William R. Ware; five painters, William Morris Hunt, John La Farge, Francis William Loring, Francis D. Millet and Frank Hill Smith; and Edward W. Hooper, Treasurer of Harvard College.

[64] Ibid., p. 14.

[65] H. Winthrop Peirce, The History of The School Of The Museum Of Fine Arts, Boston, 1877-1927 (Boston: T. O. Metcalf Company, 1930), pp. 18, 23.

[66] Francis Davis Millet to Otto Grundmann, 30 September [1876], quoted in Ibid, p. 26.

[67] Peirce, The History of the School, p. 28.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[68] Information on the program of instruction at the Museum School is based on the Museum of Fine Arts School of Drawing and Painting, Annual Reports for the years 1877-1885, School of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston Papers, [hereafter SMFAB], AAA, Reel 4998, Frames 36-124.

[69] Sylvester Baxter, "The Art-Schools of Boston," pp. 189-190.

[70] Peirce, The History of the School, pp. 32-34.

[71] Adams' diary entries indicate that he commenced sitting for the portrait on July 9, 1876, and that the portrait was finished September 14, 1876. See Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Diary, 9 July and 14 September 1876, Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Papers, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston [hereafter CFAJ Papers/MHS, Reel 2, Vol. 11.

[72] Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Diary, 4 August 1876, CFAJ Papers/MHS, Reel 2, Vol. 11.

[73] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, 2 December [1876], CWS/SUL states: "Mark Twain came into the church the other day and we had a good talk about you . . . . Mr. Howells sends you his compliments likewise Clemens who has asked me to come to Hartford and paint his portrait. I was obliged to decline because I am going away."

[74] W. D. Howells to Samuel Clemens, 30 November 1876, quoted in Henry Nash Smith and William M. Gibson, Editors, Mark Twain – Howells Letters (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960), p. 165.

[75] J. A. Crowe and G. B. Cavalcaselle, Titian: His Life and Times (London: John Murray, 1877), 2: 90 notes that Titian's painting was in the Museum of Naples during the early 1870s.

[76] The American writer, humorist and lecturer Samuel Langhorne Clemens (1835-1910), known professionally as Mark Twain, was on his way to achieving a national and international reputation in early 1877 when Millet painted his portrait. His latest novel The Adventures of Tom Sawyer had appeared in December 1876, and quickly captured attention as the symbol of American boyhood. He had already achieved recognition with Innocents Abroad (1869) and The Gilded Age (1873), the latter a collaboration with Charles Dudley Warner. Following his early success, and with the financial help of his father-in-law, Clemens in 1873 had built himself what his friend Howells termed "a stately mansion" at Nook Farm, a wooded subdivision of Hartford, Connecticut. It was in this new residence that Millet painted Clemens' portrait in January 1877. According to Clemens' biographer Albert Bigelow Paine, Millet "captured the fervent admiration of the entire family." Thus began a friendship that was strengthened when Clemens and Millet met again in Paris in 1879, and endured until Clemens died in 1910. See Albert Bigelow Paine, Mark Twain, A Biography (New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1912), 2: 583.

[77] Samuel Clemens to Francis Davis Millet [23 January 1877], quoted in Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 12, p. 4, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[78] [F. D. Millet], "The Fine Arts At The Centennial.—IV. The Austrian, Scandinavian, and Danish Pictures," American Architect and Building News (22 July 1876), p. 236.

[79] National Academy of Design. Illustrated Catalogue of the Fifty-second Annual Exhibition (New York: E. Wells Sackett & Bro., 1877), No. 187 *Portrait, C. F. Adams, Jr.*, and No. 240 *Portrait, "Mark Twain," S. L. Clemens.*

[80] "The Academy Exhibition," Art Journal New Series, 13 (1877), p. 157.

[81] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook II.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[82] Katharine Merrill to Emily Adams McCleary, 7 March 1877, quoted in Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 4, p. 6, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[83] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, 11 March 1877, and 24 April [1877], CWS/SUL.

[84] Millet's granddaughter mentions his beginning a painting for the Paris Salon, see Sharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune, p. 36; Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, 11 March 1877, CWS/SUL appears to dispute this claim.

[85] Ibid. 11 March 1877.

[86] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Warren Stoddard, 24 April 1877, CWS/SUL.

[87] Ibid. 24 April 1877.

[88] For Millet's activities as a correspondent in the Russo-Turkish War, see Sharpey-Shafer, Soldier of Fortune, pp. 36-47; Millet, "Frank Millet—A Sketch," pp. 16-20, FDM/AAA, Reel 848; Booth and Millet, Chapter 5, p JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100; F. D. Millet, "Mr. F. D. Millet and Mr. MacGahan in the Russo-Turkish Campaign," London Daily News, 21 January 1896; idem, "A Tragedy above the Clouds," Youth's Companion 70 (26 November 1896), pp. 633-634; Archibald Forbes, Czar and Sultan (Bristol, New York, 1894); Frank D. Millet, "Campaigning with the Cossacks," Harper's Monthly 74 (January 1887), pp. 235-250, and (February 1887), pp. 397-411; idem, "A Courier's Ride," Harper's Monthly 83 (October 1891), pp. 756-765; and The War Correspondence of the "Daily News," 1877-78 (London: Macmillan and Co., 1878).

[89] The Third Triennial Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College. Fourth Report – June, 1878 (Boston: Press of Rockwell & Churchill, 1878), pp. 35-36.

[90] Millet's war medals were presented to the East Bridgewater, Massachusetts Public Library on March 21, 2001 by his grandchildren, Josephine Millet Flynn and Francis Davis Millet II.

[91] Kathleen [Merrill] to a friend, 21 April 1878, FDM/ AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 861-863.

[92] The War Correspondence of the "Daily News," 1877-78.

[93] For the American artist colony in Paris see Armstrong, Margaret, ed., Day Before Yesterday, Reminiscences of a Varied Life by Maitland Armstrong (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920), pp. 266-269, 275, 283; and Homer Saint-Gaudens, ed., The Reminiscences of Augustus Saint-Gaudens (London: Andrew Melrose, 1918) 1: 214-216, 221-222, 243-250.

[94] Koch, p. 13.

[95] Armstrong, Day Before Yesterday, 275.

[96] Some of the sketches Millet made during the Russo-Turkish war are included in FDM/AAA, Reel 1098.

[97] [George Lathrop], "Frank Millet, A New England Artist in His Rural Studio," Boston Herald, [1880], undated newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[98] Ibid.

[99] Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet; A Versatile American," extensively quote Millet's horrific accounts of the brutalities of both the Russian and Turkish armies. See especially Chapter 5, pp. 31-34, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[100] Exposition Générale des Beaux-Arts 1878, Catalogue Explicatif (Bruxelles: Adlophe Mertens, 1878), p. 100.

[101] For a thorough discussion of the Society of American Artists see Jennifer A. Martin Bienenstock, "The Formation And Early Years of the Society of American Artists: 1877-1884," Ph.D. dissertation, The Graduate Center of The City University of New York, 1983.

[102] Saint-Gaudens, who was working in Paris on his *Farragut* monument in 1877, was in charge of organizing the American artists working abroad. On October 12, 1877 he wrote Helena de Kay Gilder, "I got a meeting together last Sunday evening of several of the artists here—The proposition was rec'd with enthusiasm—the following gentlemen have pledged themselves to send to A.A.A. and join heartily and earnestly in the idea, John Singer Sargent, Mary Cassatt, Charles Sprague Pearce, Henry Leland, Theodore Robinson, Frederick A. Bridgman, Milne Ramsey, Edwin Howland Blashfield, Charles DuBois, Walter Bay, and Frank Millet." As Millet was at the warfront in Bulgaria in October, Saint-Gaudens may have secured his cooperation earlier, or by correspondence. Augustus Saint-Gaudens to Helena de Kay Gilder, 12 October 1877, Papers of Augustus Saint-Gaudens, Rauner Special Collections Library, Dartmouth College, Hanover, New Hampshire, Reel 7, Frames 653-655. A.A.A. refers to American Art Association, the original title of the organization before it altered its title to the Society of American Artists in February 1878.

[103] "American Art," Daily Evening Telegraph—Philadelphia, 13 March 1878, unpaginated newspaper clipping, Archives of American Art, Papers of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Reel P53, frame 255.

[104] Reports of the United States Commissioners to the Paris Universal Exposition, 1878 (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1880), pp. 60-61

[105] Armstrong, Day Before Yesterday p. 266.

[106] Ibid. , p. 210.

[107] Sharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune, p. 51.

[108] Unless otherwise noted, information on the Paris 1878 Exposition Universelle is based on Findling, Historical Dictionary, pp. 62-71; Curti, "America at the World Fairs," p. 848; Reports of the United States Commissioners to the Paris Universal Exposition, 1878 II (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1880); and Edward Strahan [Earl Shinn], The Chefs-D'Oeuvre D'Art of the International Exhibition, 1878 (Philadelphia: Gebbie & Barrie Publishers, 1878).

[109] "International Art At The Universal Exposition, Paris. Part I. – France," Art Journal 17 (1878), p. 197.

[110] William W. Story, "Report on The Fine Arts," in Reports of the United States Commissioners to the Paris Universal Exposition, 1878, Volume II (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880), pp. 12, 14.

[111] Findling, Historical Dictionary, p. 848.

[112] Strahan [Earl Shinn], The Chefs-D'Oeuvre D'Art of the International Exhibition, 1878, pp. 115-116.

[113]Story, "Report on The Fine Arts," pp. 9-10.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[114] D. Maitland Armstrong, "Report of D. Maitland Armstrong," in Reports of the United States Commissioners to the Paris Universal Exposition, 1878, (Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1880), 1: 83, 85.

[115] "Alphabetical Catalog of the United States Exhibitors in the Art Gallery of the Universal Exposition of 1878 at Paris," in Reports of the United States Commissioners, 1: 387-389.

[116] Millet's activities at Honfleur are detailed in The Fourth Triennial Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College. Fifth Report – June, 1881, (Boston: Press of Rockwell & Churchill, 1881), p. 32. For a discussion of the popularity of such seaside resorts as Honfleur on the English Channel with artists and middle class vacationers, see Robert L. Herbert, Impressionism: Art, Leisure, and Parisian Society (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988), pp. 265-302. For a discussion of American artists who painted at Honfleur and at other resorts in Normandy, see David Sellin, Americans in Brittany and Normandy, 1860-1910, exhibition catalog (National Museum of American Art, 1983).

[117] The Fourth Triennial Report, 1881, p. 32. Millet wrote: "After the award of the recompenses I went to Normandy, in the vicinity of Honfleur, where I remained until November. Among various canvases I covered during that period I may mention one—'Philosophy in Summer.'"

[118] Paintings, Drawings and Studies By The Late Francis Davis Millet, No. 16 *Shore Between Honfleur and Trouville* and No. 43 *Near Honfleur*.

[119] "Millet's Parisian Quarters," unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[120] For a discussion of the popularity of the outdoor porch as a setting for leisure-class lounging and entertaining in America during the late nineteenth and early twentieth century, see Ronald G. Pisano, Idle Hours: Americans At Leisure 1865-1914 (Boston: Little Brown and Company, 1988), pp. 15-21.

[121] The Fourth Triennial Report, 1881, p. 32.

[122] "Millet's Parisian Quarters."

[123] For the American Aesthetic Movement see Stein, "Artifact as Ideology," pp. 23-51; and Doreen Bolger Burke, "Painters and Sculptors in a Decorative," pp. 295-339 in Burke et al, In Pursuit of Beauty.

[124] Allen Staley, "Whistler and His World," in Allen Staley and Theodore Reff, From Realism to Symbolism: Whistler and His World, exhibition catalog (Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1971), p. 16; and Robert Koch, Louis C. Tiffany, Rebel In Glass (New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1965), p. 13. Both authors note the presence of *The Primrose Room* in the 1878 Paris Exposition. Millet, undoubtedly, was also familiar with the writings of the American art critic Clarence Cook (1828-1900). Cook's writings on furniture and interior decoration in the 1870s, most notably his 1877 book The House Beautiful (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, c. 1877) and his articles in Scribner's Monthly, contributed to the Aesthetic movement in America.

[125] In late July and August 1872, Millet and his fellow Antwerp classmates—Champney, Wetherbee, Grundman, Copeland and Elwell—traveled to London. Champney, in his correspondence, notes that the group visited "the International Exhibition at S. Kensington." See Edwin Graves Champney to his father, 20 August 1872, EGCP/AAA Reel 2898, Frames 101-106 and discussion in Chapter 2, pages 72-73. They could hardly have missed seeing Whistler's *Symphony in White No. 2: The Little White Girl*, (1864) which was on display there. That same summer Whistler's *Arrangement in Grey and Black: Portrait of the Painter's Mother* (1871) was on display at the Royal Academy. See Dorment and MacDonald et al, James McNeill Whistler, pp. 78, 141.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[126] "Celebrities at Home, No. XCII: Mr. James Whistler at Cheyne-walk," London World, 22 May 1878, pp. 4-5. Quoted in Robyn Asleson, Albert Moore (London: Phaidon, Press, 2000), p. 221, fn. 111.

[127] The Exhibition of the Royal Academy of Arts, 1879, pp. 14, 43.

[128] Paintings, Drawings and Studies By The Late Francis Davis Millet, No. 57 *A Turk*.

[129] For details on Millet's marriage see Kathleen [Merrill] to a friend, 19 March 1879, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 871-874; and Saint-Gaudens, The Reminiscences of Augustus Saint-Gaudens, 1: 248-250.

[130] Biographical information regarding Elizabeth Greeley Merrill is based on Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 5, p. 63, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100; Francis Davis Millet II, "Frank Millet—A Sketch," pp. 19-20, FDM/AAA, Reel 848; The New York Times, 19 June 1932, p. 26; Sharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune, pp. 56, 59; and Joyce Sharpey-Schafer, interview by author, Penzance, England, 13 June 1999.

[131] Sharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune, p. 59.

[132] Kathleen [Merrill] to a friend, 19 March 1879. Quoted in ibid., pp 54-55.

[133] Harvard College . . . . Triennial Report. No. 3, p. 32.

[134] Charles E. Pascoe, "The Royal Academy," Art Journal New Series 5, 7 (1879), pp. 219-222.

[135] Ibid. , p. 220.

[136] For information on the Grosvenor Gallery see Christopher Newall, The Grosvenor Gallery Exhibitions: Change and Continuity in the Victorian Art World (Cambridge, England: University Press, 1995); and Colleen Denney, At the Temple of Art: The Grosvenor Gallery, 1877-1890 (Madison, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2000.

[137] Charles E. Pascoe, "The Grosvenor Gallery Summer Exhibition," Art Journal New Series, 5 (1879), pp. 223-224.

[138] E. V. Lucas, Edwin Austin Abbey, Royal Academician: A Record of His Life and Work, 2 vols. (London: Methuen and Company Limited, 1921), 1: 55-69.

[139] Charles E. DuBois to J. Alden Weir, 14 May 1879, J. Alden Weir Papers, AAA, Reel 71, Frame 1068.

[140] Edwin Austin Abbey to Charles Parsons, 15 June 1879, quoted in Lucas, Edwin Austin Abbey, 1: 85.

[141] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[142] Sharpey-Shafer, Soldier of Fortune, p. 57; Millet, "Frank Millet—A Sketch, p. 20, FDM/AAA, Reel 848; and Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet, A Versatile American," Chapter 6, p.1, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[143] Sharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune, pp. 57, 60; Booth and Millet, "A Versatile American," Chapter 6, p. 1, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100. Booth and Millet claim that Kate Millet was named for Kate Field and Kathleen (Kato) Merrill, Lily Merrill's sister.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[144] Sarah Burns, Inventing the Modern Artist: Art and Culture in Gilded Age America (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996), pp. 49-59.

[145] [George Lathrop], "Frank D. Millet: A New England Artist in his Rural Studio," Boston Herald [1880]. Descriptions of Millet's East Bridgewater studio were also published in "Personal," New York Tribune, 2 February 1880, p. 4; and in "Art News—Boston News," Art Amateur 2, 5 (April 1880), p. 99.

[146] The Old New England Kitchen that the State of Massachusetts installed in a log cabin annex at the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exposition may also have been a point of departure for Millet's interest in the American Colonial period and for the reconstruction of a similar kitchen in his East Bridgewater studio in 1879-1880. For a discussion concerning the Colonial Revival Movement see Truettner and Stein, Picturing Old New England; Kammen, Mystic Chords, pp. 93-193; and Celia Betsky, "Inside the Past," pp. 242-277.

[147] "The Abbot's Grange and Russell House, Broadway, Worcestershire, The Residence of Mr. F. D. Millet," Country Life 29, 732 (January 14, 1911), p. 59.

[148] See Museum of Fine Arts. School of Drawing and Painting. Fourth Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of The School (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1881), pp. 5, 16-17; Museum of Fine Arts. School of Drawing and Painting. Fifth Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1882), pp. 6, 16; and Museum of Fine Arts. School of Drawing and Painting. Sixth Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1883), pp 6, 15. Dates of the first series of lectures, which began in November 1880, are detailed in American Art Review II, First Division (1881), p. 38.

[149] See Millet's correspondence with General Loring, Papers of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Archives of American Art [hereafter MFAB/AAA], Reels 549 –560. For Millet's involvement with the Museum's annual exhibitions of contemporary art see also "Art and Artists," Boston Evening Transcript, 26 October 1880, p. 6; "Exhibitions and Sales. Boston," American Art Review II, First Division (1881), pp. 39-40; and "Coming Exhibitions," Studio 1, 26 (June 30 1883), p. 294.

[150] "Clubs," American Art Review I (1880), p. 176. Constitution and By-Laws of The St. Botolph Club in Boston. 10 January 1880 (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1880), pp. 6-7.

[151] Trevor J. Fairbrother, "Painting in Boston, 1870-1930," p. 41 in Trevor J. Fairbrother et al, The Bostonians: Painters of an Elegant Age, 1870-1930, exhibition catalog (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1980).

[152] "Frank D. Millet's Career," New York Tribune, 11 July 1880, p. 4. Reviewer noted that "Millet keeps up his journalistic skills by writing art criticism when not busy painting."

[153] F. D. Millet to Howard Ticknor, 21 April [1880]) in Miscellaneous Manuscripts, AAA, Reel D9.

[154] National Academy of Design. Fifty-Fifth Annual Exhibition, 1880. Millet exhibited No. 20 *Portrait*, No. 167 *A Bashi-Bazouk*, and No. 282 *Mouth of the Seine*.

[155] S. G. W. Benjamin, "National Academy of Design. Fifty-Fifth Exhibition. First Notice," American Art Review I (1880), p. 311.

[156] Sidney Hyde, "The Fine Arts. The Academy Exhibition in New York," Boston Daily Advertiser, 9 April 1880, p. 2.

[157] "The National Academy Exhibition. Second Notice," Art Amateur 3, 1 (June 1880), p. 2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[158] The Boston artist George Fuller, in a letter to his wife, reports that he, Thomas Wilmer Dewing and Millet traveled to New York to see the National Academy exhibition. See George Fuller to Agnes Fuller, 30 March 1880, George Fuller Papers, AAA, Reel 607, Frame 560.

[159] The Fourth Triennial Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College (Boston: Press of Rockwell and Churchill, 1881), p. 32. Millet notes that *A Bashi Bazouk* was exhibited in the Royal Academy in 1879, "and the following season in the Academy of Design in New York, where it was sold to John Jacob Astor, Esq.

[160] Strahan [Earl Shinn], Art Treasures of America 2:14 lists Millet's *Bashi-Bazouk* in the catalogue of John Jacob Astor's Collection c. 1880.

[161] Boston Art Club, Catalogue of the Twenty-Second Exhibition of Paintings (Boston: Mill, Knight & Co. Printers, 1880), Nos. 42, 63, 196, respectively.

[162] G. P. Lathrop, "The Exhibitions. VII – Boston Art Club Twenty-Second Exhibition, American Art Review II (1880), p. 442.

[163] Greta, "Boston Correspondence. Spring Exhibition of the Art Club—Mrs. Holmes's Silk Pictures. Notes," Art Amateur 2, 6 (May 1880), p.119.

[164] G. P. Lathrop, "St. Botolph Club, Boston, First Exhibition," American Art Review I (1880), p. 446.

[165] "The Fine Arts," Boston Daily Advertiser, May 18, 1880, p. 1.

[166] Lathrop, " St. Botolph Club," p. 445.

[167] Ibid.

[168] See, for example, F. D. Millet, "Mr. Hunt's Teaching," Atlantic Monthly 46 (August 1880), pp. 189-192; and F. D. Millet, "The Paintings—The Rimmer Collection," American Architect and Building News 8, 253 (30 October 1880), pp. 212-213. In addition, numerous unsigned clippings from the Boston Daily Advertiser preserved in AAA&L, Millet Scrapbooks I and II suggest his authorship.

[169] See for example "From Plevna to Constantinople," Boston Daily Advertiser, 24 April 1880, p. 1 and "Personal," Boston Evening Transcript, 30 July 30 1880, p. 4.

[170] From November 1880 until he left for England in 1884, Millet taught a lecture class on Costume at the School of Drawing and Painting. The series of lectures ran for ten weeks in the fall semester, and were given in conjunction with the Lowell Institute. The lectures were open to students, artists and amateurs, and were extremely popular. Almost all the costumes were made under Millet's direction and purchased by the school for use as a pedagogical tool, where they were put to immediate use in the painting class. See School of Drawing and Painting. Fifth Annual Report, p 6; and Note 123.

[171] Francis Davis Millet to General Loring, 28 June [1880], MFAB/AAA, Reel 549, Frames 1429-1430.

[172] Boston Museum of Fine Arts. Exhibition of Works by Living American Artists. Nov. 9 to Dec. 20, 1880 (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1881), pp. 7, 10, 12.

[173] Discussions of Colonial revival themes in recent critical literature have generally adopted a more cynical, sociological attitude. Celia Betsky in "Inside the Past," p. 242 viewed representations of old-time Colonial life as escapist images from the physical and human squalor of urbanization and the discontents of industrialization. Roger B. Stein, "Gilded Age Pilgrims," in Truettner and Stein et al,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Picturing Old New England, pp. 43-72 described them as rural myths constructed to reassert New England's claim to moral predominance and national leadership by reinforcing their Anglo-Saxon heritage.

[174] Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, "The Courtship of Miles Standish," in The Complete Poetical Works of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin And Company, 1894), p. 208.

[175] Baedeker. Belgium and Holland. Handbook for Travellers, pp. 267. Both paintings were in the collection of the Museum van der Hoop in Amsterdam during Millet's visit in the spring of 1872.

[176] George Parson Lathrop, "Exhibition of Works by Living American Artists at the Museum of Fine Arts Boston," American Art Review 2, division 1 (1880), p. 66.

[177] M. O. T., "Millet's Studio," unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[178] Elihu Vedder to R. Swain Gifford, 6 July 1880, R. Swain Gifford Papers, AAA, Reel 594, Frames 477-482.

[179] "Art and Artists," Boston Evening Transcript, 26 October 1880, p. 6.

[180] "The American Art Gallery," Boston Daily Advertiser, 23 January 1880, p. 1.

[181] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[182] J. B. Millet, "VI. Boston Art Club.—Twenty-Third Exhibition," American Art Review II, First Division (1881), p. 202.

[183] "American Art Chronicle," American Art Review 1 (June 1880), p. 362.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CHAPTER 4

INTERNATIONAL SUCCESS IN NEW YORK AND LONDON (1880-1884)

During the years 1880 to 1884, Millet worked hard to consolidate his artistic and financial position. He had achieved a degree of success and reputation as one of the promising young artists returning from European training. Now, with a family to support, he sought wider horizons and financial security. After taking a temporary studio in New York in the fall of 1880, he relocated to the city a year later. His work evidenced a number of changes in the early 1880s. Without abandoning the painterly academic realism of his Antwerp training and his respect for tradition, he responded to new thematic and stylistic developments in American and European art. At times his work took on a synthetic eclecticism as he sought to reconcile a number of aesthetic modes. Millet's exhibited work reveals that he continued to explore portraiture, landscape, Near Eastern subjects and Colonial themes, while turning to classical motifs and scenes of genteel domesticity. Stylistically, his work responded to the formal harmonies of British aestheticism and Whistler, seventeenth-century Dutch genre painting, the classical revival movement and, at times, the Impressionists' concern with light. Millet also became increasingly involved with decorative work; explored secondary media such as watercolor, black and white drawing and illustration; and continued his forays into costume design, fashioning costumes for theatrical productions, as well as lecturing on antique costumes. His work in several of these genres evidenced a marked elision between the fine and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

applied arts. In addition, he continued his literary pursuits, providing art criticism and fiction to such publications as the Studio, Century and Harper's New Monthly Magazine.

Millet gained public recognition and honors almost immediately, both for his artistic productions and for his tireless efforts to advance the interests of American art—interests he felt were best served by American artists' participating fully in the international arena. He was elected an associate of the National Academy of Design in 1881, and a full academician in 1885. Millet was also at the forefront of the fight to eliminate tariffs on imported artwork, and was invited to serve on the Executive Committees of the Munich International and the Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibitions, and as a member of numerous art societies and philanthropic commissions in support of American art. Regular pilgrimages to Europe reinforced the international spirit of his art. He took three trips abroad during this four-year period. He toured the Scandinavian countries and North Germany in the summer of 1882 on assignment for Harper's, with stops in London, the Cotswolds and Paris, and returned to England in the fall of 1883. Another visit to England followed in 1884, at which time Millet established dual residencies on both sides of the Atlantic, spending from May to October in England, and from November to April in the United States. This pattern, although varied with constant travel, would continue until his untimely death in 1912.

New York in the 1880s was the artistic, cultural and economic center of the nation. With the economy making a partial recovery from recession in 1879, the stimulus of new money from the railroads and the industrial sector revived Wall

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Street. As corporations and other businesses relocated to Manhattan, the city began in earnest its physical transformation to the metropolis of the present day.[1] The downtown area south of Fourteenth Street remained the commercial and financial hub, while residential housing and the amenities that supported it pushed northward and into the suburbs. The city's new millionaires built urban mansions on Fifth Avenue, and cooperative and rental apartments went up nearby.

Along with the economic upswing, the facilities and the audience for art expanded. Cultural institutions such as the Metropolitan Museum of Art, which was incorporated in 1870, settled into its new Central Park home in 1880. Three years later, the Metropolitan Opera House opened to the public. An expanded exhibition forum and new opportunities for professional advancement drew artists like Millet to the city. In addition to the long-established National Academy of Design, the Society of American Artists, where Millet's *Boys Fishing* had been exhibited, and the American Water Color Society presented the most prestigious exhibitions in the country. Across the river in Brooklyn, the venerable Brooklyn Art Association had reorganized in 1881, and frequently mounted exhibitions. Gentlemen's clubs proliferated, bringing artists and potential patrons together. Many, such as the Union League Club, had art committees and held regular exhibitions. Fraternal organizations, such as the Tile Club, the New York Art Club and the Salmagundi Club, offered informal forums for the discussion of the latest artistic developments, fostered a sense of camaraderie and also provided for art exhibitions. A growing network of private dealers served the expanding art market, including the newly formed American Art Gallery, which operated from 1879-1883, prior to its

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

reorganization in 1884 as the American Art Association.[2] New building construction offered opportunities for decorative work in private residences and public spaces. The rise of art-oriented journals like the American Art Review and the Studio and general readership magazines like the Century provided additional opportunities for illustration, and, for artists like Millet who possessed literary talent.

Notwithstanding all the excitement and prosperity that characterized New York in the 1880s, Millet would quickly discover that the market for American art remained tenuous. As art historian Linda Skalet has pointed out, while the American public's appreciation for art increased in the 1870s and 1880s, most American patrons preferred to buy European art, both contemporary and old master paintings.[3] Commentators on the arts often expressed concern that the patronage of American art had not kept pace with American artistic progress. Mariana Griswold Van Rensselaer in her review of the 1881 New York art scene concluded that the interesting and successful work promised a hopeful future for American art, "if only the public would appreciate this fact and fully do its part"!:

> The time was when Americans preferred home work, right or wrong, simply because it was home work. . . . Following in their wake are many purchasers who believe on general principles that all European work must be good, and that all American work must be second-rate. It is needless to explain who are left to encourage our own artists, --only the mass who buy for "subject," and the very, very few who have courage enough to buy for intrinsic value, and not for nationality or name.[4]

Given the state of the American art market, his longstanding cosmopolitan interests, and his belief that progress in American art was best served by its full participation in the international arena, Millet in 1884 sought to solidify his reputation by establishing himself in two geographical locales—New York and England.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A new decorative commission—an invitation from Louis C. Tiffany & Company, Associated Artists to participate in their first large-scale public project, the decoration of the Veterans' Room of the new Seventh Regiment Armory on Park Avenue at Sixty-seventh Street—brought Millet to New York in the Fall of 1880. He settled into a temporary studio at 335 Fourth Avenue, in the same building as the Tiffany operations, moving before the end of the year to more spacious quarters at 578 Fifth Avenue.[5] The company, which had recently been formed by Louis Comfort Tiffany in collaboration with the textile designer Candace Wheeler (1827-1923) and the painter and ornamental woodwork designer Lockwood de Forest (1850-1932), was quickly making a name for itself as one of the major design firms of the American Aesthetic movement.[6] Prompted in part by the lavish display of decorative arts at the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial and by Whistler's room ensembles, the fledging company specialized in luxurious interiors in which they freely combined exotic motifs and objects from a variety of cultures with their own productions—for example, painted friezes, embroidered textiles, colored glass and carved woodwork—into unified artistic environments. Tiffany and his partners had recently created elaborate interiors for the Madison Square theatre and for such private homes as the Fifth Avenue mansion of pharmaceutical manufacturer George Kemp, when the Veterans' Association of the Seventh Regiment invited them to provide a decorative scheme for one of the two major public rooms of the Armory.[7]

Built between 1877 and 1880 for New York's prestigious National Guard regiment, which was often referred to as the "Silk Stocking Regiment" because of its ties to socially prominent New York families, the Armory was designed by the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

New York architect Charles W. Clinton (1838-1910), a former member of the regiment, under the supervision of Colonel Emmons Clark (1827-1905), the regiment's commanding officer.[8] A palatial red brick fortress with crenellated towers, a rusticated granite base and solid oak doors protecting the entrances, the new armory closely resembled a medieval castle, and quickly became an architectural prototype for American armories.[9] Besides its military function, the armory served as a clubhouse for its members, and the division of the space underscored this dual role. Described by one observer as "the last word in armories," its interior was distinguished by a large drill hall covered by an impressive iron roof and by lavishly appointed meeting rooms for the officers of the regiment and the different companies.[10] Each company was allowed to choose its own decorative scheme for the space allotted to it, and the veterans sought out Louis C. Tiffany and his associates.

The firm's collaborative approach to interior decoration was similar to a Renaissance workshop, with each artist having specific responsibilities. According to contemporary accounts, Tiffany was responsible for the overall treatment of the room, planned and supervised the work and designed the stained glass.[11] Candace Wheeler created the unusual brocade, velvet and metal embroideries, and the American landscape painter Samuel Colman (1832-1920), a friend and mentor of Tiffany's who frequently assisted him with large-scale projects, advised on the color scheme. Tiffany also retained Stanford White, then a young architect who had recently come to New York to work with Charles McKim and William Mead, to supervise the architectural arrangements. In addition, he employed Frank Millet and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the American painter George Henry Yewell (1830-1923) to research, design and execute a decorative frieze—a painted canvas—depicting the history of warfare.

Candace Wheeler recalled that the firm's design for the Veterans' Room (Figs. 4.1 and 4.2) was to create a total environment that expressed the idea of the veteran, since they all understood "the significance of decorative media . . . the power in colors and in lines to make an atmosphere."[12] The walls, coffered ceiling and crossbeam were painted with silver and copper arabesques to resemble chain mail. Two massive columns supporting the crossbeam were similarly painted, and their lower portions sheathed with chain mail. A high, oak wainscoting, inlaid with a carved interlace border of Celtic design and inset with "rusted" iron plaques, circled the room. Natural light came from the stained-glass windows, and was enhanced by elaborate wrought-iron chandeliers. On the north wall a massive fireplace was faced with turquoise glass tiles, its carved mantelpiece surmounted by a painted stucco relief depicting the struggle between an eagle and a sea dragon. Brocade portieres decorated with velvet and metal designs, massive leather chairs and an oriental carpet added warmth to the space. The centerpiece of this program was the frieze designed and executed by Millet and Yewell.[13] At the top of the wall, on a continuous length of canvas approximately five feet wide, the artists depicted twenty episodes representing successive epochs of the history of war, beginning with the Neolithic Age and ending with the American Civil War. The history begins on the north wall above the center of the fireplace and immediately to the right with two Native American equestrian figures engaged in combat (Fig. 4.3), and proceeds left to right, coursing the room, until it again reaches the fireplace wall with a file of modern foot

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

soldiers (Fig. 4.4)—not unlike the men of the Seventh Regiment. In between are scenes of battles that include Persian warriors, Greeks battling Amazons, a Turkish swordsman attacking a mounted foe, and Medieval knights in full armor. These individual episodes are set within rectangular panels that alternate with circular shields representing different allegories and symbols of warfare. The entire program is held in place by an elaborate tracery pattern (not unlike that of the wainscoting) into which are woven ornamental motifs and various implements of war corresponding to the historical periods depicted. Included are early stone axes, a Roman trumpet, crossbows from the Middle Ages, and famous weaponry, as for example the sword belonging to the early crusader Godfrey de Bouillon (c. 1060-1100).[14] The result was a sumptuous, eclectic and mythic space where the Veterans of the Seventh Regiment could identify with an impressive lineage of warriors through the ages.

No documents have come to light differentiating Millet and Yewell's contributions, and perhaps this is not unusual given the mutuality of effect that was the aim of such decorative commissions. Nonetheless, one can imagine Millet's identification with the program, since he had served with the 60th Regiment of the Massachusetts Volunteer Militia during the American Civil War, and more recently as a war correspondent at the front lines during the Russo-Turkish War of 1877-1878. The panel depicting the Turkish warrior brandishing his sword on the western wall of the frieze (Fig. 4.5) in fact has affinities with Millet's sketches from the latter campaign, as for example Fig. 4.6, which suggest that he drew on personal experience as much as on historical research. The panel also illustrates a new element of Millet's

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

decorative style. Unlike the carefully modeled figures in his easel paintings and his *David* mural of 1877 in Trinity Church, Boston, the artist has simplified and flattened his forms, emphasizing dark contour lines rather than shading and foreshortening. Conventionalized forms also define the Turkish leafage and weaponry that is interwoven into a belted tracery, revealing more than a passing acquaintance with the "propositions" set forth by the British architect and ornamentalist Owen Jones (1809-1874) in his influential book, The Grammar of Ornament, published in 1856.[15] This stylization, and the warm red-ocher tones of the frieze, which are accented with silver and copper hues of related value, harmonize with the surrounding materials (predominantly oak and iron), designs, and subtle colors of the room, complementing and enhancing the military atmosphere. The careful balance of decorative effect with attention to detail, historical accuracy, and the multi-scene format are characteristics that Millet would further develop in his major mural ensembles, most notably, *The Evolution of Navigation*, which he painted in 1905-1908 for the United States Custom House at Baltimore, and *The Collection and Delivery of Mails All Over the World*, which he painted in 1910-1911 for the new Federal Building at Cleveland. These decorative projects will be discussed in the Epilogue.

Contemporary reaction to the Millet and Yewell frieze was overwhelmingly positive. A booklet privately printed by the veterans' organization in 1881 praised the concord of color, line and interpretive design in the mural, and its realization of the desired military effect. The booklet also took note of Millet and Yewell's departure from the subjects of classical antiquity then popular with contemporaneous artists

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Very much happier, as it seems to us, is this belted story of all war-times wrought into a severe adorning frieze, than all the arabesques, or cupids, or nymphs, that might in some hands have chased their idle ways over the same lifted spaces.
>
> It is such a clever escape to get one of our noble public rooms out of the hands of the man-milliners, who put fine furniture in them, and fine frescos on them, and finest satins about them,--all meaning nothing, and who do not study or comprehend the significance of decorative *media*, and the power in colors and in lines, to make an atmosphere in a room or house, that shall be redolent of the aims and purposes and meditative outlooks, that belong or should belong to the occupants.
>
> What most impresses, and what is most worthy to impress in the artistic treatment of this Veterans' room, is the positive, practical, and yet poetic adaptation of decorative material to the purposes in hand.[16]

The critic for Harper's Weekly was of a similar opinion, remarking: "The scenes, painted on canvas four feet deep, reflect the research and the handiwork of Messrs. Jewell [*sic*] and Millet, Mr. Tiffany's assistants, who did not forget that their task was decorative, and that they were not painting Academy pictures.[17] The reviewer for the New York Times, who covered the opening of the Veterans' Room in April 1881, described the room as "the most magnificent apartment of the kind in this country," and regretted that space limitations made it impossible for him to speak in detail "of the quaintly figured frieze . . . with its chronologic record of warring nations and of war weapons."[18]

William Brownell, however, in an article about the recently finished decorations in the July 1881 issue of Scribner's Monthly, was considerably less generous. While acknowledging that "the work may be called a decorative expression of the idea of the veteran," he found the veteran associations "mechanical and trivial, and of a whimsical subtlety rather than a dignified symbolism."[19]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Brownell considered the frieze, despite Millet and Yewell's erudition, an archaic affectation that was not worthy of the time and industry expended on it:

> Observe, for example, the frieze, which has the air of being the *chef-d'oeuvre* of the decoration. Like the rest, its merit consists solely in the fact that it is significant; it is not impressively significant at all . . . . I mean nothing derogatory to the erudition of Mr. Millet and Mr. Yewell in saying, furthermore, that no very exhaustive research is required for painting any of these pictures, from the aboriginal warrior to the file of men of the Seventh Regiment. There is certainly a great deal of curious detail in them, but this, in itself, tends to confirm what I have just said: it is painted in such a way as to render it next to indistinguishable from the floor, not only because of the light and dark monotone of color, but because of the equal emphasis of the interstitial shields and the surrounding arabesques; moreover, the mistake—a mistake to which I should have supposed 'associated artists' peculiarly liable—has been made of treating these representations archaically, instead of frankly; in saying which, I do not refer to the copies of antique originals, but to the whole manner of treatment, which assumes a conventionality foreign to the present stage of mural painting; in other words, in manner they are a clear affectation.[20]

Both conventional and more progressive modes of decorative painting were, in fact, gathering momentum in New York in the early 1880s. Millet and Yewell were among an increasing number of artists who were embellishing private homes and public spaces. Some of the more notable examples include Walter Shirlaw's mural *Peace and Plenty* c. 1880 for the private residence of the banker and philanthropist Darius Ogden Mills (1825-1910), John La Farge's ceiling decorations of 1880-1881 for the Union League Club's new clubrooms on Thirty-ninth Street, and Francis Lathrop's *Apollo* mural of 1884 for the Metropolitan Opera House.[21] The artists sought inspiration in a variety of subjects and styles. Shirlaw and Lathrop depicted classical subjects and allegories in a realistic manner, while John La Farge's ceiling—an elaborate network of geometric pattern and stylized foliage—shared the decorative flatness and stylization of the Veterans' Room frieze. A writer for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Harper's New Monthly Magazine described the mural work as part of a "decorative art craze" that began with the Philadelphia Centennial and was now "an organized attempt to extend and develop the achievements of art till beautiful things, and the beauty that is the result of harmony in our surroundings, become the rule and not the exception."[22] The writer, editor and curator Sylvester R. Koehler (1837-1900) was encouraged that artists were challenging traditional hierarchies of fine and applied art. He considered the progress made in decorative painting in the early 1880s "astonishing":

> This progress is due in great measure to the fact that several leading artists have interested themselves in decorative work, so that it is no longer left, at least in its most sumptuous forms, to the professional decorator. The great decorators of past ages were also great artists in other departments, who had studied something more than geometrical ornament and conventionalized plant-forms. The advances made in decoration since Messrs. La Farge, Tiffany, Coleman, etc. and Mrs. Candace Wheeler began to interest themselves in it, again show the necessity of more than technical training in the decorator. The painting of walls and ceilings, or of pictures and decorations to be fixed to them permanently, has also been taken up within a few years by artists properly so-called, as is shown by the works of Messrs. Walter Shirlaw, E. H. Blashfield, Robert Blum, Frank Hill Smith, A. A. Anderson, etc."[23]

While Koehler did not include Millet and others doing such works in his list of artist-decorators, Millet's supervision of the elaborate mural ensembles at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition at Chicago, including the murals he himself painted for the Manufactures and Liberal Arts Building, the Music Hall, the Fine Arts Building, and the New York State Pavilion would lead to a major escalation of decorative painting in the United States.[24] In her 1901 book American Mural Painting, Pauline King described the mural programs at the exposition, which built on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the initiatives of John La Farge and William Morris Hunt, as "a turning point in the development of the art of Mural Painting and of the public interest in it" in America.[25]

In the winter and spring of 1881 Millet's association with Tiffany turned his attention to another decorative medium—stained glass. He designed cartoons for what the reviewer for the Art Journal described as two "opalescent and jeweled stained-glass windows" for the new St. Stephen's Episcopal Church at Lynn, Massachusetts.[26] They depict *St. Stephen Preaching as a Child* (Fig. 4.7) and *St. Stephen Being Stoned to Death* (Fig. 4.8). Millet's knowledge of Christian iconography and his skill as a figure painter must have led Tiffany to retain his services for his ecclesiastical window designs. The St. Stephen's windows, in the dramatic vitality of the figures and in their elaborate landscape settings, recall the fresco cycle on the life of St. Stephen by Fra Filippo Lippi in the cathedral at Prato, Italy, which Millet had visited during his sojourn in Italy. Although the windows combine monumental figures and landscape, the modified illusionism of the landscape is mitigated somewhat by the geometric and stylized designs of the canopies and framing devices, which enhance the decorative effect. Streaked and rippled opalescent glass and plated colored glass, rather than painted enamel, account for the rich color and luminosity of the windows. Executed by Louis C. Tiffany & Company, Associated Artists, the windows were finished and placed in position at the end of the nave in September 1881.

While stained glass would not be a major focus of Millet's endeavors in decorative art, at least three other stained-glass designs by him are known. In 1884

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Millet would design a stained-glass window as a memorial to Ruluff Sterling Choate (1864-1884), the son of the eminent attorney and later ambassador to England Joseph H. Choate (1832-1917), in St. Paul's Episcopal Church at Stockbridge, Massachusetts. An entry in the parish register identifies the subject as *A Christian Warrior* (Fig. 4.9), inspired by the "Pilgrim" from the English author John Bunyan's (1628-1688) perennially popular Pilgrim's Progress, first published in 1678.[27] The window was installed in the north wall of the nave in 1885.[28] In addition, two pairs of windows—the *Student and Soldier* window (Fig. 4.10) and the *General Joseph Warren and Reverend John Eliot* window (Fig. 4.11)—for Memorial Hall at Harvard College, a commission from the Class of 1861 and the Class of 1878, respectively, were designed by Millet and installed in 1889.[29] All three of Millet's later window designs were executed by the Tiffany Glass and Decorating Company.

In addition to his decorative work with Tiffany in 1881, Millet became increasingly involved with costume design. "All my spare time," he remarked as he prepared his class notes for Harvard, "has been devoted to the study of costume."[30] Commuting between New York and Boston, in January he resumed the lecture series on antique costume at the Drawing and Painting School of the Museum of Fine Arts that he had begun the previous fall.[31] In March he extended these lectures to New York audiences when the Art Committee of the Union League Club invited him to address their members.[32] Shortly thereafter, he presented a series of lectures on Roman and Greek Costume before the Philological Society of Harvard College.[33] Millet's interest in costume design continued to inform his art, leading him, among other things, to design and prepare costumes for the production of Sophocles's

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Oedipus Tyrannus" at Harvard College in the spring of 1881,[34] as well as the costumes for its star player, the American actor George Riddle (1851-1910), when he assumed the role of Caliban at the Boston Theatre in June, and for the American actress Mary Anderson (1859-1940) in her portrayal of Galatea at the Fifth Avenue Theater in New York in January 1883.[35] It is also reflected in Millet's careful attention to the historical details of costumes, props and settings in his easel paintings and murals. His experience with costume design, and his lifelong interest in the subject, date to his student days at the Antwerp Academy when he studied the history of costumes and antiquities with the Belgian antiquary Arthur Goemaere, and where his proficiency garnered him first- and second-class medals in the annual *concours*.[36]

Millet's hectic schedule in the winter and spring of 1881—shuttling between New York and Boston, teaching, lecturing, designing costumes, working on the elaborate frieze for the Veterans' Room and executing cartoons for stained glass—were likely dictated by the realization that he needed additional income to supplement that derived from the sale of his paintings. Financial considerations probably also influenced his continued literary endeavors, and he contributed articles to the Studio and Musical Review and to Harper's Young People.[37] The pressures of these varied pursuits did not prevent him from preparing and showing his work. He readied pictures for several of the city's exhibition venues—the American Water Color Society, the Brooklyn Art Association, the Society of American Artists and the National Academy of Design. The eclectic nature of his easel paintings during this period indicates that he was continuing to experiment with a variety of themes and media.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In January 1881 Millet contributed two watercolors—*A Helping Hand* (unlocated) and *Embroidery* (Fig. 4.12)—to the Fourteenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society.[38] The latter was probably the picture that had intrigued his good friend Edwin Austin Abbey. "The girl in the old dress doing embroidery must be charming," Abbey wrote Lily Millet back in April 1880. "Couldn't you get her photograph taken?"[39] A modish and modest variation on the artist's *Old Flemish Woman Threading a Needle* (see Fig. 2.21), it focuses on a single female figure in a domestic interior engaged in needlecraft. Offered for sale at $100, *Embroidery* apparently found no buyer, and in March Millet displayed it at the Brooklyn Art Association watercolor show.[40] Fond of the motif, Millet repeated the subject in the signed and dated painting known today as *Portrait of a Woman in a Red Dress* (1881, Fig. 4.13). At about the same time he sent his oil painting *Portrait in Costume* (unlocated), which one critic described "as a picture of a young lady in Venetian costume," to the Society of American Artists Exhibition, where he also served on the Exhibition Committee.[41] These works received little notice in the press.

Choosing his works carefully, Millet sent four paintings to the Fifty-Sixth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design—*Chloé* and *Sweet Mistris Mercie*—which had been shown at the Boston Museum of Fine Arts Exhibition of Works by Living American Artists in November 1880, and his latest portrait and figural work—a life-size portrait of his friend Kate Field and his new composition of American Colonial life, *Baby Worship*.[42] The large scale of his newest pictures

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

suggests that they were conceived as ambitious exhibition pieces and calculated to make an impact—and the *Portrait of Miss Kate Field* certainly did.

A modern, independent woman, Kate Field was a successful journalist, author, lecturer and actress, and a prominent figure in New York art, theater and literary circles, who was said to be "continuously in the public eye and mind."[43] Unfortunately, Millet's full-length portrait of her is unlocated today. Its appearance is known only from a small illustration in American Academy Notes (Fig. 4.14) and from descriptions provided by the critics.[44] A reduced, half-length version (Fig. 4.15), now in the collection of the Boston Public Library, corresponds in terms of pose, costume, color and basic setting to the illustration, and to the many descriptions of the original canvas.[45] The writer for the Nation provided the most comprehensive account of the portrait:

> The lady is seated sidewise on a low sofa, her feet resting upon a hassock at the left, so that the figure is nearly in profile; the head being turned to the observer and supported lightly by the right arm, which rests upon an upright cushion, while the left arm reclines decorously in the lap. The canvas is five feet high by six long. The colors are old-gold, black, and cardinal, the first blazing from the plush upholstery, a brocade background, and a brass pot containing some peacock feathers which balances the ottoman, and the other two contrasting vigorously in the sitter's dress, the train of which is swept round in front with the double object of exposing its richness and showing the brazen vessel it could not but partly conceal if more naturally disposed. The dress is high-necked and sleeveless, with a black lace *fichu* which falls over the shoulder a little way and yellow gloves of many buttons complete the costume . . . . the tiny slippered feet and cardinal stockings peep coquettishly from beneath the dress.[46]

Clearly a demonstration piece of Millet's artistic ability, the grand manner portrait of a friend and well-known persona must have presented an opportunity to update the academic realist conventions that the artist had honed at the Antwerp Academy and to align his work with current international trends, including the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

fashionable styles of French Salon portraitists and of his American colleague Whistler. Informally posed within a luxurious and predominantly gold-toned interior, Kate Field is seated on a plush gold divan massed with pillows, her head framed by the gold brocade wall-hanging behind her. With one gloved hand fingering the pale gold flowers in her lap, and the other supporting her head, she leans slightly back and gazes confidently out at the viewer—a gaze several critics described as imperious.[47] The elegant black silk gown accented with red, from the Parisian couturier Worth, and the gold brooch at the sitter's neck contribute to the impression of grandeur.[48] While the full-length format, solidly modeled figure, and strong pyramidal composition recall Millet's classical training and the aristocratic portraiture of De Keyser, as for example his *Portrait of Madame Mols de Brialmont* (1853, Fig. 4.16), the tonal harmony of the carefully modulated gold pigments and the concern for decorative ensemble reveal the influence of Whistler's aestheticized portraits, particularly *Harmony in Yellow and Gold: The Gold Girl—Connie Gilchrist* (c. 1876, Fig. 4.17), which was prominently displayed at the Grosvenor Gallery in London in 1879 when Millet was in London. In its mannered pose, sumptuous setting and compositional arrangements, the picture also recalls the French painter Georges Clarin's (1843-1919) portrait of the actress *Sarah Bernhardt* (Fig. 4.18), a favorite at the 1877 Paris Salon, which Millet, who was living in Paris when it was exhibited, could hardly have missed seeing. In addition, the suggestion through pose, luxurious fabrics and sumptuous setting that the sitter was at home in such elegant surroundings, reveals affinities with the portrait by the French painter Pierre Auguste Renoir (1841-1919) of *Madame Charpentier and her Children* (1878, Fig. 4.19),

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

which was shown in the same 1879 Salon where Millet exhibited his *Les Pacificateurs à San Stefano.*

While incorporating the new, Millet's *Portrait of Miss Kate Field* also demonstrates the artist's long-standing commitment to realism and characterization—capturing the distinctive personality of his subject—and his skill at bringing that personality to life. Fluent brushstrokes and sophisticated side-lighting focus attention on the face, which is depicted without flattering idealization, and notwithstanding the opulence of the setting, exhibits a certain frankness and honesty, capturing what Field's biographer called "the dauntless spirit of this voteless, unmarried, and at times destitute woman in a man's world."[49]

Contemporary reaction to the picture was spirited. In a show that, except for the portraits, many considered lackluster, Millet's *Portrait of Miss Kate Field* was, as one critic put it, "the swell picture of the exhibition."[50] Whether one liked it or not, it "arrests the eye of the visitor, as he enters the main room, with great peremptoriness."[51] A large canvas, five feet high by six long, and prominently hung in the South Room opposite George Maynard's life-size portrait of Millet in the picturesque costume he wore as a war correspondent (1878, Fig. 4.20), few reviewers or gallery goers could ignore it. Critical reception was mixed. The majority praised Millet's brilliant paint handling, some found his color garish, and many objected to the theatricality of the canvas and what they perceived as the sitter's arrogant demeanor. The comments of Mariana Griswold Van Rensselaer in the Atlantic Monthly are typical:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Mr. Millet's immense picture of Miss Kate Field showed some very excellent painting, of course, but was showy and striking rather than artistically right—a fact that was owing to the pose as much as anything."[52]

A few writers, however, noted Millet's ability to capture the personality of his sitter, and would have agreed with the prescient reviewer who asserted that "if the portrait has an obtrusive feature in pose and costume, we would suppose that Miss Field herself has had an opinion of her own. She generally has."[53] Along these same lines, another commentator observed that "the picture does not flatter, but it does Miss Field as much justice as a picture could to a woman who is alive to the tips of her fingernails."[54]

Millet, his wife Lily and Kate Field herself, who attended the exhibition opening, were swamped by visitors, fellow artists and the press. Several reports suggest that Millet had masterminded the media event, as for example, the following unidentified newspaper clipping found in the artist's scrapbook at The American Academy of Arts and Letters:

> Everyone has heard of Frank Millet . . . . But there was a time when he was not known. He sent pictures to exhibitions, to be sure, and good ones, but no one paid any particular attention to them or said anything about them. One day he conceived an idea. He painted a picture of a lady in black sitting on a bright red sofa standing against a vivid yellow background. The effect was just a trifle startling. Friends who saw it in process of production . . . were simply astounded when he announced that he was going to send it to the exhibition . . . . They told him that the critics would "wipe the floor" with him. "They can't do that without mentioning me," said Frank , quietly. . . . To the exhibition the picture went. It killed everything within twenty feet on either side of it. You couldn't help looking at it. It simply knocked you down and held you there. The critics got into a towering passion over it. They wrote whole columns about it. They exhausted the English language in abusing it. They ridiculed the committee that permitted it to be hung. They had squibs and gibes about it, but every time they spoke of it they mentioned Frank Millet. He suddenly became the best known artist in town.[55]

The *Portrait of Miss Kate Field* certainly helped bring Millet to the attention of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

New York; but, ultimately, many of the critics dismissed his grand manner portrait as "empty."[56]

What pleased the critics were Millet's paintings of Colonial subjects--*Chloé* and *Baby Worship*. Like the *Portrait of Miss Kate Field*, *Baby Worship* (Fig. 4.21) was a large and ambitious exhibition piece that allowed for a bravura demonstration of the artist's skill. Painted, according to Millet's own account, in the spring and summer of 1880,[57] the picture depicts four women in old-fashioned costume posed in the artist's reconstructed Colonial kitchen admiring a baby who sits in a small chair atop an antique table. An ink and wash drawing, presently in the collection of the American Academy of Arts and Letters, appears to have been a preliminary study for the painting.[58] Such carefully observed props as a spinning wheel, butter churn, and period furnishings and kitchenware add to the authenticity of the setting. While the painting lacks the stunning color of the *Portrait of Miss Kate Field*, there is in it the same vigorous paint handling, firm figural construction, solid placement in space and careful observation of light—further evidence of Millet's Antwerp training, and standard fare now in his academic armature. The artist enlivened the composition by asymmetrically locating the main figural group in the right-hand corner of the canvas, and by his treatment of diffused sunlight, which emanates from the window high on the right wall, illuminates the figures, measures off the space and establishes the warm feeling of the interior.

Some critics linked *Baby Worship* (see Fig. 4.21) and *Chloé* (see Fig. 3.22), praising Millet's excellent technique, harmonious color and genteel evocation of Colonial life. In the words of one reviewer:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> One of the most refined, pleasing and well painted stories in the exhibition is that which Frank D. Millet tells in his scene of old colonial days, called "Baby Worship." The apartment is well given, and the grouping of the charming young woman by the child is excellent. We want more of these stories of old times, and we hope Mr. Millet will work the vein he opens in this work and in his "Chloé at her spinning wheel. There is fresh, honest coloring in these two pictures, solid painting and a power to secure and paint ladylike women which seems to be rare among our artists.[59]

Another commentator noted Millet's convincing naturalism and his facility to render the effects of light:

> In an old fashioned chair sat a child; by its side stood two ladies evidently rapt in admiration of it, while directly in front stood the mother with her arms open to receive the child, who seemed just ready to spring into them; and to look at it intently one could almost imagine the child moved, so accurate was the whole movement, while from a little window above, the sun reflected on the figures, giving to the picture a reality one seldom sees in painting. The picture was very life-like, and the coloring superb; 'twas a picture pleasing to look at.[60]

Millet's personal susceptibility to Colonial themes and his awareness of the popularity of such motifs has already been noted, and he had experimented with them as early as the Philadelphia Centennial, where he exhibited his first subject evocative of America's past—his *Portrait of a Woman in Costume of 1740* (see Fig. 3.4). While the New England setting in Millet's restored studio defines the American subject, the artist has grafted onto it an overarching and more universal theme celebrating motherhood and childhood, and the specifics of the setting are tempered by the relationship between the women and the infant. The complexity of Millet's image extends beyond its native subject to his early fascination with Dutch seventeenth-century domestic genre, as for example Gerard's Dou's *Young Mother and Her Child* (Fig. 4.22) of 1658, one of "the masterpieces . . . of Dou"[61] that Millet had admired in 1872 on his visit to the Museum at the Hague, as well as to more

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

contemporaneous, bourgeois celebrations of the mother and child theme such as the Hungarian artist Mihály Von Munkácsy's 1879 *Visit to the Baby* (Fig. 4.23), which had recently been acquired by the A. T. Stewart Collection in New York and had been illustrated in the January 1880 issue of Art Amateur.[62] Millet's voluminous space with a group of figures in the corner of an interior lit by a window, the light illuminating the figures and describing the space, bears many of the stylistic traits of Dou's interiors. Beyond the scope of any influence or parallel development, *Baby Worship* suggests the contentment of the artist's personal life following the birth of his daughter and first child, Kate, in January of 1880. That Millet thought highly of the painting is underscored by the $1,800 price tag he placed on it.[63] According to the New York Tribune, however, it was the more moderately priced *Chloé* that found a purchaser, selling for $350.[64] Millet subsequently sent *Baby Worship* to the Chicago Inter-State Industrial Exposition in October 1883, where it was described as one of "the principal works in the galleries."[65]

On May 11, Millet was elected an Associate member of the National Academy of Design.[66] Upon becoming an Associate, an artist was required to present the Academy with a portrait of himself. Millet's naturalistic, profile self-portrait (Fig. 4.24), in his freely brushed Antwerp manner, dates from this time. Among the other new members elected that year were Frederick Bridgman, H. Bolton Jones (1848-1927), Thomas Hovenden (1840-1895), Frederick Dielman (1847-1935), Thomas Moran (1837-1926) and George W. Maynard. Shortly thereafter Millet returned to East Bridgewater for the summer.[67]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

During the summer months in East Bridgewater and its environs, Millet painted the *Portrait of Mary Ogden Adams* (Fig. 4.25) and, according to a family account, "various sketches of landscapes near Bridgewater and in the Cape Code area, along with seascapes caught while yachting with Adams up and down the New England coast."[68] He spent a good deal of time with his friend Charles Francis Adams, Jr. and his family at their summer home at the Glades, a seaside resort community between Cohasset and Scituate on Massachusetts Bay.[69] The Adams place faced the sea and the spit of land known as Minot's Ledge and its famous lighthouse. Inland were marshes and a terrain of winding roads and gray weather-beaten houses. While there, the artist and his family lived in one of the cottages, where Adams recorded that "Millet had fixed up a studio, and . . . painted Mrs. Adams' portrait, and also a *View of Minot's and Gull Ledge*."[70] Millet's work was lightened by frequent cruises aboard the Adams sloop. An accomplished sailor, he quickly became, according to one account, Adams' "marine Man Friday," much appreciated for both his nautical skills and his legendary chowder, which became an institution on the cruises.[71]

Unfortunately, neither the *View of Minot's and Gull Ledge* nor the various seascapes and landscapes of the surrounding countryside, Cape Cod and East Bridgewater, mentioned in the family account, have been located. We know about the appearance of one of the seascapes from a description provided by a critic who visited Millet's studio:

> There are several interesting studies of water in Mr. Millet's studio made on the Massachusetts coast. One shows the incoming waves just breaking into foam, and another is an excellent study, though with surprisingly vivid coloring, of the brown

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sea weed on the rocks at low tide.[72]

It is significant that four marines and landscapes of the countryside around Cohasset were included in Millet's 1914 Estate Sale—*Cohasset, Study of Rocks off Cohasset, Shore Road Near Cohasset* and *Cohasset Shore.*[73]

The *Portrait of Mary Ogden Adams* (Fig. 4.25), now in the collection of the Adams National Historical Site in Quincy, Massachusetts, actually occupied Millet's attention for a number of years. He began the painting in the spring of 1876, but by October of that year had abandoned it as a failure, only saving the head.[74] He resumed work on the portrait in November 1879 at the Adams home in Quincy, continued it at the Glades during the summer months, and brought it to completion sometime in the fall of 1881.[75] In its half-length format, informal seated pose in three-quarter view and genial spirit, the likeness of Mrs. Adams is a fitting pendant to the portrait of her husband (Fig. 3.10). She wears a plain dark dress, edged with white ruffling at the neckline and cuffs, no jewelry, and is partially silhouetted against a pale gray background, which merges into the black of her costume at the lower right. Only the exotic, patterned shawl placed over the chair and a peacock-feathered fan in her hands, emblems of an aesthetic age, enliven the composition and suggest the refinements of the Adams lifestyle.[76] Eschewing the mannered pose and decorative ensemble that the artist had employed in his likeness of Kate Field, the portrait of Mrs. Adams is typical of the dignified, naturalistic images that characterized Millet's mature portrait style. The firmly modeled, three-dimensional form, broad, painterly manner, and skillful rendering of textures continue to reveal the influence of his Antwerp training. The lighting, while calling attention to the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

sitter's face, where more finely detailed brushstrokes establish the physical realities of the features, differs from the artist's earlier portrait of *Charles Francis Adams, Jr.* Millet seems less concerned here with strong spotlighting and impastoed highlights than in employing a more pervasive lighting to harmonize the composition. His ability to do so while capturing the pleasant, reserved demeanor of the sitter, makes the portrait a convincing and successful likeness on its own terms. Millet does not appear to have exhibited the portrait.

Millet's activities in the late summer and fall of 1881 are somewhat sketchy. The family was still at the Glades on July 15, when their second child was born, a son, whom they named Edwin Austin, in honor of their good friend, the painter Edwin Austin Abbey.[77] During August and September, Millet accompanied Adams on cruises to Beverly and Marblehead, Massachusetts; Portland, Boothbay Harbor and Camden, Maine; and to the Isles of Shoals, off the coast of New Hampshire. Millet must have returned to East Bridgewater on September 21, when the Adamses left the Glades and headed to their home to Quincy.[78] The early fall found the artist once more shuttling between Boston and New York, maintaining his affiliations and establishing new ones in both circles. He again served on the Committee of Arrangements for the Museum of Fine Arts Boston Exhibition of Works by Living American Artists scheduled to open November 15, and must have been disappointed when in October the Museum cancelled the show.[79] At about the same time the Board of Overseers of Harvard College appointed him to the Committee on Fine Arts and Music.[80] Sometime in early October Millet was in New York to attend a Tile Club dinner in honor of Abbey and the English landscape painter Alfred Parsons

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(1847-1920), both of whom had recently arrived in the city from England.[81] It was likely at this meeting that Millet was made a member of the club.

The Tile Club had begun in 1877 as an informal gathering of young artists and writers working in New York to exchange ideas about art and enjoy the fellowship of like-minded souls. Influenced by the growing taste for decorative painting, they met regularly in each other's studios, purportedly to paint tiles, and organized sketching expeditions.[82] With the exception of the reference to "painting on tile" noted in his 1858 childhood diary, Millet is not known to have had any previous experience in the field of tile painting.[83] Nonetheless, two tile pictures by him have been recorded. According to an Adams' family account, the presently unlocated tile portraits of young *Henry Adams* (b. 1875) and *John Adams* (1875-1964), the twin sons of Charles Francis Adams, Jr., were painted by Millet when the sitters were "four or five years of age."[84] On October 26 Millet joined fellow members Edwin Austin Abbey, Alfred Parsons, William Merritt Chase, J. Alden Weir, the painters Arthur Quartley (1839-1886) and Frederick Dielman, the photographer Napoleon Sarony (1821-1896), the writers William Mackay Laffan (1848-1909) and William Agnew Paton (1848-1918), and the tenor William Baird (d. 1924) on a week-long excursion to Port Jefferson, Long Island.[85] Returning to East Bridgewater, he must have finished the portrait of Mary Ogden Adams and readied new works for exhibition. *The Wineskin* (unlocated, Fig. 4.26), a signed and dated genre landscape, may also have been painted at this time. According to the artist's granddaughter, Millet based the composition on a sketch of the Roman Campagna.[86] The painting exhibits the careful attention to local

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

costume that was so much a part of Millet's work. No contemporaneous exhibition record for this picture has been located.

Soon Millet's family life was marred by an unexpected personal tragedy when Lily, Kate and the new baby contracted diphtheria.[87] Lily and Kate recovered, but four-month old Edwin died on November 15.[88] The loss of his infant son may have convinced Millet that it was time for a change in his life. Perhaps he hoped that a permanent relocation to New York would take his and Lily's minds off their loss and revitalize their spirits.[89] After Lily and Kate were well enough to travel, he moved his family to New York. His sister Lucia accompanied them to help with young Kate and to continue her supporting role in the studio.

Inactivity was anathema to Millet's nature, and after settling his family in their new quarters at 578 Fifth Avenue, he lost no time re-establishing himself in the New York art and social community. He renewed his friendships with Abbey, and Parsons and the other members of the Tile Club, including Elihu Vedder, who had recently returned to the city from Italy. Already a member of the National Academy of Design, the Society of American Artists, and the American Water Color Society, Millet was soon active in a number of other organizations, including the Artists' Fund Society and the New York Art Club.[90] The latter organization had been incorporated in 1880 for the purpose of fostering social intercourse among all New York artists. In April 1882 he would join Abbey, the actor Lawrence Barrett (1838-1891) and the writers Laurence Hutton (1843-1904), William Laffan and Brander Matthews (1852-1929) to establish the Kinsmen, an informal fraternity devoted to promoting fellowship among artists, writers and other professionals in America and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

England.[91] These affiliations provided Millet with a wide network of friendships, which along with his work, left little time for him, Lily or Lucia to feel lonely in the big city. Lucia's letters to the family in East Bridgewater offer a glimpse of their New York lifestyle and the work in progress in Millet's studio. On January 22, 1882 she wrote:

> Mornings now Lily and Kate are posing, and afternoons come my turn to do the same. Friday I went down with Mrs. Curtis (Mr. Abbey's cousin) to pose for him, he having taken a fancy to my type of face or something of the sort. I didn't ask what. Anyway, I dressed up in two or three different costumes, put on poke bonnets, etc. etc., and posed in one thing and another all day. That night I was quite tired and Mr. Ware came to dinner, he was so monotonous in his conversation that I took seven or eight short naps on the sly![92]

There were also exhibitions and fancy society parties to attend. Significant for the effect it would have on Millet's work was the showing of Alma-Tadema's pictures in January in a suite of rooms rented by the London art dealer Charles Deschamps (1848-1908).[93] As Alma-Tadema's agent, Deschamps had brought over what the critic for the New York Tribune described as "a few pictures recently painted by this distinguished artist."[94] Millet, who particularly admired Alma-Tadema's paintings, could hardly have resisted visiting the exhibition, which included such paintings as *On the Road to the Temple of Ceres: A Spring Festival* (1879, Private collection) and *Tepidarium* (1881, Lady Lever Art Gallery, Port Sunlight, Liverpool).[95] Afterwards, Lucia wrote of attending a ball with the London art dealer and other events:

> We never began to dress till eleven and were on our way at midnight. Our party consisted of Frank, Mr. Deschamps (agent and friend of Alma-Tadema) Lily and myself. We stayed till three o'clock in the morning! . . . Coming home Mr. D. proposed a sleigh ride the next day, he had already invited us to lunch with him next day at the Windsor and so directly after lunch we found ourselves bound

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> northward. We rode way up to High Bridge and never got home till after six o'clock. Kate went too.[96]

Although this is the first recorded meeting between Millet and Deschamps, Lucia's correspondence hints at what would quickly develop into a warm personal and business relationship. Millet apparently asked to be remembered to Alma-Tadema and various friends in London, and requested photographs of the artist's work. He later wrote to thank the dealer. "I'm glad to hear that Tadema remembers me and that they have heard in London that I am not dead but only sleeping. . . . I must tell you what infinite satisfaction the Tadema photographs give me," he commented. "I could so easily become an imitator of him so much do I admire his things and so much do they inspire me."[97]

Millet also devoted considerable time and energy during the ensuing months to his interest in antique costume. An acknowledged expert now on the subject, the artist was much in demand as a speaker, and he prepared a series of lectures on Roman costume, which he delivered before the members and students of the National Academy of Design[98] and before the Society of Decorative Art.[99] He maintained his commitments in Boston, attending regular meetings of the Planning Committee for the Drawing and Painting School of the Museum of Fine Arts, and traveling there weekly, beginning in early March for six weeks, to teach his class on Greek and Etruscan costume at the school.[100] The institution's annual report[101] and the student newspaper indicate the favorable reception that greeted Millet's classes, and the prodigious nature of his work:

> Among the many courses of lectures during the past year, none has been more interesting and enjoyable than that on costume by Mr. Millet. All who had the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> pleasure of hearing last year's lectures on Roman costume looked forward to the present course with great expectations; nor were they disappointed, for to the art student nothing could be more fascinating than the charming arrangements of drapery and delicate coloring displayed in the Etruscan and Greek costumes. . . .
>
> Not less interesting than the facts in regard to the ancient manners and costumes were the entertaining descriptions given by the lecturer of the means he employed in preparing his lectures.
>
> The writer was greatly entertained in Mr. Millet's studio in New York by looking over the boxes of tools, materials, etc., used in the manufacture of togas and toggery, by the artist, who is in despair of finding a tailor or shoemaker capable of making togas or sandals, and so he is obliged to execute as well as plan.[102]

Millet illustrated his classes and lectures with the aid of models, which he posed and draped with various Roman, Greek and Etruscan costumes, emphasizing the importance of studying classical sculpture in order to understand the function and method of wearing each garment, and the relationship of costume to antique manners.[103] He personally designed and supervised the preparation of the costumes, all of which were made in his studio. None of his numerous and varied activities curtailed Millet's painting schedule, and he prepared his pictures for exhibition venues in New York and Boston. Lucia's correspondence continued to inform his family about Millet's artistic endeavors, financial concerns and social life:

> Frank has commenced his lectures here. I heard him last Friday eve at the Academy and I am making the costumes, taking Mrs. Dexter's place you see. He is to give three in the Academy and as many more before the elite of New York for the benefit of the Decorative Art Society. These with six in Boston pretty well use up his evenings for writing and my time for sewing. I must tell you yesterday came a telegram from Mr. Frances in Buffaloo [*sic*] saying "send picture C.O.D. to a certain man (I have forgotten whom) in Detroit," so the *Chimney Corner* [perhaps the signed and dated and presently unlocated painting known as *Roasting Apples* of 1881 (Fig. 4.27)] is at last sold at $375. And the money is very welcome, more than welcome to Frank as he has been getting very blue. Now he is at work on a very strong Turkish picture, a man kneeling before the Koran, in his yellow robe with Turkish rugs at his back and feet . . . . To-morrow night

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Archibald Forbes is to dine here with Mr. Cutler a friend and classmate of Frank's. A week ago we all dined with Mr. Abbey at his studio, went in old-fashioned costume, I made Miss Abbey a short waisted white dress, which her brother pronounced a success, he wishes me to cut ten for him after certain plates and have some one else sew them, also make him some old fashioned bonnets. It is all fun for me and you know I enjoy doing it . . . . To-day I have been down to the Water Color Exhibition . . . .I sewed all the morning and until 2 o'clock on an Etruscan toga then went down town alone for the walk and recreation.[104]

Millet's interest in classical antiquity and costume studies was reflected in some of his new work. Among the paintings he sent to the Fifteenth Annual Water Color Society Exhibition in February 1882—*Maternal Anxiety* (Fig. 4.28) and *Study in Costume* (both unlocated)—the latter, according to press descriptions, appears to signal his earnest pictorial investigations into classical motifs, a subject that would assume a major role in his work, although never exclusively, for the remainder of the decade and, intermittingly, into the 1890s.[105] In a large exhibition that many considered the most successful watercolor show to date, Millet's works did not find favor with the critics. The reviewer for the New York Tribune remarked that "Mr. Millet . . . who is a master at dressing people up in Greek and Roman clothes . . . is a poor hand at painting them. No. 261 [*Study in Costume*] is a heavy piece of figure drawing, and the costume we should quarrel with, if Mr. Millet had not made himself responsible for it."[106] Clarence Cook reviewing the exhibition for Art Amateur was even less generous:

> For one who passes so much of his time with the Greeks and brings back so much that is delightful for the public entertainment and instruction, we find Mr. F. D. Millet a disappointing painter. His *Study in Costume* has nothing to recommend it, either in the large-headed, heavy-limbed woman herself or in her costume, which had oddly enough a very stagy and unreal look. As for his other drawing, a child with a Methuselah-head, frightened lest a wolf-skin floor-rug should eat up her rag-baby, 'twas utterly a thing of naught. Why should a man of talent, all alive with ideas, "give himself away," like this?[107]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Nonetheless, the negative reviews did little to discourage patronage, and *Study in Costume* sold for $150.[108]

Millet's shift toward classical subjects was a natural extension of his classical education at Harvard, his academic training at the Antwerp Royal Academy—which was imbued with a respect for antiquity as the most important source of inspiration for art, and where he had explored such subjects from classical mythology as the Greek god *Pan* (see Fig. 2.23) —and his sojourn in Italy, where he had the opportunity to study ancient art and Renaissance masters. Of equal importance was his knowledge of cosmopolitan currents in London and Paris. Millet's work can be seen in the context of the Classical Revival movement that began in England in the 1860s and earlier on the continent, flourished in the 1870s, and became widely popular in Europe and America by the 1880s.[109] Earl Shinn, in his illustrated compendium of European paintings in American collections entitled The Art Treasures of America, had singled out a number of classical-inspired works as paeans to Western culture, as for example Gérôme's *Pollice Verso* (1872, Phoenix Art Museum) and the French painter Jean-Louis Hamon's (1821-1874) *The Aviary* (location unknown).[110]

The popularity of paintings of the ancient world with wealthy American collectors and audiences was regularly commented on in the press. In October 1881 a reviewer for the New York Times observed that: "Alma-Tadema's *Sappho*, of last year's Royal Academy, is now owned by Mr. William T. Walters of Baltimore."[111] Walters had in fact commissioned the painting. William Bouguereau's grandiose

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

mythological themes, as for example his *Nymphs and Satyr* (1873, Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williamstown, Massachusetts), would soon realize $10,000 in the sale of the John C. Wolfe collection,[112] and his 1881 Salon favorite, *l'Aurore* (Birmingham Museum of Art, Birmingham, Alabama), was eliciting rave reviews from New York audiences.[113] Millet had admired the classical revival pictures of Leighton and Alma-Tadema as early as the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial, was friendly with both artists, and would have shared their concern for an art that sought to capture the inherent beauty and elevating spirit of the classical past in a contemporary fashion.[114] Reporting for Harper's New Monthly Magazine in 1885 on the New York exhibition of another English Victorian artist who essayed such themes, George Frederic Watts (1817-1904), an exhibition that Millet was instrumental in arranging, he would argue persuasively for the continued relevance of the classical past:

> We can not fail to recognize the vital element of all the good art of the past. We can not blind our eyes to the indisputable fact that the endeavor to represent the perfection of beauty in one form or the other distinguished the Greek artist from his predecessors, and that this purpose has made the masterpieces of Greek art models for all nations and for all times.[115]

Millet saw Watts's aesthetic classicism, an innovative treatment of an old subject, as an exemplar for modern American art—an individual artistic conception in which "the eye is pleased, the imagination excited, and the intellect awakened."[116] The recent exhibition of Alma Tadema's pictures in New York,[117] regular press reports of ongoing archeological discoveries, such as the excavations at Tanagra, Greece, and the commercial viability of antique themes may all have helped renew Millet's interest in the classical past.[118]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Millet's representations of antiquity, even more than his paintings of Near Eastern themes, would enjoy a wide appeal because they tapped into ideas and sensibilities shared by his late-nineteenth-century audience. As America emerged as a world power in the post-Civil War decades, the achievements of Greece and Rome, and of Renaissance Italy, the foremost interpreter of classical antiquity, offered potent models for Americans on many levels, reinforcing the nation's image of itself as heir to the great Western civilizations. In the arts, such views were encouraged by a constellation of writings, not always in agreement, which viewed art and culture as indices of civilization. Most notable of these were the essays of the French critic Hippolyte Taine; Charles Eliot Norton (1827-1908), editor of the Nation and Professor of Art History at Harvard College; and the English critic and poet Matthew Arnold (1822-1888). Taine's concept that art reflected the civilization that produced it and that the figure, as developed by the Greeks and perfected by the Renaissance, was the ideal model for the representation of reality, resonated with many, particularly artists who were familiar with his writings and his lectures in Paris.[119] Norton, who influenced generations of Harvard undergraduates during his twenty-three years of teaching from 1874 to 1897, and the larger Boston community through his popular lectures on Ancient Art, would have disagreed with Taine on the value of the late Renaissance, but shared his admiration for ancient Greece.[120] Norton viewed the principles of simplicity and beauty in the Parthenon and other examples of Athenian art of the fifth century B.C. as a reflection of the moral superiority of Periclean Greek civilization.[121] Millet probably met Norton as early as 1875 when he returned from Europe, and was certainly acquainted with him by 1881 when he was

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

designing the costumes for Sophocles's "Oedipus Tyrannus" at Harvard College, as rehearsals were held in Norton's study in Cambridge.[122] Later, in 1907 Norton would invite Millet to serve on the Consulting Committee for the Fogg Museum.[123] Norton's friend Matthew Arnold, writing in Literature and Dogma of 1876, defined culture as "acquainting ourselves with the best that has been known and said in the world," particularly Athenian society.[124]

Millet, like Alma-Tadema, whose work he admired (and who, incidentally, had also studied at the Antwerp Royal Academy of Fine Arts), often recorded the everyday events of the Greek or Roman world, or a single contemplative figure, rather than an heroic moral exemplar. Like Alma-Tadema and many of the English classical-subject painters, Millet's classical works were often deployed in a decorative manner that balanced content and the formal values in picture-making nourished by the Aesthetic movement, in particular by Whistler. In addition to his watercolor *A Study in Costume*, Millet would execute a cluster of classical revival subjects in various media during the 1880s and intermittently in the 1890s, including, among others, *Ode to a Grecian Urn, A Roman Girl, Lacing the Sandal, Lolla, Reading the Story of Oenone, Prosperina Gathering Flowers, Regina Convivii*, and *A Spring Offering,* which will be discussed later in this chapter.

Millet's choices for the Tile Club Exhibition, which opened February 25 at the St. Botolph Club at Boston, did not include any classical subjects. Instead, he exhibited seascapes painted the previous summer at the Massachusetts shore, including *Marine* (unlocated), and *A Koran Reader* (Fig. 4.29), the new Near Eastern subject mentioned in his sister Lucia's letter.[125] The reviewer for the Boston

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Advertiser took no notice of Millet's depiction of a Turkish man at prayer, but focused on the artist's marine pictures, identifying them as "describing the rock-bound shores of Scituate, with great rough projections of stones half-draped with soggy seaweed swashing in the rising or falling tides."[126] An "interesting little collection of about sixty oil paintings, water-colors, and works in black and white," the exhibition included contributions by fellow Tile Club associates Arthur Quartley, J. Alden Weir, F. Hopkinson Smith, Napoleon Sarony, R. Swain Gifford, Charles S. Reinhart, Frederick Dielman, Elihu Vedder, William Merritt Chase, Edwin Austin Abbey and Alfred Parsons. Although Millet had recently resigned his membership in the St. Botolph Club, he was probably instrumental in arranging the exhibition through his friends on the Art and Library Committee.[127]

Millet again showed *A Koran Reader*, together with a painting entitled *Milkmaid* (unlocated), at the Fifty-seventh Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design, which opened on March 25.[128] *Milkmaid* is known only from descriptions provided by reviewers, which suggest it was an American domestication of European peasant genre, popularized in contemporaneous pictures of French peasants by such painters as Jules Breton and Bastien-Lepage. In an exhibition that many reviewers considered unwieldy because of the sheer number of pictures, uncritical selection and overcrowded display, Millet's works were acknowledged, but either admired with reservations or dismissed. For example, one critic praised the draftsmanship and forceful naturalism of *Milkmaid*, but found it deficient as a plein-air study:

Mr. F. D. Millet's *Milkmaid*, No. 463, is an admirably-drawn and natural figure of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> a young woman walking forward on a meadow foot-path, with a pail of milk in her hand. It is a good subject, conceived without affectation. Mr. Millet is a plain realist; but he has not here done himself justice in all respects. The chiaroscuro of the picture is very untrue, and there is a want of decision and of significance in accessory parts which bespeaks insufficient acquaintance with the object—weeds and grass—which the artist would fain represent. The figure is in shadow against a light sky, which, in nature, would make it tell as a decidedly dark mass; but Mr. Millet has not made it dark. A part of the arm which holds the pail falls against the slightly rosy lower sky, and is almost precisely of the same value and the same hue. This is both impossible and untrue. The picture has not the look of having been studied out of doors. The figure appears, rather, to have been painted from a model in the studio, and the landscape background to have been thrown in from memory without sufficient reference to the relation which would actually exist between the one and the other in point of chiaroscuro.[129]

Another reviewer gave the picture high marks for its "American" qualities, although, aesthetically, he considered it inferior to J. Alden Weir's Dutch counterpart, *The Milkmaid of Popindrecht* (1881, Brigham Young University Museum of Art, Provo, Utah):

> Mr. F. D. Millet's *Milkmaid*, fairly and squarely so called, without any national epithet, has fared better, and as she is clearly an American, which scores one in her favor, she may be thought entitled to the privilege. Artistically, however, she of Popindrecht has the advantage. Will this exhaust the stock of milkmaids?[130]

Millet's *A Koran Reader* (Fig. 4.29) fared worse with the critics. A depiction of a Turkish man in prayer, the painting reflects the artist's fascination with Islamic piety during his travels in the Near East. As early as November 2, 1873, on his sea voyage from Odessa to Constantinople, Millet had been impressed with the devotional practices of the Turkish people. He wrote in his diary of waking up early one morning "to find [an] old Turk established on his rug in the little space on the floor and praying."[131] Millet made a number of sketches that day, and, again, several weeks later, after visiting the seventeenth-century Mosque of Ahmed I at Constantinople, as for example (Fig. 4.30). Perhaps one of these sketches was the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

inspiration for *A Koran Reader.* Fluid brushstrokes, high colorism, and expressive side lighting from the upper right, falling principally on the sitter's face and hands, are successful in recording the external appearance of the subject, and in suggesting his spirituality. Overlaying Millet's academic realist armature is the Dutch box-like composition, with its view past the open doorway into the room beyond. This synthesis of various stylistic influences and the cosmopolitan subject matter were part of Millet's international style. Nonetheless, his Near Eastern subject did not please the critics. "Mr. Millet also shows a *Koran Reader,*" one reviewer wrote, "which, in spite of its brilliance of color—red and yellow—is far from satisfactory, and makes one long for his *Bashi Bazook* of some years ago."[132] Clarence Cook was more caustic in his remarks: "Mr. F. D. Millet's *Koran Reader*, if true, shows how Egypt is deteriorating under the Franks; fifty years ago, or even last year, this yellow would not have been possible there . . . . [It is] a libel . . . upon Cairo."[133] The negative reviews did little to discourage patronage, however, for on April 15 Millet wrote to Charles Deschamps, who, apparently, had encouraged the artist to exhibit the picture: "The Turk sold for $800 at the Academy the first hour of the private view. You have a keen scent for saleable pictures I see."[134] The continued popular appeal of Orientalist subjects would have been demonstrated by the nearly contemporaneous exhibition of almost three hundred pictures of Near and Middle Eastern scenes by Frederick Bridgman at the American Art Gallery.[135] The upper range of this market would have been represented by the recent sale of Gerome's *The Snake Charmer* (c. 1880, Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, Williamstown, Massachusetts) for a reported $15,000.[136]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Millet appears to have saved his more progressive works for the Society of American Artists exhibition. Having accepted too many canvases to advantageously display them, the Society held two consecutive exhibitions in the spring of 1882.[137] Millet sent another seascape, *North-Easter* (unlocated), to the first show, which opened April 6 on the heels of the National Academy.[138] As art historian Jennifer A. Martin Bienenstock has pointed out, this exhibition of only one hundred fifty pictures emphasized the Society's interest in decorative painting and pleinairism,[139] and included such works as Whistler's *Arrangement in Grey and Black, No. 1: The Artist's Mother* (1871, MDO), Weir's *Portrait of a Lady* (1882, *Flora* or *Carrie Mansfield Weir*, Brigham Young University Museum of Art, Provo, Utah), Blashfield's *Autumn* (location unknown), and landscapes by Inness, Twachtman and Dwight Tryon. In a show that the New York Tribune described as without "a handful of chaff in it," Millet's picture drew praise.[140] The reviewer for the newspaper asserted: "Mr. F. D. Millet's 'Northeaster,' a well-painted corner of the ocean breaking on a beach is hardly a picture, but it shows the force that might make one."[141] The New York Times described it as "a canvas bearing a pleasant touch."[142] But it was Millet's *Portrait of Lawrence Barrett as Cassius* (unlocated), along with Thomas Eakins' *Crucifixion* (1880, Philadelphia Museum of Art), that garnered the most attention at the Society's second show, which opened on May 1.[143] Although the portrait is lost to us today, its appearance is known from an illustration in the January 1898 issue of Harper's New Monthly Magazine (Fig. 4.31), and from descriptions provided by the critics.[144]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The *Portrait of Lawrence Barrett as Cassius* was Millet's first venture into theatrical portraiture, a genre he essayed on at least one other occasion in the early 1880s in his portrait of *John McCullough as Virginius* (unlocated). One of the most acclaimed actors of the nineteenth century, Lawrence Barrett had mastered a repertory that included all the standard plays of the era. His Shakespearian roles, however, secured his fame.[145] His interpretation of Cassius in William Shakespeare's *Julius Caesar* established him as the leading representative of that Roman hero on the American stage. Millet may have attended Barrett's recent performance as Cassius at the Grand Opera-house in New York in March 1881, where a critic for the New York Tribune reported that the actor was "received with abundant favor by crowded assemblies," and described his role as "the best Cassius of our stage."[146] It is in this role—as the "lean and hungry" Roman conspirator, standing on marble steps and dressed in a white toga—that Millet's full-length portrait depicts Barrett.[147] Proud of his work, Millet exhibited the portrait at the Union League Club prior to its showing at the Society of American Artists, and commented on the picture in a letter to Charles Deschamps:

> Since you left I have finished a life-sized portrait of Lawrence Barrett in the character of Cassius. White toga, marble steps, stucco background, etc. etc It is now in the gallery of the Union League Club and will go to the Society of American Artists on the 24th inst. They are going to rehang their show. The fellows think it the best thing I have done.[148]

The critics, for the most part, agreed with Millet's colleagues, although some, like the reporter for the New York Tribune, may have missed the nuances of Barrett's performance:

The picture that first strikes the eye on entering the gallery of the Society of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> American Artists . . . is Mr. F. D. Millet's portrait of Mr. Lawrence Barrett, the tragedian, as Cassius. This is the most important picture we remember to have seen from Mr. Millet's hands, unless we except the very brilliant and life like one he paints so skillfully with his models on the stage, when he delivers his lectures on Greek and Roman Costume. His present picture has a dignified look as it hangs in its architectural frame in the center of the south wall, and it deserves to be looked at seriously. It is distinctly a portrait, although it is in costume; there has been no attempt to idealize the actor . . . . We do not, we confess understand the action of Cassius. He does not appear to be simply drawing the toga from his face, but holds on to it as if he were clinging to it in a forlorn hope.[149]

The reviewer for the New York Times offered a more perceptive assessment:

> It is seldom that we find a painter who can cope with the difficulties inherent in that hackneyed thing, the portrait of a popular actor in a Shakespearean character. Without being able to recognize a work of the first genius in this full length portrait of Mr. Barrett, there is great achievement to be recognized in it as a whole and an earnest and deft workman behind the painting of the Roman drapery and marble floor. Cassius is covering his head with the upper portion of his toga and looks down and sidewise with pinched cheeks and an expression of anger and disdain. It is not thoroughly decisive and has a touch of the actor; it has a suggestion of a pose. But this objection may be met, by saying that Mr. Millet has not attempted, and should not be expected to attempt, to improve on his sitter in the line of the profession to which that sitter belongs. He is there to paint an actor, and the best of actors must pose more or less.[150]

The critic appears to have recognized Millet's ability to respond to the tradition of theatrical portraiture that had a long history in England and America. Well-known examples include the English painter Sir Thomas Lawrence's (1769-1830) portrait of the great tragedian *John Philip Kemble as Hamlet* (c. 1801, The Tate Gallery, London) and the American painter Thomas Sully's (1783-1872) portrait of the English actor *George Frederick Cooke as Richard III* (1811, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia). As art historian William H. Gerdts has pointed out, a successful theatrical portraiture presented a triple challenge for the artist:

> [H]e should present the likeness of the actor (or actress) still recognizable and distinctive; he should project the character of the subject being portrayed, in historical and traditional terms, for audience satisfaction; and he should, if

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> possible, suggest the specific interpretation of that subject by the specific performance.[151]

The critical commentary and illustration suggest that Millet succeeded on all three levels—portraying a realistic likeness of Barrett, capturing the duplicity of Cassius, as well as the passionate intellect that in the words of one reviewer allowed Barrett to invest the old Roman "with a sentiment of comradeship; mitigating his austerity with a suggestion of almost tender mournfulness, and making him justifiable in his own eyes."[152]

Several reviewers also took note of Millet's essentially decorative arrangement of color, which depicted Barrett "robed in white against a white marble background."[153] Mariana Griswold Van Rensselaer, who praised Millet's portrait as "the best piece of work I have yet seen from his hand," wrote: "It showed the actor in white drapery against a white wall, and in the management of this difficult scheme as well as in the painting of the face and arms it was very accomplished."[154] "The various white tones which make up the entire color-harmony," asserted another critic, are "treated with great skill and productive of much beauty."[155] Such descriptions and the illustration verify that the *Portrait of Lawrence Barrett as Cassius* owes much to the subtle white on white color harmonies of Whistler's *Symphony in White, No. 1: The White Girl* (1862, Fig. 4.32), which was exhibited in 1881 at the Union League Club and at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York.[156] According to a critic for Art Amateur, Whistler's portrait generated a spate of white on white experiments, including J. Alden Weir's *Portrait of a Lady* (1882, BYUMA) and George Maynard's *Inventor* (1881, *Edward Maynard* or *The Inventor*, National Portrait Gallery,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.), which were shown in the first Society exhibition.[157] As has already been mentioned, Millet, who had made a number of trips to England in the 1870s, had a first-hand acquaintance with Whistler's work. He surely saw *Symphony in White No. 2: The Little White Girl* (1864, Fig. 4.33) at the 1872 International Exposition at the South Kensington Museum in London, and may have had an opportunity to see *Symphony in White, No. 1: The White Girl* (1862, NGA) prior to its New York debut.[158] Buoyed by the success of the Barrett portrait, Millet exhibited it at the Society of Artists Exhibition in Philadelphia and at the Munich International Exposition in 1883, and subsequently in London, where Laurence Hutton recalled that "it received no little praise."[159] As it was being transferred to its final home in the Garrick Club of London, of which Barrett was a member, the portrait, according to Hutton, "mysteriously disappeared."[160]

As the 1882 New York art season came to a close, Millet was part of what the New York Tribune described as "the annual flight of artists to Europe."[161] In early April he had written Deschamps:

> We have been tied at home, both of us, for my lecture work and the thousand other duties and I doubt if Mrs. Millet has made a call since you went away. . . .
>
> We are thinking of coming over both the Mrs. and myself. There is a project on foot with Harpers which may end in my spending two months or so in Europe. . . . So we may meet there after all.[162]

In a follow-up letter of May 14, he provided additional details:

> We have taken passage, Mrs. Millet and I, on the 24th inst. by S. S. Canada of the National Line for London. I am going to do some of Sweden and Denmark for Harpers magazine and shall get home as early in the autumn as I can, so we expect to have but a day or two in London. However we hope to say "How" to our friends and shall be sure and see you if we come. I am so busy that I can scarcely sleep and much less write.[163]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

On May 24, as scheduled, Millet and Lily sailed from New York for London, on the first leg of his projected tour through Sweden, Denmark and North Germany on assignment for Harper's New Monthly Magazine. A collaborative project for a series of articles and illustrations in the popular journal, the tour would also include the artists Thure de Thulstrup (1848-1930), R. Swain Gifford (1840-1905) and Abbey. Millet likely spent some time in London, and made a quick trip to Paris to procure photographs of ancient costumes and properties for the Boston Museum of Fine Arts,[164] before traveling to Sweden with Thulstrup. (Lily and Mrs. Thulstrup joined them, but remained in Stockholm most of the time).

Millet's diary, correspondence and sketches from this period record his fascination with the people he met and the local landscape, architecture and costumes.[165] As in all his travels, he acquired native costumes and accessories, which, along with his sketches, later served as aides-de-mémoire in the studio, and provided convincing detail for his pictures. Arriving at Göteberg, Sweden on June 18, he and Thulstrup journeyed to Stockholm, which Millet described as "the most picturesquely situated place I ever saw," although he bemoaned the fact that "thus far we have seen little or no characteristic peasant life."[166] In search of picturesque life style, dress, landscape and architecture, the two artists then headed north through the Dalecarlia province, visiting the villages of Borlänge, Leksand, Rättvik and Mora, and the university town of Upsala, before returning to Stockholm on July 9. Leaving the Thulstrups in Stockholm, on July 12 Millet and Lily took a steamer to Lübeck, Germany, where Gifford joined them on July 19, and Abbey arrived two days later.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

From Lübeck the three artists traveled through northern Germany and Denmark for another month, although the rainy weather in Copenhagen was discouraging, and Millet clearly longed to be in England. On August 6 he wrote Deschamps from Copenhagen:

> We are now all looking through blue spectacles. Weather bad, town unpicturesque and people commonplace. We think we won't buy this town. If weather gets good we are off to try and do an article on Jutland but none of us think it will "pan out well," and may come back into northern Germany to do some more Hanse towns. England is my oyster. I've missed my summer and not done anything particularly worthwhile. We expect to be back in London in about a month and I hope to stay there a week or two.[167]

Millet converted his impressions and sketches into a series of articles for Harper's New Monthly Magazine. The first two stories entitled "Dalecarlia," an account of the Sweden trip, would appear in September and October 1883, followed by three articles on his travels in northern Germany and Denmark entitled "A Wild Goose Chase," in April, May and June of 1885.[168] The articles also included illustrations by Thulstrup and Gifford. Abbey complained that he could find nothing pictorial to illustrate, and considered the trip a waste of time.[169] Millet's tour through the Scandinavian countries also generated a series of paintings, six of which were included in his 1914 Estate Sale—*Swedish House, Aalborg; Ramparts, Visby Gothead*; *Swedish Farm*; *Swedish Church*; *A Swedish Farm;* and *Swedish Kitchen* (Fig. 4.34).[170] Only the last is known today. Millet was attracted to this humble subject, and, as we have seen, painted a number of kitchen scenes throughout his career. His diary records that he painted several domestic interiors during his Swedish tour, although none of the scenes he described exactly correspond to this picture.[171] The box-like space punctuated by a window and restrained brown-toned

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

palette, enlivened with red and blue, suggest the lingering Dutch influence in his work. Despite the overall dark tonality of the room, Millet subtly captures the light that enters the window and falls upon the plants, furnishings and floorboards. The broad brushwork is typical of his early manner.

Millet returned to England in early September, spending time in London and with Abbey at Lechlade, a small Cotswold village on the upper Thames River. Disappointed that his busy schedule might preclude a visit with Deschamps, Millet wrote him from Lechlade:

> It looks as though we should miss you on our way home. Our steamer sails one week from today and I don't think I can possibly get away from here before Saturday night because I am deep in a picture. I had planned to run down into Kent for an hour or two to say "How!" and see you all but am sure I shall not have time. Two weeks seems such a long time until you have lived it and then it is only a flash. So all our London plans seem to flash suddenly out and leave us only the prospect of that so agreeable voyage.
>
> I am very anxious to see Tadema and shall venture to call without any formalities I think. Otherwise I shall miss him too—I'd give half my summer work to go there with you.
>
> We have been very happy and hungry here and I feel as I always do that there is no place like England. I know I do much better work here.[172]

His concerns notwithstanding, Millet's diary records that he met "Deschamps in London on the 18th [of September] to show him a picture he has just started."[173] On September 20, the Millets sailed for New York on the *Canada*.

Back in New York Millet prepared new pictures, refurbished others and worked on his costume designs, lectures and literary projects. Increasingly, now, he also became a more engaged public figure and a spokesperson for his fellow artists. One of the important issues of the day concerned the tariff on the importation of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

foreign art into the United States. At the close of the Congressional session in the spring of 1882, a bill had been passed increasing the duty on artworks entering the country from ten to thirty percent. Beginning in November 1882 and continuing for several years, Millet, as Chairman of a Special Committee of the Society of American Artists, during subsequent appearances before the Congressional Tariff Commission, in his extensive letter-writing campaigns and public addresses, and in his collaboration with the New York legislator Perry Belmont (1851-1947), was at the forefront of the effort to eliminate this tax and promote free trade in works of art.[174] Related to this was his organizational work on the Executive Committees of the Munich International Exposition[175] and Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibition,[176] which opened, respectively, in July and December of 1883. (These exhibitions will be discussed later in this chapter). In addition, Millet was instrumental in organizing an exhibition of works by the Society of American Artists to be held at the Grosvenor Gallery at London in 1884 and in securing the 1885 loan exhibition of paintings by George Watts for the Metropolitan Museum of Art.[177] The common denominator for Millet in these varied endeavors was the fostering of an exchange of artistic ideas and the promotion of the active participation of American artists in the international cultural community—efforts that he believed would encourage friendly rivalry and further the development of American art.

In his creative work Millet continued to paint a variety of cosmopolitan subjects, but increasingly concentrated on classical themes, which were generally well received by the critics. Stylistically, he participated in the current international debates concerning more imaginative, non-narrative approaches to subject matter, and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the expressive and formal potentials of color and paint handling. Technique, however, never took precedent over purposeful content and individual conception. True to the ethos of his academic training, Millet believed that the artist should use his talents "to perpetuate the sublime beauty of nature's highest truths; that he prepare himself by the development of his mind to illustrate his chosen subjects in a manner which shall be intelligible to the layman, and which shall present the ideas in a new aspect, the natural result of individual observation and study."[178] And, that the artist "impress the spectator with the idea he has chosen to illustrate, both by composition and by a treatment harmonious with the character of his subject,"—an organic unity of subject and technical means.[179] In the best of his work he achieved this.

Of the three drawings he sent to the Salmagundi Sketch Club Fifth Annual Exhibition in December 1882—*Kilmeny, Christmas Amenities* and *Ode on a Grecian Urn* (all presently unlocated)—the last, was almost unanimously admired.[180] The New York Herald praised the artist's "graceful female figure," calling it "a delicious little drawing in white."[181] The reviewer for the New York Times was even more effusive:

> Mr. Frank Millet's "Ode on a Grecian Urn" is incomparably the finest work here, though it is a little affair and is no deeper in subject than this—the figure of a maiden seated, who looks at a Greek or Etruscan vase. The fine handling of the paint may be imagined; what is hard to realize through printed words is the droop in the girl's figure, the charm of her pose, the loveliness of the picture throughout. Last year Mr. Millet made a startling advance in his art, but with this delicate little trifle he has surpassed his best.[182]

Conversely, *Kilmeny*, was dismissed as an attempt for originality and pictorial effect that had "fallen into the other extreme of affectation."[183] *Christmas Amenities*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(Fig. 4.35), one of the drawings that Millet produced for Harper's 1882 deluxe Christmas giftbook, went virtually unnoticed.[184]

Clearly bent on establishing his reputation, in 1883 Millet aggressively pursued an expanded exhibition schedule and audience. In addition to shows at the National Academy of Design, Society of American Artists, and American Water Color Society, he contributed to such other New York venues as the Artists' Fund Society, The New York Art Club, and the American Art Gallery, and sent his work farther afield—to exhibitions in Boston, Toronto, Cincinnati, Chicago, Detroit, Munich and London. To the Artists' Fund Exhibition in January 1883, which inaugurated what a critic for the New York Tribune referred to as "pre-eminently a season of exhibitions,"[185] Millet sent *Norman Fisher Boy* (unlocated) and *Turkish Café*, the latter possibly his refurbished *Café in Adrianople*, first exhibited to indifferent reviews at the St. Botolph Club in May 1880.[186] In a show marked by slim attendance and spiritless bidding, Millet's pictures, along with such other cosmopolitan subjects as Thomas Hovenden's *Brittany Image-Seller* (location unknown) and D. Maitland Armstrong's *Baker's Shop, Pont-Aven, Brittany* (Private collection), were praised as among those infusing "new blood" into the old society.[187] The reviewer for the New York Tribune wrote:

> Then our sympathies are drawn to Mr. Millet's "Norman Fisherboy," handsome. sleepy little fellow, whose white blouse, red tasseled cap and black curly hair make a pretty combination, while we could wish the boy a softer pillow than a coil of rope, and also that the artist had bestowed some care upon the modeling and drawing of his face. Mr. Millet is a cosmopolite, and invites us to join him in a Turkish café, but we prefer the Fisherboy with his creel of gleaming mackerel for a companion.[188]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Although the critic favored Millet's Breton theme, he clearly saw Millet as he wished to be seen—as a player on the international artistic stage. Reviews like this would have validated Millet's assimilation of European subjects and styles. Perhaps they also enhanced the commercial appeal of his work, as both of the artist's pictures found buyers.[189] Millet thought highly enough of his Near Eastern subject, to send another version, similarly entitled *Turkish Café*, perhaps the painting of the same name currently in the collection of the Vanderbilt University Fine Arts Gallery (Fig. 4.36), to the Royal Canadian Academy of Arts annual exhibition at Toronto, Canada, which opened on May 21, and to the Brooklyn Art Association exhibition in December 1884.[190] Concomitantly, Millet drew on his experiences in Turkey during the Russo-Turkish War for his fictionalized story "Yatil," which appeared in the March issue of Century Magazine.[191]

Millet returned to classical subjects for his two submissions—*A Roman Girl* (unlocated) and *Lacing the Sandal* (Fig. 4.37)—to the Sixteenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society, which opened almost simultaneously in January 1883.[192] In an exhibition that many critics praised for advancing the high standards established in the Society's 1882 show, Millet's works were indifferently received. The reviewer for the New York Tribune admired "Millet's classics," along with the contributions of Abbey, Parsons, J. Alden Weir, and Homer among others, for "their picture-making instinct," their "depth of feeling and power of expression, as well as a quality distinctly individual."[193] Conversely, the critic for the Nation, although he praised Millet's images for their grace and beauty and "exquisitely finished painting"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

technique, found the pictures "artificial," and lacking in vitality. Stumped by the artist's subtly modulated colors and concern for pictorial harmony, he wrote:

> As we have before remarked concerning Mr. Millet's work, there is in these a deficiency as regards the rendering of color values. Could we look at the actual figures represented with their backgrounds and surroundings, we feel that the relations of part to part in force of shade would not appear just as Mr. Millet has them. In No. 171 [*Lacing the Sandal*], for instance, the white-robed figure does not appear to us to tell as a white enough mass in relation to its background.[194]

A delicately painted watercolor, *Lacing the Sandal* depicts a young woman in Greek costume sitting on a divan tying the lacings of her sandal. The lack of a specific narrative, literary or allegorical reference underscores the artist's concern with creating a beautiful and graceful image, standards of beauty that he admired in Greek art, into an original, unified pictorial statement. Art historian Bruce Weber has pointed out the affinity of Millet's aesthetic agenda to the work of the English painter Albert Moore (1841-1893), especially his preoccupation with exploring the chromatic variations of pale hues to harmonize his composition.[195] The restricted palette is a concord of putty-colored wall, the palest putty chiton, a soft gold- and blue-patterned divan and white floor. A leopard-skin rug introduces an accent color, harmonizes with the pale gold tonalities of the divan and the model's dark blonde hair, and adds warmth to the marble floor and cool palette.

Millet repeated the watercolor, with only a few changes, as an oil of a similar title—*Lacing Her Sandal* (Fig. 4.38)— in which the more pronounced vertical format, inclusion of a flowering tree, and subtle color variations are particularly reminiscent of similar aestheticized classical-subject pictures by Albert Moore, as for example his *Azaleas* of 1868 (Fig. 4.39). The sinuous branches echoing the curve of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the woman's body in the Millet painting, reinforce the decorative quality of the work. A hybrid of cosmopolitan sources, the classical prototype for *Lacing Her Sandal* may be *Nike Fastening her Sandal* (c. 410 B.C., Fig. 4.40) from the parapet of the Temple of Athena Nike, while the cropped, slice-of-life perspective in both the watercolor and oil versions may owe to the influence of Japanese prints or photography.[196] A graphite on paper drawing (Fig. 4.41) of a contemporary model may have served as a preliminary study for both pictures. Such synthetic compositions were not uncommon in late-nineteenth century art. Millet sold the painting almost immediately to the New York manufacturer Thomas B. Clarke (1848-1931), one of the few collectors of the time who concentrated on acquiring the works of American artists.[197] In a letter to Clarke of May 28, 1883, Millet remarked, "I promised to let you know when a little picture was nearly done, and this note is to say that much."[198] Clarke displayed the painting along with the rest of his collection at the American Art Gallery in December 1883, a loan exhibition to inaugurate the Clarke Prize Fund for the benefit of the National Academy of Design.[199]

Another work that Millet painted at this time—the signed and dated picture known as *Classical Repose* (1883, Fig. 4.42)—bears a certain resemblance to his watercolor *Lacing The Sandal* and the related oil painting *Lacing Her Sandal*. In all three works Millet employed a model wearing a pale gossamer gown of Grecian design, a large expanse of marble floor, and an animal skin rug. In *Classical Repose*, perhaps because the picture depicts his wife Lily and their daughter Kate, Millet appears to foreground the loving relationship between mother and child rather than pictorial concerns. The personal nature of the image may account for the more

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

conservative treatment. A preparatory graphite drawing (Fig. 4.43) for *Classical Repose* is preserved in the artist's papers at the Archives of American Art.[200]

Although Millet's classical representations of women in a decorative mode were discussed in terms of their content, technical skill and formal values, his concern with beauty and aesthetic harmony has figured in recent debates about gender distinctions and the perceived role of women in late nineteenth-century society. Art historian Bailey Van Hook has argued that while the prevalence of idealized female imagery in late nineteenth-century paintings by American artists was consistent with their European training, it also dovetailed with contemporaneous perceptions of women as ideal, beautiful, pure and decorative. The aestheticized female form in particular often mirrored and reinforced attitudes that women were symbols of passivity, detached from the rigors of active life. In her study Van Hook wrote:

> Male figures, reflecting the construction of the masculine gender as active, were rendered with too much presence in painting to function well as flat and decorative. . . . The dominant ideology of separate spheres granted men an active function outside the home in the realm of business and industry, government and politics . . . while women reigned over home and culture. Since men ventured outside the world of family and intimate friends, they must have an identity or a name . . . or an occupation . . . or a role . . . or some other character that was more identified with a genre or narrative context, and so not decorative. . . . In addition, their individual identities and specific places were not interchangeable. . . . With men, it mattered who they were, whereas with women it did not; only women could be anonymous enough to perform the decorative role in a painting. . . . As the country moved from an agricultural to an industrial orientation, middle-class women were no longer required to perform visibly productive labor, and they were increasingly seen as assuming a decorative role in society.[201]

In Millet's watercolor *Lacing the Sandal* (Fig. 4.37), and his related, and similarly entitled, oil painting *Lacing Her Sandal* (Fig. 4.38), the decorative arrangement of the women, the harmonizing of their costumes and accessories with

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

their surroundings, diminution of narrative and inactivity, would appear to support such an interpretation. That Millet consciously intended such a cultural agenda, however, is speculative. His writings indicate that he viewed the pursuit of aesthetic harmony in his pictures as the mark of a progressive artist, and the realistic portrayal of his models (the women in fact retain a certain individuality), as a way of modernizing traditional subject matter.[202] Millet's decorative treatment of a male figure in *A Bashi-Bazouk* (see Fig. 3.19), if somewhat less sophisticated than the two aforementioned pictures, also suggests that we approach such readings with caution.

At the same time that Millet's classical subjects were eliciting interest at the American Water Color show, he sent a seascape—*Edge of the Sea*—to the inaugural exhibition of the New York Art Club.[203] "Mr. F. D. Millet has turned from his classical models," commented the reviewer of the New York Tribune, "to paint a quiet and harmonious little shore scene."[204] Millet's attempt to reconcile his impression of a transitory atmospheric effect with his concern for harmonious color, light and compositional arrangements was not lost on the critic for Art Amateur. He lauded Millet's efforts, and also provided the most complete description of the unlocated painting:

> Among the pictures most deserving of mention, F. D. Millet's little study of sea and shore was noteworthy. This was rather a study than a picture, although the arrangement of tones was evidently composed, not copied exactly from nature. For all that, it was in the matter of tones that the picture was most natural. The lines of the jutting promontory and detached rocks in the middle distance, the sweep of the beach in the foreground, and the curves of the breakers were, doubtless, conscientiously drawn and not willfully [*sic*] changed in the least, but they were not delicately true. The artist was satisfied with giving a careless report of them. The blue of the sky and that of the water, the brownish pink of the strand, the gray of the rocks, and the fawn color and green of the live and dead patches of grass that covered them were, on the contrary, most carefully reproduced in their

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> exact relations to one another. Even the pinkish light in the sky near the horizon and the apparent reflection in the wet sand—the most open attempt at composition in the thing—was, very likely, suggested by some transient natural effect. The little boat, dancing between the shore and the rocks was as exactly right in tone as it would be in a mirror. In Paris, such painting might not be worthy of remark, but in this city it would be wrong not to direct attention to it. Mr. Millet is one of our young men who are really young. He has a future. If he remains as conscientious, as painstaking, as delicate as he now is, there is no telling to what heights he may attain.[205]

During these early months of 1883, Millet's visibility in New York was further enhanced by his supervision of a series of tableaux-vivant performances based on the poetry of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow for the benefit of the East-Side Free Library established by Grace Church.[206] Millet brought to the project a storehouse of knowledge about historical costumes and properties. His efforts in selecting the costumes and accessories, and coaching the amateur thespians were instrumental to the benefit's success. All the while, he continued to prepare new works, while juggling his numerous activities. The physical and emotional toll of Millet's schedule, a longing for greener pastures, and the first mention that he is seriously considering a move to London, surface in his March 6 letter to Deschamps:

> I have been so busy that the winter has gone like a flash. Tableaux, designing costumes and painting—have had scarcely time to eat. It has been a very bad season here this winter very few of the fellows having sold anything at the water color show. I sold one to Mr. Marquand for $250 which considering its size, about the size of this sheet, was good enough. I have been very busy all winter trying to run the abolition of the tariff in works of art. Congress closed Saturday and a bill was passed but whether or not our special till was reached I don't yet know. Gilder and I wrote the bill. Belmont was to put it through and to help. I sent circulars all over the U.S. and names were sent in from all sides. There is a great movement in favor of free art and it will certainly come sooner or later . . . . I proposed to the Society of American Artists to apply for the Grosvenor for next winter to hold an exhibition. They did so through Philipot but whether it will come to anything or not I can't tell. Most of the Paris fellows belong and I think we would make a strong show . . . .

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> Kate still talks of you. My sister is here now as she was last year. My wife has been overworked with the costumes we have been having made for Mary Anderson, so I am about to send her over to Philadelphia for a rest . . . . I'm doing a group of four girls on a divan calling it the "Story of Oenone," and for the Society of American Artists a portrait of Barrett's daughter . . . .I have three other portraits to paint and a commission for a water color. Still I do hanker for London and long to be there settled.[207]

Perhaps one of the portraits was that of the American actor *John McCullough as Virginius* (unlocated), which the art historian Alfred Trumble in his 1887 Representative Works of Contemporary American Artists referred to as "among the masterpieces of modern portraiture."[208] Another surely was the likeness a reviewer for Art Amateur described as Millet's "excellent portrait of his artist friend, George Maynard" (unlocated), when it was shown in the Fifty-fifth Annual Exhibition of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts in October 1884.[209] Millet must have changed his mind about his submission to the Sixth Annual Exhibition of the Society of American Artists, which opened on March 26. His only entry was a classical half-length figure entitled *Lolla* (Fig. 4.44), which received scant attention and an indifferent reception from the New York press.[210] Most of the critics concentrated on the luminaries of the exhibition—Thomas Wilmer Dewing's decorative painting *A Prelude* (c. 1883, location unknown) and Sargent's portrait *Lady with a Rose* (1882, *Louise Burckhardt* or *Lady with the Rose*, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York). The reviewer for the New York Sun wrote "Millet has a very handsome model, and knows how to pose her charmingly,"[211] while the critic for Art Interchange asserted: "Lolla" would be good as a fine face and head were not the right arm uncomfortably long and awkwardly placed."[212] After the show closed in New York, it traveled to Boston for a month-long run at the Museum of Fine Arts, a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

loan exhibition that Millet, given his affiliation with the museum, likely was instrumental in arranging.[213] At about the same time Millet displayed his watercolor *A Roman Girl*, which remained unsold after the American Water Color show, at the Boston Art Club.[214] Like his oil painting, the watercolor was not discussed at any length, nor was it particularly well received, by the critics. The reviewer for the Boston Daily Advertiser described it as "a coarse type of the fleshy class, which has no refined beauty whatever, but which has some points of worth as a study."[215] Millet subsequently sent *Lolla* to Cincinnati for inclusion in the Eleventh Cincinnati Industrial Exposition in the fall of 1883,[216] where the critic for the Studio termed it one of the "important works."[217]

Reading the Story of Oenone (Fig. 4.45), the picture of "four girls on a divan," that Millet had mentioned in his letter to Deschamps, was the masterwork of his classical theme paintings of the 1880s. It successfully synthesizes the influence of his Antwerp training and that of such English classical-subject painters as Alma-Tadema, Frederic Leighton and Albert Moore who were working in an aesthetic mode, as well as the art-for art's sake philosophy of Whistler. It also codifies a number of pictorial strategies that would continue to define many of Millet's classical subjects for the rest of the decade and into the 1890s: carefully drawn and broadly painted classically-garbed figures seen disposed in shallow, frieze-like spaces or on marble courts or porticos; the displacement of narrative by a dreamy or contemplative feeling; the juxtaposition of contemporary facial types and classical costume; and the careful arrangement of color harmonies and design.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In a rare literary reference for Millet, the painting takes its subject from Ovid's story of the Greek nymph Oenone, which was popularized in the mid-nineteenth century by the 1832 and 1842 publications of Alfred Lord Tennyson's (1809-1892) poem.[218] Oenone, according to the story, fell in love with and married Paris, who soon deserted her for Helen of Troy. The elopement of Paris and Helen led to the Trojan War, during which Paris was wounded. He appealed to Oenone to heal his wounds, but she refused, and Paris died. Remorseful, she later committed suicide. Millet does not illustrate any scene in the text, but rather presents a recitation of the mournful tale. Three young women sit on a divan listening, while a fourth woman reads the story from a parchment scroll. Their poses and expressions register varied reactions—intent solemnity, sadness, even a certain withdrawal. One could argue that without its title, *Reading the Story of Oenone* would be no more than a genre scene of Greek domestic gentility. With fluid brushwork Millet manipulates the subtle color harmonies of the pale gold divan, with its accents of salmon and mauve pillows; the pale pink, taupe and lilac gowns; the flesh tones of the models, the putty-colored wall, the white marble floor, and the diffused lighting to establish an elegiac mood.

Richly eclectic, Millet's conception draws on a wide variety of sources. The frieze-like composition, the grouping of the figures and the arrangement of the drapery are all loosely modeled on the Elgin Marbles in the British Museum, specifically, the *Three Goddesses* (Fig. 4.46) from the east pediment of the Parthenon.[219] Acquired by the museum in 1818, the Parthenon sculptures were widely admired and influenced several generations of artists, including Millet, who,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

as previously discussed, saw them on a visit to the museum in 1872.[220] In keeping with his Antwerp training, Millet often looked to antique statuary, not only for compositional prototypes, but also to understand the function and arrangement of classical costume. The diaphanous wet-drapery technique of the *Three Goddesses*, which alternately reveals and conceals form, is replicated in Millet's carefully draped and posed models. The genteel genre element, rather than the heroicism, of the Greek myth, the contemporary facial types, and the recitation theme recall Alma-Tadema's *Sappho* (1881, Fig. 4.47), which features a similar decorative, horizontal arrangement of women in classical draperies listening to a poetry reading—in this instance accompanied by music. Completed in 1881, *Sappho* was in the Walters collection in Baltimore. It is possible that Millet, whose friendship with Alma-Tadema and admiration for his work had progressed by 1883, traveled to Baltimore to see the picture, or knew it from photographs supplied him by the artist or his agent, Charles Deschamps. The affinity between Millet and Alma-Tadema's work is understandable given their initial training at the Antwerp Academy and their shared interest in classical sources. Nonetheless, Millet's classical pictures are generally less anecdotal, cooler in tonality, and less crowded than those of his English colleague. In *Reading the Story of Oenone,* the diminution of narrative; carefully modulated pale color harmonies and diffused light; shallow, compressed space; and preoccupation with the decorative effect of color and form are closer to the mood-evoking "bench paintings" of Moore, Whistler and Leighton, as for example *Dreamers* (1882, Fig. 4.48), *Symphony in White, No.3* (1865-1867, Fig. 4.49), and *Summer Moon* (c. 1872, see Fig. 3.5), respectively.[221] While Millet does not approach the pure formalism of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Whistler and Moore, his decorative composition attests to his sustained interest in such pictures as Leighton's *Summer Moon* (which he had admired at the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial) that can convey the artist's idea with "a notable predominance of the aesthetic over the material element."[222]

Millet sent *Reading the Story of Oenone* to the Fifty-Eighth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design in April 1883, where it was universally admired.[223] Most writers focused on the technical skill and decorative qualities inherent in the work, as for example, the critic for Art Amateur, who asserted "Frank D. Millet's 'Story of Oenone' is delicately colored; the drawing is graceful and satisfactory, the composition excellent."[224] Or the reporter for the New York Tribune, who praised "the easy grace of the fair Grecian maidens and . . . the tender and sympathetic coloring."[225] The reviewer for the New York Times missed the subtleties of the elegiac mood, but moved beyond formal analysis to locate Millet in an international context, comparing his work to that of Alma-Tadema and Moore:

> Genre is more fully represented than usual, and in this popular branch perhaps Mr. F. D. Millet takes the lead with a picture of five lovely damsels dressed in white or in light-tinted robes that cling to the figure. They sit on a long marble bench in various attitudes of physical repose and mental activity . . . . The figure that has the most grace is the young woman to the left of the reader who rests her elbows on her knees; the line of back, neck, and head is very pleasing. Some of these classical damsels wear sandals; others are barefoot, and their naked feet on the white marble pavement involuntarily give one a shudder. Perhaps if Mr. Millet, by a richer coloring, could have suggested a greater warmth in the atmosphere, one would never think of this. Alma-Tadema, who does work like it, often manages to escape such an impression on the nerves of his observers by the warmth of tones through his pictures—sometimes, not always. But the painter of whom one is particularly reminded by it is, rather, Mr. Albert Moore, whose dreamy, long-necked, and handsome maidens clad in the most diaphanous of silken robes, are apt to adorn the walls of the Grosvenor Gallery in London.[226]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

He also recognized the affinity between Millet's painting and Dewing's similarly decorative picture *A Prelude* (c. 1883, Fig. 4.50), which was concurrently on view at the Society of American Artists exhibition:

> At the Society of Artists we find Mr. Dewing taking to the same kind of picture and suggesting Albert Moore. . . . In clearness, force, and drawing Mr. Millet may be placed before Mr. Dewing, but perhaps the latter has a shade of advantage over the former in sense of color and in delicacy and depth of brush-work.. Neither of these two bright young workmen appears to have found his true path in art; they seem to be still groping about and trying the style now of a Frenchman, now of an Englishman. Mr. Millet is much the smarter, but the race is not always to the swift.[227]

Positive criticism did not necessarily translate into patronage. Offered for sale at $2,500, the highest price that Millet had yet asked for a painting, *Reading the Story of Oenone* found no buyer in New York. In September 1883 the artist sent it to the inaugural exhibition of the Detroit Art Loan Association, where it brought him the first of many prestigious awards. The painting proved so popular that profits from the exhibition were devoted to its purchase as the first acquisition for the Detroit Museum's permanent collection.[228] Proud of his painting, Millet arranged for the museum to loan it to the Southern Exposition in Louisville, Kentucky in 1884, where it again brought accolades. "The picture is a beautiful idealism;" wrote the critic for the Louisville Courier-Journal, "a symphony in delicate shades of pink and brown, judiciously harmonized with colors of a deeper, richer tone. Mr. Millet is an authority on classic drapery and costumes, and in this picture has turned his knowledge to good account."[229]

The close of the spring exhibitions brought little respite as Millet continued his lobbying efforts on behalf of the free trade bill and was busy with organizational

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

work for several exhibitions. Already a member of the Executive Committee for the Munich International Exhibition, he was now invited to serve on the jury. He met regularly with William Merritt Chase, James Carroll Beckwith and others to select paintings for the American section of the exhibition scheduled to open at the Munich Crystal Palace in July, the first time that American artists would be represented in this venue.[230] Millet was also instrumental in soliciting contributions and subscriptions to defray the insurance and shipping costs. In May the works of the American artists selected for the Munich show, including Millet's *Portrait of Lawrence Barrett as Cassius,* were exhibited at the American Art Gallery for one week, prior to being shipped to the Bavarian capital.[231] Responding to those who criticized the selection of pictures as unrepresentative of American art because the older generation of artists was largely absent and New York artists predominated, Millet wrote a letter to the New York Herald explaining how critically important it was that Americans participate in the exhibition, even if their representation fell short of the desired display:

> . . . . The Munich International Exhibition is the most notable artistic event of the year . . . . The choicest works from the Paris Salon, the Royal Academy, the Grosvenor Gallery and other European exhibitions will unite to raise the standard of the collection to a higher point of quality than could possibly be attained by any local display. America for the first time will this year take her place as a competitor in the lists at Munich. Our representation will probably be neither comprehensive nor adequate, but it will doubtless be creditable to the country. [232]

He then proceeded to censure the National Academy of Design for their lack of leadership:

> The Committee appointed by the mass meeting of artists entered upon their labors without funds and with little encouragement of success. An appeal for aid resulted in contributions of money from the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> the Society of American Fine Arts and the Kuenstler-verein [*sic*] of St. Louis, alone. The committee had counted upon the cooperation and material support of the National Academy of Design, but they refused to grant the use of their rooms for receiving and arranging the exhibit and also declined to contribute to the fund to defray expenses of sending it to Munich. They should have performed the organizational work and assumed the position its name implied and advanced the interest of national art. . . . The committee here have worked hard to secure representative American pictures, and, if they have not entirely succeeded, the failure is not due to their lack of zeal, but to the apathy of the individuals and of the institution to whom the work properly belonged.[233]

As his work for the Munich International Exhibition wound down, Millet was appointed to the Executive Committee for the Bartholdi Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibition and shifted his attention to work for this committee.[234] Only a few preliminary meetings were held before Chase, who was directing the organizational efforts of the exhibition, left for Europe in early June. Millet must have next turned his attention to his work on the Committee of Arrangements for the Boston Museum of Fine Arts' annual Exhibition of Contemporary American Artists.[235] By late June, with his administrative work completed, Millet again joined the annual exodus of artists from the city.

The summer found the Millets in East Bridgewater, Maine and England. They spent some time at the family homestead in East Bridgewater, before heading to the island of Isle au Haut off the coast of Maine, the homeport of Charles Francis Adams' yacht, the "Winsome." It may have been during this early summer sojourn in Maine that Millet painted *Seacoast* (Fig. 4.51), the marine painting in the collection of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. The depiction of an old wharf reaching out into the sea with the mountainous coast in the distance is reminiscent of the rugged coastline surrounding Isle au Haut, the small island in Penobscot Bay. Broadly painted in rich,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

creamy brushstrokes, with light impasto areas capturing the play of light in the waves, the seascape recalls Millet's study with the painting master Josef Van Lerius at the Antwerp Academy.

In late August, after six weeks of sailing with Adams, highlighted by visits with the writer Thomas Bailey Aldrich (1836-1907) and the President of Harvard College, Charles W. Eliot (1834-1926), Millet, Lily and Kate departed for England.[236] Unfortunately, Millet left little record of his earlier sojourn in East Bridgewater and Maine or of this trip, but bits and pieces of his activities in England can be gleaned from his and Abbey's correspondence and from the accounts of family and friends.

From London, Millet and Lily once again traveled to the Cotswolds, this time to the small village of Bidford-on-Avon, about seven miles from Stratford, to visit Abbey and Parsons, who were spending the summer at the White Lion Inn.[237] There and at Stratford, they joined the artistic and literary circle that had gathered in "Shakespeare country," including among others George Boughton, Laurence Hutton, William Laffan, and the drama critic William Black (1841-1898). Judging by the results submitted to subsequent exhibitions, Millet spent the summer and fall sketching in the countryside and preparing new works. According to his own account, he went "to Lechlade to finish a picture to send to the Dudley [Institute of Painters in Oil Colors]," [238] possibly *The Window Seat* (Fig. 4.52), a painting he may have begun the previous summer. It is plausible that he also visited the major London shows and traveled to Munich to see the Munich International Exhibition, where his *Portrait of Lawrence Barrett as Cassius* was on display. "Frank is too full

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of business," Abbey complained in a note to Vedder. "Must moil and toil and . . . work. Damn work. Come over here and loaf inexpensively. I need help."[239] But there was also time for diversion. In early October the friends spent a weekend at the Shakespeare Inn at Stratford-on-Avon for a farewell party in honor of Hutton and Laffan, who were returning to the America. Millet detailed the "colossal, gigantic, mastodontic [*sic*] spree" and disclosed some information about his plans in an October 15 letter to Vedder:

> The dinner began at seven. Champagne water flowed like a river. William Black sat at one end of the table. G. H. Boughton at the other and Hutton, Laffan, Abbey, Parsons and I were spread between Mrs. Laffan, Miss Parsons and Mrs. Millet. About 11 o'clock the ladies retired well charged with champagne. Then we corralled the two chambermaids, the barmaid, the landlady and one of her daughters, ripped the carpet off the floor, cleared the tables into a corner and began. Such a wild spree I never before had in an hotel and rarely if every anywhere else. We made old Stratford ring! . . . (We shall probably sail for America about middle of November).[240]

Several sources posit that it was during this trip that Millet first became acquainted with the nearby village of Broadway. A Millet family account states that Hutton, who came upon the village by chance while exploring the English countryside, was charmed by its quaintness and on returning to the White Lion Inn "brought back news of his 'discovery' of Broadway, a little old world village fifteen miles from Stratford-on-Avon."[241] A letter written by Abbey to the English poet and essayist Austin Dobson (1840-1921) on October 20 supports this account: "If you care for a walk—we are thinking of walking across over the hills through Broadway to Lechlade—about forty-five miles—on Friday or Saturday—and should be very pleased if you will join us."[242] Whether or not Abbey or Millet actually made that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

excursion to Broadway is not known, but Millet would return the following summer and establish what would become his principal family residence in the village.

Although Millet wrote Vedder that he expected to depart for New York in mid-November, he remained in England almost another month. He followed Abbey and Parsons to London, settling himself and his family in a flat in Bedford Gardens, a few doors from the studio shared by his friends.[243] While there Millet presumably brought to completion some of the sketches begun during the summer months, and made preparations to show several of his works in the British metropolis—a pragmatic way of testing a new art market. He sailed from London, arriving in New York on December 12, [244] but left behind two paintings—*The Window Seat* and *Grandmother* (unlocated)—to be displayed in the inaugural exhibition of the Institute of Painters in Oil Colours.[245]

With *The Window Seat* (c. 1883, Fig. 4.52), Millet temporarily moved away from the classical world to a contemporary reprise of the seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish domestic interiors of his Antwerp years. One of his earliest figure subjects painted in England, it depicts Lily seated upon a window seat of an old-fashioned cottage, engrossed in her crocheting. As in the artist's classical pictures of the same period, the subject and/or narrative seeks a harmony with pictorial concerns—in this instance, capturing the effects of light and atmosphere. The painting seems irradiated with light as Millet explores the effects of shifting sunlight as it streams through the windowpanes, bathing the subject, furnishings, curtains and wall in an ambient silvery glow. The simple subject, the absorption of the sitter and the quietude of the setting and of the English countryside glimpsed beyond the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

windows convey a mood of calm, domestic tranquility, an effect heightened by the delicate white tonalities, broad brushstrokes, solid figure construction and ordered composition.

The theme of a woman engaged in needlecraft recalls Millet's *Old Flemish Woman Threading a Needle* (see Fig. 2.21) and her seventeenth-century Dutch art-historical ancestors, as for example Gerard Dou's *Old Woman with a Spool of Thread* (1660-1665, see Fig. 2.22) and Nicholas Maes' *Old Woman Spinning* (1655, see Fig. 3.25), pictures that the artist had seen during his visits to museums in Holland in the early 1870s. It is possible that Millet also knew Johannes Vermeer's *The Lacemaker* (1669-70, Fig. 4.53), which had entered the Louvre in 1870.[246] As in his Dutch prototypes, Millet appears drawn to a quiet similitude and the intense concentration of the sitter on her task. Certain compositional strategies, such as the rectilinear, box-like space, the extended view through the windows and the concern with light effects, also bear comparison with other seventeenth-century Dutch genre paintings. At the same time, the cropped, slice-of-life perspective suggests the influence of Japanese prints and photography; the delicate white tonalities reveal the influence of the Aesthetic movement and Whistler, while the serenity and evocative mood recall Vermeer. A synthesis of overlapping influences, the painting is typical of Millet's cosmopolitan works. Moreover, Millet's intimate scene of qenteel domesticity anticipates in part the cluster of genre subjects that the artist would embark on after he settled in England—pictures in which he moves easily among contemporary, historical English and early American settings.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Millet's *The Window Seat*, with its theme of qenteel domesticity, seventeenth-century Dutch genre compositional motifs and light-filled interior also presages the rich outpouring of related images by the Boston School artists from the turn of the century to World War I, such as *Girl Crocheting* (1904, Fig. 4.54) by Edmund Tarbell (1862-1938) and *The Seamstress* (1916, Fig. 4.55) by Joseph DeCamp (1858-1923).[247] Insofar as Tarbell studied with Otto Grundmann, Millet's Antwerp classmate and the first director of the Boston Museum School (see discussion in Chapter 3), and that De Camp taught with him, it is plausible that a sympathy for seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish interior domestic genre painting at the museum school paved the way for the Vermeer-inspired canvases produced during the late 1890s and early years of the twentieth century by these artists and their colleagues.[248] Despite the shared thematic and formal similarities between Millet's *The Window Seat* (Fig. 4.52) and Tarbell's *Girl Crocheting* (1904, Fig. 4.54)—a concern with the domestic life of women in sparse interiors; leisure time for traditional feminine handicraft and other pursuits; interest in light, quietude and evocative mood; and box-like Dutch composition—Millet's domestic genre paintings generally eschew the elegantly appointed, upper-class markings of the Boston School works, as well as the passive domesticity and decorative objectification of women identified by Bailey Van Hook and art historian Bernice Leader.[249]

If Millet intended his pictures to test the English market, he could hardly have been more pleased with the reception accorded *The Window Seat*. The painting was profusely praised for its excellent technical skill, delicate white harmonies, and refined mood. Almost every reviewer mentioned the masterful treatment of light.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"The lighting is most dexterously managed," wrote the Magazine of Art, "and the cleverness of the picture is almost excessive; there is no positive colour locally, except in the figure, the head being strongly painted, the cheeks ruddy with health; the sense of luminous, ubiquitous daylight is powerfully rendered."[250] The critic for the Pall Mall Gazette agreed, calling it "a very delicate and charming study in different tones of white."[251] The London Times reported that "one of the most perfect paintings in the exhibition, is that of Mr. Millet, whose 'symphony in white,' full of grace, distinction and genuine artistic feeling, is a work which leads us to expect great things from the painter."[252] Millet's competent draftsmanship and careful attention to the treatment of light elicited analogies to seventeenth-century Dutch genre painting from the reporter for the London Academy:

> Mr. F. D. Millet's picture, "The Window Seat," has a happily drawn figure; but it is not for its figure that it is most memorable. It aims, in its lighter way, rather at those triumphs in the painting and shifting and diffused sunlight which were won so continually by a certain band of the greater Dutchmen of the seventeenth century—by de Hooch and Nicholas Maes and Van de Meer of Delft. It is in a light key, and the whole wide window and table and window seat and seated figure are flooded with cool sunshine. It is a delightful picture—"epoch-making," . . . in the history of the man who produced it.[253]

Millet returned to New York in December of 1883, just as the winter art season was getting underway. He had time to attend the opening of the inaugural Clarke Prize Fund Exhibition at the American Art Association galleries where his painting *Lacing Her Sandal*, which the New York Times referred to as one of "the slender damsels of classic days," was on display, alongside Edwin Blashfield's *Music* (location unknown) and Thomas Dewing's *A Garden* (1886, Wadsworth Athenaeum, Hartford, Connecticut).[254] Clarke had arranged to exhibit his distinguished collection

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of American art as a benefit for the National Academy of Design. Proceeds from admissions and subscriptions would go toward establishing a monetary award for the best American figure painting at subsequent Academy annual exhibitions, one of the first such prizes to be offered by an American exhibiting organization.[255] Clarke's efforts to stimulate the achievements of American artists were widely praised. The reporter for the New York Tribune could not resist a little chauvinistic boosterism about the prospects for American art, noting: "the quality was so exceptional that it seemed to illustrate that it was no longer necessary to go abroad to secure excellent pictures."[256] Yet most commentators would have agreed with the writer for the Studio, who observed that the disparity between the increase in the number of American art exhibitions in 1883 and the lack of sales, did not bode well for American art:

> Nothing in the history of social phenomenon has of late been more worthy of note than the increase in the number of local art exhibitions, and the apparent interest of the public in all matters connected with art. But it must also be said that nothing is more surprising than the failure of these exhibitions in a practical point of view, for it must be confessed that the use of elaborate means has not been followed by the desired results. If a class of art patrons is demanded who will justify the artist for the time and money spent in his education, it is yet to be created. By what appears, we have a surplusage both of art and of artists . . . . In the present year, at the exhibition of the Society of American Artists in New York, the sales did not exceed $3,400, of which amount considerably more than one-half was paid to one fortunate artist for a single picture. At the National Academy Exhibitions, in New York, the showing is more favorable. The sales in 1880 were $28,000; in 1881, $42,000; in 1883, $40,000. But these figures are creditable only when a comparison is made with other cities in this country. When compared with the results of European exhibitions, the pretensions of New York in this regard became absurd.[257]

Millet's administrative responsibilities during the winter of 1883 and into 1884 attest to his own continued efforts to advance the development of the fine arts in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

America by fostering cosmopolitan channels of artistic dialogue. He must have been pleased with his endeavors when the Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibition opened in December, a show that he had helped bring to fruition.[258] Organized to raise money to construct a base for the Statue of Liberty, the painting display highlighted the work of the Barbizon landscapists and introduced many Americans to the work of some of the more progressive European artists, including the Hague School artists; the French Realists Manet and Degas; and other artists working within the currents of European modernism, as for example Giovanni Boldini (1842-1931), Guiseppe de Nittis (1846-1884), Alfred Stevens, and James Tissot (1836-1902). Less encouraging were Millet's tireless efforts to familiarize his colleagues and the American public with contemporary European art through the passage of the free trade bill, which seemed unlikely to win Congressional approval in the 1884 season.[259] As he tersely put it: "With a penalty placed by government on the importation of works of art, we cannot have the advantages of an acquaintance with the modern [art] which is best worth study."[260] Cognizant that raising the profile of American art and bringing it to parity with the art of Europe involved not just an acquaintance with the best modern art, but also a commitment to providing the very best professional art education, Millet agreed to serve as a trustee of the Harper and Hallgarten Scholarship Fund. This first award to underwrite two years of study for an American art student in Europe would be presented to Ernest. L. Major, a pupil at the Art Students' League in January 1885.[261] Millet was one of the spokesmen for the event, and his remarks are telling about the importance he placed on the need for public commitment to American art education based on European professional standards:

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> There are men in this country, still called in the language of the newspapers "rising artists," who began their studies . . . when artist and Bohemian were synonymous terms. . . . Schools then were few or almost worse than none. Behind the student were traditions of puritanical opposition to art. . . . Before him was a life of struggle to get a living by a work for which he had received no adequate preparation. . . . Since that time we have greatly advanced in many respects, but how far are we now. . . . Art schools there certainly are, and we are beginning to consider some knowledge of art a necessary factor in every system of education. But, nevertheless, art has remained alone of all the professions, as the one which has had no public encouragement or support. [262]

He called for a system of art education that went beyond technical methods (which could now be acquired in American institutions) to an immersion in a nourishing art atmosphere:

> Every student knows the kind and the quality of the influence which accompanies association with his fellow students. . . . In the art-schools abroad, the American student finds his comrades among those to whom the idea of art is as familiar as the Alphabet. His intimate association with them supplies, in a great measure, the deficiencies of his early training. He not only readily assimilates the art-ideas which to the foreign student are almost second nature, but he unconsciously acquires that respect for the profession, and that devotion to it which is one of the elements of success in its practice. This alone would make European study of the greatest value to him.[263]

Recognizing that the establishment of this first European art-scholarship held great promise for the future of American art education, Millet took full advantage of the occasion to emphasize an equally important aspect of the European educational experience—the opportunity to study the old masters and classical antiquity:

> I would not wish, on an occasion like the present, to expose myself to the charge of preaching any doctrine or theory of art, but . . . I cannot refrain from calling the attention of the trustees of these funds, of the jury, and of the students themselves, to the greatest of all the advantages of foreign travel and study, in order that we may not forget for a moment to recognize it ourselves, nor ever fail to impress it upon others. This is the priceless privilege of seeking artistic stimulus and inspiration at the very fountain-head of all modern art, the works of the old masters and the masterpieces of ancient art. . . . The attraction of novelty or the influence of personal presence may often lead us to forget for a brief period the existence of those masterpieces which made modern art a possibility. Who can

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> explain for us the grandeur and the grace of Greek art, analyze the mysterious charm of the early renaissance, or describe the dignity and nobility of the works of the mediaeval masters? We all feel in our hearts that these will for all time continue to be the great sources of all best artistic impulse.[264]

By the early 1880s, Millet was one of a number of artists who were looking to art history and tradition as exemplars for fashioning a new contemporary art. He explained that by studying the highest achievements of European painting, artists could learn to be original:

> If we, then, fully recognizing the merits of modern work, and exalting it with that frank enthusiasm which is the life of art, seek to trace its inspiration to the original source, and from the same springs drink our own virtalizing draughts, we shall best gain what is most rare and most precious in art, the power of remaining simply and individually ourselves.[265]

As noted earlier, Millet's respect for tradition as a font of modern artistic inspiration, conditioned his negotiations to secure the George Watts Loan Exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, a show which introduced Americans to idealized modern English art.[266] Millet's enduring commitment to professionalizing American art education, along the lines of European academic principles, would culminate in his work with the American Academy in Rome.

Classical subjects again dominated the pictures Millet readied for exhibition in 1884. He sent his works to fewer shows than he had in 1883, including the Artists' Fund Society, the American Art Association, the American Water Color Society, the Brooklyn Art Association, the National Academy of Design, the St. Botolph Club, and the Society of American Artists. No doubt the time he devoted to organizational matters prevented the artist from working on his own paintings. If his pictures were fewer in number, their critical reception was increasingly enthusiastic.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The first exhibition of the new year was the Twenty-fourth Annual Artists' Fund Society show, which was held on January 15-16, 1884. Although the New York Tribune reported that attendance was good, the bidding was not brisk and prices were generally low.[267] Millet's contribution, a Greek minstrel entitled *A Hymn* (Fig. 4.56), did not sell, but drew praise for its decorative qualities. The critic for the New York Tribune wrote:

> Our interest in the robust classical maiden who chants Mr. Millet's "Hymn" is distracted by appreciation of the dainty color scheme of which she forms a part. The harmonious blending of tunic, cream background and darker dado show a color sense unusually delicate and refined.[268]

In late January Millet sent *Prosperina Gathering Flowers* (*The Poppy Field*) (Fig. 4.57) to a Special Exhibition of Representative Pictures by American Artists at the American Art Association. As in *Reading the Story of Oenone*, the painting takes its subject from Greek mythology. According to Ovid's story, Prosperina, the daughter of the corn-goddess Ceres, was picking flowers in a meadow, when she was snatched away to the underworld by Pluto. Ceres negotiated Prosperina's return to earth each spring. The painting is more closely related to the text than is *Oenone*, as Millet depicts the moment in the myth, prior to the abduction, when Prosperina is gathering flowers.[269] A Greek temple is visible in the left background. The carefully drawn, firmly modeled figure of Prosperina, rendered with portrait-like fidelity and attention to details of costume, bears comparison with De Keyser's images of Biblical women, such as his *Rebecca at the Well* (1860, Fig. 4.58). Millet's Antwerp training is also reflected in his adaptation of an antique prototype. The classical source for Prosperina is the "Primavera" from Stabiae, a first-century Roman wall painting in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the Museum at Naples, which Millet sketched (Fig. 4.59) during a visit to the museum in the early 1870s.[270] The bright chromatic palette and flickering brushwork of the garden give the picture a decorative quality. It is possible that Millet began the garden scene during his visit to the Cotswolds the previous summer, and completed the painting in his New York studio.[271] This might account for the seeming incongruities of color and perspective noted by the critic for the New York Times:

> Mr. Millet shows a classical maiden picking poppies and showing, as she bends, a round, handsome shape under some very cleverly painted drapery. A minor detail—the extension of the very red poppies far into the distance—seems to be a mistake for two reasons: one, because the left upper part is better without the strong color of the remainder of the field; the other, because at such great distances even poppy-fields are subdued in color.[272]

The painting was, nonetheless, well received, with the reviewer for Art Amateur calling it "perhaps the most striking" of the pictures in the exhibition.[273] It sold for $375 to Millet's friend Lawrence Barrett,[274] who loaned it to the Museum of Fine Arts Boston Fifth Annual Exhibition of Contemporary American Art in May, 1885.[275]

When the Seventeenth Annual Exhibition of the Water Color Society opened on February 4, on the heels of the American Art Association show, Millet's classical subjects continued to receive accolades.[276] In a large exhibition of 714 works, in which many commentators worried that the lavishly decorated galleries, would distract from the pictures, Millet's lively *Cymbal Player* (Fig.4.60) caught the attention of the critics:

> Mr. Millet's "Cymbal Player" is in an excellent vein of art, and is marked by a genuine mastery over action, which is one of the most valuable qualities in figure painting—to catch a fleeting action is as much rarer a gift than the simple posing of one well and gracefully, as shooting on the wing is more difficult than shooting

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

at a target, and is a quality *sine qua non* in the highest range of design.[277]

The reviewer for the New York Tribune wrote that it was among the "work which at once commands attention."[278] Unfortunately, sales at the Water Color show were particularly sluggish, and neither the positive commentary nor the illustration of the drawing in the catalog helped find a purchaser. Millet reduced the price and sent it to the Brooklyn Art Association Spring Exhibition of Water Colors, but it remained unsold.[279]

By February Millet had made up his mind to live abroad for part of the year. The time spent in England during two previous summers, the positive critical reception to his work there, and the constant interruptions in New York to his creative work had convinced him that it was time for a change. He wrote to Charles Deschamps of his plans:

> I am quite moved by the interest you take and shall not scruple to ask you to keep your eye open for a place for us in London. My hope has been for a great while to be able to spend from May to October in England. I can see no reason why a man shouldn't do that as well as go into the country here for the same length of time. Sooner or later I hope to spend some seasons abroad but until I get better on my feet I must stay here winters. You don't know how glad it makes me to think that my work was liked in England. It's encouraging and discouraging at once. Encouraging me to try harder and discouraging because I fear I can't fill the bill. However, I can only go on doing as well as I can. [280]

Millet also detailed his recent activities, and the challenge of maintaining the focus on his creative work amidst the pressures of his administrative obligations:

> It is very difficult to do anything here at all. Whether I shall be able to send anything to the Grosvenor or any other exhibition depends on my luck. I'm painting the Barrett portrait, new background version drapery, etc. I asked Carr about exhibiting that there as Barrett was very anxious to have it seen in London . . . . Carr said he thought it would be accepted. When I have it done I shall ship it to you and ask you to show it to Carr and frame it. Barrett sails the 18th of March and will pay you all charges. I shall give him a note to you . . . . You will not be

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> surprised to hear that my daylight is all occupied by models and my evenings with correspondence and the Fine Art question. I have led my committee into Washington had a hearing before the congressional committee and have lobbied 3 days with distinguished success. The committee have reported the bill favorably in the house and we have the greatest confidence in its passage. Legislative machinery will alone defeat it. The members are pledged to sustain it. As a lobbying scheme I propose to accept the invitation of the National Museum to deliver 2 lectures on costume before 800 selected Washington guests. This would fetch the ladies over to our cause solid. The men follow like sheep. Would it be worthwhile? All this takes time and costs money. But the game is worth the candle. I'm not going to let up on that thing until it is passed.[281]

He closed with the usual pleasantries and family news:

> The family is well and all send warmest regards. We are as busy as usual. Lily has her house full of sewing women and her brain crammed with details of housekeeping so that I see comparatively little of her. (What gracious times we had at your house!) Kate is a great romping girl. We shan't bring her over this year for various reasons . . . . I can't thank you enough for your letter and the encouragement in it. I will send catalogue of water color show in a day or two.[282]

Millet appears to have saved his most important work in 1884 for the Fifty-Ninth Exhibition of the National Academy of Design, which opened on April 7. He displayed three pictures—*Regina Convivii* (Fig. 4.61), *Portrait*, and *The Cottage Garden* (Fig. 4.62).[283] *Portrait* (unlocated), described by a reviewer for the New York Tribune as "a portrait of a young lady in creamy white robes . . . painted much in one key and characterized by the harmony usual in Mr. Millet's coloring,"[284] is probably the portrait of Lawrence Barrett's daughter that Millet had mentioned in his March 6, 1883 letter to Charles Deschamps. The portrait was not offered for sale and Lawrence Barrett was listed in the catalog as its owner. Another reviewer observed that the artist had not lost his ability to capture the personality of his sitter: "This is, so far as can be judged from the portrait alone, a thorough piece of characterization—too individual not to be true—and the classic sympathies of the painter are shown in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the treatment of the accessories, the subtle play of pale tints, and the frank severity of the design."[285]

In a large exhibition that included Homer's *The Life Line* (1884, Philadelphia Museum of Art), J. Alden Weir's *The Mother* (1884, Private collection) and Charles Ulrich's *Castle Garden* (1884, Corcoran Gallery of Art), and which despite its faults was considered the best show the Academy had held in the last five years, both Millet's *Portrait and Regina Convivii* elicited what was now almost standard praise for their technical mastery and decorative character. The critics who commented on *Regina Convivii* (Fig. 4.61) also noted its cosmopolitan context, and favorably compared the artist to Lawrence Alma-Tadema. The following discussion in the New York Sun is typical:

> His large canvas (No. 118) in the East Gallery is the most brilliantly decorative picture of its class that has been seen in the Academy. It is large in conception and design, graceful in its drawing, and radiant in the exquisite quality of its color and the delicacy and refinement of its treatment. The influence of Alma-Tadema is strongly apparent . . . . Threefold, it reveals itself in his choice of subjects, in his study and adaptation of draperies, in his leaning to the Greek type and the material of Greek art. The picture in question is essentially classical in feeling and design. It represents a maiden presiding over some unseen festivity, with a rose raised, as if in pleasant admonition, in her hand, while her head is wreathed with other roses, too beautiful, perhaps, to have grown in ancient Greece or Italy, but very fitting to the warm and sensuous type of femininity that they are made to adorn. Her full and graceful figure is draped in the elegant folds of some soft and pliant fabric which reveals its exquisite contour, while the color alternates from the rich crimson beauty of the flowers to the pale and vanishing gray of the marble background and the tessellated floor. The whole plan and treatment of the composition is delightful, and the picture from every point of view most successful. Mr. Millet has chosen a most exacting and difficult line of work, but one for which he seems to be specially adapted. Unless treated with great imaginative power such subjects as his are apt to be stiff and unsympathetic, but he imbues them with vitality and clothes them with poetic sentiment.[286]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The critic for Art Amateur concurred:

> Mention must not be omitted of the interesting and always intelligent work of F. D. Millet. His principal contribution, "Regina Convivii"—a single female figure—is agreeable in color and shows careful study of drapery and textures. Mr. Millet probably comes nearer excellence as a follower of the Alma-Tadema school than any other painter in this country.[287]

Even the few dissenters agreed, although one would have preferred "less absorption in color and more human interest in Mr. Millet's work,"[288] and another thought the expression "a trifle sad and tired for a 'Regina Convivii.'"[289] *The Cottage Garden* (unlocated) (Fig. 4.62), a memento of the artist's summer in the English countryside, drew no attention from the critics.

For the Seventh Annual Society of American Artists Exhibition, which opened on May 26, Millet again sent a classical subject—*A Spring Offering* (unlocated, Fig. 4.63).[290] The exhibition was highly controversial due to the prominence given to William Merritt Chase and his "students," and to the Society's decision to hold the exhibition at the National Academy of Design. The critics were somewhat less than enthusiastic about Millet's work. While some would have agreed with the reporter for the New York Evening Post that "Millet's contribution is not up to his Academy mark, though, as always, earnest and classic in feeling as well as form,"[291] others voiced concern about the apparently trivial subject. After praising the picture's careful drawing and graceful and historically accurate costume, the critic for the Commercial Advertiser asserted that: "The motive of the piece, nevertheless, is vague and slight, and we are inclined to doubt whether Mr. Millet has done full justice to the strength that is in him."[292]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

When the exhibition season ended, Millet traveled to England as planned for the first of what turned out to be twenty-seven summers. Sailing from New York on May 28, he and Lily arrived in London on June 10.[293] They stayed at 54 Bedford Gardens, the home and studio that Abbey and Parsons had shared for several years. Their son Lawrence Frederick Millet (1884-1945) was born there on July 23, 1884.[294] Millet had originally planned to look for a home in London, but with a wife and two small children, he now sought out lodgings in the countryside. Writing his Harvard class notes a few years later, the artist looked back at this time and reminisced: "We took lodgings in this village [Broadway, Worcestershire] a few weeks later, and afterwards took an annual lease of a house."[295] While staying at the Lygon Arms Inn, he arranged to rent Farnham House, a characteristic Cotswold stone dwelling on the corner of the village green for the following summer.[296] On August 23, 1884, Millet wrote his friend Charles Stoddard: "We spend our summers here now and I do lots of work and we both lay in nervous strength enough to stand the wear and tear of a New York winter."[297]

Although Millet's decision to establish a second home at Broadway in the summer of 1884 in the wake of his early critical success seems a bit of a surprise, it was actually a well-considered move. He had contemplated such a transfer for several years. As early as 1880, before he shifted his activities from Boston to New York, Millet had told a reporter for the Boston Herald:

> I think of going to New York this year . . . . But the ideal way of dividing time would be to pass two months of every summer—the "green season," when everything is too green to paint—in England and Paris, seeing the exhibitions and refreshing the mind and eye.[298]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In September 1882, after a brief stint in England and Paris "refreshing the mind and eye" and painting in the English countryside, Millet, as already discussed, had concluded that England offered a congenial working environment,[299] and by March 1883 could confidently write Charles Deschamps "I do hanker for London and long to be there settled."[300]

The decision may have been largely motivated by commercial reasons. Paradoxically, Millet's efforts to foster an appreciation for the arts in America by educating the public about contemporary European art through his participation in and promotion of international exhibitions, and through his work to repeal the foreign art tariff, may have stimulated the patronage for European art. Despite the generally enthusiastic response to his work by the American press, and the honor of having one of his first masterworks, *Reading the Story of Oenone* purchased by the Detroit Museum, the market for American art remained small. As Clarence Cook noted: "Americans as a rule would rather buy any picture than one painted by an American."[301] Stagnant financial markets did little to help matters. In summing up the 1884 season, a writer for the New York Tribune sought to put the lagging sales at the major American art exhibitions in a positive light:

> It is an encouraging sign that more exhibitions have been held during the past year than ever before, despite the continuance of "business depression." Although the sales at the regular exhibitions have shown a decrease in most cases as compared with previous years, the sum total of the receipts from all local exhibitions would compare more favorably with past results. The Artists Fund sale of 1884 proved unexpectedly successful, but the sales at the Water-Color Exhibition, the spring and fall exhibitions at the Academy, and the exhibition of the Society of American Artists all showed a falling off.[302]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The critic for Art Age put it more bluntly: "Like everything else in and out of the Stock Exchange . . . the picture business has gone to the dogs in these days of financial strangulation."[303]

The languishing American picture market in fact forced many artists to seek alternative venues to sell their work. As early as April 1881 a short article in the New York Times suggested that the Paris Salon was not the only foreign sales forum for American artists:

> The London exhibitions will contain landscapes by Ernest Parton and R. C. Minor; Hennessey will send work from France, and Magrath and Helmick submit cottage interiors. The latest arrival in the American art colony is Walter Shirlaw, who has taken a London studio.[304]

In June 1882 the New York Times noted the large representation of American artists at both the Grosvenor Gallery and Royal Academy exhibitions:

> The Grosvenor Gallery has works by the following Americans: Boughton, Hennessy, Sargent, Whistler, Mark Fisher, T. C. Farrer, McClur Hamilton, Eugene Benson, and Julian and Waldo Story, the sons of W. W. Story. The Royal Academy has also representatives from the studios of Boughton, Hennessy and Sargent, as well as Winslow Homer, Bridgman, Mrs. Merritt, Ernest Parton, and R. C. Woodville.[305]

The London correspondent for the Studio reported in June 1883, that in the prior month alone there had been thirty-six picture exhibitions in London, including a special exhibition of American watercolors and etchings at the Egyptian Hall. "Whatever may be the fate of the American Water Color Exhibition, in a pecuniary point of view," he observed, "it is certain now that American art is appreciated in England."[306] The favor with which the watercolor display was received in fact led the directors of Grosvenor Gallery to offer the Society of American Artists the use of their gallery for an exhibition the following year, a show Millet had helped to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

arrange.[307] In May 1884 as Millet sailed for England, the American marine painter Arthur Quartley (1839-1886) also prepared to take up residence in London, prompting a writer for Art Amateur to note: "it might not be amiss to remark that no American of . . . ability has yet gone to England without, in a short time, more than doubling his New York or Boston studio prices."[308]

Millet's friendships and affiliations within London's art, literary and theatrical community insured an easy transition for himself and his family. His summers in Broadway would usher in a new phase in his career in which the representation of idealized genre paintings of contemporary and historical English and early American life would form another major cluster of work. He would continue to produce these in tandem with his classical-subject pictures until the end of the decade and into the 1890s. Like all of his work they seek a symbiotic relationship between purposeful content and aesthetic harmony—a unity of idea and formal means—but they constitute another chapter in his life. With his relocation to England in 1884, Millet's formative years had come to an end. In 1885 Millet would be elected an Academician at the National Academy of Design and appointed a Trustee of the National Society of Art,[309] further solidifying his reputation. The following year, 1886, *No Unwelcome Guest (At the Inn),* one of the first pictures the artist painted in Broadway, would win the $2,500 American Art Association Exhibition's Second Prize Fund award and enter the collection of the Union League Club. While not exactly a prophet without honor in his own country, Millet's relocating to England may have enhanced his reputation in America and helped stimulate his market there.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

At the very least, this Yankee was a rising international star, who had successfully established himself in two major world art markets.

The remaining years of Millet's life and artistic productivity are beyond the scope of this study. However, his busy, productive early years crystallized his idealistic artistic philosophy—that art is meant to engage the intellect and the imagination to convey a broad humanistic idea expressed in an aesthetically harmonious and original manner. His commitment to public service for the advancement of American art was largely motivated by his activities and experiences during this period and would continue to be important to him until his death in 1912.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Endnotes to Chapter 4

[1] Information on the transformation of New York in the early 1880s is based on Edwin G. Burrows and Mike Wallace, Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), pp. 1042-1169; and Bayrd Still, Mirror For Gotham: New York as Seen by Contemporaries from Dutch Days to the Present (New York: Fordham University Press, 1995), pp. 205-256; I. N. Phelps Stokes, The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909 (New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1926), 5: 1936-2029; and Benjamin J. Lossing, History of New York City (New York: George E. Perine, 1884), 2: 835-843.

[2] For an excellent history of the early years of the American Art Gallery and the American Art Association, and of their efforts to promote American art, see Gerald Douglas Bolas, "The Early Years of the American Art Association, 1879-1900" (Ph.D. diss., The Graduate Center of The City University of New York, 1998).

[3] Linda Hene Skalet, "The Market For American Paintings in New York," Ph.D. dissertation, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, 1980, p. 247.

[4] [M]ariana. G. Van Rensselaer, "The New York Art Season," The Atlantic Monthly (August 1881), p. 202.

[5] Millet is not listed in the New York City Directory until 1884. His 335 Fourth Avenue address for the fall of 1880 is found in the Catalogue of the Fifty-Sixth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design, 1881, p. 49, although by the time the exhibition opened he had already moved to 578 Fifth Avenue. See F. D. Millet to Mr. Bugbee (January 6, 1881), St. Botolph Club Records, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

[6] Although Tiffany consistently listed his design firm in the New York Business Directory as "Louis C. Tiffany & Co.," he simultaneously formed business ventures with other artists that operated under a variety of names. For "Louis C. Tiffany & Co." see Wilson's Business Directory of New York City, 1881-1884, pp. 528, 595, 588, 550, respectively. For information concerning Louis C. Tiffany & Company, Associated Artists see Alice Cooney Frelinghuysen, "Louis Comfort Tiffany at The Metropolitan Museum," The Metropolitan Museum of Art Bulletin 41, 1 (Summer 1998), pp. 10-11; Alastair Duncan, Louis Comfort Tiffany (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., 1992), pp. 31-52; Catherine Hoover Voorsanger, "Dictionary of Architects, Artisans, Artists, and Manufacturers," in Doreen Bolger Burke et al, In Pursuit of Beauty: Americans and the Aesthetic Movement, exhibition catalog (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1986), pp. 474-475; and Koch, Louis C. Tiffany, Rebel In Glass, pp. 11-22. The confusing history and misconceptions about the collaboration of Tiffany, Wheeler, de Forest and the landscape painter Samuel Colman in a decorating firm called "Associated Artists" is best explained in Amelia Peck, "Candace Wheeler: A Life in Art and Business," in Amelia Peck and Carol Irish, Candace Wheeler: The Art and Enterprise of American Design, 1875-1900, exhibition catalog (The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2001), pp. 38-48. According to Peck, Tiffany and Wheeler were associates in 1880 in the decorating firm "Tiffany & Wheeler." Sometime in late 1880, or early 1881, Tiffany, Wheeler, and de Forest, along with William P. Mitchell, formed the new, expanded decorating firm "Louis C. Tiffany & Company, Associated Artists." Mitchell served as business manager; Colman, while not an official member of the firm, stepped in as an "associate" when Tiffany requested his services. The firm dissolved in 1883, after which time Wheeler pursued her textile work under the name of "Associated Artist," de Forest started his own furniture import business, and "Louis C. Tiffany and Company" continued to handle decorative projects.

[7] The contract appears to have been held by Tiffany. Invoices presented to the Seventh Regiment, and disbursements paid by them, were in the name of "Louis C. Tiffany & Co." See Sophia Duckworth Schachter, "The Seventh Regiment Armory of New York City: A History of its Construction and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Decoration," (M.A. Thesis, Historic Preservation Program, Columbia University, 1985), p. 58; and Cash Book, Seventh Regiment New Armory Fund, Seventh Regiment Collection, The New-York Historical Society. For information about the commission see Colonel Emmons Clark, History of the Seventh Regiment of New York, 1806-1889 (New York: Seventh Regiment, 1890), 2: 285; and Schachter, "The Seventh Regiment Armory," p. 48. The author's interview with Kenyon Fitzgerald, President of the Seventh Regiment Fund, confirmed that Tiffany's long-standing association with the Seventh Regiment had helped to secure the commission. Tiffany relatives had served in the Seventh Regiment, and various members of the Tiffany family made substantial contributions to the New Armory Fund and to the Fair that was held in April 1879 to raise funds for the new Armory. Tiffany himself served on the Art Committee for the Fair. See Kenyon Fitzgerald, interview by author, New York, New York, 13 November 2003; and Schachter, "The Seventh Regiment," pp. 37-39, and Appendix A, The Seventh Regiment New Armory Fund. Receipts and Disbursements, Jan. 15th, 1876 – Jan. 15th, 1881, pp. 6, 10. In addition, Tiffany clients were affiliated with the Seventh Regiment, most notably George Kemp, whose Fifth Avenue mansion Tiffany and Wheeler decorated in 1880, was the brother of Edward Kemp, a member of the Ways and Means Committee appointed by the Veterans to take charge of decorating their room. See Schachter, "The Seventh Regiment," pp. 53-54.

[8] Clark, Ibid, 2: 298-299.

[9] Robert M. Fogelson, America's Armories: Architecture, Society, and Public Order (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989), p. 128.

[10] Ibid, p. 130.

[11] The Veteran's Room. Seventh Regiment. N.G.S.N.Y. Armory (New York: Privately printed, 1881), pp. 9-10; "Veterans Housed Sumptuously," The New York Times, 23 April 1881, p. 2; and [William Crary Brownell], "Decoration in the Seventh Regiment Armory," Scribner's Monthly 22, 3 (July 1881), pp. 370-381. Although Brownell states that Augustus Saint-Gaudens and David Maitland Armstrong worked on the room, there is no documentary corroboration.

[12] Quoted in Koch, Rebel in Glass, p. 14.

[13] [Brownell], "Decoration in the Seventh Regiment Armory," Scribner's, p. 376.

[14] The Veteran's Room Seventh Regiment, p. 21.

[15] Owen Jones, The Grammar of Ornament (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1982, pp. 5-8, 61-63, Plates XXXVI, XXXVIII.

[16] The Veteran's Room Seventh Regiment, p. 23.

[17] "The Veterans' Room," Harper's Weekly (25 June 1881), p. 414.

[18] "Veterans Housed Sumptuously," New York Times, p. 2.

[19] [Brownell], "Decoration in the Seventh Regiment Armory," p. 375.

[20] Ibid, 376-377.

[21] Richard H. Murray, "Checklist of Murals and Their Painters," typescript, 1991; and A. F. Oakey, "A Trial Balance of Decoration," Harper's New Monthly Magazine 383, 64 (April 1882), pp. 734-740.

[22] A. F. Oakey, p, 735.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[23] S. R. Koehler, The United States Art Directory and Year-Book (New York: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1884), pp. 9-10.

[24] F. D. Millet, "Report of the Director of Decoration & Functions," in Daniel H. Burnham, The Final Official Report of the Director of Works of the World's Columbian Exposition (June, 1894, repr., New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989), p. 68. Millet's account states that he "painted the two tympana in the north-west corner Pavilion of the Manufactures & Liberal Arts building; one of them illustrating the art of spinning; the other the art of weaving. Both subjects were taken from the Odyssey . . . . Mr. Millet also decorated with figure subjects the interior of Music Hall, painting two compositions in the spandrels of the Proscenium and one in the ceiling of the Recital Hall, together with fifteen single figures, fifteen heads and six trophies. Besides this work Mr. Millet designed the figures in the pendentives of the Art building." In addition to the murals he executed for the Exposition Company, Millet also painted the ceiling of the New York State Building with *The Triumph of Juno,* an allegory of the Empire State encouraging the arts and sciences. For the latter commission, see Report of the Board of General Managers of the Exhibit of the State of New York at the World's Columbian Exposition (Albany: James B. Lyon, 1894), pp. 98-99.

[25] King, American Mural Painting, p. 55.

[26] "Art Notes," The Art Journal 7, 9 (1881), p. 288.

[27] Reverend Edmund Randolph Laine to Doctor John P. Millet, 24 January 1938, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100, Frame 345.

[28] Ibid; Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 12, pp. 10-11, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100; and Margaret French Cresson, St. Paul's Church, Stockbridge, Massachusetts. A List of the Memorials and the People Who Made Them (St. Paul's Church, 1960), pp. 17-18.

[29] "Expression in Glass," Boston Daily Globe, 21 June 1889, unpaginated newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[30] The Fourth Triennial Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College.—Fifth Report-June, 1881 (Boston: Press of Rockwell and Churchill, 1881), p. 33.

[31] "Art Notes," New York Times, 2 January 1881, p. 5; and "Notes on the Fine Arts," New York Times 7 February 1881, p. 6.

[32] "Among the Artists," New York Tribune, 27 March 1881, p. 2.

[33] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[34] "Oedipus Tyrannus," New-York Tribune, 16 May 1881, pp. 14-18.

[35] For George Riddle see New York Sun, 14 June 1881, p. 2. For Mary Anderson see "Pygmalion and Galatea" New York Times, 23 January 1883, p. 5; and M. Anderson, A Few Memories (New York: 1896), p. 117.

[36] Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts à Anvers, Année Académie 1871-1872. Rapport Annuel et Distribution Solennelle des Prix (Anvers: J. E. Buschmann, 1872), p. 44; and idem, Année Académie 1872-1873. Rapport Annuel et Distribution Solennelle des Prix (Anvers: J. E. Buschmann, 1873), p. 44.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[37] Millet's writings for these publications include: F. D. Millet, "Tom's Carnival," Harper's Young People (17 May 1881), pp. 452-454; and Frank D. Millet, "American Artists As Exhibitors Abroad," Studio And Musical Review 1, 1 (1881), pp. 25-26.

[38] Illustrated Catalogue Fourteenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society, 1881, No. 196 *Embroidery*, No. 599 *A Helping Hand*.

[39] Edwin Austin Abbey to Lily Millet, 1 April 1880, quoted in Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 6, p. 3, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[40] Clark S. Marlor, ed., A History of The Brooklyn Art Association with an Index of Exhibitions (New York: James F. Carr, nd), p. 277.

[41] "What Artists Are Doing," New York Tribune, 17 February 1881, p. 5.

[42] Catalogue of the Fifty-Sixty Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design (New York, 1881), pp. 21, 23, 25, 27.

[43] For Kate Field see Carolyn J. Moss, Kate Field: Selected Letters (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1996); and Lilian Whiting, Kate Field, A Record (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1899).

[44] Charles M. Kurtz, ed., American Academy Notes (New York: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co., 1881), p. 43;

[45] Boston Public Library files identify the painting as *Kate Field*, oil on canvas, signed and dated, lr "F. D. Millet 1887," approximately 50 inches x 40 inches, Bequest of Mrs. Edgar John Fellowes. Notes concerning dating provided to the author state: "Most have read the date next to Millet's signature in the lower right corner as 1887. However, the last digit may be a 1." See John Dorsey, to the author, 9 January 2003; and "BPL Clerk of the Trustees Files – Gifts – Mrs. Maren Fellows." The portrait in the collection of the Boston Public Library appears to be a partial replica of the original, full-length portrait.

[46] "Fine Arts. Fifty-Sixth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design.—1," Nation (31 March 1881), p. 229.

[47] See M. G. Van Rensselaer, "The New York Art Season," Atlantic Monthly (August 1881), p. 200; "The Academy Pictures. More Notable Features of the Exhibition," New York Times, 3 April 1881, p. 10; S. G. W. Benjamin, "The Exhibitions. VII.—National Academy of Design. Fifty-Sixth Exhibition," American Art Review 2, Second Division (1881), p. 29; and unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[48] Lillian Whiting, Kate Field: A Record (Boston: Little Brown, and Company, 1900), p. 402; and "Tete-A-Tete," Boston Evening Transcript, 12 October 1880, p. 1.

[49] Carolyn J. Moss, ed., Kate Field, Selected Letters, p. xi.

[50] "Fine Arts. Fifty-Sixth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design – I," p. 229.

[51] Ibid.

[52] Van Rensselaer, "The New York Art Season," p. 132.

[53] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[54] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[55] "One of Frank Millet's Odd Pictures," unidentified newspaper clippings, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[56] "The Academy Exhibition," New York Times, 20 March 1881, p. 2.

[57] The Fourth Triennial Report, p. 32.

[58] Francis Davis Millet Papers, AAA&L, No. PP124 *Baby Worship*, ink wash on paper.

[59] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[60] M. O. T., "Millet's Studio," unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[61] Francis Davis Millet Holland Diary, March 1872, FDM/AAA, p. 57, not microfilmed.

[62] For Gerard Dou's *Young Mother and Her Child* see K Baedeker, Belgium and Holland Handbook for Travelers, (Coblenz: Karl Baedeker, 1871) p. 234, No. 30; for Mihály Von Munkácsy's *Visit to the Baby* see "Munkacsy," Art Amateur (January 1880), pp. 23-24.

[63] Catalogue of the Fifty-Sixth Annual Exhibition, No. 462, p. 27, lists painting for sale at $1,800 and identifies Millet as the owner. M. O. T., "Millet's Studio," had previously noticed the painting in Millet's East Bridgewater studio, and reported that it had been purchased by the Boston art dealer E. Adams Doll (d. October 29, 1880), of the well known Doll and Richards Gallery: "Mr. Doll admired it particularly, and bought it the Monday previous to his death." Presumably, Millet took the painting back after Doll's untimely death. For E. Adams Doll see "Obituary," Boston Daily Advertiser, 30 October 1880, p. 4.

[64] "Notes of Art Work," New York Tribune, 15 May 1881, p. 5.

[65] "The Chicago Exposition," Studio 2, 41 (13 October 1883), pp. 161-162.

[66] "Minor Notes," Art Journal (June 1881), p. 192.

[67] Ibid, p. 223.

[68] Francis Davis Millet II, " Frank Millet— A Sketch," p. 21, FDM/AAA, Reel 848.

[69] For information on the Adams summer home at the Glades see Kirkland, Charles Francis Adams, Jr., pp. 79, 134.

[70] Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Diary entry, 4 July 1881, quoted in Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 6, p. 5, JAMP/AAA, Reel 1100.

[71] Ibid, pp. 5-6; and Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Diary entries 1, 3, 6, 9 September 1881, CFAJ Papers/MHS, Reel 2, Vol. 16.

[72] "Water Colors and Oils. What the Artists Have Been Doing," New York Tribune, 17 January 1882, p. 2.

[73] Paintings, Drawings and Studies By The Late Francis Davis Millet, Nos. 35, 44-46.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[74] Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Diary entries, 1 March; 25 and 28 April; 1 May; 7, 23 and 26 June; 8, 21 and 24 July; 29 October; 5-6 November; 9-10 December, 1876, CFAJ Papers/MHS, Reel 2, Vol. 11.

[75] Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Diary entries, 17, 24 November 1879, CFAJ Papers/MHS, Reel 2, Vol. 14; and 5 January 1880; 4 July 1881; and 21 September 1881, quoted in Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 6, pp. 5-6, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[76] Catherine Lynn, "Surface Ornament: Wallpapers, Carpets, Textiles, and Embroidery," in Bolger Burke et al, In Pursuit of Beauty, pp. 66, 87 noted that certain ornamental items and exotic goods from the East, including peacock feathers and Near Eastern and Indian patterned shawls had tremendous appeal with Americans during the Aesthetic movement.

[77] Booth and Millet, Chapter 6, p. 5, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100 note the birth of Edwin Austin Millet on July 15, 1881. Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Diary entry, 15 July 1881, CFAJ Papers/MHS, Reel 2, Vol. 16 suggests that young Edwin was born at the Glades, where his parents were the guests of the Adamses. Adams writes that he "ran up to Boston but returned to the Glades to be with Millets by 6 o'clock." See also Asa Millet Genealogy Book, p. 237 [renumbered p. 220], entry 51, Papers of the Millet Family, EBPL.

[78] Millet's activities may be partially reconstructed from Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Diary entries for 14, 30-31 August 1881; and 3, 6, 21 September 1881, CFAJ Papers/MHS, Reel 2, Vol. 16.

[79] "American Art Chronicle," American Art Review II, First Division (1881), pp. 39-40; and "Artists and Their Work," New York Times, 9 October 1881, p. 10.

[80] Records of the Board of Overseers of Harvard College Vol. 11, 1871-1882, p. 463, Harvard University Archives.

[81] For an excellent and comprehensive discussion of the Tile Club see Ronald G. Pisano, The Tile Club and the Aesthetic Movement in America (New York: Harry N. Abrams, Inc., Publishers in Association with The Museums at Stony Brook, 1999). For the October dinner in honor of Abbey and Parsons see Pisano, p. 47.

[82] See Pisano, p. 48 re the Tile Club's 1881 sketching expedition to Port Jefferson, Long Island. In April 1882 Millet also wrote an article entitled "Some American Tiles" for Century Magazine. The article is a serious discussion about the manufacture of artistic tiles in America, particularly the Low Art Tile Works at Chelsea, Massachusetts, as a byproduct of the emphasis on good design in the industrial arts stimulated by the 1876 Philadelphia Exposition.

[83] See discussion in Chapter 1, p. 25 regarding Millet painting on tile as a child; and Francis Davis Millet 1858 Diary, entry for January 10, 1858, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[84] Elizabeth O. Adams to John Alfred Parson Millet, 22 December 1937, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100, Frame 300.

[85] Lucas, Edwin Austin Abbey 1: 116.

[86] Joyce A. Sharpey-Shafer, interview by author, Penzance, England, 13 June 1999.

[87] Booth and Millet, Chapter 6, p. 5, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100 note that Mrs. Millet, Kate and young Edwin contracted diphtheria. See also Sharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune, p. 60; and Francis Davis Millet to Kate Field, Thursday [November 1881], Kate Field Collection, Rare Books and Manuscripts Collection, Boston Public Library, Boston.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[88] Birth and death dates for Edwin Austin Millet have been provided by the Central Cemetery in East Bridgewater, Massachusetts, where the Millet family burial plot is located.

[89] Scharpey-Schafer, Soldier of Fortune, p. 60.

[90] "Artists' Fund Society," New York Tribune, 15 February 1882, p. 5, reported that Millet had been elected a member of the society. For Millet's membership in the New York Art Club and a discussion of the Club aims see Koehler, United States Art Directory and Year-Book, p. 112.

[91] Brander Matthews, These Many Years, Recollections of a New Yorker (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917), p. 232.

[92] Lucia Millet to Huldah Millet, 22 January 1882, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[93] "Pictures by Alma-Tadema," New York Tribune, 26 January 1882, p. 5. For Charles Deschamps see Maas, Gambart: Prince of the Victorian Art World, p. 223. Charles Deschamps (1848-1908) was the nephew of the art-dealer Ernest Gambart. He served as an agent for Lawrence Alma-Tadema, and was secretary to the Society of French Artists—Durand-Ruel's London branch. In the latter position he was responsible for the display and distribution of impressionist works throughout England from 1872 onward.

[94] "Pictures by Alma-Tadema," p. 5.

[95] Ibid.

[96] Lucia Millet to Huldah Millet, Monday eve. [1882], FDM/AAA, not microfilmed..

[97] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, 15 April [1882], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 885.

[98] "A Lecture on Roman Costume at the National Academy," New York Sun, 11 February 1882, p. 10; "Ancient Roman Costumes," New York Times, 18 February 1882, p. 3; and "Roman Costumes. An Interesting Lecture by Mr. Frank D. Millet," New York Times, 25 February 1882, p. 8.

[99] "A Roman in Full Dress. Many Forms of the Toga and How It was Worn," New York Times, 1 March 1882, p. 2; "Roman Arms and Costumes. Another of Mr. F. D. Millet's Interesting Course of Lectures," New York Times, 8 March 1882, p. 3; and "Roman Costumes Described," New York Times, 15 March 1882, p. 2.

[100] "Art and Artists," Boston Evening Transcript, 1 March 1882, p. 6.

[101] Museum of Fine Arts. Fifth Annual Report, p. 6.

[102] "Costume Lectures, 1882," The Art Student (June 1882) 1, 1, np.

[103] See Millet's illustrated manuscript notes on classical costume in FDM/AAA, Reel 1098, Frames 698-988; and his article, F. D. Millet, "Costumes in the Greek Play at Harvard," Century Magazine 23, 1 (November 1881), pp. 65-89.

[104] Lucia Millet to Huldah Millet, Wednesday Eve [February 1882], FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[105] Illustrated Catalogue Fifteenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society, 1882 No. 261 *Study in Costume*, No. 444 *Maternal Anxiety*. See also Clarence Cook, "The Water-Color Society's Exhibition," Art Amateur 6, 4 (March 1882), p. 73. Millet had experimented with classical

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

subject matter during his student years at the Antwerp Royal Academy, as for example his picture of *Pan* (1872), but now would pursue the subject matter more extensively. See discussion re *Pan* in Chapter 2, p. 71.

[106] "The Water-Color Society," New York Tribune, 5 February 1882, p. 7.

[107] Cook, "The Water-Color Society's Exhibition," p.73.

[108] "In Gallery and Studio," New York Tribune, 19 January 1882, p. 9.

[109] Information on the Classical Revival movement in England is based on R. J. Barrow, Lawrence Alma-Tadema (London, Phaidon Press Limited, 2001); Robyn Asleson, Albert Moore (London: Phaidon Press, 2000); Richard Ormond et al, Frederic, Lord Leighton: Eminent Victorian Artist, exhibition catalog (Royal Academy of Arts, London, 1996); Allen Staley et al, Victorian High Renaissance, exhibition catalog (The Minneapolis Institute of Arts), 1978; and Philip Hook, "The Classical Revival in English Painting," Connoisseur 192, 772 (June 1976), pp. 122-127.

[110] Strahan, Edward [Earl Shinn], The Art Treasures of America, pp. 24, 90.

[111] "Art Notes," New York Times, 30 October 1881, p. 14.

[112] Montezuma, "My Note Book," Art Amateur (May 1882), p.115.

[113] "The Work of the Artists," New York Tribune, 23 April 1882, p. 5

[114] Hook, "The Classical Revival in English Painting," pp. 124.

[115] F. D. Millet, "The Watts Exhibition," Harper's New Monthly Magazine 71 (June 1885), p. 97. Millet's role in negotiating the Watts Loan Exhibition for the Metropolitan Museum is noted in G. W. S., "The Watts Exhibition," New York Tribune, 1 September 1884, p. 6; and "The Pictures of G. F. Watts," Studio New Series, 7 (8 November 1884), pp. 74-79.

[116] Millet, "The Watts Exhibition," p. 97.

[117] "Pictures by Alma-Tadema," p. 5.

[118] Regular press accounts reported on archeological discoveries at Tanagra and other sites. See for example "Art Notes," New York Times, 15 January 1882, p. 4.

[119] Thomas H. Goetz, Taine and the Fine Arts (Madrid: Playor, S. A., 1973), p. 16.

[120] Kermit Vanderbilt, Charles Eliot Norton: Apostle of Culture in a Democracy (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1959), pp. 123, 126, 131-132. For Norton's lectures on the History of Greek Art in Boston, see "Art Notes" New York Times, 25 December 1881, p. 6.

[121] Vanderbilt, Charles Eliot Norton, pp. 126-129.

[122] Ibid, p. 148.

[123] F. D. Millet to Charles E. Norton, 21 April 1907, and 10 February 1908, Charles Eliot Norton Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard College, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

[124] Quoted in Vanderbilt, Charles Eliot Norton, pp. 2-3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[125] A Catalogue of Pictures by the Tile Club Exhibited at The St. Botolph Club (Boston, February 25, 1882), np.

[126] Although the above-mentioned catalog lists only No. 18 *Marine* and No. 19 *A Koran Reader*, a newspaper review suggests that Millet added additional pictures to the exhibition. See "The Fine Arts. The Tile Club's Pictures," Boston Daily Advertiser, 3 May 1882, p. 4.

[127] For Millet's involvement with the Tile Club exhibition in Boston, see Pisano, p. 50. For Millet's resignation from the St. Botolph Club, see F. D. Millet to Mr. Bugbee, 6 January 1881, St. Botolph Club Records, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston.

[128] Catalogue of the Fifty-Seventh Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design (New York: 1882), pp. 25, 34.

[129] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[130] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[131] Francis Davis Millet, Post-1973 Exposition Diary, entries for 2 and 24 November 1873, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed.

[132] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[133] Clarence Cook, "The National Academy Exhibition," Art Amateur 6, 6 (May 1882), p. 116.

[134] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, 15 April [1882]), FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 882.

[135] Exhibition of Pictures and Studies by F. A. Bridgman, at The American Art Gallery, February 1881. Of the 296 works for sale and the ten paintings on loan from collectors, less than one-third were Breton or other non-Orientalist subjects.

[136] "Miscellaneous. European Pictures Bought by Americans," American Art Review II, First Division (1881), p. 42.

[137] For an excellent discussion of this unusual two-part exhibition, see Bienenstock, "Formation of the Society of American Artists," p. 131-142.

[138] Society of American Artists Fifth Annual Exhibition at The American Art Gallery (New York: The Art Interchange Publishing Company, 1882), No. 70.

[139] Bienenstock, "Formation of the Society of American Artists," p. 131.

[140] "Fine Arts. Society of American Artists," New York Tribune, 6 April 1882, p. 5.

[141] Ibid.

[142] "Society of American Artists," New York Times, 4 May 1882, p. 5.

[143] Society of American Artists Fifth Annual Exhibition, No. 168 *Portrait of Lawrence Barrett as Cassius*.

[144] The portrait is illustrated in the article by Laurence Hutton, "A Group of Players," Harper's New Monthly Magazine 96, 572 (January 1898), p. 203. I am grateful to Peter A. Engstrom for bringing this to my attention.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[145] For biographical information on Lawrence Barrett see Dictionary of American Biography, pp. 646-648.

[146] "Mr. Barrett's Performances," New York Tribune, 21 March 1881, p. 5.

[147] Laurence Hutton, Talks in a Library (New York: G. P. Putnam, 1905), p. 98.

[148] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, 15 April 1882, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 881.

[149] "Society of American Artists. Fifth Annual Exhibition—New Pictures," New York Tribune, 4 May 1882, p. 5.

[150] "Society of American Artists," New York Times, 4 May 1882, p. 5.

[151] William H. Gerdts, "Natural Aristocrats in a Democracy: 1810-1870," in Michael Quick et al American Portraiture in the Grand Manner, 1729-1920, exhibition catalog (Los Angeles Museum of Art, 1981), p. 34. For an excellent discussion of the tradition of theatrical portraiture in American art see idem, pp. 33-35, 42-43.

[152] "Mr. Barrett's Performances," New York Tribune, 15 October 1881, p. 4.

[153] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[154] M. G. V. R. [Mariana Griswold Van Rensselaer], "Art Matters," Lippincott's Magazine 4, 8 (July 1882), p. 106.

[155] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook I.

[156] "The Union League Club," The Art Journal (May 1881), p. 159 noted that at the first exhibition of pictures in the club's new galleries, "the most noteworthy picture of the display was Mr. Whistler's 'The White Lady.'" "Art Notes," The Art Journal (June 1881), p. 192 described Whistler's 'White Lady' as "perhaps the most interesting canvas by an American painter" in the museum's loan collection of modern pictures."

[157] "The American Artists' Exhibition," Art Amateur 6, 6 (May 1882), p. 114.

[158] Dorment and Macdonald et al, Whistler, p. 78 notes that Whistler's *Symphony in White No. 2. The Little White Girl* of 1864 was exhibited at the London International Exhibition in 1872. Champney to his father, 20 August 1872, EGCP/AAA, Reel 2898, Frame 102 confirms that he, Millet and Grundmann visited this exhibition, where they would have seen the Whistler painting.

[159] Hutton, Talks In a Library , p. 98.

[160] Ibid. Although Hutton suggested that portrait had been exhibited at the Royal Academy, and newspaper accounts reported that Millet had exhibited the portrait at the Grosvenor Gallery, a review of the exhibition catalogs of both institutions failed to corroborate these claims.

[161] "Close of the Art Season," New York Tribune, 28 May 1882, p. 2.

[162] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, 15 April [1882], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 881-885.

[163] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, 14 May [1882], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

886-887.

[164] See Francis Davis Millet to General Loring, 2 May 1882, Museum of Fine Arts Boston Papers/AAA, Reel 550, Frame 1164. Millet writes: "I am pretty certain of going to Europe for a very brief and much occupied season. I shall devote a large proportion of my time in London and Paris to the study of costume et al, and shall try and get for you the full set of photographs of the collection of ancient costume reproductions in the Museé d'Artillerie in Paris, also the mannekins [*sic*] if practicable." Francis Davis Millet to General Loring, 18, December [1882], idem, Frame 1169 reports "I couldn't get a mannekin [*sic*] owing to the shortness of my stay there, but I am now engaged in looking into the matter here for the National Museum at Washington. If anything comes of it I will look out for your figures."

[165] Francis Davis Millet Diary – Sweden and North Germany, 1882, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed. Millet's sketches from this trip have become separated from the artist's original sketchbooks. A number of them are reproduced in FDM/AAA, Reel 1098.

[166] Francis Davis Millet Dairy – Sweden and North Germany, 1882, places him on Göteberg on June 18. For Millet's description of Stockholm see Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, 22 June [1882], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 888.

[167] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, 6 August [1882], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 706-707.

[168] F. D. Millet, "Dalecarlia," Harper's New Monthly Magazine (September 1883), pp. 489-503; (October 1883), pp. 672-688. See also idem, "A Wild Goose Chase," Harper's New Monthly Magazine (April 1885), pp. 663-678; (May 1885), pp.937-949; (June 1885), pp.18-32.

[169] Edwin Austin Abbey to Charles Parsons, 20 August 1882, quoted in Lucas, 1: 121-122.

[170] Paintings Drawings and Studies By The Late Francis Davis Millet, Nos. 34, 36, 38, 39, 40, 53, respectively. The Scandinavian pictures are also noted in Francis Millet Rogers, "Frank D. Millet, American of Americans," Typescript, c. 1945, FMRP/AAA, Reel 1096, Frame 178.

[171] Francis Davis Millet Diary – Sweden and North Germany, 1882, FDM/AAA, not microfilmed. See entries for 25, 27-28 June 1882.

[172] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, Wednesday [1882], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 890-891.

[173] Excerpts from Millet's Diary, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 1368.

[174] There is an extraordinary amount of information on this topic. See especially "My Note Book," Art Amateur 7, 6 (November 1882), p. 112; "The Tariff on Works of Art," New York Evening Post 28 November 1882, newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook II; "The Tariff Question," Studio 1, 14 (7 April 1883), pp. 115-117; idem, 1, 21 (26 May 1883), pp. 213-214; "War Among Artists. Thomas Donaldson Replies Gaily to Frank D. Millet's Strictures," Philadelphia Press, 5 January 1884, and "Millet Answers Donaldson. What the Chairman of the Artists' Committee Has to Say About Protection," Philadelphia Press, 7 January 1884, newspaper clippings, AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook II; and "Our Congress and Works of Art," Studio New Series 1 (2 August 1884), pp. 10-11.

[175] For Millet's work on behalf of the Munich International Art Exposition see "Meeting re Munich International Art Exhibition," Art Interchange 10, 5 (1 March 1883), p. 61; "The Munich Exhibition,"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Studio 1, 10 (10 March 1883), p. 80; idem, 1, 15 (14 April 1883), pp. 129-130; "Notes and News," Art Interchange 10, 11 (24 May 1833), p. 133; "The Jury for the Munich Exhibition," Studio 1, 19 (12 May 1883), p. 190; "The Munich Exhibition. American Exhibitions and the National Academy of Design—Mr. F. D. Millet's Censure," New York Herald, 15 May 1883, newspaper clipping in AAA&L, Francis Davis Millet Scrapbook II; and "The Munich Exhibition," Studio 1, 20 (19 May 1883), pp 201, 220-221.

[176] For Millet's work on behalf of the Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibition see Maureen C. O'Brien, In Support of Liberty. European Paintings at the 1883 Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibition, exhibition catalog (The Parrish Art Museum, Southampton, New York, 1986), p. 17; "For the Pedestal," Studio 1, 20 (19 May 1883), pp. 203-204; and "Notes From Other Papers," Studio 2, 41 (13 October 1883), pp. 166-167.

[177] For Millet's role in negotiating the Watts Loan Exhibition for the Metropolitan Museum of Art see G. W. S., "The Watts Exhibition," p. 6; and "The Pictures of G. F. Watts," pp. 74-79.

[178] Millet, "The Watts Exhibition," pp. 96-103. As in his earlier writings about the art displays at the Vienna 1873 Exposition and the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial, Millet reiterates and expands his idealistic artistic philosophy. He uses Watts as an exemplar to demonstrate "that modern art may be noble, may be dignified, may be classical in spirit, without being imitative; that it may, indeed, be of our age, and appeal to our modern tastes and sympathies, and still have the essence of the highest art in its motives and in its results." Millet's prescriptive for modern American art includes the following tenets: First, art whose province is "to elevate, to delight, and to entertain," has no use for "the ugly and the commonplace." Second, artists should "exercise their intelligence in the selection of what they shall represent," and the public must "encourage the best intentions in art." The artist must share the public's sensibilities and tap into "human sentiments and human passions." He notes that the masterpieces of Greek art provide worthy models "for all nations and for all time." Millet, like many critics of his day, worries that American artists because of their belated training opportunities have been preoccupied with methods and materials and focused on the realistic representation of objects rather than the higher qualities of art. Thus, his third prescriptive asserts that the artist's purpose should be "to impress the spectator with the idea he has chosen to illustrate, both by the composition and by a treatment harmonious with the character of the subject," and to be able to express his idea without distracting the viewer by his means. Finally, Millet advocates that art engage broad human sentiments and passions and that it avoid the national and the local in either subject or execution. He concludes that "the best way to encourage American art is to encourage the development of true artists among us, whether they paint subjects inspired by civilized American life or by the barbarism of remote Asia. The purpose is the all-important object . . . . Let 'art for art's sake' be the cry, not 'art for the sake of patriotism.'"

[179] Ibid, p. 98.

[180] Salmagundi Sketch Club: Illustrated Catalog, 1882, Nos. 76, 488, 213, respectively.

[181] New York Herald, 2 December 1882, p 5.

[182] "Black and White," New York Times, 2 December 1882, p. 4.

[183] "The Salmagundi Exhibition. Second Notice," New York Tribune, 21 December 1882, p. 5.

[184] This drawing and another entitled *Under Cover of a Rifle* accompanied Millet's article, "My Double Christmas," in Harper's Christmas. Pictures and Papers—Christmas 1882—done by The Tile Club and its Literary Friends (New York: Harper Bros., 1882), p. 29.

[185] "The Art Club of New York. First Exhibition," New York Tribune, 13 February 1883, p. 5.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[186] Lathrop, "St. Botolph Club," pp. 445-446.

[187] "The Artist's Fund Society. Twenty-Third Annual Exhibition," New York Tribune, 28 January 1883, p. 7.

[188] Ibid.

[189] "Artist Fund Slaughter," Studio 1, 7 (17 February 1883), pp. 52-53 notes that *Norman Fisher Boy* sold for $150, and *Turkish Café* for $60.

[190] For the Toronto exhibition see Evelyn de R. McMann, Royal Canadian Academy of Arts/Académie royale des arts du Canada. Exhibitions and Members 1880-1979 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981), p. 287 No. 44 *Turkish café* $200; and "Notes on Art and Artists," New York Times, 22 April 1883, p. 12. For the Brooklyn exhibition see Catalogue 1884, Brooklyn Art Association, p. 9 No. 54. *Turkish Café* $110.

[191] Frank D. Millet, "Yatil," Century 25, 5 (March 1883), pp. 745-752.

[192] Illustrated Catalogue Sixteenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society, 1883, No. 25 *A Roman Girl*, No. 171 *Lacing the Sandal*.

[193] "Sixteenth Annual Exhibition," New York Tribune, 27 January 1883, p. 5.

[194] "The Watercolor Exhibition," The Nation 36 (February 15, 1883), p. 137.

[195] Bruce Weber, Drawn From Tradition: American Drawings and Watercolors from the Susan and Herbert Adler Collection, exhibition catalog (West Palm Beach: Norton Gallery of Art, 1989), p. 13.

[196] Mary Beth Kreiner first suggested this source for Millet's painting in her excellent article, "Francis Davis Millet's *Reading the Story of Oenone*, Bulletin of the Detroit Institute of Arts 69, 1-2 (1995), p. 20.

[197] For an excellent discussion of Clarke's patronage of American art see H. Barbara Weinberg, "Thomas B. Clarke: Foremost Patron of American Art From 1872 to 1899," American Art Journal (May 1976), pp. 52-83. Weinberg notes that *Lacing Her Sandal* was in Clarke's collection by July 1883.

[198] F. D. Millet to Mr. Clark, 28 May [1883], Archives of American Art, Charles Henry Hart Autograph Collection, Reel D5, Frame 198.

[199] The Private Collection of Thomas B. Clarke (American Art Gallery, New York, 1884), No. 80 *Lacing the Sandal*.

[200] Francis Davis Millet Sketches, FDM/AAA, Box 1, not microfilmed.

[201] Van Hook, Angels of Art, pp. 179-180.

[202] Millet, "The Watts Exhibition," pp. 96-103. See discussion in Note 178.

[203] American Art Association Exhibition of Paintings by the Members of the Art Club (The Art Club of New York, 1883), No. 70 *Edge of the Sea*.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[204] "The Art Club of New York. First Exhibition," p. 5.

[205] "The New York Art Club Exhibition," Art Amateur 8, 5 (April 1883), pp. 100-101.

[206] "Pictures From Longfellow," unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[207] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, 6 March [1883], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 708-710.

[208] Trumble, Representative Works of Contemporary American Artists, np.

[209] "Pennsylvania Academy Exhibition," Art Amateur 12, 1 (1884), p. 7.

[210] Society of American Artists 1883, March 26th – April 28th Sixth Annual Exhibition, American Art Gallery, No. 86 *Lolla*.

[211] "Art Exhibitions. The Society of American Artists," New York Sun, 25 March 1883, p. 5.

[212] "Sixth American Artists," Art Interchange (29 March 1883), p. 82.

[213] The Society of American Artists 1883. Opens in Boston, May 7th. Closes June 3d. Sixth Annual Exhibition Catalogue, No. 83 *Lolla*.

[214] Illustrated Catalogue Twenty-Eight Exhibition of the Boston Art Club of Water Colors and Works in Black and White at the Club Galleries, 1883, No. 88 *Roman Girl*.

[215] "The Art Club Exhibition," Boston Daily Advertiser 14 April 1883, p. 9.

[216] Illustrated Catalogue of the Art Department. Eleventh Cincinnati Industrial Exposition, 1883, No. 51 *Lolla*.

[217] "The Cincinnati Exhibition," Studio 2, 41 (13 October 1883), p. 161.

[218] Kreiner, "*Reading the Story of Oenone*, p. 18.

[219] Ibid.

[220] In August 1872 Millet visited the British Museum, where he saw the Elgin Marbles. See Edwin Graves Champney to his father, 20 August 1872, EGCP/AAA Reel 2898, Frame 102.

[221] Millet may have had the opportunity to see Moore's *Dreamers* during his summer 1882 trip to England, at which time it was on display at the Royal Academy exhibition. See Asleson, Albert Moore, p. 155.

[222] See Chapter 3, p.136, note 41 concerning Millet's comments about the English paintings at the 1876 Philadelphia Centennial Exposition. In [F. D. Millet], "The Fine Arts At The Centennial.—II," American Architect and Building News (8 July 1876), p. 221, Millet re-emphasizes his admiration for English art. Commenting specifically on Leighton's painting, he writes: "'The Summer Moon,' two beautiful women asleep in the strong moonlight, is an idyll of the harvest month full of classical grace."

[223] Catalogue of the Fifty-Eighth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design, 1883, No. 462 *The Story of Oenone*.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[224] "The Academy Exhibition," Art Amateur (May 1883), p. 127.

[225] "The National Academy of Design," New York Tribune, 31 March 1883, p. 5.

[226] "Pictures at the Academy. Viewed in the Quiet of Varnishing Day," New York Times, 31 March 1883, p. 5.

[227] Ibid.

[228] "Detroit Took Up Art Just Fifty Years Ago," Art Digest 8 (15 October 1933), p. 32.

[229] [Louisville] Courier Journal, 24 August 1884, unpaginated newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[230] "The Jury for the Munich Exhibition," p. 190. Unable to travel to Boston with Chase and Beckwith to select works for the exhibition, Millet wrote to General Loring: "Chase & Beckwith are coming into Boston Monday or Tuesday to see if we can get some of the Hunts Fullers etc. etc for the Munich International exhibition this summer. I have recommended them to consult with you before doing anything and I hope you will be able to give them some assistance. . . . I should have come with Chase and Beckwith but I can't get away." See Francis Davis Millet to General Loring, 4 May [1883], MFAB Papers/AAA, Reel 551, Frames 503-504.

[231] "Art News and Comments," New York Tribune, 4 May 1883, p. 5; and "The Munich Exhibition. American Works of Art Collected for It," Boston Daily Advertiser, 21 May 1883, p. 8.

[232] F. D. Millet, "To The Editor of the Herald," New York Herald, 15 May 1883, unpaginated newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook II.

[233] Ibid.

[234] "For the Pedestal," p. 21.

[235] "Coming Exhibitions," Studio 1, 26 (30 June 1883), p. 294; and New York Times, 24 June 1883, p. 6.

[236] Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 6, p. 8. JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[237] Ibid., and Lucas, 1: 130.

[238] "Sept. 1883 . . . . Going to Lechlade to finish a picture to send to the Dudley [Institute of Painters in Oils.]" Excerpts from Millet's Diary, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 1368.

[239] Abbey added this note to a letter written by Frank Millet to Elihu Vedder. See Frank Millet to Elihu Vedder, 1 October 1883), with a note from Edwin Austin Abbey. Quoted in Lucas, 1: 175.

[240] Francesco di Milleto to Vedder, 15 October [1883], quoted in Regina Soria, Elihu Vedder (Rutherford: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1970), pp. 175-176.

[241] Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 6, p. 9, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[242] Abbey to Austin Dobson, 20 October 1883, quoted in Simpson, "Reconstructing The Golden Age," pp. 12-13.

[243] Booth and Millet, "Frank Millet: A Versatile American," Chapter 6, p. 9, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[244] Francis Davis Millet to General Loring, 14 December 1883, MFAB Papers/AAA Reel 551, Frames 505-506 documents his return home by December 12, 1883.

[245] "The Institute of Painters in Oil Colours," The Athenaeum (22 December 1883), p. 822.

[246] Arthur K. Wheelock, Jr., ed., Johannes Vermeer, exhibition catalog (National Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C., 1996), p. 176-178 identifies this painting as being in The Louvre in 1870, the first Vermeer to enter a public collection in France..

[247] Boston School artists include among others Edmund Tarbell, Joseph DeCamp, Frank Benson (1862-1951), William McGregor Paxton (1869-1941), Philip Leslie Hale (1865-1931), and Lilian Wescott Hale (1881-1963). They painted idealized, genteel, female figures in elegantly appointed, quiet, light-filled domestic interiors; scenes of passive domesticity that were less concerned with anecdotal genre than evocation of mood. Their subjects and style were inspired by a renewed interest in the art of the seventeenth-century Dutch artists, especially the work of Johannes Vermeer. For the Boston School see Trevor J. Fairbrother, The Bostonians: Painters of an Elegant Age, 1870-1930 (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1986); William H. Gerdts, American Impressionism (New York: Abbeville Press Publishers, 1984), pp. 201-218; and Carol Troyen, The Boston Tradition: American Paintings from the Museum of Fine Arts Boston (Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1980).

[248] The central position of Otto Grundmann at the Boston Museum School suggests perhaps an Antwerp legacy at that institution. See R. H. Ives Gammell, The Boston Painters, 1900-1930 (Orleans, Massachusetts: Parnassus Imprints, 1986), pp. 21-27. While not specifically addressing the influence of seventeenth-century Dutch and Flemish interior domestic genre scenes, Gammell credits Grundmann "with having given the Boston group their most distinctive characteristic."

[249] Van Hook, Angels of Art, pp. 104-105; and Bernice Leader, "Antifeminism in the Paintings of the Boston School," Arts Magazine (January 1982), pp. 112-119. Leader viewed Boston School images of passive, genteel domesticity as antifeminist propaganda during a time when Boston women were making strides in education, professional life, and civic and social reform.

[250] "The Institute," Magazine of Art 8 (1884), p. 161.

[251] Pall Mall Gazette, 19 December 1883. Newsclipping in AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[252] London Times quoted in "Art News and Comments. The Week in Art Circles," New York Tribune 6 January 1884, p. 4.

[253] London Academy, quoted in "Art Notes," The New York Times, 13 January 1884, p. 4.

[254] "Mr. Clarke's Exhibition," New York Times, 28 December 1883, p. 5.

[255] Weinberg, " Thomas B. Clarke: Foremost Patron of American Art," p. 58. Weinberg notes that this annual prize of $300 for the best figure painting of an American subject by a non-academician shown at the Academy's spring exhibition was initiated in 1884. At first prizes were awarded by exhibitors' votes, and, after 1889, by a jury.

[256] "Art News and Comments," New York Tribune 1 June 1884, p. 4.

[257] "Notes from Other Papers," Studio 2, 43 (27 October 1883), pp. 203-204.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[258] For a comprehensive discussion of the Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibition see Maureen O'Brien In Support of Liberty: European Paintings at the 1883 Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibition, exhibition catalog (National Academy of Design, 1986).

[259] Montezuma, "My Note Book," Art Amateur 10, 6 (May 1884), p. 122.

[260] F. D. Millet, "The Art Competitions," Harper's New Monthly Magazine 69, 414 (November 1884), p. 923.

[261] "Art Students to Compete. The Hallgarten and Harper Scholarship Funds Combined," New York Times, 19 May 1884, p. 8.

[262] "The Award of the Harper and Hallgarten Scholarship," Studio New Series, 12 (17 January 1885), pp. 134-135.

[263] Ibid, p. 135.

[264] Ibid.

[265] Ibid.

[266] Millet, "The Watts Exhibition," pp. 96-103.

[267] "The Artists' Fund Picture Sale," New York Tribune, 17 February 1884, p. 5.

[268] "The Artists' Fund Society," New York Tribune, 6 January 1884, p. 2.

[269] The Greek myth was popular with artists and writers throughout the nineteenth century. Those who treated the theme include the American Neoclassical sculptor Hiram Powers (1805-1873) whose marble bust of *Proserpine* was first produced about 1839, the English poet and critic Algernon Swinburne (1837-1909), whose "The Garden of Proserpine" was published in his Poems and Ballads of 1866, and the English Pre-Raphaelite painter Dante Gabriel Rossetti (1828-1882), who represented the subject in a series of paintings and drawings beginning in 1871.

[270] FDM/AAA, Reel 1098, Frame 629.

[271] Millet was working on the painting as late as January 7, 1884, when he made reference to the artwork in his letter to the Editor of The Philadelphia Press. Writing as Chairman of the Artists' Committee in favor of free trade in art, Millet responded to criticism from Thomas Donaldson, a supporter of the protectionist tariff on foreign art. Millet described himself as a hard working painter "standing at his easel, his ragged velveteen coat bedaubed with paint, his hair dishevelled . . . . Before him stood a model plucking an imaginary poppy from an imaginary poppy field. Both artist and model were tired and cross; both had been hard at work for hours. . . . I have a perfect right, as one of the protected, to cry out against Protection. I have no pupils, paint no decorations, have no salary and no income except from my profession. I paint few portraits and depend entirely on the sale of my pictures for the support of myself and family. . . . I have a better right to be heard on the question of free art than Mr. Donaldson or any other man who is not a competitor in the same sense that I am."

[272] "American Art Association," New York Times, 19 January 1884, p. 3.

[273] "The Art Association Exhibition," The Art Amateur 10, 4 (March 1884), p. 87.

[274] "Art News and Comments," New York Tribune, 3 February 1884, p. 4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[275] Museum of Fine Arts Catalogue of the Fifth Annual Exhibition of Contemporary American Art (Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1885), No. 33 *A Poppy Field.*

[276] Illustrated Catalogue, Seventeenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society (National Academy of Design, 1884), No. 378 *Cymbal Player.*

[277] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[278] "The Water Color Society," New York Tribune, 2 February 1884, p. 2.

[279] 1884 Brooklyn Art Association Spring Exhibition of Water Colors, No. 91 *Cymbal Player.*

[280] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, 18 February 1884, FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 813-815.

[281] Ibid.

[282] Ibid.

[283] Catalogue of the Fifty-Ninth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design, 1884 (New York), No. 118 *Regina Convivii*, No. 210 *Portrait*, No. 493 *The Cottage Garden.*

[284] "The Academy of Design," New York Tribune, 5 April 1884, p. 5.

[285] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[286] New York Sun, April 1884, unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L Millet Scrapbook I.

[287] "The National Academy Exhibition," The Art Amateur 11, 1 (1884), p. 10.

[288] "The Academy of Design," p. 5

[289] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[290] Society of American Artists Seventh Annual Exhibition (1884), No. 59. *A Spring Offering.*

[291] "Exhibition of The Society of American Artists," The Evening Post, 27 May 1884, p. 3.

[292] Unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

[293] Excerpts from Millet's Diary," FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 1368.

[294] The Sixth Triennial Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College. Seventh Report—December 31, 1887 (Boston: Press of Rockwell and Churchill, 1888), p.36.

[295] Ibid.

[296] Booth and Millet, Chapter 6, p. 12, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100.

[297] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Stoddard, 23 August 1884, CWS/SUL.

[298] [George Lathrop], "Frank D. Millet: A New England Artist in His Rural Studio," Boston Herald [1880], unidentified newspaper clipping, AAA&L, Millet Scrapbook I.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[299] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, Wednesday [September 1882], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 890.

[300] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Deschamps, 6 March [1883], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 708.

[301] Clarence Cook, "Thomas B. Clarke's Pictures," Art Amateur 10, 3 (February 1884), p. 62.

[302] "Art News and Comments," New York Tribune 28 December 1884, p. 10.

[303] "Art Gossip," Art Age 3, 25 (August 1885), p. 6.

[304] "Art Notes," New York Times, 4 April 1881, p. 2.

[305] "Art Notes," New York Times, 26 June 1882, p. 3.

[306] "From Our London Correspondent," Studio 1, 26 (30 June 1883), p. 287.

[307] Ibid.

[308] Montezuma, "My Note-Book," Art Amateur 10, 6 (May 1884), p. 123.

[309] "The National Society of Arts," Studio New Series, 17 (28 March 1885), pp. 196-197. The National Society of Arts was established in New York City in 1885. Composed of artists, collectors, and other friends of art, its purpose was "to protect and promote the interest of Art in the United States, in connection with similar organizations which may be hereafter established in other cities of the Union, to form collectively the National Society of Arts."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

EPILOGUE

Millet's cosmopolitan outlook, his ties to London's artistic circles, and his international stature insured an easy transition to his new home in the English countryside. By 1884, when he established himself at Broadway, he was a successful and critically acclaimed artist. His early easel paintings had been warmly praised and had entered several major private and public collections. His mural works had also drawn approbation. Millet's participation in international fairs and his activities on behalf of American art organizations had added luster to his reputation at home and abroad. His stature in the American art world was solid, and an analogous position in the London art world was almost assured. The high points of his artistic achievement would be his supervision of the mural program at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition, his monumental murals of the 1890s and 1900s, and his assumption of the directorship of the American Academy in Rome in 1912.

During the years from1885 to 1889 Millet's home in Broadway, Worcestershire (first at Farnham House, then, beginning in 1886, at Russell House and the adjacent fourteenth-century Abbot's Grange) was the center of an Anglo-American artists' colony that included Edwin Austin Abbey, John Singer Sargent, and the English landscape painter Alfred Parsons.[1] Marc Simpson has admirably described this period in his Ph.D. dissertation, "Reconstructing the Golden Age: American Artists in Broadway, Worcestershire, 1885 to 1889."[2] It was in Millet's

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

garden at Broadway in the summer and autumn of 1885 and 1886 that his friend Sargent painted his *tour de force* Impressionist canvas, *Carnation, Lily, Lily, Rose* (Tate Gallery, London). At Broadway Millet found other subjects to which he could apply his academic skills, uniting a respect for tradition with modernist experimentation. Inspired by the quaint old-world charm of the village, and by 1889, a burgeoning interest in American subjects, Millet produced many of his well-known idealized genre paintings of contemporary and historical English and early American life such as *The Granddaughter* of 1885 (Museum of Fine Arts, Boston), and *Anthony Van Corlear, the Trumpeter of New Amsterdam* of 1889 (Duquesne Club, Pittsburgh). Although Millet's subjects drew on his immediate surroundings and American history, his new work had clear old master precedents in the seventeenth-century Dutch genre scenes that he had studied and admired in the 1870s. His friend Henry James described the paintings as redolent of "charming old objects . . . old surfaces and tones . . . old sentiments too, and the old picture-making vision . . . in the direct tradition of Terburg and De Hoogh and Metzu."[3]

No doubt Millet adapted his style to complement his new subject matter, yet, despite a trace of sentimentality, overt narrative did not displace formal concerns. The English-generated pictures (some were actually painted in his New York studio) are more precisely painted than his earlier work, with masterful attention to textures, light effects and compositional arrangements akin to the style of the Dutch "little masters" he admired. Millet generally debuted these pictures in London, often at the Institute of Painters in Oil Colours and at the Royal Academy, where they were enormously popular, before sending them to the National Academy of Design in New

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

York and other American venues. In 1886 the New York collector George Seney purchased Millet's *A Cosy Corner* when it was exhibited at the National Academy of Design, and the following year presented it to The Metropolitan Museum of Art.[4] Meanwhile, Millet continued to show his classical-subject pictures in major exhibitions throughout the United States. By 1887 Millet was doing sufficiently well financially to purchase a Federal-period townhouse at 92 Clinton Place, which he refurbished with the help of his friend Stanford White.[5] Here the artist and his family spent the winter season, and he resumed his vital contribution to the New York art scene before sailing to Broadway for the summer months. Millet's son John Albert Parsons Millet was born in Russell House at Broadway on July 8,1888.[6] Millet's other activities during this period include contributions to popular journals and books,[7] and a translation of Tolstoy's Sebastopol from the French.[8] Respect for Millet's work and his judgment continued to grow, and in 1889 he was invited to serve on the New York jury for the Paris Exposition.[9] He also exhibited at the fair, where he showed *A Difficult Duet* (1886, Private collection) and *A Handmaid* (see Fig. 2.14) in the American section, and *The Piping Times of Peace* (1887, location unknown) in the English section.

During the early 1890s Millet continued to paint easel pictures, which he sent to exhibition venues in London and New York, and to pursue his myriad activities. In 1892 his seventeenth-century English genre scene *Between Two Fires* (see Fig. 2.15) scored a popular and critical success when it was exhibited at the Royal Academy. It was purchased under the terms of the Chantrey Bequest, and entered the collection of the South Kensington Museum, a remarkable honor for an American

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

artist.[10] Millet's literary activities also continued unabated and included art criticism,[11] and a number of book publications.[12] Increasingly, Millet's role as a leader in American art became more prominent. In 1891 he was elected vice-president of the National Academy of Design.

The following year the architect Daniel Burnham, the Director of Works for the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition in Chicago, appointed Millet Director of Decorations for the fair, following the resignation of William Pretyman. The quadricentennial celebration of Columbus' discovery of America, the World's Columbian Exposition, with its classical and Renaissance-inspired architecture spray painted in a uniform coat of whitewash, represented the official embrace of neoclassicism and public art. The main features of the facades allowed for an abundance of sculpture, while the domes, panels, and interior walls of the major pavilions offered space for mural decorations—commissions that Millet would assign to his artistic colleagues. His contributions to the exposition received many tributes from his contemporaries, of which Kate Field's encomium was only one. In his official report Burnham detailed Millet's duties and accomplishments, expressing a warm appreciation for his rare combination of executive ability, cooperative spirit and genius for friendship that engendered the respect and affection of all who knew him:

> His title here was that of Director of Decorations. He had charge of all coloring inside and outside the buildings, the flags, banners and woven fabric effects of the processions and ceremonies inside of the grounds, and later of all the music and illuminations and fireworks. He directed and controlled the sculpture and mural paintings, and was the friend and advisor of the Chief of Construction in everything. His suggestions and support were a help and encouragement to every man on the staff. He was not only looked to on questions of Art, but he was loved for himself and the ever present sunshine and stimulating effect of his life. The Exposition almost owes success to him. He made the Fair more beautiful and more pleasant to live in and he increased the revenues by the steady interest he

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> kept up in his management of the various functions on the land and water during the time the Exposition was open.[13]

Millet's functions, in fact, were so comprehensive in scope and so varied that, as he wrote Burnham, they were "almost, if not quite impossible to define accurately."[14]

Perhaps Millet's most significant contribution, in terms of this study, was his complete charge of the design and execution of the monumental mural paintings and interior decorations, a role for which his tenure at the Antwerp Academy and his study of Italian Renaissance, Baroque, and nineteenth-century prototypes had prepared him. Murals, with their antecedents in the great pictorial cycles of the Renaissance and Baroque eras, were valued for their ability to educate, illustrate history, and elevate culture, and would have been considered the pinnacle of the academic hierarchy. Millet, who spent most of his formative years in Europe, was intimately familiar with European decorative programs, beginning with the mural ensemble by his teacher Nicaise De Keyser, *The Glory of the Antwerp School* (1862-1872, see Fig. 2.9) at the Antwerp Academy Museum, part of the nineteenth-century revival of mural painting in Antwerp and other European cities. His own early murals at Trinity Church in Boston and at the Seventh Regiment Armory in New York had given him first-hand experience with this métier. Millet's summary report is significant, and worth quoting at length, because it documents his role in the Exposition mural program, which showcased American mural painting, and, in effect, would make murals part of the mainstream of American art:

> Contracts had already been made by my predecessor with Mr. Walter McEwen and Mr. Gari Melchers for the decoration of the southeast and southwest

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

corner tympana in the Manufactures and Liberal Arts building; with Mr. G. W. Maynard for the figure and ornamental decoration of the porticos, loggias and colonnade of the Agricultural building. Mr. W. L. Dodge had been promised a contract for the decoration of the dome of the Administration building; and Mrs. Frederick MacMonnies and Miss Mary Cassatt had likewise been promised the decoration of the two tympana in the Woman's Building. . . .

The mechanical side of the question naturally occupied my attention at first, and for a few days, with the aid of Mr. George Pearson, Inspector of Painting, the legacy of my predecessor, I made myself thoroughly familiar with all the details of the different buildings then in course of construction, and with the terms of the contracts already made by the Exposition Company with the different artists and with the different contractors for mechanical work. . . .

Once the mechanical problem was fairly settled, the plan of the purely decorative work was vigorously taken up. . . . I was able to secure the services of a number of well-known painters and sculptors to continue the scheme already begun.

I was determined first to close the promised contracts with Mr. Dodge, with Mrs. MacMonnies and with Miss Cassett for their respective decorations; and they were, consequently, communicated with; and Mr. Dodge started in to work on the 8th of June, 1892, in a studio in the Horticultural building. Before the end of the month Messrs. J. C. Beckwith, E. H. Blashfield, Kenyon Cox, Robert Reid, C. S. Reinhart, Walter Shirlaw, E. E. Simmons, and J. A. Weir had been invited to undertake the painting of the pendentive domes in the Manufactures building. Studios were provided for them in the Horticultural building, and in the course of two or three weeks they were all at work preparing the sketches and making studies. Meanwhile, Mr. Maynard arrived and began his work for the Agricultural building.

Mr. Elihu Vedder was tendered the contract for the decoration of the dome of the Art building, but refused the same; and the work was left in abeyance.

Purely artistic decorative painting having been fairly well settled upon, the decorative painting of the hemicycle and loggias of the Electricity building and the corner domes of the Manufactures building was contracted for with Messrs. F. J. Sarmiento & Company, of Detroit, Michigan; and the execution proceeded under the Direction of Mr. E. E. Garnsey, a member of this firm. . . .

In late winter and in early spring the north-east and north-west tympana [of the Manufactures and Liberal Arts building] were filled with figure compositions by Mr. Lawrence C. Earle and Mr. F. D. Millet, respectively; the latter undertaking also the figure decoration of the Music Hall, in association with Messrs. F. J. Sarmiento & Company, as sub-contractors and mechanical decorators; and to Mr. Charles Caryl Coleman was given the contract for the decoration of the frieze of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the dome of the Horticultural building. . . .

> Mrs. Rosina Emmet Sherwood, Miss Lydia Emmet, Miss Lucia Fairchild and Mrs. Amanda Brewster Sewell each decorated a panel in the central hall of the Woman's building with a figure composition; and Mrs. Dora Wheeler Keith decorated the ceiling of the library in the same building. The services of these last five ladies were engaged by the Board of Lady Mangers.[15]

Years later, Edwin Blashfield recalled that the lucky mural candidates summoned by Millet to Chicago "were all green together. . . . mural painting was brand new to all of us save William Morris Hunt and La Farge. Hunt was gone . . . . La Farge was busy with his glass, Sargent and Abbey deep in their library work, Low hard at his illustrations to Keats." Thus, "like a bond of brotherhood, the men . . . stood about the bed of this new birth where Frank Millet presided as fairy godmother."[16]

Besides hiring the artists engaged by the Exposition Company and supervising the entire decorative program, Millet also designed a number of mural paintings himself. His report provides descriptions of all these endeavors, including his own contributions:

> Mr. F. D. Millet, of New York painted the two tympana in the north-west corner Pavilion of the Manufactures & Liberal Arts building; one of them illustrating the art of spinning; the other the art of weaving. Both subjects were taken from the Odyssey. . . .
>
> Mr. Millet also decorated with figure subjects the interior of Music Hall, painting two compositions in the spandrels of the Proscenium and one in the ceiling of the Recital Hall, together with fifteen single figures, fifteen heads and six trophies. Besides this work Mr. Millet designed the figures in the pendentives of the dome of the Art building.[17]

In addition to the murals that he executed for the Exposition Company, Millet also decorated the ceiling of the New York State Building with *The Triumph of Juno* (Fig. 5.1), an allegory of the Empire State encouraging the arts and sciences.[18]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

As many commentators of the time observed, the Columbian Exposition of 1893 inspired a popular enthusiasm for mural painting that quickly spread across America.[19] Until that time, decorative painting was largely restricted to private homes, clubs, and ecclesiastical buildings. The only major civic mural programs were those executed for the United States Capitol and William Morris Hunt's paintings, *The Flight of Night* and *The Discoverer*, for the Albany State Capitol.[20] Under Millet's guidance, the Columbian Exposition redirected mural painting toward public and government-sponsored projects, as for example the artist's classical-inspired decoration *Thesmophoria* of 1897 (see Fig. 3.7) (destroyed) for the main banking room of the Bank of Pittsburgh,[21] and the 1894 mural program for the Criminal Courts in New York. Besides his substantial administrative role at the Exposition, Millet was also a member of both the International and New York Fine Arts juries, and a prominent exhibitor.[22]

After the close of the exposition Millet returned to New York,[23] where he collaborated with Daniel Burnham on a financially unsuccessful illustrated chronicle of the exposition entitled World's Columbian Exposition. The Book of the Builders.[24] By November 1894 Millet was back at Broadway preparing easel pictures for exhibitions. He wrote James Hunt that the book project had cost him "a years [*sic*] hard work" and that he had "to scramble pretty hard now a days to keep going particularly since the picture market is so bad."[25] In 1895 Millet began the restoration of the fourteenth-century Abbot's Grange,[26] which became the setting for many of his antiquarian genre scenes, and he resumed an active exhibition schedule, sending pictures to the Royal Academy and the Institute of Painters in Oil Colors in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

London, as well as to such venues in the United States as the National Academy of Design, the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, and the Carnegie International. Perhaps straightened financial concerns dictated some of his other activities. Millet's correspondence with Charles Francis Adams, Jr. in January 1898 indicates that he and Mrs. Millet were also involved in an interior design business.[27] Millet capped off the decade by securing appointments as a special correspondent for the London Times, the New York Sun and Harper's Weekly during the Spanish-American War. In 1899 he published an illustrated account of his experience entitled Expedition to the Philippines.[28]

In the years surrounding the turn of the century, Millet became increasingly involved in mural painting, portraiture and the development and promotion of American art. In 1900 Millet's familiarity with European art circles made him a natural candidate to help organize the American section of the Paris Exposition Universelle, where he oversaw the decoration of the United States Pavilion. He was also a member of the national jury for painting that convened in Paris, and a member of the International Awards jury representing the United States. In addition, he was an exhibitor at the fair, showing *The Expansionist* (1899, High Museum of Art, Atlanta) and *Unconverted* (c. 1890, Private collection).[29] Millet maintained his active exhibition schedule until the end of the decade, sending contemporary and antiquarian genre scenes and portraits to shows in London and the United States, including the Pan American Exposition in Buffalo in 1901 and the Louisiana Purchase Exposition in St. Louis in 1904. But, beginning in 1904, murals and other public commissions dominated his creative imagination, while administrative responsibilities increasingly

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

vied for his attention. During these years, he carried what was clearly a staggering workload at a breathtaking pace. Nevertheless, descriptions of his demeanor record that he maintained a remarkably calm frame of mind throughout.

In 1904-1905 Millet received a commission from the American architect Cass Gilbert (1859-1934) for two historical pictures—*The Treaty of Traverse des Sioux* (Fig. 5.2) and *The Fourth Minnesota Regiment Entering Vicksburg* (Fig. 5.3)—to decorate the Governor's Reception Room in the new Minnesota State Capitol at St. Paul.[30] While Millet was still working on these murals, the United States Treasury commissioned him to do all the interior painting and artistic decoration for the new Custom House at Baltimore,[31] and the United States Army invited him to design seven campaign medals.[32] "I am as busy as usual," Millet wrote Adams on March 5, 1905:

> Painting quite a number of portraits, among others President Butler of Columbia. I am soon to begin for St. Paul the "Entrance of the 4th Minnesota Volunteers into Vicksburg," and this summer I shall have my hands full over the Baltimore Custom House which the government has decided I shall decorate (and whitewash). Then I have been designing the medals for the War Department and doing a lot of odd jobs besides.[33]

The paintings for the Baltimore Custom House were to be Millet's finest and most extensive mural work. This visually stunning ensemble consists of eighty-three panels in all, including a large ceiling panel, *Entering the Harbor* (Fig. 5.4) (thirty feet wide by sixty-three feet long), lunettes, coves, spandrels and friezes—the entire program illustrating the *Evolution of Shipping* (Fig. 5.5), from the galleys of the ancient world to the steam vessels of the twentieth century.[34] The murals, completed in July 1908, were an immediate success that soon led to a spate of other decorative commissions. Before the end of the year, Millet was already working on several

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

projects simultaneously: a new historical painting—*The Foreman of the Grand Jury Rebuking the Chief Justice of New Jersey,* 1774 (Fig. 5.6)—for the Essex County Court House at Newark, New Jersey;[35] thirteen panels representing *The History of the Settlement of Ohio* (Fig. 5.7) for the main banking room of the Cleveland Trust Company building;[36] and the general color scheme and three panels for the Federal Building in Wheeling, West Virginia.[37] Millet's August 1908 letter to Adams captures the bewildering pace of his schedule:

> I have not yet been able to stop my mad career, and have even taken on another building, the Federal building in Wheeling, West, Va. Now I am flying between there and Cleveland and Jersey City and here. Three large buildings and a busy studio is all I want to keep my time occupied. The Commission of Fine Arts, contrary to my expectation has begun to get busy already and I, as vice-chairman, being in Washington, and the only member here, have more to do than I like. However it is useful work and that is something.
>
> I don't know when I can get East. I hoped to way before this. I called a meeting of the Niagara Committee at Niagara on the 22d and had a . . . hope to come around back by way of Boston but I must "hike" from Niagara to Cleveland and hurry to Wheeling and hurry back here. Such is life.[38]

In June 1909, following the success of the Cleveland Trust Company and Baltimore Custom House decorations, the United States Treasury awarded Millet the contract to decorate a portion of the new Federal Building in Cleveland, Ohio with thirty-five panels illustrating *The Collection and Delivery of the Mails All Over The World* (Fig. 5.8).[39] In 1910 the architect Hugh Roberts appointed Millet Director of Decorations for the Hudson County Court House in Jersey City, New Jersey.[40] Millet hired Edwin Blashfield, Kenyon Cox, Howard Pyle and Charles Turner to assist with the decorative program. He himself designed two large lunettes depicting scenes from the seventeenth-century history of Jersey City—*The Repulse of the Dutch,*

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

September 13, 1609 and *Paying for the Land, January 30, 1658*—and twelve small panels illustrating scenes in the history of Hudson County.

In his murals of the early 1900s Millet abandoned the allegorical and classical subjects that had informed his decorative paintings of the prior decade, and depicted historical episodes that resonated with their particular locales, and that responded to the nationalist sensibilities of the time. "They were something different," he himself said mockingly, than the usual "group of young women in their nighties presenting a pianola to the city of New York."[41] Yet, Millet's earlier work had never been insignificant. While his subject matter changed, his aesthetic philosophy, inspired by his training at the Antwerp Royal Academy, that art be an individual artistic conception in which "the eye is pleased, the imagination excited, and the intellect awakened," remained steadfast.[42] Artistic expression for Millet was never limited to patriotic subjects, to any one subject, or mere technique. As he himself put it: "The best way to encourage American art is to encourage the development of true artists among us, whether they paint subjects inspired by civilized American life or by the barbarism of remote Asia. The purpose is the all-important object. . . . Let 'art for art's sake be the cry.'"[43] He did not mean Whistlerian formalism, but an individual idea that transcended national boundaries, conveyed with an eloquent mastery of expression. He eventually came to believe that "the true elements of art which make it characteristic of a people, and therefore a national art, are found, not in the subject, but in the mind of the artist himself."[44]

A careful student of his art, whether in easel paintings or mural decorations, Millet strove for a harmonious treatment sympathetic to his subjects, and subjects that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

engaged the artist's intelligent selection to give visual expression to his own time. His friend Edwin Blashfield, who knew him well, said Millet "loved significance in decoration. . . .If he decorated a postoffice [*sic*], for instance, he at once harmonized his preaching with the purpose of the place. . . . [I]n his Baltimore Custom House decoration the fleets of all past time . . . sail upon walls and ceiling . . . to the delight of the captains who stand underneath them, approving their rigging. For with Millet every detail was verified by nature or by document . . . . His detail, however, admirable as it was, was but incidental: it was his big synthetic sense that counted most.[45] Superbly crafted, the best of his mural paintings present a careful balance of decorative effect, attention to detail and historical accuracy in the service of thought-provoking content. All of Millet's murals are also deeply indebted to a European tradition of public art, and to his intimate knowledge of Renaissance, Baroque and nineteenth-century decorative ensembles that he encountered during his travels on the continent.

The first decade of the twentieth century was a period of intense creativity that coincided with Millet's participation in an astounding number of American art organizations. Even at the height of this, his most characteristic American expression, the establishment of an American artistic infrastructure, Millet drew on features of European culture and on a philosophy of stewardship of the arts that was part of a well-entrenched European tradition. Among others, he was a member of the Harvard University Committee on Fine Arts and Architecture;[46] Acting Chairman of the Niagara Falls Commission;[47] Vice-chairman of the National Commission of Fine Arts;[48] Secretary of the American Federation of Arts;[49] Vice-President of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Municipal Art Commission of the City of New York[50]; and Chairman of the Advisory Committee of the Smithsonian Institution on the National Gallery.[51] Millet was elected to the National Institute of Arts and Letters in 1908, and to the American Academy of Arts and Letters two years later. In 1908, at the behest of President Roosevelt, he traveled to Japan as a member of the United States Commission to the Tokyo Exposition, planned for 1912.[52] Millet's dedication to advancing the interests of art and art education in America culminated in his being appointed director of the American Academy in Rome, shortly before his death in 1912.

A charter member of the Academy since its incorporation in 1905, Millet's tireless work on the school's behalf was influenced by a personal ethos of civic duty that was part of his upbringing, and by the high level of public commitment to art education that he had witnessed in Europe. The European model and high-minded agenda that Millet hoped to see flourish in the academy are described in an article that he wrote about the school in 1905:

> What the Academy in Rome proposes to do is to . . . give him [the artist] the advantages of cloistration for a period long enough for him to absorb the ideals of the great art of the past, and to stimulate his imagination and his invention by diligent study and by close association with the masterpieces with which Rome abounds in overwhelming profusion. . . .
>
> The American Academy has been established, professedly, on the lines of the French Academy in the Villa Medicis, which was founded in 1666. . . .
>
> It will be understood that the course is, so to speak, a post-graduate one. . . . .' The beneficiaries will be selected by competition from among the best in the country. . . . They will receive a subsidy of sufficient amount to free them from the necessity of other pecuniary aid, and the courses of study will be so arranged that at the end of the period the student will at least have had the opportunity of developing everything there is in him which makes for progress in his profession.[53]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Between 1906 and 1911 Millet made four trips to Rome on Academy business.[54] In early February 1912, having been persuaded to accept the position of chief administrator of the school in order to oversee the reorganization of its facilities in Rome, he sailed for Europe.[55] Called back to the United States on other academy business and to meet with George B. Post about murals for the Wisconsin State Capitol,[56] Millet perished with the sinking of the Titanic on April 14, 1912. Lost with him were the sketches for another mural commission—the decoration of the New Bedford Public Library in Massachusetts, a program depicting the history and development of the whaling industry native to the city.[57] After Millet's death, a flood of commemorative tributes from both sides of the Atlantic, including memorial meetings, an exhibition, numerous articles, the establishment of a chair at the American Academy in Rome, and a memorial fountain in Washington, D. C., attested to the high esteem and affection in which he was held by his colleagues and by the political and cultural leaders of his time. His friend the artist and critic William Coffin (1855-1925) recognized Millet's cosmopolitan spirit and Yankee chauvinism, pointing out that Millet's activities took him "pretty much all over the world. . . . His acquaintance was very wide and embraced many prominent men in official life, both at home and abroad. He was American, however, wherever he went."[58] Millet's tireless contributions to the advancement of art in America are also reflected in Coffin's eulogy: "His place cannot really be filled by any one man that we can think of, for he was capable of filling a number of responsible positions at the same time, and filling them all rather better than anybody else could do."[59]

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Endnotes to Epilogue

[1] In 1890 Millet purchased the Abbot's Grange. By this time the Broadway property had became the family's primary residence (although Millet would continue to maintain a house in New York and a studio in Washington, D. C.), and Mrs. Millet would live here until her death in 1932. For Millet's purchase of the Abbot's Grange see Booth and Millet, Chapter 6, pp. 31-32, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100..

[2] Simpson, 1993.

[3] James, Picture and Text, p. 12.

[4] "Recent Gifts to the Metropolitan Museum," Studio Series 2, 10 (April 1887), p. 173.

[5]The Millets had previously been renting. In his Harvard class notes, Millet wrote: "In the latter part of December, 1886, we reached New York, and having given up our apartment there, I spent a few weeks in the not over agreeable task of house-hunting. At last I found a place to suit me, 92 Clinton place, and bought it. I have now built a cheerful studio in the house . . . ." The Sixth Triennial Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College—Seventh Report – December 31, 1887 (Boston: Press of Rockwell and Churchill, 1888), p. 37. Concerning renovations see F. D. Millet to Stanford White, 26 August [1887]. Stanford White Papers, Manuscript Department, The New-York Historical Society, New York City.

[6] Report of the Secretary of The Class of 1869 of Harvard College, Eighth Report – Twenty-Fifth Anniversary (Boston: Press of Rockwell and Churchill, 1894), p. 58.

[7] Frank D. Millet, "Medusa's Head, Harper's New Monthly Magazine 80 (December 1889), pp. 130-136; idem, "Campaigning with the Cossacks, I—A Summer Campaign," Harper's New Monthly Magazine 74 (January 1887), pp. 235, 250; idem, "Campaigning with the Cossacks, II—A Winter Campaign," Harper's New Monthly Magazine 74 (February 1887), pp. 397-411; idem, "Tedesco's Rubina, Scribner's Magazine 1, 4 (April 1887), pp. 499-507; idem, "Progressive Changes in Costumes and Customs," in Charles E. Beale, ed., Gately's World's Progress (Boston: Gately & Co., 1886).

[8] Count Leo Tolstoy, Sebastopol, trans. Frank D. Millet (New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1887). Presumably the universality of Tolstoy's theme and the heroic ideal of a righteous quest appealed to Millet.

[9] Annette Blaugrund, Paris 1889: American Artists at the Universal Exposition, exhibition catalog (Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, 1989), pp. 187-188, 286.

[10] Ronald Alley, Assistant Keeper, The Tate Gallery to John A. P. Millet, M.D., 25 August 1954, Tate Gallery Library and Archives, London, England. Works purchased under the Chantrey Bequest were transferred to the Tate Gallery in 1897. See David Brown, "Some Old Favourites and Other Works," Tate Gallery (April 4 – May 14, 1978), p. 1.

[11] F. D. Millet, "Home of the Indolent. The Island of Capri," Century Magazine 56 (October 1898), pp. 853-858; idem, "The Decoration of the Exposition," Scribner's Magazine 12, 6 (December 1892), pp. 693-709; idem, "The Designers of the Fair," Harper's New Monthly Magazine 85, 510 (November 1892), pp. 872-883; idem, "What the Artists think of Sargent's 'Beatrice,'" Harper's Weekly 35 (9 May 1891), pp. 346-347; idem, "What Are Americans Doing In Art?" Century Magazine 43, 1 (November 1891), pp. 46-49.

[12] F. D. Millet, A Capillary Crime and Other Stories (New York, 1892)—a series of mystery stories originally published in Atlantic Monthly, Century, Harper's New Monthly Magazine and Scribner's Magazine between 1876 and 1891; and F. D. Millet, The Danube, From the Black Forest to the Black

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sea (New York, 1893)—an illustrated adventure narrative of a canoe trip down the Danube, which he made with Alfred Parson and Poultney Bigelow in the summer of 1891.

[13] Daniel H. Burnham, "Report of the Chief of Construction and Director of Works," in idem, The Final Official Report of The Director of Works of The World's Columbian Exposition (June, 1894; repr., New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989), 15.

[14] F. D. Millet, "Report of the Director of Decoration & Functions," in Burnham, The Final Report, p. 57.

[15] Ibid, pp.57-59, 66, 68.

[16] Edwin H. Blashfield, "A Painter's Reminiscences of a World's Fair," New York Times Magazine, 18 March 1923, p. 13.

[17] Millet, "Report of the Director of Decoration & Functions," p. 68.

[18] See Chapter 4, Note 24.

[19] See Edwin Howland Blashfield, Mural Painting in America (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928), pp. ix-x; Florence N. Levy, editor, "Mural Painting in the United States," American Art Annual (New York, 1911), p. 13; Isham, History of American Painting, p. 544; and King, American Mural Painting, p.62.

[20] For an excellent and comprehensive discussion of Hunt's murals in the Assembly Chamber of the State Capitol at Albany see Sara Webster, "The Albany Murals of William Morris Hunt," (Ph. D. diss., The Graduate Center of the City University of New York, 1985).

[21] By 1897 Millet's allegorical classicism engendered both positive and negative criticism. See respectively Charles H. Caffin, "Frank D. Millet's Mural Painting for Pittsburg," Harper's Weekly 41, 2140 (25 December 1897), pp. 1294-1295; and Sadakichi Hartman, "Matters Mural," Criterion 16 (1 January 1898), pp. 16-17.

[22] Millet exhibited eight easel paintings: *Antony Van Corlear, The Trumpeter; Old Harmonies; Sweet Melodies; Rook and Pigeon; A Difficult Duet; At the Inn; Lacing the Sandal* and *The Window Seat*; the watercolor *Roman Maiden*; and four black and white drawings: *Study of Head, A Prisoner, In the Supper Room* and *Driving a Team*. See Official Catalogue of Exhibits, World's Columbian Exposition. Department K. Fine Arts (Chicago: W. B. Conkey Company, 1893), pp. 4, 22, 31, 42-27.

[23] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 14 February [1894], CFAJ Papers/MHS. Millet wrote Adams that as to plans he had "None until the great North American 'Book of the Builders' is done. Burnham and I are writing it and I am illustrating it or rather to be more exact, I am writing it and engaging artists to illustrate it." In his Harvard class notes, Millet wrote: "At the close of the Exposition I returned to New York, and since that time have been occupied, in association with Mr. D. H. Burnham . . .in writing, illustrating, and publishing . . .'The Book of the Builders.'" See Report of the Secretary of The Class of 1869 of Harvard College, December 31, 1887—August 1, 1894. Eighth Report – Twenty-Fifth Anniversary (Boston: Press of Rockwell and Churchill, 1894), pp. 59-60.

[24] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 13 July [1894], CFAJ Papers/MHS. Millet wrote "The Book was going on finely and was a great success but the publishers, as we have since found, were in financial difficulties before they took it up and they suddenly went into receivership leaving me out of my winter's work and several thousand dollars besides which I had been obliged to spend on their account to get the work done in time."

[25] F. D. Millet to James Hunt, 13 December 1894, AAA&L, James Hunt Collection, Box 1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[26] For Millet's restoration of the Priory see Booth and Millet, Chapter 6, pp. 33-34, JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100; and "The Abbot's Grange, and Russell House, Broadway, Worcestershire, the Residence of Mr. F. D. Millet," Country Life 29, 732(14 January 1911), pp. 54-61.

[27] Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 2 January 1898, CFAJ Papers/MHS. Millet's correspondence implies that he and Lily were involved in the interior decoration of the Frederick Vanderbilt home in Hyde Park, New York. Millet wrote: "I am sorry to be unable to do that chowder this trip but expect to come over again in the spring for we have another house (F. W. Vanderbilt's . . .) on the docket and it may be necessary for one of us or both to run over about it." Weinberg, "The Career of Francis Davis Millet," p. 12 noted correspondence between Millet and Rutherford Mead, dating from July 8, 1895 to July 31, 1896, recording Millet's involvement in decorating interiors for the Twombly house in Madison, New Jersey, which McKim, Mead, and White had designed.

[28] Millet was assigned to the staff of Army General Wesley Merritt, and entered Manila with the American troops. See Booth and Millet, Chapter 9, pp. 1-13; and JAPM/AAA, Reel 1100, Frames 1049-1050. Francis Davis Millet, Expedition to the Philippines (New York: Harper Brothers, 1899). During this period Millet also published an illustrated recollection of his experiences during the Russo-Turkish War. See F. D. Millet, "Mr. F. D. Millet and Mr. MacGahan in the Russo-Turkish Campaign, London Daily News, 21 January 1896.

[29] Diane P. Fischer, editor, Paris 1900: The "American School" at the Universal Exposition, exhibition catalog (The Montclair Art Museum, Montclair, New Jersey, 1999), pp. 6, 73, 91, 201; and Francis Davis Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 4 June [1900], CFAJ Papers/MHS, discusses his work at the Exposition.

[30] See F. D. Millet to Cass Gilbert, 10 May 1904, New-York Historical Society, Cass Gilbert Collection, Minnesota State Capitol, Correspondence Box 13, File 108; and Cass Gilbert to F. D. Millet, 6 April 1905, The New-York Historical Society, Cass Gilbert Collection, Minnesota State Capitol, Correspondence Box 4, File 2.

[31] Leila Mechlin, "Mr. F. D. Millet's Decorations in the Baltimore Custom House," Architectural Record 26 (August 1908), pp. 98-108.

[32] The medals designed by Millet include the Certificate of Merit Medal, the China Campaign Medal, the Civil War Campaign Medal, the Indian Campaign Medal, the Philippine Campaign Medal, the Philippine Congressional Medal, and the Spanish War Service Medal. See Lt. Col. C. O. Zollars, United States War Department to William C. Lane, 10 December 1920, W. C. Lane, Librarian, General Correspondence File 1897-1928, Box UAIII 50 8.10.2, Harvard University Archives, Pusey Library, Cambridge.

[33] F. D. Millet, Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 5 March [1905], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 653-654.

[34] General Services Administration Publication, The Evolution of Navigation—A Catalogue of the Vessels in the Decorations in the Call –Room of the Custom-House at Baltimore.

[35] Cass Gilbert, Essex County Court House Memorandum, 8 October 1907, New-York Historical Society, Cass Gilbert Collection, Essex Country Court House, Correspondence, Box 104.

[36] Leila Mechlin, "A Decorator of Public Buildings," World's Work 19 (December 1909), pp. 12379-12386; and The Cleveland Trust Company, "The Development of Civilization in America," Reproductions of the Mural Paintings by Frank Millet in the Main Banking Room, [1908].

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[37] Annual Report of the Supervising Architect of the Treasury Department for the Year Ended June 30, 1910, p. 459 notes that "On June 9, 1910, Francis Davis Millet received a contract for decorating and painting." General Services Administration, Historic Preservation Structural Report (December, 1977), p. 82 notes: "Millet completed this work by December 14, 1910. He planned to donate paintings for three panels in the courtroom, but before he did this, he lost his life when the Titanic sank on April 15, 1912. None of Millet's work survived the remodeling of the interior of the building in 1937-38."

[38] F. D. Millet to Charles Francis Adams, Jr., 14 August [1908], FDM/AAA, Reel 1097, Frames 687-688.

[39] W. J. Murphy, Custodian, A Brief Description of Mural Paintings and Statuary Federal Building Cleveland, Ohio, 1916, pp. 18-19.

[40] For an excellent and comprehensive discussion of this program see Sanford, Heroes in the Fight for Beauty.

[41] Sylvester Baxter, "Francis Davis Millet: An Appreciation of the Man," p. 640.

[42] Millet, "The Watts Exhibition," p. 97.

[43] Ibid.

[44] Millet, "What Are Americans Doing in Art?" p. 46.

[45] Edwin Howland Blashfield, "Frank D. Millet As Mural Painter," Art and Progress 2, 9 (July 1912), pp. 650-651.

[46] Charles Francis Adams, Jr. to F. D. Millet, 4 November 1904, CFAJ Papers/MHS. Adams informs Millet that he is putting him and Daniel Burnham on the Committee: "if he [Burnham] can't act as Chairman, you must."

[47] In January 1907 Secretary of War William Howard Taft appointed Millet, Charles Follen McKim, Frederick Law Olmsted, Jr. and Captain John S. Sewell of the Corps of Engineers "to consider the preservation of natural scenic effects at Niagara Falls; [and] to recommend remedial measures of reasonable cost which would result in improving conditions on the American side of the Gorge." See unpaginated typescript of the report of the Niagara Falls Commission, January 1908, McKim, Mead & White Archives, New-York State Historical Society, Box 559, Old Mixed Files, 1950. See also F. D. Millet to Charles Francis Adams, 14 August [1907], AAA, Reel 1097, Frame 687, Millet writes "I called a meting of the Niagara Committee at Niagara on the 22d."

[48] On the eve of leaving office on January 19, 1909, President Theodore Roosevelt appointed a Council of Fine Arts by Executive Order, which said in part: "Hereafter before any plans are formulated for any buildings or grounds, or for the location or erection of any statue, the matter must be submitted to the Council [of Fine Arts] I have named and their advice followed unless for good and sufficient reasons the President directs that it be not followed." The Commission was reaffirmed by an act of Congress during the administration of President William Howard Taft. Taft reappointed Millet to the Commission, which consisted of 21 architects, four painters, four sculptors, and one landscape architect. See Glen Brown "Memories 1860-1939" quoted in FMRP/ Reel 1096, Frame 21.

[49] The American Federation of Arts founded in 1910 by Elihu Root (Secretary of State in administration of Theodore Roosevelt) was a service organization to unite American art institutions, museums, local and municipal art societies into a central national body to promote American art, and effect Congressional art legislation. Charles L. Hutchinson, president of the Art Institute of Chicago,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

was the first president, Millet, secretary, and Leila Mechlin, assistant secretary. See Glenn Brown, 1860-1930 Memories, p. 412, quoted in FMRP/AAA, Reel 1096, Frame 21.

[50] Glenn Brown, "Francis Davis Millet," Francis Davis Millet Memorial Meeting, p. 30.

[51] Ibid.

[52] "Bay State Man Placed On Tokio [*sic*] Commission," Boston Herald, 1 June 1908. Unpaginated newspaper clipping in Harvard University Archives, Pusey Library, Francis Davis Millet, Student Biographical File, HU G 300.

[53] Millet, "The American Academy in Rome," p. 715.

[54] Valentine, The American Academy in Rome, pp. 55-63.

[55] Ibid.; and American Academy in Rome. Annual Report (1911).

[56] Valentine, pp. 62-63.

[57] See F. D. Millet's copious correspondence with George H. Tripp, Librarian, 4 February 1910 to 10 February 1912, New Bedford Free Library Archives, New Bedford, Massachusetts, especially F. D. Millet to George H. Tripp, 10 February 1912. Millet writes: Thanks for the blue prints and measurements which reached me this morning. I am off to Rome for a brief stay on Mar. 2 and then I hope to start in, even while I am in Rome, to worry about the job in detail."

[58] William A. Coffin, "Francis Davis Millet," New York Evening Post, 22 April 1912, unpaginated newsclipping, EBPL.

[59] Ibid.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

FRANCIS DAVIS MILLET –THE EARLY YEARS OF "A COSMOPOLITAN YANKEE," 1846-1884

by

Gina M. D'Angelo

Volume II

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Art History in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, The City University of New York

2004

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Unpublished Sources

American Academy in Rome Records. Microfilm reels ITRO 13, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, New York, New York.

American Academy in Rome Records. Francis Davis Millet General Correspondence 1904-1912, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Archives, Nationaal Hoger Instituut en Koninklijke Academie voor Schone Kunsten, Antwerp, Belgium. Archives, Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts à Anvers. Registre d'inscription, Année 1870-1871 à 1874-1875; Registre d'inscription, 1870-1873; Concours de l'année académique 1871-1872; Concours de l'année académique 1872-1873.

Cass Gilbert Collection. Essex Country Courthouse and Minnesota State Capitol Papers. The New-York Historical Society, New York, New York.

Charles Eliot Norton Papers. Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Charles Follen McKim Papers. General Correspondence 1893-1912, Microfilm Reel 10, Library of Congress, Manuscript Division, Washington, D. C.

Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Papers. Correspondence and Diaries, Manuscript Division, Massachusetts Historical Society, Boston, Massachusetts.

Charles Warren Stoddard Collection. Department of Special Collections, Bird Library, Syracuse University, Syracuse, New York.

Edwin Graves Champney Papers. Microfilm reels 2898, 2899, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, New York, New York.

Edwin Howland Blashfield Correspondence. The New-York Historical Society, New York, New York.

Francis Davis Millet and Millet Family Papers. Microfilm reels 848-849, 1052, 1080, 1095-1101, 1117, 1817, and 3161, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, New York, New York.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Francis Davis Millet and Millet Family Papers. Unmicrofilmed diaries, sketchbooks, and correspondence, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

Francis Davis Millet Civil War Diary. Private Collection.

Francis Davis Millet Papers. The American Academy of Arts and Letters, New York, New York.

Francis Davis Millet Papers. New Bedford Free Library Archives, New Bedford, Massachusetts.

George B. Post Collection. The New-York Historical Society, New York, New York.

George Fuller Papers. Microfilm reel 607, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.

George Henry Yewell Papers. Special Collections Department, University of Iowa Libraries, Iowa City, Iowa

Harvard University Archives. Harvard Faculty Records, 1864-1872, Pusey Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

_____. Records of the Board of Overseers of Harvard College, 1871-1882, Pusey Library, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

John Ferguson Weir Papers. Microfilm Reel 71, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, New York, New York.

_____. Manuscripts and Archives Division, Yale University Library, New Haven, Connecticut.

The Kate Field Collection. Rare Books Division, Boston Public Library, Boston, Massachusetts.

Millet Family Papers. East Bridgewater, Massachusetts Public Library, East Bridgewater, Massachusetts.

The Papers of Augustus Saint-Gaudens and the Saint-Gaudens Family. Rauner Special Collections Library, Dartmouth College Library, Hanover, New Hampshire.

Richard H. Murray. "Checklist of Murals and Their Painters." Typescript, 1991.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Robert Swain Gifford Papers. Microfilm Reel 594, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, New York, New York.

John Singer Sargent Papers. Microfilm Reel 5460, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, New York, New York.

School of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston Records. Annual Reports and Director's Correspondence, Microfilm Reels 536-587, 4998, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, New York, New York.

Seventh Regiment Armory Collection. The New-York Historical Society, New York, New York.

Stanford White Correspondence. The New-York Historical Society, New York, New York.

Thomas Bailey Aldrich Papers. Houghton Library, Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Dissertations

Bienenstock, Jennifer A. Martin. "The Formation and Early Years of the Society of American Artists: 1877-1884." Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1983.

Broun, Elizabeth. "American Paintings and Sculpture in the Fine Arts Building of the World's Columbian Exposition, Chicago, 1893." Ph.D. diss., Graduate School of The University of Kansas.

Docherty, Linda Jo. "A Search For Identity: American Art Criticism and the Concept of the 'Native School.' 1876-1893." Ph.D. diss., The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1985.

Fink, Lois Marie. "The Role of France in American Art, 1850-1870." Ph.D. diss., University of Chicago, 1970.

Neff, Nancy C. "American Artists in Belgium, 1881-1914." M.A. thesis, The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences of the George Washington University, 1984.

Schachter, Sophia Duckworth. "The Seventh Regiment Armory of New York City; A History of its Construction and Decoration." M.S. thesis, Graduate School of Architecture and Planning, Columbia University, 1985.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sheehan, Roberta A. "Boston Museum School: A Centennial History, 1876-1976." Ph.D. diss., Boston College, 1983.

Simpson, Marc Alfred. "Reconstructing The Golden Age: American Artists in Broadway, Worcestershire, 1885-1889." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1993.

Skalet, Linda Henefield. "The Market For American Painting in New York: 1870-1915." Ph.D. diss., the Johns Hopkins University, 1980.

Stott, Annette. "American Painters Who Worked in the Netherlands, 1880-1914." Ph.D. diss., Boston University Graduate School, 1986.

Weber, Bruce. "Robert Frederick Blum (1857-1903) And His Milieu." Ph.D. diss., The City University of New York, 1985.

Webster, Sara Beye. "The Albany Murals of William Morris Hunt." Ph.D. diss., The City University of New York, 1985.

Weinberg, Helene B. "The Decorative Work of John La Farge." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1972.

Weldman, Jeffrey. "William Rimmer: Critical Catalogue Raisonne." Ph.D. diss., Indiana University, 1982.

Books, Reports, and Pamphlets

Abington Vital Records, Births From 1850- 1963. Abington, Massachusetts: 1986.

Académie Royale D'Anvers. Réorganisation. Arrêté royal du 18 octobre 1841. Bruxelles: Moniteur Belge, 1841.

Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts A Anvers. Année Académique 1871-1872. Rapport Annuel et Distribution Solennelle des Prix, 5 Mai 1872. Anvers: J. E. Buschmann, 1872.

_____. Année Académique 1872-73. Rapport Annuel et Distribution Solennelle des Prix, 4 Mai 1873. Anvers: J. E. Buschmann, 1873.

Ackerman, Gerald M. American Orientalists. Paris: ACR Édition, 1994.

Adams, Charles Francis, Jr. Charles Francis Adams 1835-1915, An Autobiography. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1916.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

_____. The Vienna Exposition and the Philadelphia Centennial. Report of Charles Francis Adams, Jr. commissioner of the State of Massachusetts to the Universal Exposition at Vienna. Boston: Estes & Lauriat, 1874.

The Adjutant General. Massachusetts Soldiers, Sailors, and Marines in the Civil War. Massachusetts: Norwood Press, 1932

Allwood, John. The Great Exhibitions. London: Cassell and Collier Macmillan, c. 1977.

Alperin, Richard J. Art's Anglo-American Paper Lion: John McLure Hamilton's Untold Story. Philadelphia: Junius, Inc., 1993.

Anderson, M[ary]. A Few Memories. New York: 1896.

Antwerp Académie, Rapport Annual 1843-1844.

Armstrong, D. Maitland. Report of D. Maitland Armstrong, Superintendent of the Art Gallery. In Reports of the United States Commissioners to the Paris Universal Exposition, 1878, 83-86. Vol. 1. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880.

Armstrong, Margaret, ed. Day Before Yesterday: Reminiscences of a Varied Life by Maitland Armstrong. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1920.

Asleson, Robyn. Albert Moore. London: Phaidon Press, 2000.

Bacon, Edwin M. The Book of Boston: Fifty Years' Recollection of the New England Metropolis. Boston: The Book of Boston Company, 1916.

Baedeker, K. Belgium and Holland. Handbook for Travellers. Coblenz: Karl Baedeker, 1871.

Barker, Virgil. American Painting: History and Interpretation. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1950.

Barrie, Robert. My Log. Philadelphia: The Franklin Press, 1917.

Barrow, R. J. Lawrence Alma-Tadema. London: Phaidon Press Limited, 2003.

Benjamin, Samuel G. W. Contemporary Art in Europe. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1877. Reprint, New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1976.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Berko, P. and V. Dictionary of Belgian Painters Born Between 1750 and 1875. Brussels: Laconti, c. 1981.

Betsky, Celia. "Inside the Past: The Interior and the Colonial Revival in American Art and Literature, 1860-1914." In Alan Axelrod, ed., 241-277. The Colonial Revival in America. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 1985.

Blashfield, Edwin Howland. Mural Painting in America. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1928.

Bolger Burke, Doreen. "Francis Davis Millet." In American Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art. Vol. III, 3-7. Edited by Kathleen Luhrs. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1980.

The Boston Directory, City Record. 1865-1872; 1875-1877; 1880-1885.

The Bridgewater Book. Boston: George H. Ellis, Printer, 1899.

Brook-Shepherd, Gordon. The Austrians: A Thousand-Year Odyssey. New York: Carroll & Graf Publishers, Inc., 1996.

Brown, Glen. Francis Davis Millet Memorial Meeting. Washington, D.C.: American Federation of Arts, 1912.

Buckley, Laurene. Joseph DeCamp: Master Painter of the Boston School. Munich and New York: Prestel-Verlag, 1995.

_____. Edmund C. Tarbell: Poet of Domesticity. New York: Hudson Hills Press, 2001.

Bürger, Wilhelm. [Théophile Thoré]. Musées de la Holland. 2 Vols. Paris: Jules Renouard, 1858-1860.

Burnham, Daniel Hudson and Francis Davis Millet. World's Columbian Exposition: The Book of the Builders: Being the Chronicle of the Origin and Plan of the World's Fair. Chicago: Columbian Memorial Publication Society, 1894.

Burnham, Daniel H. The Final Official Report Of The Director Of Works Of The World's Columbian Exposition. Reprint, New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989.

Burns, Sarah. Inventing the Modern Artist: Art and Culture in Gilded Age America. New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1996.

Burrows, Edwin G. and Mike Wallace. Gotham: A History of New York City to 1898. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Caffin, Charles H. The Story of American Painting: The Evolution of Painting in America from Colonial Times to the Present. 1907. Reprint, New York and London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1970.

The Cambridge Directory. 1865-1871.

Champney, James W. and Frank D. Millet. Massachusetts Artists Centennial Album. Boston: J. R. Osgood & Co., 1876.

Child, Theodore. Art and Criticism. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1892.

Chu, Petra Ten Doesschate. French Realism and the Dutch Masters. Utrecht: Haentjens Dekker and Gumbert, 1974.

Clark, Colonel Emmons. History of the Seventh Regiment of New York, 1806-1889. New York: Seventh Regiment, 1890.

The Cleveland Trust Company. "The Development of Civilization in America," Reproductions of the Mural Paintings by Frank Millet in the Main Banking Room. Cleveland, [1908].

Constitution and By-Laws of The St. Botolph Club, in Boston With a List of the Officers and Members of the Club at the Date of Organization, 10 January 1880. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1880.

Cortissoz, Royal. American Artists. New York and London: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1923.

Crowe, J. A. and G. B. Cavalcaselle. A History of Painting in Italy. London: John Murray, 1923.

_____. Titian: His Life and Times. London: John Murray, 1877.

Cresson, Margaret French. St. Paul's Church, Stockbridge, Massachusetts. A List of the Memorials and the People Who Made Them. St. Paul's Church, 1960.

Crowninshield, Frederic. Mural Painting. Boston: Tichnor and Company, 1887.

Culturel et Artistique, Retrospective Polydore Beaufaux, Number 21.

[The Decorator and Furnisher]. Seventh Regiment Armory. Illustrated. New York: J. W. Pratt & Son, c. 1885.

Denney, Colleen. At the Temple of Art: The Grosvenor Gallery, 1877-1890 Madison, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 2000.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dictionnaire Biographique illustré des Artistes en Belgique depuis 1830. Arto: 1987

Findling, John E. Historical Dictionary of World's Fairs and Expositions, 1851-1988. New York: Greenwood Press, 1990.

Fink, Lois Marie. American Art at the Nineteenth-Century Paris Salons. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Flippo, Willem G. Lexicon of the Belgium Romantic Painters. Antwerp: International Art Press, 2000.

Fogelson, Robert M. America's Armories: Architecture, Society, and Public Order. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989.

French, Mrs. Daniel Chester. Memories of a Sculptor's Wife. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1928.

Gerdts, William H. American Impressionism. New York: Abbeville Press, 1984.

Gilder, Rosamond, ed. Letters of Richard Watson Gilder. Boston: Houghton Mifflin and Company, 1916.

Goetz, Thomas. Taine and the Fine Arts. Madrid: Playor, S. A., 1973.

Halsby, Julian. Venice: The Artist's Vision, A Guide to British and American Painters. London: B. T. Batsford Ltd., 1990.

Harper's Christmas. Pictures and Papers Done by the Tile Club and Its Literary Friends. New York: Harper & Bros., 1882.

Hastings, Thomas. Commemorative Tributes to John LaFarge, Edwin Austin Abbey, Francis Davis Millet. New York: American Academy of Arts and Letters, 1913.

Harvard College. Class of 1869. Secretary's Report. No. 1. 1869.

_____. Class of 1869. Triennial Report, No. 1. Boston: Press of Rockwell & Churchill, 1872.

_____. The Second Triennial Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College. Third Report – June, 1875. Boston: Press of Rockwell & Churchill, 1875.

_____. The Third Triennial Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College. Fourth Report – June, 1878. Boston: Press of Rockwell and Churchill, 1878.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

_____. The Fourth Triennial Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College. Fifth Report – June, 1881. Boston: Press of Rockwell and Churchill, 1881.

_____. The Fifth Triennial Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College. Sixth Report – August, 1884. Boston: Press of Rockwell and Churchill, 1884.

_____. The Sixth Triennial Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College. Seventh Report – December 31, 1887. Boston: Press of Rockwell and Churchill, 1888.

_____. Report of the Secretary of the Class of 1869 of Harvard College, December 31, 1887 – August 1, 1894. Eighth Report – Twenty-Fifth Anniversary. Boston: Press of Rockwell and Churchill, 1894.

_____. Ninth Report of The Class of 1869 of Harvard College. From 1894 to 1901. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1901.

_____. Tenth Report of The Class of 1869 of Harvard College. June 1908. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1908.

_____. Eleventh Report of The Class of 1869 of Harvard College. June, 1919 Fiftieth Anniversary. Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1919.

Harvard University. Quinquennial Catalogue of the Officers And Graduates 1636-1930. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1930.

Herbert, Robert L. Impressionism: Art, Leisure, and Parisian Society. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1988.

Hobart, Benjamin. History of the Town of Abington, Plymouth County, Massachusetts from its First Settlement. Boston: T.H. Carter and Son, 1866.

Hook, Philip and Mark Poltimore. Popular 19th Century Painting: A Dictionary of European Genre Painters. Woodbridge, Suffolk: Antique Collectors Club, 1987.

Hughes, Thomas Patrick and Frank Munsell. American Ancestry: Giving the Name and Descent, in the Male Line, of Americans Whose Ancestors Settled in the United States Previous to the Declaration of Independence, A.D. 1776. Baltimore: Genealogical Pub. Co., 1968.

Hunt, James. A List of Paintings, Drawings, Mural Decorations and Designs, Civil and Military Awards and Literary Works of Francis David Millet. c. 1920.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Hutton, Laurence. Talks in a Library. New York: G. P. Putnam, 1905.

Hymans, Henri. Notice sur la Vie et les Travaux de Nicaise De Keyser. Bruxelles: F. Hayes, 1889.

Isham, Samuel. The History of American Painting. New York: 1905. Reprint, New York: The Macmillan Company, 1936.

Jacobs, Michael. The Good and Simple Life: Artist Colonies in Europe and America. Oxford: Phaida Press Limited, 1985.

James, Henry. Picture and Text. New York: 1893.

Jarves, James Jackson. The Art-Idea. 1864. Reprint, Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960.

Jarves, James Jackson. The "Old Masters" of Italy: Painting. New York: Derby and Jackson, 1861.

Jones. Owen. The Grammar of Ornament. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1982.

Jowell, Frances Suzman. Thoré-Bürger and the Art of the Past. New York & London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Kenin, Richard. Return to Albion: Americans in England 1760-1940. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1979.

Kammen, Michael. Mystic Chords of Memory: The Transformation of Tradition in American Culture. New York: Alfred A. Knoff, 1991.

Kann, Robert A. A History of the Habsburg Empire, 1526-1918. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.

King, Pauline. American Mural Painting. Boston: Noyes, Plat & Company, 1902.

Kirkland, Edward Charles. Charles Francis Adams, Jr. 1835-1915, The Patrician at Bay. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965

Koch, Robert. Louis C. Tiffany, Rebel in Glass. New York: Crown Publishers, Inc., 1965.

Koehler, S. R. The United States Art Directory and Year-Book. 2 Vols. New York: Cassell & Company, Limited, 1882-1884.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Larkin, Oliver W. Art and Life in America. New York: Rinehart & Company, Inc., 1949.

Lears, T. J. Jackson. No Place of Grace: Antimodernism and the Transformation of American Culture, 1880-1920. Chicago & London: The University of Chicago Press, 1994.

Levy, Florence N., ed. "Mural Painting in the United States." In. American Art Annual, 13-33. New York: 1911.

Lossing. Benjamin J. History of New York City. New York: George E. Perine, 1884.

Lovell, Margaretta M. A Visitable Past: Views of Venice by American Artists, 1860-1915. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press, 1989.

Lucas, E. V. Edwin Austin Abbey, Royal Academician: A Record of His Life and Work. 2 Vols. London: Methuen and Company Limited 1921.

Maas, Jeremy. Gambart: Prince of the Victorian Art World. London: Barrie & Jenkins, 1975.

Maass, John. The Glorious Enterprise: The Centennial Exhibition of 1876. Watkins Glen, New York: The American Life Foundation and Study Institute, 1973.

MacKenzie, John M. Orientalism: History, theory and the arts. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press, 1995.

Maret, Leon. Le peintre Polydore Beaufaux prix de Rome.

Matthews, Brander. These Many Years, Recollections of a New Yorker. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.

McMann, Evelyn de R. Royal Canadian Academy of Arts/Académie royale des arts du Canada. Exhibitions and Members 1880-1979. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981.

Millet, F. D_____. "Fine Arts of the Present Time." In Massachusetts Commission to the Vienna Exposition. Reports of the Massachusetts Commissioners to the Exposition at Vienna, 1873. With Special Reports Prepared for the Commission. Edited by Hamilton A. Hill, Associate Commissioner, 157-215. Boston: Wright and Potter, State Printers, 1875.

_____. "Progressive Changes in Costumes and Customs." In Gately's World's Progress. Charles E. Beale, ed. Boston: M. R. Gately, 1887.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

_____. A Capillary Crime and Other Stories. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1892.

_____. The Danube, From the Black Forest to the Black Sea. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1893.

_____. "Report of the Director of Decoration & Functions." In Daniel H. Burnham. The Final Official Report of The Director of Works of The World's Columbian Exposition, 57-83. June, 1894. Reprint, New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1989.

_____. "American Art." In The United States of American; a study of the American commonwealth, its natural resources, people, industries, manufactures, commerce, and its work in literature, science, education, and self-government, ed. Nathaniel Southgate Shaler, Vol. 2, 414-424. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1894.

_____. "Introductory note and description of pictures." In Early English and Barbizon Paintings Belonging to William H. Fuller. New York: American Art Association, 1898. Sale: 25 February 1898.

_____. Expedition to the Philippines. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1899.

_____. "Introduction." In Catalogue of Pictures Collected by the Late David C. Lyall of Brooklyn. Sale: American Art Galleries, New York, 1903.

_____. "Introduction." In Illustrated Catalogue of Paintings, Pastels and Water Colors by the Late Robert C. Minor, N.A. Sale: American Art Galleries, 1905.

Millet, Frank D. et al. Some Artists at the Fair. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1893.

Mitchell, Nahum. History of the Early Settlement of Bridgewater, in Plymouth County, Massachusetts, Including an Extensive Family Register. Boston: Kidder & Wright, 1940.

Moore, Charles. Daniel H. Burnham, Architect, Planner of Cities. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1921.

Morgan, H. Wayne. New Muses: Art in American Culture, 1865-1920. Norman, Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1978.

Morison, Samuel Eliot. Three Centuries of Harvard, 1639-1936. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1936.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Moscheles, Felix. In Bohemia with Du Maurier. New York: Harper and Brothers Publishers, 1897.

Moss, Carolyn J. Kate Field: Selected Letters. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1996.

Motley, John Lothrop. A History of the Rise of the Dutch Republic. 3 Vols. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1856.

Mumford, Lewis. The Brown Decades: A Study of the Arts in America 1865-1895. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company, c. 1931.

Murray, Charles F. Francis Davis Millet 1846-1912: A Monograph. Wilmington, Delaware, privately printed, 1985.

Murphy, W. J. A Brief Description of Mural Paintings and Statuary Federal Building Cleveland, Ohio. 1916.

Museum of Fine Arts, School of Drawing and Painting. First Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1877.

_____. Second Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1878.

_____. Third Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, Printers, 1879.

_____. Fourth Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1881.

_____. Fifth Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1882.

_____. Sixth Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1882.

_____. Seventh Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1883.

_____. Eighth Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1884.

_____. Ninth Annual Report of the Permanent Committee in Charge of the School. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1885.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Muther, Richard. The History of Modern Painting. 4 Vols. London: J. M. Dent and Company, 1907.

New York City Commercial Register. 1865-1866; 1873.

[New York] Landmarks Preservation Commission Report LP-1794. Seventh Regiment Armory Interior. New York: Landmarks Preservation Commission, July 19, 1994.

Newall, Christopher. The Grosvenor Gallery Exhibitions: Change and Continuity in the Victorian Art World. Cambridge, England: University Press, 1995.

Nochlin, Linda. "The Imaginary Orient." In Linda Nochlin. The Politics of Vision, 33-59. New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1989.

Paine, Albert Bigelow. Mark Twain, A Biography. New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1912.

Park, Charles F. A History of the Lowell Institute School, 1903-1928. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931.

Perkins, Robert F., Jr. and William J. Gavin III. The Boston Athenaeum Art Exhibition Index, 1827-1874. Boston: The Library of the Boston Athenaeum, 1980.

Peters, Harry T. America on Stone. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company, Inc., 1931.

Pevsner, Nikolaus. Academies of Art Past and Present. New York: Da Capo Press, 1973.

Peirce, H. Winthrop. The History of the School of the Museum of the Fine Arts, Boston, 1877-1927. Boston: Museum of the Fine Arts, 1930.

Pierce, Sally and Catharina Slautterback. Boston Lithography, 1825-1880: The Boston Athenaeum Collection. Boston: The Boston Athenaeum, 1991.

Pisano, Ronald G. Idle Hours: Americans at Leisure 1865-1914. Boston, Toronto, London: Little, Brown and Company, 1988.

Report of the Board of General Managers of the Exhibit of the State of New York at The World's Columbian Exposition. Albany: James B. Lyon, 1894.

Reports of the United States Commissioners to the Paris Universal Exposition, 1878. Vols. 1-2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Richardson, Edgar P. Painting in America. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1956.

Rooses, Max. Art in Flanders. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1909.

Said, Edward. Orientalism. New York: Vintage, 1978.

Saint-Gaudens, Homer, ed. The Reminiscences of Augustus Saint-Gaudens. 2 vols. London: Andrew Melrose, 1913.

Savage, James. A Genealogical Dictionary of the First Settlers of New England. Baltimore: Genealogical Publishing Co., Inc., 1990.

Scott, William Bell. Gems of Belgian Art. London: George Routledge and Sons, 1872.

Shannon, Martha A. S. Boston Days of William Morris Hunt. Boston: Marshall Jones Company, 1923.

Sharpey-Schafer, Joyce A. A Soldier of Fortune: F.D. Millet, 1846-1912. Utica: privately printed, 1984.

Sheldon, George William. Recent Ideals in American Art. New York and London: D. Appleton and Company, c. 1888. Reprint, New York and London: Garland Publishing Inc., 1977.

Shelton, William Henry. The Salmagundi Club. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin and Co., 1918.

Smith, Henry Nash and William M. Gibson, eds. Mark Twain – Howells Letters Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1960.

Soria, Regina. Elihu Vedder. Rutherford, New Jersey: Fairleigh Dickinson University Press, 1970.

_____. Dictionary of Nineteenth-Century American Artists in Italy, 1760-1914. East Brunswick, New Jersey: Associated University Presses, Inc., 1982.

Sparkes, John. "Report of the Head Master of the National Art Training Schools, On His Visit to the Art Schools of Belgium and Düsseldorf," 1876. In Frank Waller, Report on Art Schools to the Art Students' League, 9-46. New York: 1879.

Still, Bayrd. Mirror For Gotham: New York as Seen by Contemporaries from Dutch Days to the Present. New York: Fordham University Press, 1995.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Stokes, I. N. Phelps. The Iconography of Manhattan Island, 1498-1909. Vol. 5. New York: Robert H. Dodd, 1926. Reprint, New York: Arno Press, Inc., 1967.

Stott, Annette. Holland Mania: The Unknown Dutch Period in American Art and Culture. New York: The Overlook Press, 1998.

Strahan, Edward. [Earl Shinn]. The Art Treasures of America. Philadelphia: George Barrie Publisher, 1879-1882. Reprint, New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

_____. The Chefs-D'Oeuvre d'Art of the International Exhibition, 1878. Philadelphia: Gebbie & Barrie Publishers, 1878.

_____. The Masterpieces of the Centennial International Exhibition. Philadelphia: Gebbie & Barrie, 1876. Reprint, New York: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

Story, William W. "Report on the Fine Arts." In Reports of the United States Commissioners to the Paris Universal Exposition, 1878, 3-170. Vol. 2. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1880.

Swan, Mabel Munson. The Athenaeum Gallery, 1827- 1873. Boston: The Boston Athenaeum, 1940.

Swanson, Vern G. The Biography and Catalogue Raisonné of the Paintings of Sir Lawrence Alma-Tadema. London: Garton & Co., 1990.

Tager, Jack. "Massachusetts and the Age of Economic Revolution." In Jack Tager and John W. Ifkovic, eds. Massachusetts in the Gilded Age: selected essays, 3-28. Amherst: The University of Massachusetts Press, 1985.

Taine, H[ippolyte]. Lectures on Art. Translated by John Durand. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1875. Reprint, New York: AMS Press, Inc., 1971.

Tappert, Tara. "Francis Davis Millet." In American Paintings in the Detroit Institute of Arts. Vol. II, 184-186. New York: Hudson Hills Press in Association with the Detroit Institute of Arts Founders Society, 1997.

Thurston, Robert. Reports of the Commissioners of the United States to the International Exhibition Held at Vienna, 1873. 4 Vols. [1876].

Tolstoy, Count Leo. Sebastopol. Translated by Frank D. Millet. New York and London: Harper & Brothers Publishers, 1887.

Trachtenberg, Alan. The Incorporation of America: Culture and Society in the Gilded Age. New York: Hill and Wang, 1994.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Trow's Business Directory of New York City. 1885.

Trow's New York City Directory. 1865-1873; 1880-1885.

Troyen, Carol. The Boston Tradition: American Paintings from the Museum of Fine Arts Boston. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1980.

Trumble, Alfred. Representative Works of Contemporary American Artists. New York: c. 1887. Reprint, New York and London: Garland Publishing, Inc., 1977.

United States General Services Administration. The Evolution of Navigation—A Catalogue of the Vessels in the Decorations in the Call-Room of the Custom-House at Baltimore.

Valentine, Lucia and Alan Valentine. The American Academy in Rome 1894-1969. Charlottesville, Virginia: University Press of Virginia, 1973.

Van Den Branden, F. Jos. Geschiedenis der Antwerpsche Schilderschool. Antwerp: J. E. Buschmann, 1883.

Van Hook, Bailey. Angels of Art: Women and Art in American Society, 1876-1914. University Park, Pa.: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1996.

_____. The Virgin & the Dynamo: Public Murals in American Architecture 1893-1917. Athens, Ohio: Ohio University Press, 2003.

Van Looij, L. Theo. "De Antwerpse Koninklijke Academie Voor Schone Kunsten." In Anton W. A. Boschloo, ed. Academies of Art Between Renaissance and Romanticism, 302-319. 'S – Gravenhage: Sdu Uitgeverij, 1989.

_____. Een Eeuw Nationaal Hoger Instituut voor Schone Kunsten te Antwerpen:1885/1985. Antwerp: Nationaal Hoger Instituut and Koninklijke Academie voor Schone Kunsten, 1985.

Van Rensselaer, M. G. The Book of American Figure Painters. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott Company, 1886.

Vanderbilt, Kermit. Charles Eliot Norton: Apostle of Culture in a Democracy. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1959.

The Veteran's Room. Seventh Regiment. N.G.S.N.Y. Armory. New York: privately printed, 1881.

Vital Records of East Bridgewater, Massachusetts to The Year 1850. Boston: The New England Genealogical Society, 1917.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The War Correspondence of the "Daily News," 1877-78. London: Macmillan and Co., 1878.

Webster, Sally. William Morris Hunt, 1824- 1879. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Weeks, Edward. The Lowells and Their Institute. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1966.

Weinberg, H. Barbara. The Lure of Paris: Nineteenth-Century American Painters And Their French Teachers. New York: Abbeville Press, 1991.

Wheeler, Candace. Yesterday's In a Busy Life. New York and London: Harper & Brothers, Publishers, 1918.

Whitehill, Walter Muir. Museum of Fine Arts Boston, A Centennial History. 2 vols. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1970.

Whiting, Lilian. Kate Field, A Record. Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1899.

Wilkinson, Burke. Uncommon Clay: The Life and Works of Augustus Saint Gaudens. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers, 1985.

Wilson, Douglas, L., ed. "Introductory." In George Santayana. The Genteel Tradition; Nine Essays, pp. 1-25. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1967.

Wilson's Business Directory of New York City. 1879-1884.

Wood, Christopher. Victorian Painting. Boston, New York and London: Little, Brown and Company, 1999.

Exhibition and Sales Catalogues

American Art Association. Catalogue of Paintings Exhibited by the Following American Artists. J. Wells Champney, William M. Chase, Charles Melville Dewey, C. Harry Eaton, P. K. M. Rehn, F. D. Millet, Robt. C. Minor, H. R. Poore, Frederick [*sic*] Remington, Carlton Wiggins. New York: The American Art Galleries, April 1890.

American Art Association Exhibition of Paintings by the Members of the Art Club. The Art Club of New York, 1883.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Ayres, Linda. "The American Figure: Genre Paintings & Sculpture." In National Gallery of Art, Washington. An American Perspective: Nineteenth-Century Art from the collection of Jo Ann & Julian Ganz, Jr., 41-83. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, Washington, 1981.

Bermingham, Peter. American Art in the Barbizon Mood. Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1975.

Blaugrund Annette et al. Paris 1889: American Artists at the Universal Exposition. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, 1989.

Bolger, Doreen and Catherine Hoover Voorsanger. "The Hudson River School in Eclipse." In Kevin J. Avery et al. American Paradise: The World of the Hudson River School, 71-98. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1987.

Bolger Burke, Doreen et al. In Pursuit of Beauty, Americans and the Aesthetic Movement, New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1987.

Boston Art Club. Catalogue of the Twenty-Second Exhibition of Paintings. Boston: Mill, Knight & Co. Printers, 1880.

[Boston Art Club]. Illustrated Catalogue. Twenty-Eighth Exhibition of the Boston Art Club of Water Colors and Works in Black and White. Club Galleries, 1883.

_____. Massachusetts Centennial Art Exhibition, At The Galleries Of The Boston Art Club. Boston, April 1876.

Boston Art Club. Second Exhibition for 1878. April 17 to May 4.

Boston Museum of Fine Arts. Exhibition of Works by Living American Artists. Nov. 9 to Dec. 20, 1880. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1880.

[Boston Museum of Fine Arts]. Museum of Fine Arts Catalogue of the Fifth Annual Exhibition of Contemporary American Art. Boston: Alfred Mudge & Son, 1885.

Brooklyn Art Association Spring Exhibition of Water Colors. Brooklyn, 1884

Brooklyn Museum. The American Renaissance, 1876-1917. Brooklyn: Brooklyn Museum, 1979.

Cardyn-Oomen, Dorine, "Nicaise De Keyser (1813-1887)." In Nicaise De Keyser: Antwerps Portret, 5-19. Antwerp: Nationaal Hoger Instituut en Koninklijke Academie voor Schone Kunsten in association with Koninklijk Museum voor Schone Kunsten te Antwerpen en de Stad Antwerpen, 1987.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Campbell, Julian. The Irish Impressionists: Irish Artists in France and Belgium, 1850-1914. Dublin: The National Gallery of Ireland, 1984.

Carr, Carolyn Kinder et al. Revisiting The White City: American Art at the 1893 World's Fair. Washington, D.C.: National Museum of American Art and National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, 1993.

Catalogue, Allston Club First Exhibition. [Boston]: 1866.

Catalogue du Musée d' Anvers. Anvers: Le Conseil d'Administration de l'Académie Royale des Beaux-Arts, 1874.

Catalogue 1884, Brooklyn Art Association.

Catalogue of Pictures of the Tile Club Exhibited at The St. Botolph Club Boston. February 25, 1882.

Cercle Culturel et Artistique Polydore Beaufaux. Rétrospective Polydore Beaufaux, Prix de Rome 1857 Wavre: Salle culturelle de l'Hôtel de Ville, 1969.

[De Keyser, N.]. Catalogue de la Collection Delaissée par M. N. De Keyser. Anvers: April 7-8, 1888.

Detroit Institute of Arts and the National Gallery of Art, Washington. American Paintings from the Manoogian Collection. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1989.

Dorment, Richard and Margaret F. Macdonald et al. James McNeill Whistler. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1995.

Dreishpoon, Douglas and Susan E. Menconi. The Arts of the American Renaissance. New York: Hirschl & Adler Galleries, Inc., New York, 1985.

Duncan, Alastair et al. Masterworks of Louis Comfort Tiffany. Washington, D.C.: Renwick Gallery of the National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, 1989.

Edwards, Holly and Brian T. Allen et al. Noble Dreams, Wicked Pleasures: Orientalism in America, 1870-1930. Princeton: Princeton University Press in Association with The Sterling and Francine Clark Art Institute, 2000.

The Exhibition of the Royal Academy of Arts, 1879.

Exposition Génerérale des Beaux-Arts 1875. Catalogue Explicatif. Bruxelles, Adolphe Mertens, 1875.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Exposition Génénerale des Beaux-Arts 1878. Catalogue Explicatif. Bruxelles: Adolphe Mertens, 1878.

Exposition Universelle de Vienne, 1873. France. Oeuvres d' Art et Manufactures Nationales. Paris, 1873.

Fairbrother, Trevor J. et al. The Bostonians: Painters of an Elegant Age, 1870-1930. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1986.

Fifth Exhibition in New York of Pictures, the Contributions of Artists of the French, English, and Flemish Schools. New York: Studio Building, 1866.

Fink, Lois M. and Joshua Taylor. Academy: The Academic Tradition in American Art. Washington, D.C.: National Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution, 1975.

First Exhibition in New York of Pictures, the Contributions of Artists of the French Etching Club. New York, 1866.

Fischer, Diane P., ed. Paris 1900: The "American School" at the Universal Exposition. Montclair, New Jersey: The Montclair Art Museum, 2000.

Fourth Exhibition in New York of Pictures, The Contributions of Artists of the French, English, and Flemish Schools. New York: 1865-1866.

Gammell, R. H. Ives. The Boston Painters, 1900-1930. Edited by Elizabeth Ives Hunter. Orleans, Massachusetts: Parnassus Imprints, 1986.

Gerdts, William H. "Figure Painting in the United States." In The National Academy of Design. From All Walks of Life: Paintings of the Figure From The National Academy of Design, 7-14. New York: The National Academy of Design, 1979.

_____. "Natural Aristocrats in a Democracy: 1820-1870." In Michael Quick et al. American Portraiture in the Grand Manner: 1720-1920, 27-60. Los Angeles: Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1981.

Gerdts, William H. and Theodore E. Stebbins, Jr. "A Man of Genius": The Art of Washington Allston (1779-1843). Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, 1979.

Goley, Mary Anne. The Hague School and its American Legacy. Norton Gallery And School of Art, West Palm Beach, Florida, 1982.

Greenthal, Kathryn. Augustus Saint-Gaudens, Master Sculptor. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1985.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

[The Guild of Boston Artists]. The Easel Paintings of Francis Davis Millet. Boston: The Guild of Boston Artists, 1999.

Hayward, Judith. "The Italian Presence in American Art, 1860-1920." In The Italian Presence In American Art 1860-1920, 9-34. New York: Richard York Gallery, 1989.

Hills, Patricia. The Painters' America: Rural and Urban Life, 1810-1910. New York: Praeger Publishers in association with the Whitney Museum of American Art, 1974.

Hobbs, Susan. 1876: American Art of the Centennial. Washington, D.C.: National Collection of Fine Arts, Smithsonian Institution, 1976.

Hobbs, Susan A and Barbara Dayer Gallati. The Art of Thomas Wilmer Dewing: Beauty Reconfigured. Brooklyn: The Brooklyn Museum, 1996

Hoyle, Pamela. A Climate For Art. the History of the Boston Athenaeum Gallery, 1827-1873. Boston: Boston Athenaeum, 1980.

Huntington, David C. and Kathleen Pyne. The Quest for Unity: American Art Between World's Fairs 1876-1893. Detroit: The Detroit Institute of Arts, 1983.

Husby, Andrea. "Kate Field." In David B. Dearinger, ed. Rave Reviews: American Art and Its Critics, 1826-1925, 230-232. New York: National Academy of Design, 2000.

_____ and David B. Dearinger. "Reading the Story of Oenone." In David B. Dearinger, ed. Rave Reviews: American Art and Its Critics, 1826-1925, 235-236. New York: National Academy of Design, 2000.

Illustrated Catalogue Fourteenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society, 1881.

Illustrated Catalogue Fifteenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society, 1882.

Illustrated Catalogue Sixteenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society, 1883.

Illustrated Catalogue, Seventeenth Annual Exhibition of the American Water Color Society. New York: National Academy of Design, 1884.

Illustrated Catalogue of the Art Department. Eleventh Cincinnati Industrial Exposition, 1883.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Illustrated Catalogue Twenty-Eight Exhibition of the Boston Art Club of Water Colors and Works in Black and White at the Club Galleries, 1883.

Jarzombek, Nancy Allyn et al. Boston Art Club 1855-1950. Boston: Vose Galleries of Boston, 2000.

Koninklijk Museum Voor Schone Kunsten Antwerpen. Tentoonstelling Dossier, Nicaise De Keyser 1, 2 (2000).

Kurtz, Charles M., ed. American Academy Notes (New York: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co., 1881.

_____. Illustrated Art Notes. 1883. 58th Spring Exhibition. National Academy of Design, New York. New York: Cassell, Petter, Galpin & Co.

[Millet, F. D.]. Catalogue of Sale of Studio Properties, Antique Furniture, and Effects, at the Abbot's Grange, Broadway, Worcs. Broadway: G. H. Bayley & Sons, 1912. Sale: 6-7 November 1912.

_____. Catalogue of the Finished Paintings, Drawings and Studies Left by the Late Francis David Millet, N.A. New York: The American Art Association at The American Art Galleries, 6 March 1914.

[National Academy of Design]. Catalogue of the Fifty-First Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design, 1876. NewYork: E. Wells Sacket & Bro., 1876.

National Academy of Design. Illustrated Catalogue of the Fifty-Second Annual Exhibition. 1877. New York: E. Wells Sackett & Bro., 1877.

[National Academy of Design]. Catalogue of the Fifty-Fourth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design, 1879.

National Academy of Design. Fifty-Fifth Annual Exhibition, 1880.

[National Academy of Design]. Catalogue of the Fifty-Sixth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design, 1881.

_____. Catalogue of the Fifty-Seventh Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design. New York, 1882.

_____. Catalogue of the Fifty-Eighth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design. New York, 1883.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

_____. Catalogue of the fifty-Ninth Annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design. New York 1884.

O'Brien, Maureen C. In Support of Liberty: European Paintings at the 1883 Pedestal Fund Art Loan Exhibition. Southampton, New York: The Parrish Art Museum, 1986.

Official Catalogue of the International Exhibition of 1876. Philadelphia: Centennial Catalogue Co., 1876.

Official Catalogue of Exhibits, World's Columbian Exposition. Department K. Fine Arts. Chicago: W. B. Conkey Company, 1893.

Ormond, Richard et al. Frederic, Lord Leighton: Eminent Victorian Artist. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1996.

Paris Universal Exhibition of 1878. Catalogue of the British Fine Art Section. London: 1878.

[Paris]. Exposition Universelle Internationale de 1878 à Paris. Catalogue Officiel. Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1878.

Peck, Amelia and Carol Irish. Candace Wheeler: The Art and Enterprise of American Design, 1875-1900. New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 2000.

Pisano, Ronald G. The Tile Club and The Aesthetic Movement in America. Stony Brook, New York: The Museums at Stony Brook, 1999.

The Private Collection of Thomas B. Clarke. New York: American Art Gallery, 1884.

Quick, Michael. American Expatriate Painters of the Late Nineteenth Century. Dayton: Dayton Art Institute, 1976.

Salmagundi Sketch Club: Illustrated Catalog, 1882.

Sanford, Cynthia H. Heroes in the Fight for Beauty: The Muralists of the Hudson County Court House. New Jersey: Jersey City Museum, 1986.

Sellin, David. Americans in Brittany and Normandy, 1860-1910. Washington, D.C.: National Museum of American Art, 1983.

Sheehy, Jeanne. Walter Osborne. Dublin: The National Gallery of Ireland, 1984.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Shepherd, Deborah Fenton. "Reading the Story of Oenone." In David C. Huntington and Kathleen Pyne. The Quest for Unity: American Art Between World's Fairs 1876-1893, 122-123. Detroit: The Detroit Institute of Art, 1983.

Simpson, Marc. "The Window Seat." In Frances P. Smyth. American Paintings from the Manoogian Collection. Washington, D.C.: National Gallery of Art, 1989.

Simpson, Pamela H. So Beautiful An Arch: Images of the Natural Bridge. Lexington, Virginia: Washington and Lee University, 1982.

Society of American Artists. Fourth Annual Exhibition. March 28th – April 29th New York, 1881.

Society of American Artists. Fifth Annual Exhibition at The American Art Gallery April 6th – May 6th, 1882.

Society of American Artists. Fifth Annual Exhibition at The American Art Gallery May 1st – May 20th, 1882.

Society of American Artists 1883, March 26th – April 28th Sixth Annual Exhibition, American Art Gallery.

The Society of American Artists 1883. Opens in Boston, May 7th. Closes June 3d. Sixth Annual Exhibition Catalogue.

Society of American Artists Seventh Annual Exhibition. New York, 1884.

Staley, Allen. "Whistler and His World." In Allen Staley and Theodore Reff. From Realism to Symbolism: Whistler and His World, 11-22. Philadelphia: Philadelphia Museum of Art, 1971.

Staley, Allen et al. Victorian High Renaissance. The Minneapolis Institute of Art, 1978.

Stebbins, Theodore E., Jr. et al. The Lure of Italy: American Artists and the Italian Experience, 1760-1914, 29-65. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1992.

Stevens, MaryAnne, ed. The Orientalists: Delacroix to Matisse, The Allure of North Africa and the Near East. London: Royal Academy of Arts, 1984.

Truettner, William H. and Roger B. Stein et al. Picturing Old New England: Image And Memory. Washington, D.C.: National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, 1999.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Une commande "nicoise" au belge Nicaise De Keyser: Les Peintres des Grandes Ecoles de la collection Ernest Gambart. Nice: Musée des Beaux-Arts, 1997.

Weber, Bruce. Drawn From Tradition: American Drawings and Watercolors from The Susan and Herbert Adler Collection. West Palm Beach: Norton Gallery of Art, 1989.

Weber, Bruce. "Philosophy in Summer." In Bruce Weber. American Paintings VI, 1990, 62-63. New York: Berry-Hill Galleries, Inc., 1990.

Weinberg, H. Barbara. "The Lure of Paris. Late-Nineteenth-Century American Painters & Their French Training." In Theodore E. Stebbins, Jr., Carol Troyen & Trevor F. Fairbrother. A New World: Masterpieces of American Painting 1760-1910, 16-32. Boston: Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1983.

_____. "Cosmopolitan Attitudes: The Coming of Age of American Art." In Annette Blaugrund et al, Paris 1889: American Artists At the Universal Exposition, 33-51. Philadelphia: Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, 1989.

Weisberg, Gabriel P. and Petra Ten-Doesschate Chu. Redefining Genre: French and American Painting 1850-1900. Washington, D.C.: Trust for Museum Exhibitions, 1995.

Wheelock, Arthur K., Jr., ed. Johannes Vermeer. Washington, D. C.: National Gallery of Art, 1996.

Periodical and Journal Articles Before 1915 - These are arranged chronologically.

1860s

Bürger, Wilhelm. [Théophile Thoré]. "Van der Meer de Delft." Gazette des Beaux-Arts 21 (1866): 297-330, 458-470, 542-575.

"The Unsettled State of Europe. Belgium." Nation 2, 27 (4 January 1866): 17.

Sturgis, Russell. "French and Belgian Schools of Art." Nation 2 (25 January 1866): 121-123.

"French and Belgian Pictures on Exhibition." Nation (1 February 1866): 152-154.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1870s

Millet, F. D. "An Hour in an Italian Amphitheatre." Appleton's Journal 14 (28 August 1875): 273-274.

_____. "A Fourth of July in San Marino." Appleton's Journal (20 November 1875): 652-655.

_____. "The Fourth Waits." Atlantic Monthly 38 (November 1876): 578-597.

"Art." Atlantic Monthly 37 (May 1876): 632-633.

"Art." Atlantic Monthly 37 (June 1876): 758-763.

Marble, Earl. "Art in Boston. Centennial Pictures." Aldine 8, 6 (June 1876): 191-192.

"The Old Cabinet." Scribner's Monthly 12, 2 (June 1876): 270-271.

[Millet, Frank D.]. "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—I." American Architect and Building News (1 July 1876): 213-214.

_____. "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—II." American Architect and Building News (8 July 1876): 221.

_____. "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—III. The German Pictures." American Architect and Building News 1 (15 July 1876): 229.

_____. "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—IV. The Austrian, Scandinavian, and Danish Pictures." American Architect and Building News (22 July 1876): 236.

_____. "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—V. The Dutch Pictures." American Architect and Building News (29 July 1876): 245.

_____. "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—VI. The Belgian Pictures." American Architect and Building News (5 August 1876): 254.

_____. "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—VII. The French and Spanish Pictures." American Architect and Building News (12 August 1876): 261-262.

_____. "The Fine Arts at the Centennial.—VIII. The American Pictures." American Architect and Building News (19 August 1876): 269-270.

"American Art." Scribner's Monthly 13, 1 (November 1876): 126-127.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"The Academy Exhibition." Art Journal New Series, 13 (1877): 157-160.

"La Farge's Decorations of Trinity Church, Boston." Art Journal New Series, 3 (1877): 285-286.

Cook, Clarence. "Recent Church Decoration." Scribner's Monthly 15, 4 (February 1878): 569-577.

Baxter, Sylvester. "The Art-Schools of Boston." Art Journal 40 (June 1878): 189-190.

"International Art At The Universal Exposition, Paris. Part I – France." Art Journal 17 (1878): 197-199.

Van Brunt, Henry. "The New Dispensation of Monumental Art." Atlantic Monthly 43 (May 1879): 633-636.

"Whistler in Painting and Etching." Scribner's Monthly 18, 4 (August 1879): 481-495.

Pascoe, Charles E. "The Royal Academy." Art Journal New Series 5, 7 (July 1879): 219-222.

_____. "The Grosvenor Gallery Summer Exhibition." Art Journal New Series 5, 7 (July 1879): 223-224.

Lucas, Thomas John. "Art Life in Belgium." Portfolio 10 (1879): 178-183.

1880s

"Munkacsy." Art Amateur (January 1880): 23-24.

"Art News." Art Amateur 2, 5 (April 1880), p. 99.

"Clubs." American Art Review 1 (1880): 176.

Benjamin, S. G. W. "National Academy of Design. Fifty-Fifth Exhibition. First Notice." American Art Review 1 (1880): 306-313.

"American Art Chronicle." American Art Review 1 (1880): 362.

Lathrop, G. P. "The Exhibitions. VII – Boston Art Club Twenty-Second Exhibition." American Art Review 1 (1880): 441-444.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

_____. "St. Botolph Club, Boston, First Exhibition." American Art Review 1 (1880): 444-446.

Greta. "Boston Correspondence. Spring Exhibition of the Art Club—Mrs. Holmes's Silk Pictures. Notes." Art Amateur 2, 6 (May 1880): 118-120.

Brownell, William C. "The Younger Painters of America. First Paper." Scribner's Monthly 20, 1 (May 1880): 1-15.

"The National Academy Exhibition. Second Notice." Art Amateur 3, 1 (June 1880): 2-3.

Brownell, William C. "The Younger Painters of America. Second Paper." Scribner's Monthly 20, 3 (July 1880): 321-335.

Millet, F. D. "Mr. Hunt's Teaching." Atlantic Monthly (August 1880): 189-192.

_____. "The Paintings.—The Rimmer Collection" 8, 253 American Architect and Building News 8 (30 October 1880): 212-213.

Lathrop, George Parsons. "Exhibition of Works by Living American Artists at the Museum of Fine Arts Boston." American Art Review 2, First Division (1881): 65-71.

"Fine Arts. Fifty-Sixth annual Exhibition of the National Academy of Design—I." Nation (31 March 1881): 229-230.

"The Union League Club." The Art Journal (May 1881): 159-160.

Millet, F. D. "Tom's Carnival." Harper's Young People (17 May 1881): 452-454.

"Art Notes." Art Journal (June 1881): 189-190.

"Minor Notes." Art Journal (June 1881): 192.

Brownell, William C. "The Younger Painters of America. III" Scribner's Monthly 22, 3 (July 1881): 322-334.

[Brownell, William Crary]. "Decoration in the Seventh Regiment Armory." Scribner's Monthly 22, 3 (July 1881): 370-381.

Millet, Frank D. "American Artists As Exhibitors Abroad." Studio and Musical Review 1, 1 (1881): 25-26.

"Art Notes." Art Journal 7, 9 (1881): 288.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"American Art Chronicle." American Art Review 2, First Division (1881): 39-40.

"Miscellaneous. European Pictures Bought by Americans." American Art Review 2, First Division (1881): 42.

Millet, J. B. "VI. Boston Art Club.—Twenty-Third Exhibition." American Art Review 2, First Division (1881): 202-206.

Benjamin, S. G. W. "The Exhibitions. VII. National Academy of Design. Fifty-Sixth Exhibition." American Art Review 2, Second Division (1881): 21-29.

Van Rensselaer, [M]ariana G. "The New York Art Season." Atlantic Monthly (August 1881): 193-202.

Millet, F. D. "Costumes in the Greek Play at Harvard." Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine 23, 8 (November 1881): 65-79.

Clarence Cook. "The Water-color Society's Exhibition." Art Amateur 6, 4 (March 1882): 73-76.

Millet, Frank. Some American Tiles." Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine 23, 6 (April 1882): 896-904.

Oakey, A. F. "A Trial Balance of Decoration." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 383, 64 (April 1882): 734-740.

"The American Artists' Exhibition." Art Amateur 6, 6 (May 1882): 114-115.

Cook, Clarence. "The National Academy Exhibition." Art Amateur 6, 6 (May 1882): 116-118.

Montezuma. "My Note Book." Art Amateur 6, 6 (May 1882): 115.

"Costume Lectures, 1882." The Art Student 1, 1 (June 1882), np.

M. G. V. R. [Mariana Griswold Van Rensselaer]. "Art Matters." Lippincott's Magazine 4, 8 (July 1882): 105-108.

"My Note Book." Art Amateur 7, 6 (November 1882): 112.

"The Watercolor Exhibition." Nation 36 (15 February 1883): 137.

"Artist Fund Slaughter." Studio 1, 7 (17 February 1883): 52-53.

"Meeting re Munich International Art Exhibition." Art Interchange 10, 5 (1 March 1883): 61.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Millet, Frank D. "Yatil. Century Illustrated Monthly Magazine 25, 5 (March 1883): 745-752.

"The Munich Exhibition." Studio 1, 10 (10 March 1883): 80.

"Sixth American Artists." Art Interchange 10, 7 (29 March 1883): 82.

"The New York Art Club Exhibition." Art Amateur 8, 5 (April 1883): 100-101.

"The Tariff Question." Studio 1, 14 (7 April 1883): 115-117.

"The Munich Exhibition." Studio 1, 15 (14 April 1883): 129-130.

"The Academy Exhibition." Art Amateur (May 1883): 126-128.

"The Jury for the Munich Exhibition." Studio 1, 19 (12 May 1883): 190.

"For the Pedestal." Studio 1, 29 (19 May 1883): 203-204.

"The Munich Exhibition." Studio 1, 20 (19 May 1883): 201, 220-221.

"Notes and News." Art Interchange 10, 11 (24 May 1883): 133.

"The Tariff Question." Studio 1, 21 (26 May 1883): 213-214.

"From Our London Correspondent." Studio 1, 26 (30 June 1883): 287.

"Coming Exhibitions." Studio 1, 26 (30 June 1883): 294

Millet, F. D. "Dalecarlia." Harper's New Monthly Magazine (September 1883): 489-503.

_____. "Dalecarlia." Harper's New Monthly Magazine (October 1883): 672-688

"The Chicago Exposition." Studio 2, 41 (13 October 1883): 161-162.

"The Cincinnati Exhibition." Studio 2, 41 (13 October 1883): 161.

"Notes From Other Papers." Studio 2, 41 (13 October 1883): 166-167

_____. Studio 2, 43 (27 October 1883): 203-204.

Gustafson, Zadel Barnes. "Nicaise De Keyser." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 67, 401 (October 1883): 688-696.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"The Institute of Painters in Oil Colours." The Athenaeum (22 December 1883): 822.

"The Institute." Magazine of Art 8 (1884): 161.

Cook, Clarence. "Thomas B. Clarke's Pictures." Art Amateur 10, 3 (February 1884): 61-62.

[Cook, Clarence]. "The Art Association Exhibition." Art Amateur 10, 4 (March 1884): 87-88.

Montezuma. "My Note Book." Art Amateur 10, 6 (May 1884): 122-123.

"The National Academy Exhibition." Art Amateur 11, 1 (1884): 8-10.

Beta. "Pennsylvania Academy Exhibition." Art Amateur 12, 1 (1884): 7-8.

"Our Congress and Works of Art." Studio New Series 1 (2 August 1884): 10-11.

Millet, F. D. "George Fuller." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 69, 412 (September 1884): 517-523.

_____. "The Art Competitions." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 69, 414 (November 1884): 917-923.

"The Pictures of G. F. Watts." Studio New Series, 7 (November 8, 1884): 74-79.

"The Award of the Harper and Hallgarten Scholarship." Studio New Series, 12 (17 January 1885): 134-135.

"The National Society of Arts. Studio New Series, 17 (28 March 1885): 196-197.

Millet, F. D. "A Wild Goose Chase." Harper's New Monthly Magazine (April 1885): 663-678.

_____. "A Wild Goose Chase." Harper's New Monthly Magazine (May 1885): 937-949.

_____. "A Wild Goose Chase." Harper's New Monthly Magazine (June 1885): 18-32.

Millet, F. D. "The Watts Exhibition." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 71, 421 (June 1885): 96-102.

_____. "Campaigning with the Cossacks, I—A Summer Campaign." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 74, (January 1887): 235-250.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

_____. "Campaigning with the Cossacks, II—A Winter's Campaign." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 74 (February 1887): 397-411.

_____. "Tedesco's Rubina." Scribner's Magazine 1, 4 (April 1887): 499-507.

Downes, William Howe. "Boston Painters and Paintings. VI. Private Collections." Atlantic Monthly 62. (December 1888): 780-785.

Millet, Frank D. "Medusa's Head." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 80 (December 1889): 130-136.

1890s

Millet, F. D. "What the Artists think of Sargent's 'Beatrice.'" Harper's Weekly 35 (9 May 1891): 346-347.

_____. "What Are We Americans Doing in Art?" Century Magazine 43, 1 (November 1891): 46-49.

_____. "A Courier's Ride." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 83 (October 1891): 756-765.

_____. "The Designers of the Fair." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 85, 510 (November 1892): 872-883.

_____. "The Decoration of the Exposition." Scribner's Magazine 12 6 (December 1892): 693-709.

Ritchie, Alick. P. F. "L'Academie Royale Des Beaux-Arts D'Anvers," Studio 1 (1893): 141-142.

Bates, Dewey. "George Clausen, A.R.A." Studio 25 (April 1895): 3-8.

Millet, F. D. "A Tragedy above the Clouds." Youth's Companion 70 (26 November 1896): 633-634.

Caffin, Charles H. "Frank D. Millet's Mural Painting for Pittsburg." Harper's Weekly 41, 2140 (25 December 1897): 1294-1295.

Hartman, Sadakichi. "Matters Mural." Criterion 16 (1 January 1898): 16-17.

Hutton, Laurence. "A Group of Players." Harper's New Monthly Magazine 96, 572 (January 1898): 196-210.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Millet, F. D. "Home of the Indolent. The Island of Capri." Century Magazine 56 (October 1898): 853-858.

1900-1915

Millet, F. D. "The American Academy in Rome." Review of Reviews 31 (June 1905): 713-715.

Skinner, Charles. "The Domestic Pictures of Frank D. Millet." International Studio 32, 128 (October 1907): CXI-CXXI.

Mechlin, Leila. "Mr. F. D. Millet's Decorations in the Baltimore Custom House." Architectural Record 26 (August 1908): 98-108.

_____. "A Decorator of Public Buildings." World's Work 19 December 1909):12379-12386.

Baxter, Sylvester. "Francis Davis Millet, An Appreciation of the Man." Art and Progress 3, 9 (July 1912): 636-637.

Blashfield, Edwin Howland. "Frank D. Millet As Mural Painter." Art and Progress 3, 9 (July 1912): 650-651.

Coffin, William A. "Francis Davis Millet's Easel Pictures." Art and Progress 3, 9 (July 1912): 642-648.

Maynard, George. "Francis Davis Millet—A Reminiscence." Art and Progress 3, 9 (July 1912): 653-654.

Hunt, James. "Millet at Work: A Chronicle of Friendship." Art and Progress 4, 11 (September 1913): 1087.

Periodical and Journal Articles After 1915 - These are arranged alphabetically by author.

Baekeland, Frederick. "Collectors of American Painting, 1813 to 1913." American Art Review 3, 6 (November- December 1976): 120-166.

Barter, Judith A. "Frank Millet and Nineteenth Century History Painting." Nineteenth-Century American Art, Mead Art Museum Monographs 5 (Spring 1985): 5-9.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Cikovsky, Nicolai, Jr., "William Merritt Chase's Tenth Street Studio," Archives of American Art Journal 16. (1976), pp. 2-14.

Clark, H. Nichols B. "A Taste for the Netherlands: The Impact of Seventeenth-Century Dutch and Flemish Genre Painting on American Art 1800-1860." American Art Journal 14, 2. (Spring 1982): 23-38.

Curti, Merle. "America at the World Fairs, 1851-1893." American Historical Review. 55 (July 1950): 833-856.

"Detroit Took Up Art Just Fifty Years Ago." Art Digest 8 (15 October 1933): 32.

F. P. "Oud-Antwerpsche Portretten Galerie. Jozef Van Lerius (1823-1876)." Fonolagsvriend (27 October 1935): 194.

Fink, Lois Marie. "19th Century Evolutionary Art." American Art Review (January 1978): 74-81, 105-109.

_____. "French Art in the United States, 1850-1870. Three Dealers and Collectors." Gazette des Beaux-Arts 92. (September 1978): 87-100.

Harris, Neil. "The Gilded Age Reconsidered Once Again." Archives of American Art Journal 23, 4. (1983): 8-18.

Hook, Philip. "The Classical Revival in English Painting." Connoisseur 192, 772 (June 1976): 122-127.

Hunting, Mary Anne. "The Seventh Regiment Armory in New York City." Antiques (January 1999): PAGES

Kreiner, Mary Beth. "Francis Davis Millet's Reading the Story of Oenone." Bulletin of the Detroit Institute of Arts 69, 1/2 (1995): 14-25.

Lampo, Jan. "Een Tempel Bouwen Voor De Muzen: Een korte geschiedenis van de Antwerpse Academie (1663-1995)." Periscoop (April 2000): 3-32.

Leader, Bernice. "Antifeminism in the Paintings of the Boston School." Arts Magazine (January 1982): 112-119.

Maas, Jeremy. "Gambart and the Missing De Keyser Pictures." Connoisseur 190, 764 (October 1975): 80-86.

Sheehy, Jeanne. "The Flight from South Kensington: British Artists at the Antwerp Academy 1877-1885." Art History 20, 1. (March 1997): 124-153.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Simpson, Marc. "Windows on the Past: Edwin Austin Abbey and Francis Davis Millet in England." American Art Journal 22, 3 (1990): 65-89.

Weinberg, Barbara H. "Thomas B. Clarke. Foremost Patron of American Art From 1872 to 1899." American Art Journal (May 1976): 52-83.

_____. "The Career of Francis Davis Millet," Archives of American Art Journal 17, 1 (1977): 2-18.

_____. "Late-Nineteenth-Century Painting: Cosmopolitan Concerns And Critical Controversies." Archives of American Art Journal 23, 4 (1983): 19-26.

Newspaper Articles - These are arranged alphabetically by publication, and then chronologically.

Abington [Massachusetts] Herald

"Frank D. Millet: Artist, Journalist, Critic." Abington [Massachusetts] Herald, 20 March 1884.

"The Millets." Abington [Massachusetts] Herald, 23 March 1884.

Boston Courier

F. D. M. "Transylvania." Boston Courier, 22 November 1874, p. 1.

_____. "Szeklarland." Boston Courier, 29 November 1874, p. 1.

_____. "Roumania." Boston Courier, 13 December 1874, p. 1.

Francis Davis Millet. [Epiphyry Kin]. "The Art Frauds and Miss Hosmer's Letter Reviewed." Boston Courier, 14 February 1875, p. 2.

_____. [Epiphyry Kin]. "Venice. The Visit of Francis Joseph To Victor Emmanuel." Boston Courier, 23 May 1875, p. 1.

Boston Daily Advertiser

Boston Daily Advertiser, 17 April 1866, p. 4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"The Second Reception of the Boston Art Club." Boston Daily Advertiser, 19 April 1866, p. 1.

Boston Daily Advertiser, 26 April 1866, p. 1.

"The Allston Club Exhibition." Boston Daily Advertiser, 1 May 1866, pp.2-3.

Boston Daily Advertiser, 15 January 1869, p. 2; 5 February 1869, p. 1; 12 May 1869, p. 3; 7 June 1869, p. 3; 16 August 1869, p. 1; 1 September 1869, p. 1

"Art Matters," Boston Daily Advertiser. 2 October 1869, p. 1.

"Summary of European News," Boston Daily Advertiser, 11 October 1869, p. 1.

Boston Daily Advertiser, 12 October 1869, p. 2; 15 October 1869, p. 2; 6 November 1869, p. 1; 11 November 1869, p. 1; 18 November 1869, p. 1; 20 November 1869, p. 3; 23 November 1869, p. 2; 27 November 1869, p. 1; 29 November 1869, p. 1; 22 December 1869, p. 2.

"Local Matters," Boston Daily Advertiser, 23 December 1869, p. 1.

Boston Daily Advertiser, 24 December 1869, p. 1

"Art Matters," Boston Daily Advertiser, 29 December 1869, p. 4.

Boston Daily Advertiser, 5 January 1870, p. 1

"Reception by the Boston Art Club," Boston Daily Advertiser, 9 May 1870, p. 1.

Boston Daily Advertiser, 17 June 1870, p. 1

F. D. M. "The World's Fair," Boston Daily Advertiser, 5 June 1873, p. 2.

_____. "The Exhibition. First Impressions of the Visitor After an Exterior View." Boston Daily Advertiser, 20 May 1876, p. 2.

_____. "The Exhibition. A Comparison with the Vienna Weltaustellung." Boston Daily Advertiser, 22 May 1876, p. 2.

_____. "The Exhibition. The Visit of the Commercial Club of Boston." Boston Daily Advertiser, 23 May 1876, p. 1.

_____. "The Exhibition. Appearance of the Display in Memorial Hall." Boston Daily Advertiser, 24 May 1876, p. 4.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

_____. "The Exhibition. English Contributions to the Fine Art Department." Boston Daily Advertiser, 25 May 1876, p. 1.

_____. "The Exhibition. The Distribution of Space in the Grounds." Boston Daily Advertiser, 7 June 1876, p. 4.

_____. "The Austrian Art-Department." Boston Daily Advertiser, 16 June 1876, p. 1.

[F. D. M.]. "German Exhibition of Fine Art." Boston Daily Advertiser, 16 June 1876, p. 4.

_____. "The Exhibition. The English and French Ceramics." Boston Daily Advertiser, 21 June 1876, p. 1.

_____. "The Exhibition. Metal and Enamel Work." Boston Daily Advertiser, 3 July 1876, p. 1.

_____. "The Great Corliss Engine." Boston Daily Advertiser, 31 July 1876, p. 2.

" Mr. F. D. Millet's Paintings." Boston Daily Advertiser, 3 February 1876, p. 2.

"The Fine Arts." Boston Daily Advertiser, 23 February 1876, p. 2.

"The American Art Gallery." Boston Daily Advertiser, 23 January 1880, p. 1

Hyde, Sidney. "The Fine Arts. The Academy Exhibition in New York." Boston Daily Advertiser, 9 April 1880, p. 2.

"From Plevna to Constantinople." Boston Daily Advertiser, 24 April 1880, p. 1.

"The Fine Arts." Boston Daily Advertiser, May 18, 1880, p. 1.

"Obituary." Boston Daily Advertiser, 30 October 1880, p. 4.

"The Fine Arts. The Tile Club's Pictures." Boston Daily Advertiser, 3 May 1882, p. 4.

"The Art Club Exhibition." Boston Daily Advertiser, 14 April 1883, p. 9.

"The Munich Exhibition. American Works of Art Collected for It." Boston Daily Advertiser, 21 May 1883, p. 8.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Boston Globe

"Expression in Glass." Boston Globe, 21 June 1889.

[Field, Kate]. "Clever Frank Millet." Boston Globe, 16 December 1892, p. 9.

Boston Saturday Evening Gazette

"Notes." Boston Saturday Evening Gazette, 11 June 1870, p. 2.

"Art Notes." Boston Saturday Evening Gazette, 6 May 1871, p. 2.

Boston Evening Transcript

"Art and Artists." Boston Evening Transcript, 10 August 1875, p. 3.

Boston Evening Transcript, 25 February 1876, p. 6.

"Personal." Boston Evening Transcript, 30 July 1880, p. 4.

"Tete-A-Tete." Boston Evening Transcript, 12 October 1880, p. 1.

"Art and Artists." Boston Evening Transcript, 26 October 1880, p. 6.

"Art and Artists." Boston Evening Transcript, 1 March 1882, p. 6.

Boston Herald

[George Lathrop]. "Frank Millet, A New England Artist in His Rural Studio." Boston Herald, [1880].

New York Herald

New York Herald, 10 April 1875; 2 December 1882, p. 5.

"Millet—Servant of American Art." New York Herald. Magazine Section, 12 May 1912, pp.1-2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

New York Sun

New York Sun, 14 June 1881, p. 2.

"A Lecture on Roman Costume at the National Academy." New York Sun, 11 February 1882, p. 10.

"Art Exhibitions. The Society of American Artists." New York Sun, 25 March 1883, p. 5.

New York Times

"Fine Arts." New York Times, 8 April 1866, p. 5.

"Joseph Van Lerius." New York Times, 23 March 1876, p. 2.

"Art Notes." New York Times, 2 January 1881, p. 5.

"Notes on the Fine Arts." New York Times, 7 February 1881, p. 6.

"The Academy Exhibition." New York Times, 20 March 1881, p. 2.

"The Academy Pictures. More Notable Features of the Exhibition." New York Times, 3 April 1881, p. 10.

"Art Notes." New York Times, 4 April 1881, p. 2.

"Veterans Housed Sumptuously." New York Times, 23 April 1881, p. 2.

"Artists and Their Work." New York Times, 9 October 1881, p. 10.

"Art Notes." New York Times, 30 October 1881, p. 14; idem, 25 December 1881, p. 6; idem, 15 January 1882, p. 4.

"Ancient Roman Costumes." New York Times, 18 February 1882, p. 3.

"Roman Costumes. An Interesting Lecture by Mr. Frank D. Millet." New York Times, 25 February 1882, p. 8

"A Roman in Full Dress. Many forms of the Toga and How It was Worn." New York Times, 1 March 1882, p. 2.

"Roman Arms and Costumes. Another of Mr. F. D. Millet's Interesting Course of Lectures." New York Times, 8 March 1882, p. 3.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Roman Costumes Described." New York Times, 15 March 1882, p. 2.

"Fine Arts. Society of American Artists." New York Times, 4 May 1882, p. 5.

"Society of American Artists." New York Times, 4 May 1882, p. 5.

"Art Notes." New York Times, 26 June 1882, p. 3.

"Black and White." New York Times, 2 December 1882, p. 4.

"Pygmalion and Galatea." New York Times, 23 January 1883, p. 5.

"Pictures at the Academy. Viewed in the Quiet of Varnishing Day." New York Times, 31 March 1883, p. 5.

"Mr. Clarke's Exhibition." New York Times, 28 December 1883, p. 5.

"Art Notes." New York Times, 13 January 1884, p. 4.

"American Art Association." New York Times, 19 January 1884, p. 3.

"Art Students to Compete. The Hallgarten and Harper Scholarship Funds Combined." New York Times, 19 May 1884, p. 8.

Blashfield, E. H. "A Painter's Reminiscences of a World's Fair." New York Times Magazine, 18 March 1923, pp. 13-14.

"Obituary." New York Times, 19 June 1932, p. 26.

New York Tribune

[Cook, Clarence]. "Fine Arts. The National Academy of Design. Fiftieth Annual Exhibition. Third Notice." New York Tribune, 29 April 1875, p. 7.

_____. "Academy of Design. Fifty-First Annual Exhibition." New York Tribune, 6 May 1876, p. 2.

"Personal." New York Tribune, 2 February 1880, p. 4.

"Frank D. Millet's Career." New York Tribune, 11 July 1880, p. 4.

"What Artists Are Doing." New York Tribune, 17 February 1881, p. 5.

"Mr. Barrett's Performances." New York Tribune, 21 March 1881, p. 5.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Among the Artists." New York Tribune, 27 March 1881, p. 2.

"Notes of Art Work." New York Tribune, 15 May 1881, p. 5.

"Oedipus Tyrannus." New York Tribune, 16 May 1881, pp. 14-18.

"Mr. Barrett's Performances." New York Tribune, 15 October 1881, p. 4.

"Water Colors and Oils. What the Artists Have Been Doing." New York Tribune, 17 January 1882, p. 2.

"In Gallery and Studio." New York Tribune, 19 January 1882, p. 9.

"Pictures by Alma-Tadema." New York Tribune, 26 January 1882, p. 5.

"The Water-Color Society." New York Tribune, 5 February 1882, p. 7.

"Artists' Fund Society." New York Tribune, 15 February 1882, p. 5.

"Fine Arts. Society of American Artists." New York Tribune, 6 April 1882, p. 5.

"The Work of the Artists." New York Tribune, 23 April, 1882, p. 5.

"Society of American Artists. Fifth Annual Exhibition—New Pictures." New York Tribune, 4 May 1882, p. 5.

"Close of the Art Season." New York Tribune, 28 May 1882, p. 2.

"The Salmagundi Exhibition. Second Notice." New York Tribune, 21 December 1882, p. 5.

"Sixteenth Annual Exhibition." New York Tribune, 27 January 1883, p. 5.

"The Artist's Fund Society. Twenty-Third Annual Exhibition." New York Tribune, 28 January 1883, p. 7.

"The Art Club of New York. First Exhibition." New York Tribune, 13 February 1883, p. 5.

"The National Academy of Design." New York Tribune, 31 March 1883, p. 5.

"Art News and Comments." New York Tribune, 4 May 1883, p. 5.

"The Artists' Fund Society." New York Tribune, 6 January 1884, p. 2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Art News and Comments. The Week in Art Circles." New York Tribune, 6 January 1884, p. 4.

"The Water Color Society." New York Tribune, 2 February 1884, p. 2.

"Art News and Comments." New York Tribune, 3 February 1884, p. 4.

"The Artists' Fund Picture Sale." New York Tribune, 17 February 1884, p. 5.

"The Academy of Design." New York Tribune, 5 April 1884, p. 5.

"Art News and Comments." New York Tribune, 1 June 1884, p. 4.

G. W. S. "The Watts Exhibition." New York Tribune, 1 September 1884, p. 6.

"Art News and Comments." New York Tribune, 28 December 1884, p. 10.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.