

NOTE TO USERS

**Illustrations in this document have not been
filmed at the request of the author. They are
available for consultation at the author's
university library.**

307-356

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI[®]

“REVISING HISTORY”: CREATING A CANON OF AMERICAN ART
AT THE CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION

by

KIMBERLY ORCUTT

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

2005

UMI Number: 3187359

Copyright 2005 by
Orcutt, Kimberly

All rights reserved.

UMI[®]

UMI Microform 3187359

Copyright 2006 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

©2005

KIMBERLY ORCUTT

All Rights Reserved

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.

Date

Dr. Sally Webster, Chairperson

Date

Dr. Patricia Mainardi, Executive Officer

Dr. Katherine Manthorne

Dr. Kevin Murphy

Dr. Theodore E. Stebbins, Jr.

Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract**“REVISING HISTORY”: CREATING A CANON OF AMERICAN ART
AT THE CENTENNIAL EXHIBITION**

by

Kimberly Orcutt

Adviser: Professor Sally Webster

Nineteenth century international expositions were mainly commercial in nature; their function was to bring together an array of objects to create a comprehensive view of the world, then to select those that were most praiseworthy. The 1876 Centennial Exhibition, however, was also commemorative, as it memorialized the signing of the Declaration of Independence. It represented an opportunity to show American goods – a manifestation of the country’s present – along with a call to reflect upon its past and to “revise history,” as it was put in a newspaper article of the period.

This was no less true for American art. The United States art exhibition provided not just an opportunity, but a mandate to create a canon of the country’s art from the past century, along with a historical narrative that would join the past to the present and enshrine a national “American School.” This challenge came at a time that one critic called “an era of revolution,” as the nativists of the Hudson River School of landscape painting were challenged by expatriates who studied abroad and favored figural subjects. Artists from these two camps competed fiercely to determine who would represent the “American School” and inherit the mantle of history at the Centennial Exhibition. However, the display that they presented was impossibly large and confusing, and riddled with absences.

Their attempted canon was overtaken by the written accounts of critics, who were claiming new authority over the nation's cultural life. The shortcomings that they discerned in the exhibition led them to create their own interpretations that reached far beyond the display itself to present rudimentary narratives of American art, and to debate questions of national identity in the face of foreign influences. Their discussions resonated through the rest of the century in new histories of art that departed from earlier biographical models and followed the Centennial ideal of progress, weaving narratives of continual advancement that addressed the inescapable reality of European influences. At the same time, world's fairs emerged as occasions to define the American school. Both written and exhibited accounts show that the discourses inspired by the Centennial Exhibition shaped the perception of American art through the rest of the century.

Acknowledgements

Scholarship is far from a solitary endeavor, and this dissertation has benefited greatly from the exceptional kindness and collegiality of the Americanist community of art historians. My committee at the Graduate Center was headed by Professor Sally Webster, whose patient and thorough first reading of my manuscript gave clarity to a complex project. Professor Katherine Manthorne's thoughtful comments encouraged a more textured reading of key issues. Professor Kevin Murphy kindly stepped in at a late date and offered valuable suggestions. Theodore E. Stebbins, Jr., Curator of American Art at the Fogg Art Museum, enthusiastically supported this project from its beginning, and his insights have enriched it immeasurably.

I am grateful to many other colleagues for their assistance. First and foremost, William H. Gerdts, Professor Emeritus at the Graduate Center, has been wonderfully supportive, and I have been privileged to draw from both his accumulated wisdom and his incomparable library. I received valuable advice from two Centennial experts of long standing, Dr. Susan A. Hobbs, Director, Thomas Wilmer Dewing and Maria Oakey Dewing Catalogues Raisonné; and Dr. David Sellin. Other scholars generously shared their own research and insights, including M. Elizabeth Boone, Associate Professor, Humboldt State University; Kathleen Foster, Robert L. McNeil Curator of American Art, Philadelphia Museum of Art; Abigail Booth Gerdts, Director of the Lloyd Goodrich and Edith Havens Goodrich Whitney Museum of American Art Record of Works by Winslow Homer; Dr. Susanna Gold; Dr. Karen Lemmey; Patricia Mainardi, Professor and Executive Officer, Graduate Center; Dr. Katharine Martinez, Herman and Joan Suit Librarian of the Fine Arts Library, Harvard University; Dr. Kevin Moore; and Thayer

Tolles, Associate Curator, and H. Barbara Weinberg, Alice Pratt Brown Curator of American Paintings and Sculpture, Metropolitan Museum of Art.

The staffs of several libraries and archives were very helpful, including those of the Free Library of Philadelphia, the Harvard Libraries, the Historical Society of Pennsylvania, particularly Jack Gumbrecht and Kerry McLaughlin, the Library Company of Philadelphia, the Library of Congress, and the Philadelphia City Archives. At the Smithsonian American Art Museum Library I benefited from the kind assistance of Cecilia Chin and Alice Clarke, and from the remarkable body of research assembled by Colonel Merl M. Moore, Jr. I would also like to acknowledge the help of Susan K. Anderson at the Philadelphia Museum of Art Archives, Cheryl Leibold of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts Archives, and Theresa Stuhlman of the Fairmount Park Commission, as well as the assistance of Danielle Archibald of the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Elizabeth Beaman of Sotheby's, and Carol Lees of the Graduate Center's Visual Resources Collection.

I had the opportunity to present aspects of this dissertation at the Nineteenth Century Studies Association Conference, the Yale Graduate Student Symposium, and the Frick Symposium on the History of Art, and my work has benefited from the conversations that resulted. The Art History program at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York supported my work with a Luce Dissertation Fellowship and a Dr. Catherine Hoover Voorsanger Fellowship, and I am honored by their confidence.

Finally, I wish to thank my husband Brian, whose steadfast support has made this journey not only possible, but a great joy.

Table of Contents

List of Illustrations	ix
Introduction: The Stakes	1
Chapter One: The Struggle	52
Chapter Two: Exhibiting History	123
Chapter Three: Writing History	192
Chapter Four: Revising History	241
Illustrations	307
Appendix A: Centennial Exhibition, United States Art Department, Paintings and Sculpture (by artist)	357
Appendix B: Centennial Exhibition, United States Art Department, Paintings and Sculpture (by location)	393
Bibliography	429

List of Illustrations

- Figure I.1. Emanuel Gottlieb Leutze, *Worthington Whittredge*, 1861. Oil on canvas, 30 x 24 5/8 in. National Academy Museum, New York (767-P).
- Figure I.2. William Curtis Taylor, *John Sartain*, n.d. Albumen print, 10 5/8 x 8 5/8 in. Print and Picture Collection, Free Library of Philadelphia.
- Figure I.3. Centennial Photographic Company, *Memorial Hall*, 1876. Stereograph, 4 3/4 x 7 7/8 in. Print and Picture Collection, Free Library of Philadelphia.
- Figure I.4. Centennial Photographic Company, *Memorial Hall, Design and Construction*, 1876. Silver albumen print, 8 1/4 x 10 1/4 in. Print and Picture Collection, Free Library of Philadelphia.
- Figure I.5. Hiram Powers, *Fisher Boy*, 1841-44. Marble, 1857, 57 1/2 x 19 x 16 in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Bequest of Hamilton Fish, 1894 (94.9.1).
- Figure I.6. Frederic E. Church, *Niagara*, 1857. Oil on canvas, 42 1/2 x 90 1/2 in. Corcoran Gallery of Art, Museum Purchase, Gallery Fund (76.15).
- Figure I.7. G.P.A. Healy, *Pope Pius IX*, 1873. In G.P.A. Healy, *Reminiscences of a Portrait Painter* (Chicago: A.C. McClurg, 1894), 136.
- Figure I.8. "The Thirty-Sixth Annual Fair of the American Institute," *Harper's Weekly* 7 October 1865, 632.
- Figure I.9. Charles Parsons, *An Interior View of the Crystal Palace*, 1853. Lithograph printed in colors, 13 1/2 x 20 3/8 in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, The Edward C. Arnold Collection of New York Prints, Maps, and Pictures, Bequest of Edward C. Arnold, 1954 (54.90.1047).
- Figure I.10. Emanuel Leutze, *George Washington Crossing the Delaware*, 1851. Oil on canvas, 159 x 255 in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of John S. Kennedy, 1897 (97.34).
- Figure I.11. Richard Caton Woodville, *The Sailor's Wedding*, 1853. Oil on canvas, 18 1/8 x 22 in. The Walters Art Museum, Baltimore.
- Figure I.12. Hiram Powers, *The Greek Slave*, 1847. Marble 65 1/2 in. h. The Newark Museum, Gift of Franklin Murphy, Jr., 1926 (26.2755).
- Figure I.13. Washington Allston, *Belshazzar's Feast*, 1817-43. Oil on canvas, 144 1/8 x 192 1/8 in. Detroit Institute of Arts.

- Figure I.14. "The Metropolitan Sanitary Fair -- The Art Gallery," *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper*, 23 April 1864, 69.
- Figure I.15. John Vanderlyn, *Ariadne Asleep on the Island of Naxos*, 1814. Oil on canvas, 68 ½ x 87 in. Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Philadelphia.
- Figure I.16. Jasper F. Cropsey, *Spirit of War*, 1851. Oil on canvas, 43 5/8 x 67 9/16 in. National Gallery of Art, Avalon Fund (1978.12.1).
- Figure I.17. Jasper F. Cropsey, *Spirit of Peace*, 1851. Oil on canvas, 43 5/8 x 67 9/16 in. Woodmere Art Museum, Philadelphia.
- Figure 1.1. P.B. Wight, *National Academy of Design*, 1863-65. National Academy of Design Archives.
- Figure 1.2. John La Farge, *Fish*, 1865. Oil on wood panel, 23 ¾ x 17 ½ in. Fogg Art Museum, Bequest of Grenville L. Winthrop, 1943.138.
- Figure 1.3. *128 West Fourteenth Street*, c. 1900. Metropolitan Museum of Art Archives.
- Figure 1.4. "Map of the Grounds of the Centennial Exhibition in Fairmount Park," *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 10 May 1876, 1.
- Figure 1.5. Centennial Photographic Company, *Memorial Hall, Opening Day*, 1876. Silver albumen print, 13 x 16 1/8 in. Print and Picture Collection, Free Library of Philadelphia.
- Figure 1.6. Frank Furness, *Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts*, c. 1880. Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts Archives.
- Figure 1.7. Fairmount Park Art Gallery. Undated clipping, Fairmount Park Archives.
- Figure 1.8. Peter Rothermel, *The Battle of Gettysburg – Pickett's Charge*, c. 1870. Oil on canvas, 94 x 377 in. State Museum of Pennsylvania, Harrisburg.
- Figure 1.9. Howard Roberts, *La Premiere Pose*, 1876. Marble, 51 ¼ in. h. Philadelphia Museum of Art, Gift of Mrs. Howard Roberts, 1929.
- Figure 1.10. Thomas Eakins, *The Gross Clinic*, 1875. Oil on canvas, 96 x 78 in. Jefferson Medical College of Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia.
- Figure 1.11. David Kennedy, *Art Annex to Art Building, International Exhibition of 1876, at Philadelphia*. Watercolor on paper, 9 ½ x 13 in. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, David J. Kennedy Collection, K: 3-86.

- Figure 1.12. Unknown photographer, *Ward One of the U.S. Army Post Hospital*, 1876. Vintage photograph, 8 x 10 in. Library of Congress.
- Figure 1.13. "Studio of H. Humphrey Moore," *Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly* 19 (May 1885): 560.
- Figure 1.14. "Studio of H. Humphrey Moore," detail, *Frank Leslie's Popular Monthly* 19 (May 1885): 560.
- Figure 1.15. Harry Humphrey Moore, *A Moroccan Guard*, 1876. Oil on canvas, 20 x 12 in. Sotheby's, May 22, 1985, lot 50.
- Figure 1.16. Georges du Maurier, "Exhibition at the Royal Academy," *Punch's Almanac for 1879* 76 (9 December 1878).
- Figure 2.1. "Ground Plan of Memorial Hall," United States Centennial Commission, *Report of the Director General, Including the Reports of Bureaus of Administration*, vol. 1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 136.
- Figure 2.2. "Ground Plan of Art Annex," United States Centennial Commission, *Report of the Director General, Including the Reports of Bureaus of Administration*, vol. 1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 138.
- Figure 2.3. Centennial Photographic Company, *Memorial Hall*, 1876. Silver albumen print, 17 3/8 x 21 1/4 in. Print and Picture Collection, Free Library of Philadelphia.
- Figure 2.4. "The Chap Who Attempts to do the Exhibition in One Day," Bricktop, *Going to the Centennial and A Guy to the Great Exhibition* (New York: Collin & Small, 1876), 29.
- Figure 2.5. "Character Sketches in Memorial Hall and the Annex," Frank H. Norton, ed., *A Facsimile of Frank Leslie's Illustrated Historical Register of the Centennial Exposition, 1876* (New York: Paddington Press, 1974), 144.
- Figure 2.6. "Donkeys at the Centennial," *Harper's Weekly* 20 (1 July 1876): 536.
- Figure 2.7. "Samantha in the Art Gallery," Marietta Holley, *Josiah Allen's Wife as a P.A. and a P.I. Samantha at the Centennial* (Hartford, CT: American Publishing Company, 1877), 477.
- Figure 2.8. Centennial Photographic Company, *Memorial Hall, American*, 1876. Stereograph, 4 3/8 x 7 in. Print and Picture Collection, Free Library of Philadelphia.

- Figure 2.9. John Singleton Copley, *Mrs. Thomas Boylston, Sr.*, 1766. Oil on canvas mounted on masonite, 51 x 40 in. Harvard University Collections, Bequest of Ward Nicholas Boylston to Harvard College, 1828, H16.
- Figure 2.10. Worthington Whittredge, *A Home by the Sea*, 1872. Oil on canvas, 36 1/8 x 54 1/8 in. Addison Gallery of American Art, Museum Purchase.
- Figure 2.11. Eastman Johnson, *Negro Life at the South (Old Kentucky Home)*, 1859. Oil on canvas, 36 x 45 1/4 in. New-York Historical Society, Robert L. Stuart Collection, on permanent loan from the New York Public Library, S.225.
- Figure 2.12. Thomas Eakins, *The Chess Players*, 1876. Oil on wood, 11 3/4 x 16 3/4 in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of the artist, 1881 (81.14).
- Figure 2.13. Centennial Photographic Company, *Memorial Hall, American Department (Gallery C, "Saloon of Honor")*, 1876. Stereograph, 4 3/8 x 7 in. Free Library of Philadelphia, Print and Picture Collection.
- Figure 2.14. David Sellin, *United States, Main Gallery in Memorial Hall*, c. 1974. Smithsonian Institution Archives, Record Unit 459, Box 6.
- Figure 2.15. Winslow Homer, *Snap the Whip*, 1872. Oil on canvas, 22 x 36 in. Butler Institute of American Art, Youngstown, Ohio, Museum purchase, 1919 (919-0-108).
- Figure 2.16. Eastman Johnson, *Catching the Bee*, 1872. Oil on canvas, 22 7/8 x 13 3/4 in. The Newark Museum, Newark, New Jersey, Purchase 1958 Wallace M. Scudder Bequest Fund, 58.1.
- Figure 2.17. P.F. Connolly, *Thetis and Achilles*, 1872. Marble, 56 x 32 x 45 1/2 in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Mrs. A.E. Schermerhorn, 1877 (77.2a).
- Figure 2.18. Edmonia Lewis, *Death of Cleopatra*, c. 1876. Marble, 63 x 31 1/4 x 46 in. Smithsonian American Art Museum, Gift of the Historical Society of Forest Park, Illinois (1994.17).
- Figure 2.19. Centennial Photographic Company, *Memorial Hall Annex, American Department (#948)* (Gallery 14), 1876. Stereograph, 4 3/8 x 7 in. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Centennial Stereographic Views Collection.
- Figure 2.20. Centennial Photographic Company, *Memorial Hall Annex, American Department (#949)* (Gallery 14), 1876. Stereograph, 4 3/8 x 7 in. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Centennial Stereographic Views Collection.
- Figure 2.21. Daniel Chester French, *The Minute Man, 1775*, 1874. Bronze, 84 x 48 x 48 in. Minuteman National Park, Concord, Massachusetts.

- Figure 2.22. William Merritt Chase, *"Keying Up" -- The Court Jester*, 1875. Oil on canvas, 39 $\frac{3}{4}$ x 25 in. Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Gift of the Chapellier Galleries (1969.37).
- Figure 2.23. Walter Shirlaw, *Toning the Bell*, 1874. Oil on canvas, 40 x 30 in. The Art Institute of Chicago, Friends of American Art Collection, 1938.1280.
- Figure 2.24. Benjamin West, *The Death of General Wolfe*, 1770. Oil on canvas, 60 $\frac{1}{2}$ x 84 in. National Gallery of Canada, Transfer from the Canadian War Memorials, 1921, Gift of the 2nd Duke of Westminster, Eaton Hall, Cheshire, 1918 (no. 8007).
- Figure 2.25. Toby Rosenthal, *Elaine*, 1874. Oil on canvas, 38 $\frac{9}{16}$ x 62 $\frac{1}{2}$ in. The Art Institute of Chicago, Gift of Mrs. Maurice Rosenfeld, 1917.3.
- Figure 2.26. John La Farge, *Bishop Berkeley's Rock, Newport*, 1868. Oil on canvas, 30 $\frac{1}{4}$ x 25 $\frac{1}{4}$ in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Dr. Frank Jewett Mather, 1949 (49.76).
- Figure 2.27. Pietro Guarnerio, *Apotheosis of Washington*, 1876. In Earl Shinn, *The Masterpieces of the Centennial Exhibition* (Philadelphia: Gebbie & Barrie, 1876), 156.
- Figure 2.28. Henry Bacon, *The Boston Boys and General Gage, 1775, 1875*. Oil on canvas, 59 $\frac{3}{8}$ x 94 $\frac{9}{16}$ in. The George Washington University Permanent Collection.
- Figure 2.29. Thomas Waterman Wood, *A Bit of War History: The Contraband*, 1866. Oil on canvas, 28 $\frac{1}{4}$ x 20 $\frac{1}{4}$ in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Charles Stewart Smith, 1884 (84.12a).
- Figure 2.30. Thomas Waterman Wood, *A Bit of War History: The Recruit*, 1866. Oil on canvas, 28 $\frac{1}{4}$ x 20 $\frac{1}{4}$ in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Charles Stewart Smith, 1884 (84.12b).
- Figure 2.31. Thomas Waterman Wood, *A Bit of War History: The Veteran*, 1866. Oil on canvas, 28 $\frac{1}{4}$ x 20 $\frac{1}{4}$ in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Charles Stewart Smith, 1884 (84.12c).
- Figure 2.32. Francesco Pezzicar, *The Abolition of Slavery in the United States*, 1863. Stereograph, 4 $\frac{3}{8}$ x 7 in. The Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Centennial Exhibition Records.

- Figure 2.33. Alexandre Cabanel, *Echo*, 1874. Oil on canvas, 38 ½ x 26 ¼ in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Mary Phelps Smith, in memory of her husband, Howard Caswell Smith, 1965 (65.258.1).
- Figure 2.34. Thomas Moran, *Mountain of the Holy Cross*, 1875. Oil on canvas, 82 1/8 x 64 ¼ in. Museum of the American West Collection, Autry National Center. Donated by Mr. and Mrs. Gene Autry.
- Figure 3.1. Charles Farrer, *Clarence Cook*, 1861. In *Poems by Clarence Cook* (New York: Gilliss Press, 1902), frontispiece.
- Figure 3.2. Napoleon Sarony, *Earl Shinn*, c. 1865. Archives of American Art, Earl Shinn Photographic Portrait, reel 3898.
- Figure 3.3. "Fighting the Battle Over Again," Bricktop, *Going to the Centennial and A Guy to the Great Exhibition* (New York: Collin & Small, 1876), 32.
- Figure 3.4. Jervis McEntee, *Frosty Morning*, n.d. Oil on canvas, 18 x 30 in. Adams Davidson Galleries, Washington, D.C.
- Figure 3.5. Albert Bierstadt, *Entrance into Monterey (The Settlement of California, Bay of Monterey, 1777)*, 1876. Oil on canvas, 72 x 122 in. Collection of the U.S. House of Representatives.
- Figure 3.6. Frederic E. Church, *Chimborazo*, 1864. Oil on canvas, 48 x 84 in. Huntington Library, San Marino, California, The Virginia Steele Scott Gallery of American Art.
- Figure 3.7. Charles Sprague Pearce, *L'Italienne*, 1875. Unlocated.
- Figure 3.8. Anna M. Lea, *A Patrician Mother*, 1875. Oil on canvas, 58 x 34 ½ in. Collection of the Hudson River Museum, Yonkers, NY. Gift of Mr. and Mrs. John Bond Trevor, Jr., 71.28.1.
- Figure 3.9. Frederic A. Bridgman, *The Peacock Fan (Flower of the Harem)*, 1875. Oil on canvas, 28 ¾ x 23 ½ in. Sotheby's, January 21, 1978, lot 188.
- Figure 3.10. Eastman Johnson, *Old Stage Coach*, 1871. Oil on canvas, 36 ¼ x 60 1/8 in. Milwaukee Art Museum, Layton Art Collection, Gift of Frederick Layton (L1888.22).
- Figure 3.11. John Smibert, *The Bermuda Group*, 1729. Oil on canvas, 69 ½ x 93 in. Yale University Art Gallery, Gift of Isaac Lothrop, 1808.1.
- Figure 3.12. Winslow Homer, *Prisoners from the Front*, 1866. Oil on canvas, 34 x 38 in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Mrs. Frank B. Porter, 1922 (22.207)

Figure 4.1. Memorial Hall, 2002. Photo courtesy of the author.

Figure 4.2. Frank Duveneck, *The Turkish Page*, 1876. Oil on canvas, 42 x 58 ¼ in. Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Joseph E. Temple Fund (1894.1).

Figure 4.3. Worthington Whittredge, *Harvest of Seaweed*, c. 1884. Oil on canvas, 31 x 51 in. Spanierman Gallery, New York.

Figure 4.4. Burt, *Henry Inman*. In C. Edwards Lester, *The Artists of America: A Series of Biographical Sketches of American Artists* (New York: Baker & Scribner, 1846), 32.

Figure 4.5. A.B. Frost, Untitled illustration of Columbus "discovering" Boston. In David Solis Cohen, *One Hundred Years a Republic: Our Show* (Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, 1876), 9.

Figure 4.6. Thomas R. Gould, *The West Wind*, 1870. In William J. Clark, Jr., *Great American Sculptures* (Philadelphia: Gebbie & Barrie, 1878), 125.

Figure 4.7. Frederic A. Bridgman, *Burial of a Mummy on the Nile (Funeral of a Mummy)*, 1877. Oil on canvas, 33 x 62 ¾ in. Berry-Hill Galleries.

Figure 4.8. William T. Dannat, *The Quartette*, 1884. Oil on canvas, 94 ¾ x 94 3/8 in. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, Gift of Mrs. William H. Dannat, 1886 (87.26).

Figure 4.9. Winslow Homer, *Huntsman and Dogs (Return from the Hunt)*, 1891. Oil on canvas, 28 1/8 x 48 in. Philadelphia Museum of Art, The William L. Elkins Collection, 1924 (E1924-3-8).

Figure 4.10. John Singer Sargent, *Mrs. Edward L. Davis and Her Son Livingston Davis (Mother and Child)*, 1890. Oil on canvas, 86 x 48 in. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Frances and Armand Hammer Purchase Fund.

Figure 4.11. George Inness, *Sunny Autumn Day*, 1891. Oil on canvas, 32 x 41 ¾ in. Cleveland Museum of Art, Anonymous Gift, 56.578.

Figure 4.12. Abbott Thayer, *Virgin Enthroned*, 1891. Oil on canvas, 72 ½ x 52 ½ in. Smithsonian American Art Museum, Gift of John Gellatly (1929.6.131).

Figure 4.13. J.G. Brown, *Heels Over Head*, c. 1894. Oil on canvas, 40 x 60 in. Private Collection.

Introduction: The Stakes

There is a powerful notion, perhaps one would even call it a myth, that somehow everything hangs together and that one can at least begin to show how.¹

Worthington Whittredge (figure I.1), a leading landscape painter and President of New York's august National Academy of Design, arrived at the Centennial Exhibition fairgrounds in Philadelphia's Fairmount Park on April 24, 1876. He was accompanied by the New York painter and engraver James Smillie. These two respected artists had come to help hang the United States fine art display in Memorial Hall, an ambitious and highly anticipated survey of American art from its beginnings to the present day that would be viewed by a national and international audience. The very next day Smillie noted in his diary the antagonism between Whittredge and the Exhibition's Art Bureau Chief John Sartain (figure I.2), an engraver and a prominent figure in Philadelphia art circles who supported such progressive European-trained figure painters as the young Thomas Eakins. By May 2 Smillie reported that "Whittredge and Sartain are by the ears and quarrel all the time." Things came to a head on May 5, just five days before the opening, when Smillie wrote that Sartain had "put [Whittredge] out of Mem. Hall (practically) and things had reached such a crisis that something had to be done."² Why was this exhibition, little noted today, so important in its time that its installation caused such a heated altercation? What was at stake in the American art exhibition that inspired an emotionally charged dispute between two artists who were the leaders of their respective art communities?

¹ Frank Kermode, *Forms of Attention* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 83.

² James D. Smillie diary, Smillie Family Papers, Archives of American Art, reel 2850 (no frame numbers).

Both men realized that the United States art display at the Centennial Exhibition provided an unprecedented opportunity to fix an American canon of past art, and to define that of the present day in an “American school.” The Centennial Exhibition was an event of national scope and broad ideological significance, and the United States display would represent the country’s first officially sanctioned, full scale reckoning of its art.³ The task of creating a national canon at the Centennial Exhibition set off a struggle to determine the nature of American art. It occurred during a tumultuous period when the forces of cultural authority were in flux. Major museums, which would later wield considerable power, were in their infancy. Among artists, an old guard and a new guard tussled for preeminence.

The New York landscapists now known as the Hudson River School had long considered themselves the reigning national movement, and thus the natural arbiters of the American canon. They were challenged, however, by young upstarts who had been trained in Europe; their emphasis on technique and figural subjects seemed anything but American to the artists of the National Academy. The exhibition that resulted from this struggle has long been perceived as an apotheosis of the Hudson River School. In fact however, neither camp was victorious. Close examination reveals that the display was fairly evenly divided between nativist landscapes by artists like Whittredge, and the technically daring figural works advocated by Sartain. Though it would be natural to try to identify one or the other as the hero or the villain in the events surrounding the exhibition, this account cannot be reduced to such simplistic terms. Both were driven by their zeal for American art, and their conviction that their own vision for its future was

³ An earlier and more modest retrospective, the Brooklyn Art Association’s “First Chronological Exhibition of American Art” of 1872, will be discussed later.

the right one. The construction of a national canon was complicated not only by conflicts between artists, but also by problems inherent to exhibitions, and these struggles inspired a call for a complete reconsideration of the nation's fine art "story."

That call was answered by American critics, who were quickly growing in professionalism and sophistication, and were claiming new authority and influence over the United States' cultural life. The Centennial call to "revise history" (as it was put in a newspaper article of the period),⁴ when combined with the critics' dissatisfaction with the American art display, inspired them to write the first narrative histories of art. In articulating the contentious process of building this high-stakes national canon and shaping an American school, critics such as Clarence Cook and Earl Shinn claimed their voice in the art community, and their accounts of the American art display endured long after the exhibition closed.

The discourses inspired by the Centennial Exhibition generated debates on issues of national identity, influence, and cultural authority. These debates resonated through the rest of the century, as new histories of art attempted to solidify the American canon. However, there are no heroes here either. It was not critics like Cook and Shinn who led the way, as their attempts to translate their Centennial assessments into book form proved unsuccessful. It was left to such writers as S.G.W. Benjamin, Sadakichi Hartmann, Samuel Isham and finally, Charles H. Caffin, to continue what Cook and Shinn had begun at the Centennial Exhibition. In addition, organizers of future international expositions continued Sartain's and Whittredge's efforts, as world's fairs became occasions to define the American school. The story of the Centennial Exhibition's American art display resists easy categories and neat characterizations, and instead

⁴ "Revising History," *New-York Times*, 4 May 1875, 6.

emerges as a richly textured tale of flawed but passionate people trying to discern the meaning of their times and pursuing what they deemed its highest ideal.

The International Exhibition of Arts, Manufactures, and Products of the Soil and Mine, in the City of Philadelphia, better known as the Centennial Exhibition, ran from May 10 through November 10, 1876.⁵ It was the first world's fair on American soil to reach a genuinely national and international audience; thirty-six countries participated, and over six months almost ten million people attended, a number equaling nearly one-fourth of the United States population.⁶ Nineteenth century international expositions were mainly commercial in nature. Their function was to bring together an array of objects to create a comprehensive view of the world, then to select those that were most praiseworthy. The Centennial Exhibition, however, was also commemorative, as it memorialized the signing of the Declaration of Independence. It would manifest the country's present through an enormous display of American goods, but along with that great commercial opportunity came a call to reflect upon the nation's past.

The *New-York Daily Tribune* described the national mood as "at once jubilant and solemn, congratulatory and sternly introspective."⁷ An unsigned article in the *New-York Times* of May 4, 1875 entitled "Revising History" anticipated that "great will be the rummaging among the dusty archives of our national history," and expected that with an updated accounting, "those who celebrate in 1975 [a century into the future] will be saved a world of trouble."⁸ A writer for the *New-York Times* recommended the

⁵ "The Centennial Exhibition," *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 161.

⁶ Robert W. Rydell, John E. Findling, and Kimberly D. Pelle, *Fair America: World's Fairs in the United States* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000), 25; John Maass, *The Glorious Enterprise: The Centennial Exhibition of 1876 and H.J. Schwartzmann, Architect-in-Chief* (Watkins Glen, NY: American Life Foundation, 1973), 36.

⁷ "International Exhibitions," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 10 May 1876, 6.

⁸ "Revising History," *New-York Times*, 4 May 1875, 6.

compilation of a carefully researched and profusely illustrated book on life and customs in the early Republic, noting that there were already many books of this kind, but they were very inaccurate, and he exhorted Americans to pay more attention to their past.⁹ The search for an underlying logic to the country's development spoke to the intellectual need for a triumphal account of American progress that would link the country's illustrious past to its troubled present, as the nation dealt with the aftereffects of the Civil War and the traumas of Reconstruction.

This was no less true for the country's art. In the decades leading up to the Centennial, artists and collectors organized United States contributions to numerous fairs at home and abroad, and their previous experiences informed their approach to the exhibition in Fairmount Park. But in this case the organizers faced a new challenge, as the evaluative function common to all fairs had to combine with the unique Centennial impulse to "revise history." The American art exhibition provided not just an opportunity, but a mandate to gather the country's greatest art achievements from the past century, and formulate a historical narrative that would join the past to the present and enshrine a national American school. The *New-York Times* confirmed these expectations a few months before the opening of the Exhibition, assuring readers that "special efforts are to be made to send proper illustrations of the history of American art, from the earliest period to the present day."¹⁰ The *Art Journal's* critic anticipated seeing the most notable American artists, "from Copley to the latest students of Munich."¹¹

⁹ "A Book for the Centennial," *New-York Times*, 26 December 1874, 4.

¹⁰ "The New-York Centennial Board," *The New-York Times*, 16 March 1876, 8.

¹¹ S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], "Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition," *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 283-4.

When critics wrote of an American art history, and of the art of the past versus that of the present day, their limited terminology was shorthand for complex and heavily freighted ideas. All involved were inspired by the hundred-year anniversary to recognize the most highly-esteemed, most influential artists of the past century and to mold them into a compact, teleological progression. This implies an American canon, a sanctioned body of works meeting a generally accepted critical standard. But the term “canon” is itself highly contested. The art historian E.H. Gombrich discussed the concept in a 1975 exchange of letters with the novelist Quentin Bell. According to Gombrich, the canon consists of “achievements handed down in tradition as a touchstone of excellence,” though he recognized that “cultures differ in the kind of mastery they value.” He saw the canon as a platonic ideal that arises naturally. Bell probed Gombrich’s definition, noting that “it is the devaluation of old values and the discovery of new forms of excellence which concerns us: this surely is the very stuff of art history.”¹²

In his question, Bell casually exchanged the term “canon” for “art history.” However, the two words are not synonymous. “Canon” is traditionally understood to reference a group of artists and their works that have been chosen by authoritative parties as enduring exemplars of merit. Histories of art, on the other hand, place these works into various contexts, such as the artist’s biography, social or political developments, or stylistic movements, in order to explain their existence. Bell’s conflation of “canon” and “history” echoes the prevailing attitude toward the two ideas at the Centennial Exhibition. World’s fairs created a commercial canon of sorts, as exhibitors presented their products and juries chose those that were most highly esteemed. But the anniversary of the

¹² E.H. Gombrich, *Ideals and Idols: Essays in Values in History and in Art* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1979), 156, 179.

country's founding introduced an element of history, and demanded an explanation of how American progress had led to the manifestation in Fairmount Park. The Centennial combination of the commercial and the commemorative, of "products" and their contexts, blurred the distinctions between canonical objects and their history. I will employ the two terms to represent distinct ideas in this discussion, but when reading contemporary criticism, it must be kept in mind that our current understanding of these concepts is more precise and more carefully parsed than it was in the Centennial year, or even in recent decades.

Bell's question in 1975 about the constantly changing values that define the canon, and that in turn create art history, anticipated the debates of the following decades. The nature of the canon was called into question, and scholars considered whether the canon was naturally driven by the best artists finding their due recognition, or whether hegemonic structures of cultural authority, often dominated by affluent white males, had excluded deserving artists from marginalized groups, such as women and blacks.¹³ These arguments complicated Gombrich's simplistic definition and raised questions about how the canons of the past were built. Following the machinations of artists, institutions, and critics at the Centennial Exhibition exposes these processes, and I will present examples of those who were unjustly neglected, in order to illustrate the inner workings of canon-building during this period.

¹³ A few of numerous examples are Mirra Bank, *Anonymous Was a Woman* (New York: St. Martin's Griffin, 1979); David C. Driskell, *Two Centuries of Black American Art* (exh. cat., Los Angeles County Museum of Art, 1976); Lynda Roscoe Hartigan, *Sharing Traditions: Five Black Artists in Nineteenth-Century America* (exh. cat., National Museum of American Art, Washington, D.C., 1985); and Linda Nochlin, "Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?" in *Art and Sexual Politics*, Thomas Hess and Elizabeth Baker, eds. (New York: Macmillan, 1973). The theory of canon-building was most thoroughly explored by literary critics, and their ideas will be discussed in chapter four.

By the 1870s the roll call of canonical “old masters” like Copley from the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries was undisputed. However, the art community also hoped that the Centennial Exhibition would showcase a representation of American art of the “present day;” the *Art Journal*’s telling example was the Munich school. Discussions of contemporary art were often framed in terms of “schools,” and discussed in particular the existence of an American school.¹⁴ For this reason I will apply the term “American school” to the attempts made to identify and consolidate a unified style that expressed the current national identity.

The challenge of discerning and displaying a contemporary American school came at a time that the critic Clarence Cook called “an era of revolution.”¹⁵ This period in the mid 1870s was marked by heated debates between the New York-based nativists of the Hudson River School of landscape painting, represented by Whittredge; and the cosmopolitan expatriates advocated by Sartain in Philadelphia and in Boston by the Barbizon-influenced painter William Morris Hunt. They supported artists who studied and worked abroad, most often in Munich and Paris, taking the human figure as their principal subject.¹⁶ These tensions simmered all through the Centennial year, and erupted most publicly and most intensely at the United States exhibition in Fairmount Park. They boiled over once again the following year when younger foreign-trained artists seceded

¹⁴ For examples, see “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (19 August 1876): 269; Sylvester W. Burley, *American Enterprise. Burley’s United States Centennial Gazetteer and Guide, 1876* (Philadelphia: S.W. Burley, 1876), 637-8; S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], “Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 284-5.

¹⁵ Clarence Cook, “Fine Arts: The National Academy of Design,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 29 April 1875, 7.

¹⁶ I recognize that a handful of Hudson River School artists trained abroad, such as Albert Bierstadt, John Frederick Kensett, and even Worthington Whittredge. Many others traveled in Europe, but not as students. When Frederic E. Church, Thomas Cole, Asher B. Durand, Sanford Gifford, and Jervis McEntee journeyed to Europe, they did so as mature artists whose painting styles were firmly established, and while there they sought out landscapes, just as they did in the United States. For the purposes of this analysis I am defining “nativist” Hudson River School artists as those New York-based landscape painters with a self-identified American sensibility, and no interest in actively seeking out contemporary foreign styles to emulate.

from the National Academy of Design to form the Society of American Artists, in response to the Academy's perceived bias against artists studying and working abroad. The mandate of the Centennial Exhibition was to conjoin the agreed-upon canon of the past with the disputed American School of the present. These two camps, embodied in New York's Whittredge and Philadelphia's Sartain, competed fiercely for the opportunity to determine who would represent the "American school," and in so doing, inherit the mantle of history. In this way, the conflicts played out at Fairmount Park reached far beyond Philadelphia to the nation's principal cities, and subsequently, the entire country.

The questions raised at the Centennial Exhibition remain surprisingly relevant today. John Davis' 2003 article "The End of the American Century: Current Scholarship on the Art of the United States" presented a panoramic view of recent developments in the study of American art, and he wrote in particular of its increasingly multivalent nature, as the field has moved from a single narrative focused on "nationalism, imperialism, cultural dominance and a single world view" to a plurality of voices, approaches, and topics, as once-marginalized artists are brought to the fore. Scholars in all areas of artistic endeavor have called to "open up the canon" to artists who were previously excluded merely on the basis of race, gender, or socioeconomic or political status. Davis asserted that while past studies were concerned with defining national identity, the focus is now on individual identity and the role it plays in the formation of ideology. For this reason, he doubted the viability of speaking about a canon of American art, saying that while it might exist, "it is so far off the radar screen of most art historians who work in European-derived modernism that categories of high and low become

relatively collapsed.”¹⁷ In a period when “canon” has become a provocative term, what can be learned from the efforts of a group of long-deceased white men to build an admittedly monolithic and univocal narrative of American progress?

Davis’ assessment of current academic methodology rings true, yet it presents serious problems for scholarly practice. Empirical limits force art historians to make choices, whether it is a curator deciding which paintings to hang in a regrettably small gallery space, or a professor sifting through slides (or more likely now, digital images) to determine just how many artists and works can be covered in the short space of one lecture. The number and diversity of eighteenth and nineteenth century artists represented in museums and in classrooms has expanded, but a core of familiar names has endured, such as the triumvirates of Copley, Stuart, and Allston, and later, Homer, Eakins, and Ryder, as well as Sargent, Whistler, and Cassatt. The formation of the canon continues, but how is it created, and what questions inform it? If the same names remain relevant over many decades, is it perhaps because we continue to ask enduring and distinctly American questions?

Wanda Corn conducted a stock-taking exercise similar to that of Davis in her 1988 article, “Coming of Age: Historical Scholarship in American Art.” She identified three traits of the field that continue to apply, even as approaches and voices multiply. First, she cited a “certain nervousness” about questions of quality, acknowledging that these concerns have deep roots going back to the eighteenth century, and Davis agrees that they still vex scholars to this day.¹⁸

¹⁷ John Davis, “The End of the American Century: Current Scholarship on the Art of the United States,” *Art Bulletin* 85 (September 2003): 544-6, 561.

¹⁸ Wanda Corn, “Coming of Age: Historical Scholarship in American Art,” *Art Bulletin* 70 (June 1988): 190; Davis, 561.

Second, Corn pointed out the distinction between national and international approaches to American art. Davis too has observed that much of Americanist art history in the twentieth century is concerned with defining the idea of “Americanness.” Corn commented that the only big issue discussed in the 1960s was “the Americanness of American art,” but that in the following decade questions turned to artists’ “‘nurture’ abroad, rather than their American ‘nature.’” Questions of foreign exchanges and influences versus native character are still a focus of today’s scholarship; Davis used as an example Corn’s own 1999 study, *The Great American Thing*.¹⁹

Finally, Corn realized how historical narratives are informed by the needs and agendas of their creators, and are established by their makers’ relative power at the time. She observed that since most early Americanist scholarship was undertaken by museums, it took on a documentary “cataloguing, describing, venerating” approach. In another example, critics of the 1950s, such as Clement Greenberg, were quick to link Abstract Expressionism to European modernism to create an avant-garde genealogy for the movement; but a decade later, Americanist art historians such as Barbara Novak and John McCoubrey looked for ways to join the New York School to the American past to bring much-deserved attention to the art of the eighteenth, nineteenth, and early twentieth centuries.²⁰ The field is defined by issues of taste, nationalism, and cultural authority. All are integral to canon building, and all found their first national expression in the American art display at the Centennial Exhibition.

Much has been gained from the inclusion of neglected voices and alternative approaches to the history of American art, but after decades of post-modern skepticism

¹⁹ Corn, 197; Davis, 570.

²⁰ Corn, 191-3; Elizabeth Johns, “Histories of American Art: The Changing Quest,” *Art Journal* 44 (Winter 1984): 342.

about metanarratives, there seems to be a “return of the repressed,” a growing openness to grand mythologies and narrative subject matter; witness the success of recent retrospectives for Matthew Barney at the Guggenheim Museum and John Currin at the Whitney Museum of American Art. What was true in 1876 remains true today: human nature craves clear and reassuring explanations of the world, whether through religion, history, or art. But then, as now, history tended to be written by the parties holding cultural authority. Recent scholarship and new methodologies make us aware that accounts of past events are colored by context and language. Using these new approaches to disentangle the threads of the struggle surrounding the Centennial Exhibition’s American art display allows us to analyze the people and institutions that shaped the canon-building efforts of the Centennial year; to discern who in this way “revised history;” and to determine how their narratives affected those that followed.

The Centennial Exhibition Through the Lens of History

Given its historical significance, it is astounding that the American art department at the Centennial Exhibition has received very little serious attention from modern scholars. In its time, the general public and the art community alike recognized the Centennial Exhibition as a signal moment in the nation’s cultural history. The importance of the United States art display was readily acknowledged in the decades following, though assessments of its merit would vary according to the aesthetic values of the moment.

In 1876 the art critic Philip Quilibet called the exhibition in Fairmount Park “the first general muster for inspection ever attempted by American art.”²¹ Similarly, Centennial Commissioner John W. Forney rhapsodized, “the American Centennial is the

²¹ Philip Quilibet, “Drift-Wood,” *Galaxy* 21 (May 1876): 696.

Genesis of a new civilization.”²² An article in the 1887 *Princeton Review* entitled “American Art Since the Centennial” marked it as a turning point.²³

The unqualified triumph of American art at the World’s Columbian Exposition sixteen years later began a careful distancing from the Centennial that would continue into the twentieth century.²⁴ In 1893 a writer for the Boston *Evening Transcript* commented that “the paintings at Philadelphia are not remembered critically – or critically only from one point of view; American pictures made no impression.”²⁵

The fiftieth anniversary of the Centennial Exhibition in 1926 produced favorable remembrances: a writer for *Art and Archaeology* acknowledged it as “the debut of American art.” The following year William Pierce Randel declared in his book *Centennial: American Life in 1876* that the art gallery “represented the considered opinion of painting and sculpture,” confirming the importance that Sartain, Whittredge and others had placed on the exhibition.²⁶

Another opinion was expressed by Suzanne LaFollette, whose caustic remarks in her 1929 survey *Art in America* are often quoted. She believed that the exhibition “impressed upon American minds that artistically all was not for the best in the best of all possible countries.”²⁷ In his 1949 *The Tastemakers*, Russell Lynes breezily dismissed the entire enterprise, perhaps because the era was sadly out of fashion during the period of

²² John W. Forney, *A Centennial Commissioner in Europe* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1876), 12.

²³ S.G.W. Benjamin, “American Art Since the Centennial,” *The Princeton Review* 4 (July 1887): 14.

²⁴ Carolyn Kinder Carr, “Prejudice and Pride: Presenting American Art at the 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition,” in *Revisiting the White City: American Art at the 1893 World’s Fair*, eds. Carolyn Kinder Carr and George Gurney (exh. cat., National Museum of American Art and National Portrait Gallery, 1993), 99, 112.

²⁵ M.L. Bumpus, “The Fine Arts: American vs. French Art at Chicago,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 16 August 1893, 6.

²⁶ “The Centennial Exposition: 1876, A Summary,” *Art and Archaeology* 21 (April 1926): 162; Randel, 382.

²⁷ Suzanne LaFollette, *Art in America* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1929), 251.

high modernism. He called it an “artistic calamity that produced not a single new idea, but was, rather, the epitome of the accumulated bad taste of the era that was called the Gilded Age, the Tragic Era, the Dreadful Decade, or the Pragmatic Acquiescence, depending on which epithet you thought most searing.” He couldn’t resist adding that “Americans drank deep of the heady wine of art, and the hangover lasted for at least a quarter of a century, or longer than anyone cares to remember.”²⁸

Modern studies of the Centennial Exhibition began with Mildred Byars Matthews’ 1946 article in *Art in America* entitled “The Painters of the Hudson River School in the Philadelphia Centennial of 1876,” a statistical analysis of the representation of the Hudson River School at the American exhibition. Though an attempt to force works of art to conform to a scientific method is bound to have its limits, it proved to be an interesting and useful experiment.²⁹ Dorothy E.C. Ditter’s 1947 dissertation “The Cultural Climate of the Centennial City: Philadelphia, 1875-1876” at the University of Pennsylvania is an entirely contextual study which addresses such issues as clothing, public education, and the temperance movement, only touching on the Centennial Exhibition itself in a brief chapter at the end. Christine Hunter Donaldson’s dissertation of the following year at Yale University, “The Centennial of 1876: The Exposition, and Culture for America,” is a general documentary account of the Exhibition as a whole. In the well-known 1966 book *The Year of the Century: 1876*, Dee Brown discussed the Exhibition in detail, calling it “that grand rediscovery of America.”³⁰

The impending Bicentennial celebrations of 1976 inspired further study of the great exhibition one hundred years before. John Henry Hicks’ 1972 dissertation, “The

²⁸ Russell Lynes, *The Tastemakers* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949), 112, 115.

²⁹ Matthews’ conclusions will be discussed in detail in chapter 2.

³⁰ Brown, 23.

United States Centennial Exhibition of 1876” at the University of Georgia brought the basic facts to light. He called the American art display the “juncture between the old and new in painting, sculpture, and architecture.”³¹ Around this time the art historian David Sellin began an ambitious project under the auspices of the Smithsonian Institution to recreate the American art display at the Centennial Exhibition. The idea came to fruition on a modest scale, in a 1976 exhibition entitled *1876: American Art of the Centennial*, with twenty-four objects and a brief but informative catalogue by Susan Hobbs. Sellin’s *The First Pose: Howard Roberts, Thomas Eakins, and a Century of Philadelphia Nudes* of 1975 took specific American works at the Centennial as keynotes for his discussion.

In the past few decades, articles and exhibition catalogues have highlighted the importance of the United States’ artistic participation in the international expositions of the late nineteenth century through anniversary exhibitions and scholarly catalogues such as Annette Blaugrund’s *Paris 1889: American Artists at the Universal Exposition* at the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Carolyn Kinder Carr’s *Revisiting the White City: American Art at the 1893 World’s Fair* at the Smithsonian American Art Museum and the National Portrait Gallery, and Diane Fischer’s *Paris 1900: The “American School” at the Universal Exposition* at the Montclair Art Museum. However, American art at the Centennial Exhibition has been neglected. A few studies have addressed it peripherally, such as Daniel Huntington’s 1983 exhibition catalogue *The Quest for Unity: American Art Between the World’s Fairs, 1876-1893*. Linda J. Docherty studied criticism of the American art display in her 1985 dissertation “A Search for Identity: American Art Criticism and the Concept of the ‘Native School’” at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Caroline V. Green’s 1992 dissertation “Fabricating the Dream: American

³¹ Hicks, 4.

World's Fair Sculpture, 1876-1915" at Boston University discussed public sculpture throughout the fairgrounds (rather than that on display on Memorial Hall) as part of a larger project of national myth-building.

More recently, there are signs of growing interest in American art at the Centennial Exhibition. Bruno Giberti broke ground with his thoughtful 1994 dissertation, "The Classified Landscape: Consumption, Commodity Order, and the 1876 Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia" at the University of California, Berkeley, which was published in 2000 as *Designing the Centennial: A History of the 1876 International Exhibition in Philadelphia*. He studied the exercise and the implications of categorizing all the goods and manufactures displayed at the fair, along with their relation to its architecture, and included an insightful chapter on the awards controversy in the art department. In 2000 Ethan Robey's essay "John Sartain and the Contest of Taste at the Centennial" from the exhibition catalogue *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy* examined issues of high and low culture in the American art exhibition. Susannah Gold of the University of Pennsylvania recently completed a dissertation entitled "Imaging Memory: Re-Presentations of the Civil War at the 1876 Centennial Exhibition," which examines the role of war-related artworks in restructuring a national identity. These studies show that scholars are beginning to discover the Centennial Exhibition as a rich and illuminating field of inquiry. However, to date there has been no significant study concentrating solely on the American art display and its impact. My dissertation will attempt to fill the void.

This study follows the development of the American art display at the Centennial Exhibition. It will show how the occasion demanded a recounting of the history of

American art and an assessment of the character of the American school, and it will trace the ways that the dialogue inspired by this process reverberated through the art community in the years following. The preceding introduction, entitled “The Stakes,” offers a contextual framework for the exhibition. It outlines historical and art historical issues at play in the tumultuous years following the Civil War, a time when growing nationalism combined with an increasing concern about how American culture was perceived both through various fairs at home and in international expositions abroad.

Chapter one, “The Struggle,” follows the contentious process of building an art canon beginning with the appointment of the Philadelphian John Sartain as Chief of the Art Department mere months before the exhibition’s opening. The planning process was marked by bitter civic and ideological divisions among the committees of Selection and Arrangement, creating tensions that were only exacerbated by Sartain’s frequent attempts to circumvent their authority. The Selection committee’s work led to controversies between the old and new guards that went far beyond the well-known rejection of Thomas Eakins’ *The Gross Clinic*. The Committee on Arrangement encountered difficulties as well, as was illustrated by the confrontation between Sartain and Whittredge. In addition, problems with the selection and transportation of American works created abroad had decisive effects on the representation of expatriate artists.

Chapter two, “Exhibiting History,” describes the display that these two groups of artists ultimately created, in the form of a sprawling exhibition of over eight hundred fifty paintings and sculptures that were placed with their relative importance in mind. The experience of seeing this American canon and American school can be approximated by recreating the sights and sounds that visitors encountered, taking into consideration how

nineteenth-century modes of perception would have affected their impressions. The United States display was complicated by numerous problems inherent to any exhibition. Though Civil War themes were prohibited, local politics forced the inclusion of some such works. New Yorkers asserted their authority by mounting a competing exhibition in their city that made many major American works unavailable for inclusion in Philadelphia's Centennial canon. Sartain had to beat back constant mercantile attacks on the integrity of the American art display. Even the awards process proved contentious, as judges for the fine arts refused to follow the procedures dictated for commercial goods, and instead created their own. The display was impossibly large and confusing, as well as controversial and riddled with absences. Ultimately, a close examination of the works displayed and their locations shows that contrary to past accounts, expatriate artists were surprisingly well represented, and mounted an effective visual challenge to the venerable Hudson River School.

Chapter three, "Writing History," follows the efforts of the rising professional class of critics to discern the exhibition's message and meaning. At the same time that artists were arguing over which of them would control the presentation of American art at the Centennial Exhibition, critics such as Clarence Cook and Earl Shinn were taking their place as the new arbiters of culture and history. The shortcomings they discerned in the exhibition led them to create their own interpretations of the canon that reached far beyond the works displayed in Fairmount Park. Their responses appeared in a variety of books and periodicals, from art journals for sophisticated audiences, to newspaper and magazine accounts that reached a much broader readership, to books on the Centennial Exhibition intended as souvenirs of the fair. Many used their reviews to "correct" the

American art display and present their own rudimentary narratives of American art. The Centennial Exhibition gave critics the opportunity to bring to a national forum issues simmering in pockets on the East Coast. They discussed questions of national identity in the face of foreign influences, the role of aesthetics and realism, and what an American school of art should look like. The canons developed by critics in response to the Centennial Exhibition had the advantage of being disseminated and preserved in writing, so that they endured long after the Exhibition closed.

Chapter four, “Revising History,” traces how the exhibition affected the perception and presentation of American art in written histories and at world’s fairs through the rest of the century. The Centennial ideal of progress had a distinct impact; a spate of American art histories followed that departed from earlier models of merely stringing together received biographical accounts, and instead wove narratives of continual advancement that addressed the inescapable reality of European influences. However, linking the American canon of the past to the American school of the present day proved difficult. World’s fairs over the rest of the century emerged as moments to take stock of the present. Both written and exhibited accounts of the country’s art in the years after the Centennial show the continuing struggle to integrate foreign styles into a vision of American art’s past and present. These presentations encompassed broad issues of influence, authority, and identity whose rich and multi-layered implications have not yet been exhausted, even by contemporary scholars.

There is a wealth of documentation on the Centennial, and the Exhibition is a remarkably rich and relatively untapped area of study that can provide fresh insights on the nation’s art, history, and culture. The art department alone would provide fascinating

material for several full-length studies. Of necessity, the scope of this inquiry must have its limits. The formation of the Exhibition as a whole and the facts of its six-month run are covered in the dissertations mentioned above, so it will be discussed only as it illuminates the American art display. For the same reason other American departments will not be covered, for example, the Woman's Building, which was the subject of dissertations by Mary Frances Cordato and Virginia Grant Darney.³²

There are important facets of the Department of Art exhibition that do not relate directly to this discussion, such as the colonial revival and the rise of the Aesthetic movement in the decorative arts. The decorative arts received a great deal of media and public attention at the Centennial Exhibition. However, they were displayed in the Main Building with manufactured goods. These aspects too have been the subject of recent scholarly studies.³³ The works examined here will be limited to painting and sculpture, since they were the undisputed media of "fine art" in their period, and were firmly placed at the pinnacle of the art hierarchy in Memorial Hall. They were segregated from engraving, lithography, and photography, both in the galleries and in critical accounts.³⁴ This includes watercolors as well. Although the medium was growing in importance, it cannot be considered part of the American canon at the Centennial Exhibition. There were two galleries of watercolors in Memorial Hall, and they received their share of critical acclaim. However, the selection was not broadly representative of American art.

³² See Mary Frances Cordato, "'Representing the Expansion of Woman's Sphere': Woman's Work and Culture at the World's Fairs of 1876, 1893 and 1904" (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 1989) and Virginia Grant Darney, "Women and World's Fairs: American International Expositions 1876-1904" (Ph.D. diss., Emory University, 1982).

³³ See Alan Axelrod, ed., *The Colonial Revival* (New York: N.W. Norton & Co., 1985); William B. Rhoads, *The Colonial Revival* (Ph.D. diss., Princeton, 1974); and Sylvia L. Yount, "'Give the People What They Want': The American Aesthetic Movement, Art Worlds, and Consumer Culture, 1876-1890" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1995).

³⁴ Photography is of particular interest as a topic in its own right, since an entire building was devoted to the photography exhibition and Philadelphians were pioneers in popularizing and legitimizing the medium.

Almost the entire group comprised a mass submission by New York's American Society of Painters in Water Colors, and the only award won by an American watercolorist was a group award for that organization.³⁵

The critical accounts studied here will focus on American writers responding to the United States exhibition. I draw this distinction cautiously, well aware of earlier scholarly tendencies to present American art in a vacuum, isolated from outside influences.³⁶ However, such a restriction is appropriate here since attendance at the exhibition was overwhelmingly American; in fact, some of the organizers expressed disappointment at the low foreign attendance.³⁷ Much of the rhetoric surrounding the American art display was based on the expectation that the nation's art would come under the eye of Europeans, but artists' and critics' efforts are no less self-conscious for the relative lack of response. The "fresh eyes" with which one sees one's home on expecting a visitor can prompt action, whether the visitor actually arrives or not. Criticism is drawn heavily from periodicals and newspapers of Boston, Philadelphia, and New York, as those publications covered the exhibition most thoroughly, had a long-standing interest in American art, and employed writers with the most sophisticated critical apparatus. Most importantly, and whether for good or ill, the majority of works in the American art display came from artists of these three cities, and it was in these metropolitan areas that the great changes defining the Centennial moment were most pronounced.

³⁵ United States Centennial Commission, *International Exhibition, 1876. Reports and Awards*, vol. 7, Groups XXI-XXVII (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 85.

³⁶ Corn, 191.

³⁷ Titus Munson Coan, "People and Pictures at the Fair," *Galaxy* 22 (December 1876): 761.

“After All, Not to Create Only”: The Centennial Nation

Walt Whitman’s “Song of the Exposition” was originally commissioned for the 1871 American Institute fair, but it was later co-opted to represent the Centennial Exhibition. Indeed, his grand vision is most appropriately applied to the 1876 fair.³⁸

Whitman wrote of a “dream of a union of the new forces of industrialism with the great tradition of the arts in a culture dedicated to democratic human values.”³⁹ His incisive verses trace the many threads of American life in the Centennial year, and their import for how its art would be understood, as the nation grappled with issues of nationalism, religion, and leadership:

After all not to create only, or found only,
But to bring perhaps from afar what is already founded,
To give it our own identity, average, limitless, free,
To fill the gross torpid bulk with vital religious fire,
Not to repel or destroy so much as accept, fuse, rehabilitate,
To obey as well as command, to follow more than to lead.⁴⁰

The Centennial year represented a break with the past based on far more than an anniversary. Industrialization, urbanization, and incorporation wrought cataclysmic changes in the decade after the Civil War. The integrity of the country’s leaders was called into question, along with the very religious values that were credited as its foundation. Ironically, it was an Englishman, the scientist Thomas Henry Huxley, who posed the question often quoted to sum up the uncertainties of that year:

³⁸ Ethan Robey, “The Utility of Art: Mechanics’ Institute Fairs in New York City, 1828-1876” (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 2000), 323. The organizers of the Centennial Exhibition had no stomach for Whitman’s earthy, irreverent take on America, hiring instead the conservative Sidney Lanier to write a Centennial cantata, John Greenleaf Whittier for a hymn for the opening ceremonies, and Bayard Taylor for a Fourth of July ode. See Dee Brown, *The Year of the Century: 1876* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1966), 126.

³⁹ John G. Cawelti, “America on Display: The World’s Fairs of 1876, 1893, 1933,” in *The Age of Industrialism in America*, ed. Frederic Cople Jaher (New York: The Free Press, 1968), 322.

⁴⁰ Walt Whitman, “Song of the Exposition,” in *Leaves of Grass* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992), 148.

I cannot say that I am in the slightest degree impressed by your bigness, or your material resources, as such. Size is not grandeur, and territory does not make a nation. The great issue, about which hangs a true sublimity, and the terror of overhanging fate, is what are you going to do with all these things? What is to be the end to which these are to be the means?⁴¹

Huxley's question embodied the country's almost horrifying awareness of its barely-governable power, combined with the complete uncertainty of its future in the face of great changes.

The impact of the Civil War was still keenly felt, and the Centennial Exhibition was intended as an occasion to heal the breach between the North and South and present a united nation to the world. It was referenced constantly in the planning stages and in the ceremonies surrounding the exhibition. The *New York Herald* quoted President Ulysses S. Grant's hopeful remark to General Robert E. Lee that "the animosities which attended the war" were "dying out," and "we shall soon celebrate their funeral in the centenary."⁴² A writer for the *Atlantic Monthly* observed the flags lining the streets of Philadelphia and rejoiced that "the last time the waving of those colors brightened the air, it meant war and woe; now it means peace and exultation," but he added somberly, "how much lies in between!"⁴³

Reconstruction had almost run its sad and ineffectual course, but in 1876 Florida, Louisiana, and South Carolina were still under federal military control.⁴⁴ The South was left behind economically, as large-scale farms in the Midwest and manufacturing concerns in the East eclipsed its small-scale agrarian economy. In the late 1870s per

⁴¹ Brown, 295.

⁴² *New York Herald*, 1 May 1876, 6; quoted in Christine Hunter Donaldson, "The Centennial of 1876: The Exposition, and Culture for America" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1948), 67.

⁴³ "Characteristics of the International Fair," *Atlantic Monthly* 38 (July 1876): 88.

⁴⁴ William Pierce Randel, *Centennial: American Life in 1876* (Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company, 1927), 240.

capita wealth in the South dropped to half the national average.⁴⁵ Though the reunion of the North and South was a major focus of the Centennial, the Southern states had little voice or participation in the proceedings. Southern artists were sparsely represented in any form at the Centennial Exhibition, including the art department, and northeastern cities would continue to set the direction of American art.

The Centennial summer saw wave after wave of political scandals and setbacks. News trickled in of Custer's disastrous last stand of June 25 against the Sioux Indians at Little Big Horn – on July 4, nine days after the battle, word had still not reached Philadelphia. Secretary of War William W. Belknap was impeached under suspicion of accepting bribes and soon resigned, though his trial ended in July with an acquittal.⁴⁶ The Whiskey Ring scandal revealed tax evasion at all levels, most notably by two Washington agents who were close friends of President Grant.⁴⁷

Fortunes were built from steel, oil, and railroads, and often those fortunes financed the collections that played a part in the Centennial Exhibition. The budding labor movement became a serious concern in 1876 with suppression of striking coal miners known as the “Molly Maguires.”⁴⁸ The tensions that simmered through the Centennial year exploded soon after with the Great Railway Strike of 1877, the first nationwide clash between labor and management.⁴⁹

Along with these very visible events, subtler changes were shaping the country. Alan Trachtenberg notes that “the spectacle of runaway forces and collapsing values was

⁴⁵ Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1967), 15.

⁴⁶ Brown, 168, 107.

⁴⁷ Randel, 203.

⁴⁸ Randel, 194.

⁴⁹ Walter T.K. Nugent, “Seed Time of Modern Conflict: American Society at the Centennial,” in *1876: The Centennial Year*, Lillian B. Miller, Walter T.K. Nugent, and H. Wayne Morgan (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1973), 40.

the major inner drama of the period.” The population became increasingly urban: in the early 1870s farmers no longer comprised the majority of employed people. The United States was becoming a nation of cities, and the character of those cities was changing. Up to this point the country was a society of “island communities,” isolated localities with little communication among them. This is evidenced in the very distinct artistic identities of Boston, Philadelphia, and New York at the time of the Centennial Exhibition. However, the post Civil War period was, in Trachtenberg’s words, “dominated by an increasingly standardized national way of life,” as an “official breed of culture” was disseminated throughout the country via the eastern seaboard.⁵⁰ The project of creating an art canon and enshrining an American school for the entire country evidenced this nationalizing impulse.

The country’s spiritual life was shaken to its foundations in the late nineteenth century. Charles Darwin’s *Origin of Species* was published in 1859, but it was not until after the Civil War that his ideas were widely discussed in the United States, causing intellectuals to question the philosophical underpinnings of the world’s origin, and more specifically, but no less importantly, the origin of the United States. As the foundations of national identity were shaken, the Centennial provided an even more poignant (and more urgent) moment of reckoning, an opportunity to discern how the country’s history had led to this moment, and how an unstable present might be securely linked to a reassuring past.

The art world was at crossroads as well, facing challenges from within and without. In addition to the growing antagonism between nativist artists concentrated in

⁵⁰ Alan Trachtenberg, ed., *Democratic Vistas, 1860-1880* (New York: George Braziller, 1970), 1-2, 15; Nugent, 38-9; Wiebe, xiii.

New York and expatriate artists supported by many in Philadelphia and Boston, exhibition organizers faced the task of melding their distinct civic identities into a comprehensive vision of American art. In an article seven years before the Centennial, Clarence Cook described the three cities that dominated the planning of the Centennial. In his typical caustic tone, he asserted that “if a man should compare our three chief Atlantic cities with reference to the interest they seem to take in the Fine Arts, the result would be somewhat like this: New York, indifferent; Boston, more indifferent; Philadelphia, don’t care a --, well, a button.” He went on to explain the distinct varieties of each city’s apathy: New Yorkers offered little financial support for the fine arts; there was no library, no museum, and (in a sharp jab at the National Academy) no school of design better than any in a thousand small towns. Philadelphians had few pictures in their homes and offered little patronage to artists. Boston, with its numerous busts of great men, reminded Cook of “those unhappy children with no ear who are forced by their parents, and their own sense of duty, to learn the piano-forte.”⁵¹

Contrary to Cook’s pessimistic assessment, newly wealthy Americans acquired art on an unprecedented scale in the years following the Civil War, and slowly gained respect abroad as serious collectors.⁵² In New York, August Belmont and John Taylor Johnston purchased works by both American and European artists. The *Atlantic Monthly* observed that even in conservative Philadelphia, art collecting picked up after the war, and well-to-do citizens began building houses with picture galleries.⁵³ William Morris Hunt introduced Boston elites to Jean-François Millet and the French Barbizon style, and

⁵¹ Clarence Cook, “Art Notes: Art in Philadelphia,” *New York Daily Tribune*, 22 May 1867, 2, 6.

⁵² Donaldson, 119.

⁵³ “Characteristics of the International Fair,” *Atlantic Monthly* 38 (July 1876): 87.

they enthusiastically purchased such works from both French and American artists.⁵⁴

Further afield, great collections were being formed by T.O. Walker of Minneapolis and E.B. Crocker of Sacramento.⁵⁵

The Centennial Exhibition also presented a challenge from without, as its American art department would showcase the country's artistic taste to European audiences, to face either their approbation or their scorn during a period when artists and collectors turned increasingly to French and German ideals. Americans were anxious to show their sophistication at the Centennial, and questions of taste were discussed with dire seriousness. The art exhibition in Fairmount Park was housed in Memorial Hall (figure I.3) (which still stands) and a nearby art annex. Fine art displays from the United States, Great Britain, France, Spain, Italy, Germany, Japan, Mexico, Australia, Brazil, and Russia, among others, would be seen and compared side by side. This exhibition marked the first time that a large number of American works were displayed in the United States in a truly national and international context.

A writer for the *Art Journal* realized that an exhibition of art works from other countries would represent “the first time that the American public have had to opportunity to study, in anything like an adequate manner, the peculiarities and the style of artists whose pictures are familiar to us by name and also by engravings.”⁵⁶ But just as important, an article in the same publication noted that the main purpose of the art exhibition was “to compare the artistic skill of different peoples, to ascertain how the arts with us in our Centennial year stand by the side of other countries, and to gather

⁵⁴ Carol Troyen, *The Boston Tradition: American Paintings from the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston* (exh. cat., Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1980), 27.

⁵⁵ Donaldson, 118.

⁵⁶ “Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition: The English Pictures,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 218.

instruction by comparison of our native work with the designs and methods of our rivals.”⁵⁷ A later *Art Journal* article reiterated the point: “in no way can a country better find out where it stands in its artistic aims, and accomplishment, than by looking at a full collection of its own works side by side with those of other nations.”⁵⁸ Americans were keenly aware that their culture and taste (or to their dread, the lack of it) would be on display at the Centennial Exhibition. The self-consciousness created by the mere contemplation of this exercise would shape the conception and reception of the exhibition.

Preparations for the Centennial Exhibition presaged other issues that would color the American art display. A heated Congressional debate raged from 1869 to 1871 over whether the exhibition would take place in Philadelphia or New York. On March 3, 1871 a bill was signed into law designating Philadelphia as the host city.⁵⁹ Contemporary historians claim that “there was never any question that Philadelphia would be the site,”⁶⁰ since it was the location of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, the event being commemorated. However, New Yorkers of the time would have disagreed -- their bitterness is apparent in the New York press’s hostility toward government support for the Exhibition, as the *New York Sun*, the *New York World*, and the *New York Herald* all opposed a congressional appropriation.⁶¹ Even after the Exhibition opened the *New-York Daily Tribune* teased Philadelphians about exploiting their guests, assuring readers that “it must be a slander that nobody is allowed to register at a Philadelphia hotel who does

⁵⁷ “The Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 161.

⁵⁸ S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], “Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 285.

⁵⁹ John Henry Hicks, “The United States Centennial Exhibition of 1876” (Ph.D. diss., University of Georgia, 1972), 31.

⁶⁰ Rydell et al, 19.

⁶¹ Hicks, 114.

not have at least one trunk marked ‘Greenbacks.’”⁶² The rivalry between the nation’s first and second-largest cities would be a decisive feature of the American art display.

Publications all over the nation closely tracked the developments in Fairmount Park. Even the *Art Journal* covered the building of “a new city on the banks of the Schuylkill”⁶³ (figure I.4). Readers were bombarded with statistics on the astonishing size and scope of the preparations – over 200,000 cubic yards of earth were moved to grade the land, 300,000 cubic yards were moved to create a chain of ornamental lakes, and twenty miles of streets, sidewalks, and railroads were installed.⁶⁴ One hundred ninety buildings dotted 236 acres of land, of which seventy-five acres were “under roof.”⁶⁵ The *Art Journal* boasted that the Centennial Exhibition would be the largest world’s fair ever, far exceeding its closest rival, the 1873 Vienna Exposition, at fifty acres.⁶⁶

That even the decorous *Art Journal* joined the Centennial boosterism shows just how ubiquitous the event was in the months leading up to the May 10 opening. Almost a full year previous, the *Galaxy* reported on “Centennial fever”: “you can hardly buy bread that is not from a centennial oven, nor slate your house without the aid of a centennial roofer. The centennial hackman drives you in his coach, ‘The Centennial,’ to a centennial hotel, where your furniture and food are centennial.”⁶⁷ Centennial balls and buckwheat cakes, centennial soda pop, coffee, cigars, and matches drove one editorial writer to complain “if ever a poor innocent word has been misused it is the one now rapidly becoming hateful to us – Centennial...but there is one comfort that it comes only once in

⁶² “The American System of Award,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 26 May 1876, 1.

⁶³ “The Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 161.

⁶⁴ Bruno Giberti, “The Classified Landscape: Consumption, Commodity Order, and the 1876 Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia” (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1994), 99.

⁶⁵ Hicks, 7.

⁶⁶ “The Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 161.

⁶⁷ Philip Quilibet, “Drift-Wood: The Centenary,” *Galaxy* 20 (July 1875): 118.

a hundred years.”⁶⁸ It is clear that the Centennial celebration, with the Exhibition as its focus, was an inescapable fact of life for all Americans in 1875 and 1876, and members of the art community were surely moved to ponder what it meant for their history and their future.

American Art at the Fair: A Prelude to the Centennial Exhibition

Organizers of the great fairs in the United States and abroad took on a monumental task: to create a system of order that included and explained all the products of man, both commercial and cultural, and to produce, as Umberto Eco put it, “a final recapitulation in the face of a hypothetical end of the world.”⁶⁹ The nineteenth-century concern for creating order is evident in the careful attention paid to the minute details of classification in early exhibitions.⁷⁰ This concern naturally implied an imposition of that order, a winning of hearts and minds that was of particular import for a young and unproven national American art.

World’s fairs have been characterized as constructs of cultural unity, even hegemony, and it has been observed that these events have “exerted a formative influence on the way Americans thought about themselves and the world in which they lived.”⁷¹ This vision of unity extended to a historical narrative that justified both the past and the present. Each world’s fair recast history in accordance with the aims of its organizers; modern scholar Paul Greenhalgh noted that “especially for the host nation, the exhibition would invariably be a celebration of the past as a preparation for a better future, [a

⁶⁸ Brown, 11.

⁶⁹ Umberto Eco, “A Theory of Expositions,” in *Travels in Hyper Reality* (San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1983), 292; Bruno Giberti, *Designing the Centennial* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2002), 1.

⁷⁰ Giberti, “Classified Landscape” discusses the importance of such classification schemes.

⁷¹ Maass, 1, 131-2.

demonstration that] ‘things will get better’” and importantly, that “the fine arts were one of the few areas where an exploration of the past was openly sanctioned.”⁷² Planning documents show that the Centennial Commission was quick to recognize that “on these great occasions civilization halts a moment and ‘takes inventory’ of her resources and measures her progress,”⁷³ and indeed, American progress was an overriding theme of the Centennial Exhibition.

World’s fairs can be understood from several points of view, including cultural imperialism, as in Robert Rydell’s *All the World’s a Fair* of 1984; and spectatorship, as in Tony Bennett’s 1988 article “The Exhibitionary Complex.” But first and foremost, nineteenth century fairs were distinctly commercial enterprises -- as John Maass put it, “the business of the Victorian exhibition was business.”⁷⁴ Fine arts displays were often considered the “frosting on the cake” that would attract visitors. However, this mercantile orientation could be at odds with the high-minded aims of art exhibition planners. Artists and jurors resisted the commercializing impulse that drove fairs leading up the Centennial Exhibition, and they made efforts to segregate and sacralize the art display.

In the decades leading up to the Centennial, American artists and collectors participated in numerous exhibitions ranging from local mechanics fairs to international expositions abroad. These events laid the foundations for concerns that would shape the American art display at the Centennial Exhibition. Among these issues were how and by whom the works were selected; whether the display accurately represented the nation’s

⁷² Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World’s Fairs, 1851-1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 23, 200.

⁷³ United States Centennial Commission, *Journal of the Proceedings of the United States Centennial Commission at Philadelphia, 1st session, 1872* (Philadelphia: E.C. Markley & Son, 1872), 44.

⁷⁴ Maass, 94.

art, that is, whether expatriate or “stateside” artists would dominate; and whether the art display was shielded from the commercial nature of the overall exhibition.

The first major world’s fair was London’s 1851 Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations, better known as the Crystal Palace. The event was wildly popular, attracting over six million visitors and spawning “an epidemic of expositions” in the decades following.⁷⁵ However, the exhibition included very little painting, and sculpture was scattered throughout the building. Along with a small central sculpture court, five “Fine Art Courts” focused on the ancient styles considered the high points of art: Egyptian, Greek, Roman, the Alhambra, and Nineveh.⁷⁶ American participation comprised only three pieces of sculpture, among them Hiram Powers’ *Fisher Boy* (figure I.5).⁷⁷

The next major international exhibition represented a watershed moment for art at world’s fairs. For the Exposition Universelle of 1855 in Paris, Napoleon III declared that the fine arts were equal in importance to industry, and should be displayed in a separate building; the event was billed as a universal exhibition of fine arts running parallel with a universal exhibition of industry.⁷⁸ Future world’s fairs, including the Centennial Exhibition, would accord art a special status and make every effort to separate it from the coarse and motley products of industry.

⁷⁵ Edward C. Bruce, *The Century: Its Fruits and Its Festival: Being a History and Description of the Centennial Exhibition, with a Preliminary Outline of Modern Progress* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1877), 49.

⁷⁶ Greenhalgh, 207-8.

⁷⁷ *The Crystal Palace Exhibition; Illustrated Catalogue, London 1851. An Unabridged Republication of the Art-Journal Special Issue* (London: Dover Publications, 1970), 288.

⁷⁸ Giberti, “Classified Landscape,” 45; Greenhalgh, 14.

American participation in the 1855 exhibition was minimal, comprising thirty-nine paintings lent by ten artists living in France.⁷⁹ William Morris Hunt and William P. Babcock, disciples of the Barbizon painter Millet, lent three and eight works respectively. The portraitist G.P.A. Healy was represented with fourteen paintings.⁸⁰ As the first American contribution of reasonable size to a foreign world's fair, it is notable that it was entirely organized by, and composed of, expatriate artists. The makeup of such representations became a major bone of contention in future exhibitions, including, of course, the Centennial.

American participation in the art exhibition at the 1867 Exposition Universelle in Paris was handled quite differently from that of 1855. New York's National Academy of Design charged landscapists Frederic E. Church and Jasper Francis Cropsey, as well as Edwin White, a painter of interiors and historical and religious works, to form a selection committee composed of "well-known connoisseurs of art" and suggested that "as the American school has furnished particularly fine landscapes, a preference be given to paintings of this class."⁸¹ The committee that the three appointed was dominated by New York collectors who favored the art of the Hudson River School.⁸² It is not surprising that the ninety-five works contributed were heavily weighted toward native subjects by New

⁷⁹ Carol Troyen, "Innocents Abroad: American Painters at the 1867 Exposition Universelle, Paris," *The American Art Journal* 16 (Autumn 1984): 4.

⁸⁰ Greenhalgh, 214; Sally Webster, *William Morris Hunt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 27. Other American artists represented there included the painters Christopher Pearse Cranch, Regis Gignoux, Henry P. Hunt, G. Powers-Alanson, John Robertson, Thomas P. Rossiter, and David B. Walcutt, and the sculptor Eugène Warburg. See *Exposition des Beaux-arts de 1855: Liste par Ordre Alphabétique des Artistes Étrangers et Français dont les Ouvrages sont Exposés au Palais des Beaux-Arts* (Paris: Vinchon, 1855).

⁸¹ "Our Artists at the Paris Exposition," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 23 January 1867, 12.

⁸² Troyen, "Innocents Abroad," 5. The committee was chaired by William Hoppin and included dealers Samuel P. Avery and Michael Knoedler, critic Henry T. Tuckerman, industrialists and collectors John T. Johnston, Marshall O. Roberts, Robert L. Stuart, and Robert M. Olyphant. All but two, Joseph Harrison, Jr. and George Whitney of Philadelphia, were from New York and favored the Hudson River School.

York artists, often from committee members' own collections, and that American art was represented by artists working in the United States.⁸³

Foreign criticism of American art at the 1867 exhibition was lukewarm at best. Beyond Church's *Niagara* (figure I.6), comments focused on whether the subjects were sufficiently representative of national life, and suggested that Americans develop a style that was less imitative of British art. The overall reaction of American art critics, and importantly, of collectors, was outright embarrassment for American provincialism, and admiration for the sophisticated French style.⁸⁴ James Jackson Jarves wrote in his famous *Art Thoughts* of 1869 that the display "taught us a salutary lesson by placing the average American sculpture and painting in direct comparison with the European, thereby proving our actual mediocrity."⁸⁵ Over twenty years later one writer would recall that the American paintings exhibition "was such a failure that our commissioner, Frank Leslie, published an apology in four languages."⁸⁶ While this seems unlikely, the comment illustrates the lasting shame some felt over the nativist selection in 1867.

Though rarely discussed today, the Vienna Universal Exhibition of 1873 was of enormous interest to Americans, since it took place as work on the 1876 Exhibition was beginning, and it provided a point of reference and comparison for the planners and the public. For instance, a *New York Herald* article from the Vienna exhibition included in its headline: "Hints, Hopes and Good Advice for the Centenary."⁸⁷ The United States

⁸³ Troyen, "Innocents Abroad," 5, 13; Greenhalgh, 214-5. In a notable exception, James McNeill Whistler insisted on displaying his work in the American galleries instead of the British section, and sent some of his most important paintings, such as *The White Girl*, *Wapping*, and *Crepuscle in Flesh Color and Green: Valparaiso*. See Troyen, "Innocents Abroad," 8.

⁸⁴ Troyen, "Innocents Abroad," 6, 13, 20.

⁸⁵ James Jackson Jarves, *Art Thoughts* (New York: Hurd and Houghton, 1869), 297-9; quoted in Troyen, "Innocents Abroad," 14.

⁸⁶ "New York Notes," *Boston Evening Transcript*, 4 March 1889, 6.

⁸⁷ "The Vienna Exhibition," *New York Herald*, 4 August 1873, 3.

Centennial Commission, the City of Philadelphia, and the state of Massachusetts sent delegations to Vienna, and their observations were published in voluminous official reports. The 1873 exhibition was still strongly in mind three years later, as accounts of the Centennial Exhibition often referred to Vienna's fair. Frank H. Norton's guide to the Centennial called the 1873 exhibition "the grandest exhibition of the kind ever yet attempted (to be excelled only by the United States Centennial Exhibition of 1876)."⁸⁸ *The Nation's* articles on the opening in Philadelphia were full of comparisons to Vienna, contrasting the pomp of the ceremonies, the buildings, and the views afforded by their positioning on the grounds.⁸⁹

In spite of the close attention paid to the Vienna Exhibition, the American part in it was a humiliating failure. American newspapers were filled with accusations that some fairground concessions for taverns and barrooms, and the very posts of United States Commissioners, were purchased. Moreover, United States Commissioner General Thomas R. Van Buren was not only complicit in these transactions, but benefited from them. He was relieved of his duties, and several commissioners were suspended.⁹⁰ The agent of one of the country's largest companies (who was left unidentified) was accused of trying to bribe the president of the jury for his exhibiting group.⁹¹ The *New York Herald* called it "America's failure" and the *New-York Daily Tribune* noted the "frauds, incompetence, pretensions and the utter social and intellectual insignificance" of the

⁸⁸ Frank H. Norton, ed., *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Historical Register of the Centennial Exposition 1876: A Facsimile of Frank Leslie's Illustrated Historical Register of the Centennial Exposition, 1876* (New York: Paddington Press, 1974), 7.

⁸⁹ "The Progress of the Exhibition," *The Nation* 22 (16 March 1876): 174-5. Unfortunately, the Vienna exhibition was plagued by bad luck. A stock market crash near the time of the opening caused hotels and restaurants to double their rates, and tales of the greedy Viennese made their way across Europe and the United States. A cholera epidemic further suppressed attendance. See Maass, 30 and Norton, 7.

⁹⁰ "The Vienna Exhibition," *New York Herald*, 4 August 1873, 3; "Suspension of Vienna Commissioners," *The Evening Star* (Washington, D.C.), 26 April 1873, 1.

⁹¹ "Vienna and the Centennial," *The International Review* 2 (January 1875): 20-1.

organizers, lamenting that “the American department is a thing which will be passed by with derision as long as the Exhibition lasts.”⁹²

The United States art contribution fared little better. A planning committee of “amateurs” met with resistance because it included no artists, and the members resigned. Representatives of the National Academy of Design reluctantly agreed to spearhead the exhibition, but found little cooperation from artists or collectors, so they too resigned.⁹³ Just two months before the opening it was feared that no American art would appear in Vienna at all.

In the end about twenty pictures were sent, seventeen of which came from an unnamed private collector in Chicago, including works by Whittredge, Bierstadt, the animal painter Arthur Fitzwilliam Tait, and the history painter Henry Peters Gray – hardly a representative sampling of American art.⁹⁴ This meager group had not even arrived at Vienna when the exhibition opened, and when it finally did, no space had been reserved for it. One official decided that the works were not worthy of a place in the fine arts display, and was not convinced to hang them until a very late hour.⁹⁵ The paintings were probably scattered throughout the galleries, as it was reported that one of Bierstadt’s paintings had the dubious distinction of being “skied” in the Salon d’Honneur, and G.P.A. Healy’s portrait of Pope Pius IX (figure I.7) was hung in the Belgian annex.⁹⁶

⁹² “The Vienna Exhibition,” *New York Herald*, 4 August 1873, 3; W.J. Stillman, “The Irregularities in the American Department,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 14 June 1873, 7.

⁹³ “American Art at Vienna,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 4 March 1873, 4.

⁹⁴ B.T. [Bayard Taylor], “The Universal Exhibition,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 28 May 1873, 1.

⁹⁵ “The Universal Exhibition,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 10 June 1873, 1; Massachusetts Commission to the Vienna Exposition, *Reports of the Massachusetts Commissioners to the Exposition at Vienna, 1873* (Boston: Wright & Potter, 1875), 210.

⁹⁶ Massachusetts Commission to the Vienna Exhibition, 210. Being “skied” meant that a painting was hung so high that it was difficult to see, though it was placed in a gallery reserved for the best paintings. Two paintings by Bierstadt were contributed, and it is unclear which was placed there; one was “*The Emerald Pool*,” *White Mountains, New Hampshire* and the other was recorded simply as “oil painting.” See United

The jurying for the fine arts was equally unsatisfactory. The number of judges appointed from each country was proportional to the number of exhibitors from that nation, and as a result of the United States' miniscule contribution, no Americans were included. In spite of the extremely unenthusiastic response to the American contribution upon its arrival, the United States won sixteen fine arts medals, which would have included nearly every work displayed.⁹⁷ Later reports charged "lavish and indiscriminate distribution of medals and diplomas" and complained that "artists not rewarded with medals are the exception, not the rule."⁹⁸ The proliferation and subsequent devaluation of the medals would be remembered by the fine arts jury in 1876.

There were some positive comments on American art at Vienna -- Bayard Taylor gamely reported for the *New-York Daily Tribune* that "one of Eastman Johnson's pictures would shine out like a gem" and "I found no landscape worthy to be placed anywhere near Gifford and McEntee."⁹⁹ However, Taylor was referring not to paintings that were present, but works that he wished were there. In doing so he created his own "imagined exhibition," a device that would shape the criticism of the American art display at the Centennial Exhibition. Writings on the works that could actually be seen were less favorable. The *Reports of the Massachusetts Commissioners to the Exposition at Vienna, 1873* called Thomas Satterwhite Noble's depiction of John Brown (New-York Historical Society) "weak and monotonous in color, awkwardly composed, and without the saving graces of good drawing or passable relief;" Bierstadt's works "dry, tricky and conventional;" and Henry Mossler's *The Lost Cause* (unlocated) "especially prominent

States Commission to the Vienna Exposition, *Report of the Hon. H. Garretson, Chief Executive Commissioner of the United States* (Washington: Government Office, 1875), 194.

⁹⁷ United States Commission to the Vienna Exposition, 93, 147, 199.

⁹⁸ Bruce, 56; Massachusetts Commission to the Vienna Exposition, 185.

⁹⁹ B.T. [Bayard Taylor], 1.

from the lack of all good qualities.”¹⁰⁰ A *New York Herald* reporter writing on American art at the Centennial Exhibition still could not shake “the painful recollections of three years ago, at Vienna, where we did worse than nothing.”¹⁰¹ This ignominious showing just a few years before the Centennial Exhibition must have placed considerable pressure on the organizers of its American art display to redeem the country’s cultural reputation.

One of the most notable developments in world’s fairs, and one of the most important for the character of the Centennial Exhibition’s American art display, was the introduction of retrospective exhibitions. The best known precedent was the 1857 Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition, which comprised an incredible 16,000 works of art, among them over one thousand old master paintings. It included a display of historical and contemporary British art, providing an unrivaled opportunity to study the English national school and trace its progress up to the present day.¹⁰² As world’s fairs proliferated, organizers found it increasingly difficult to attract worthy contemporary works, since they sold quickly and owners were reluctant to lend them to exhibition after exhibition. The International Exhibition of 1862 in London avoided the problem by displaying British art of the previous hundred years. In like manner, the London International Exhibition of 1871 combined the work of deceased and living artists, and the London International Exhibition of 1874 added a retrospective display of old masters of the participating countries.¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ Massachusetts Commission to the Vienna Exposition, 210-1.

¹⁰¹ “The World’s Display of Art,” *New York Herald*, 11 May 1876, 6.

¹⁰² Suzanne Fagence Cooper, “The British School at the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857,” *Apollo* 153 (June 2001): 30. Also see Elizabeth Ariana Pergam, “‘Waking the Soul’: The Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857 and the State of the Arts in Mid-Victorian Britain,” (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2001).

¹⁰³ Greenhalgh, 200, 208.

A similar historicizing impulse developed in the United States. In 1872 the Brooklyn Art Association organized an exhibition of about 260 works billed as the “First Chronological Exhibition of American Art.” The display included paintings by such early masters as Washington Allston, Joseph Blackburn, Thomas Cole, John Singleton Copley, Henry Inman, John Krimmel, Gilbert Stuart, John Trumbull, and Benjamin West. Consultants included the conservative painters Daniel Huntington, John F. Kensett, and Worthington Whittredge, the dealer Samuel P. Avery, and critics John Durand and Henry Tuckerman.¹⁰⁴ Whittredge and Huntington would serve on committees for the American art department at the Centennial just a few years later. The Centennial organizers’ early decision to include a retrospective element in the American art display was no doubt influenced by the growing popularity of such exhibitions.

The London Crystal Palace of 1851 was the first exposition of international scope, but American artists and collectors had been participating in similar exhibitions at home for decades previous. These fairs were presented by mechanics institutes, organizations dedicated to educating workingmen and improving the quality of American manufactures.¹⁰⁵ The longest-running presenter was the American Institute, whose annual fairs in New York dated from 1828. These exhibitions were highly successful – over half a million people attended the 1852 fair, and even the well-to-do considered it an important social event, with music, fireworks, orations, and odes (including Whitman’s poem “After All, Not to Create Only” at the 1871 fair).¹⁰⁶

¹⁰⁴ Kate Nearpass, “The First Chronological Exhibition of American Art, 1872,” *Archives of American Art Journal* 23 (1983): 21-2.

¹⁰⁵ See Robey for a thoughtful account of mechanics fairs and their significance.

¹⁰⁶ Robey, 25, 68.

Art galleries were included at an early stage (figure I.8). The 1830 American Institute Fair boasted a department of “Pictures, Sculptures, &c.” that included the work of local amateur and professional artists, usually submitted by the artists themselves. Paintings by Jasper Francis Cropsey, Asher B. Durand, William Sidney Mount and John Quidor could be found in these displays.¹⁰⁷ Over time, both artists and judges complained about the quality of the works on view, and encouraged selection committees of qualified judges. For New York fairs, those judges were often members of the National Academy of Design, such as Thomas Seir Cummings, Asher B. Durand, John Frazee, and Samuel F. B. Morse.¹⁰⁸

The art exhibition became an increasingly important attraction, and an increasingly segregated aspect of mechanics fairs. The art display was sometimes in an upstairs gallery, as it was in the 1844 American Institute fair; its higher position reminded visitors that their behavior should be similarly elevated. For the 1867 exhibition the size and quality of the art department were touted as a highlight of the fair. At the 1874 Massachusetts Charitable Mechanics Association, a special art gallery was constructed with skylights, fabric-covered walls, and gold molding. Works by prominent Americans such as J.G. Brown, James M. Hart, Hunt, and George Inness, as well as French academics including Leon Bonnat and James Tissot, made the exhibition a great success. It was billed as “the finest Art Exposition...yet seen in this country.”¹⁰⁹ This distinction became something of a bragging right, as several exhibitions in the next few years would stake similar claims, including, of course, the Centennial Exhibition.

¹⁰⁷ Alfred Frankenstein, “American Art and the Urban Fair” in *The Shaping of Art and Architecture in Nineteenth-Century America* (exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972), 95; Robey, 206.

¹⁰⁸ Robey, 208-9, 297-9.

¹⁰⁹ Robey, 107, 301-11.

Mechanics fairs provided organizers with decades of experience in developing temporary art exhibitions for a broad public, and standards were raised ever higher over the years. Just as important for the Centennial Exhibition, the works of art were increasingly set apart from manufactured goods, as organizers drew distinctions between the fine and “practical” arts. In New York, these fairs included the work of amateurs and professionals alike in a variety of media, such as painting, sculpture, engraving, lithography, photography, wax figures, and objects relegated to the heading of “novelty work.”¹¹⁰ As early as the 1840s judges voiced concerns about the quality of works submitted and the advisability of displaying all media together.¹¹¹

In the next decade mechanics fairs became openly commercial, with items being sold straight from exhibits.¹¹² By the time of the Centennial this practice was considered vaguely unsavory, as it conflicted with the Exhibition’s ostensible didactic purpose. The organizers of the Centennial allowed exhibitors to take orders on site, but not to sell items directly. These concerns were heightened for the American art exhibition, where its educational mission was all-important, and questions of commercialism would loom large.

The New York Crystal Palace of 1853 was organized by a private group of investors hoping to duplicate the financial success of the London Crystal Palace, and it represented the first attempt at an international fair in the United States. It introduced the idea of a world’s fair to Americans, and laid the groundwork for the important role that the art department would play at the Centennial Exhibition. The New York Crystal Palace

¹¹⁰ Robey, 205.

¹¹¹ Linda Henefield Skalet, “The Market for American Painting in New York, 1870-1915,” (Ph.D. diss., The Johns Hopkins University, 1980), 294-5.

¹¹² Robey, 101-2.

boasted the first separate picture gallery included in such an exposition, housed in a two-story annex to the main building¹¹³ (figure I.9). However, it drew protests from artists, who had apparently learned from their experiences with Mechanics Fairs, and had strong ideas about the art exhibition's role. New York artists objected that the 1853 exhibition, like its London counterpart, had no special classification for fine art, and the Sketch Club refused en masse to send works because the arrangement degraded art.¹¹⁴ Others associated with the National Academy of Design boycotted the Crystal Palace because the idea of an art exhibition connected with "grosser material – *manufactures* – has always been repugnant to the American artist."¹¹⁵

Local artists' reluctance to participate may account for the tiny fraction of American paintings in the display. Only thirty of 685 paintings were by Americans; most came from the Watercolor Society of New York's collection, and some were copies of European works. Notable paintings included Emanuel Leutze's *Washington Crossing the Delaware* (figure I.10), William Sidney Mount's *The Trappers (Catching Rabbits)* (The Long Island Museum of American Art, History, and Carriages) and *Cider Making* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art), Rembrandt Peale's *Equestrian Portrait of George Washington (Washington Before Yorktown)*, (private collection), and Richard Caton Woodville's *The Sailor's Wedding* (figure I.11).¹¹⁶ While one New York diarist called the paintings exhibition "rather a failure," sculpture was a major attraction; Hiram

¹¹³ Norton, 6.

¹¹⁴ Robey, 306-7.

¹¹⁵ Thomas Seir Cummings, *Historic Annals of the National Academy of Design* (Philadelphia: G.W. Childs, 1865; reprint, New York: Kennedy Galleries, 1969), 238.

¹¹⁶ Ellen Sacco, "Art for the Millions: The Rise of Barnum's American Museum and the New York Crystal Palace" (M.A. thesis, Hunter College, City University of New York, 1991), 63; Ivan D. Steen, "America's First World's Fair: The Exhibition of The Industry of All Nations at New York's Crystal Palace, 1853-1854," *The New-York Historical Society Quarterly* 47 (July 1963): 278-9; Stephanie Mayer, "Reconsidering the 1853 Crystal Palace" (unpublished paper, Boston University, 2002), 21-2.

Powers garnered high praise for examples of his many versions of *Eve Tempted*, *The Fisher Boy*, *Proserpine*, and *The Greek Slave* (figure I.12).¹¹⁷

The fine arts jury was headed by Durand, then President of the National Academy of Design, and included a mix of critics, collectors, and artists.¹¹⁸ The awards system drew complaints, since medals with no comment from the judges made them “obscure and unsatisfactory.”¹¹⁹ Perhaps in response, the Centennial Exhibition awards included detailed written reports that would present a whole new range of difficulties.

The New York Crystal Palace exhibition was plagued with problems. The project was not endorsed by the United States government, and few foreign countries participated. As a result, the exhibition was never considered to speak with a national voice, and attendance was disappointing. Organizers of the Centennial Exhibition would assure that the 1876 fair had a government sanction, along with the authority lent by broad national and international involvement.¹²⁰

Most influential for the Centennial Exhibition were the Sanitary Fairs that dotted the northern states during the Civil War. Approximately thirty-five such events took place in cities including Brooklyn, Chicago, and Cincinnati.¹²¹ The fairs set important precedents for the structure that would be followed in 1876, as well as for the conflicts

¹¹⁷ Steen, 279; Mayer, 26.

¹¹⁸ Mayer, 22; Horace Greeley, ed., *Art and Industry as Represented in the Exhibition at the Crystal Palace, New York, 1853-4* (New York: New-York Daily Tribune, 1853), xviii. Jury members included Edward Antonissen, New York; A.M. Cozzens, Esq., New York; Charles A. Dana, *New-York Daily Tribune*; A.B. Durand; Charles Elliott, Esq., New York; Hon. Edward Everett, Boston; Prof. Foresti, New York; Henry Greenough, Cambridge; S.F.B. Morse; Mons. Sebron, No. 4 Leroy Place (no city); William Young, Editor of *The Albion*; Henry Ulke, New York; and H.K. Browne.

¹¹⁹ Steen, 280.

¹²⁰ In March 1854, P.T. Barnum took over the Exhibition, but even the great showman could not stimulate interest, and it closed just eight months later. The building was available for rent in the following years and finally burned down in 1858 during, ironically, a mechanics fair of the American Institute. See Steen, 282-7 and Norton, 6.

¹²¹ See Evdokia Savidou-Terrono, “For the ‘Boys in Blue’: The Art Galleries of the Sanitary Fairs,” (Ph.D. diss., The City University of New York, 2002) for a thorough study of these exhibitions.

that would be played out in the American art exhibition. Beginning in 1863, the United States Sanitary Commission organized fairs to raise funds in aid of Union soldiers at the front. In larger cities these fairs included art galleries organized by local artists and collectors. For the first time great displays of private collections were included, as collectors opened their homes to the public during the course of the exhibitions.¹²² The three largest and most important of these were the New England Fair in Boston, the Metropolitan Fair in New York, and the Great Central Fair in Philadelphia.

Organizers of the New England Fair in Boston of December 1863 relied heavily on the collection of the Boston Athenaeum to fill its art gallery, and supplemented it with just thirty-five paintings. This small group included works by local artists from its past such as Copley and Allston, including the latter's famous *Belshazzar's Feast* (figure I.13).¹²³ The living painter William Morris Hunt made the city a bastion of the Barbizon style throughout the late nineteenth century; unfortunately, Hunt was represented by only one painting, *Roman Peasant* (unlocated), from the collection of a T. Lee. Hunt would refuse to participate in the Centennial Exhibition, though a few of his works would be contributed by collectors. Bostonian artists and collectors strongly favored the work of expatriate artists influenced by the French academics and the Barbizon school of landscape, but the city's characteristically proud and self-sufficient nature made them less vocal than denizens of New York and Philadelphia. This inward-looking perspective would be evident once again at the Centennial Exhibition, where Bostonians (perhaps

¹²² Robey, 71.

¹²³ Savidou-Terrono, 440; At that time the Athenaeum collection included several works by Washington Allston, oil portraits by Chester Harding, Gilbert Stuart, and Thomas Sully, and portrait sculptures by Thomas Ball, Shobal Clevenger, Thomas Crawford, John Frazee, Horatio Greenough, Erastus Dow Palmer, and most notably, a 1861 portrait by Nahum Ball Onthank entitled *John Brown of Osawatomie*. See Jonathan P. Harding, *The Boston Athenaeum Collection: Pre-Twentieth Century American and European Painting and Sculpture* (The Boston Athenaeum, 1984).

also preoccupied with the opening of their new art museum) would take a tertiary role in comparison to New Yorkers and Philadelphians.

New York's Metropolitan Fair of April 1864 (figure I.14) included a remarkably elaborate art exhibition that apotheosized the Hudson River School.¹²⁴ The Art Committee was chaired by the landscape painter John F. Kensett and Mrs. Jonathan Sturges, wife of the distinguished collector. Special subcommittees were recruited to solicit contributions from foreign countries, including from American artists living abroad.

The fine arts gallery housed the largest display of paintings to that point in New York, and included such monuments of American landscape painting as Church's *Niagara* (figure I.6), *The Heart of the Andes* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art), Bierstadt's *Rocky Mountains, Lander's Peak* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art), and other paintings by Cole, Kensett and Durand. The art exhibition drew over 77,000 visitors, and for an additional charge fairgoers could visit the private galleries of August Belmont and William H. Aspinwall.

Following on the heels of the New York event, Philadelphia's "Great Central Fair" took place in June 1864 as a joint effort of groups in Pennsylvania, Delaware and New Jersey, and the event that planted the seeds of the Centennial rivalry between the two major cities. With an art exhibition boasting a staggering 1,400 pictures, a local publication called the fair "beyond question the largest, most valuable, the most complete collection of paintings ever known in America," a comment that could only be taken as a

¹²⁴ Its effects extended far beyond the Centennial Exhibition, as it inspired the founding of the Metropolitan Museum of Art.

challenge to New York's Metropolitan Fair.¹²⁵ The Art Exhibition committee was composed mainly of local collectors such as James L. Claghorn, who would head up the initial fine arts committee for the Centennial Exhibition. In fact, of twenty-eight members, the only artists were Thomas Moran, Christian Schussele, Thomas Sully, and John Sartain, who would organize the American art exhibition in 1876. Perhaps remembering his experiences with the Great Central Fair, Sartain would assure that the display at the Centennial Exhibition was organized principally by artists rather than collectors, though he did not anticipate how deeply divided the artists would be.

The art gallery at the Great Central Fair was hugely popular -- average daily attendance was estimated at 12,000.¹²⁶ By this measure, more than 220,000 people visited over the approximately nineteen days the exhibition was open, far outstripping attendance at New York's Metropolitan Fair. For reasons of prurience or prudery, John Vanderlyn's notorious 1814 nude *Ariadne Asleep on the Island of Naxos* (figure I.15) was exhibited in a separate gallery for an additional charge of fifty cents, twice as much as the twenty-five cent charge for the rest of the art exhibition. Perhaps following the lead of Messrs. Belmont and Aspinwall in New York, the Philadelphian Joseph Harrison opened his home to the public. His collection included works by Cole, James Hamilton, Louis Lang, Leutze, Thomas Buchanan Read, Peter Rothermel, Schussele, Sully, and featured Jasper Francis Cropsey's *Spirit of War* and *Spirit of Peace* (figures I.16, I.17).

¹²⁵ "The Art Gallery," *Forney's War Press* 3, 31 (11 June 1864): 5; quoted in Savidou-Terrono, 177. Ironically, most of the works in the exhibition were contributed by New York collectors such as William Aspinwall, Marshall Roberts, Robert Olyphant, Michael Knoedler, William T. Blodgett, and John Taylor Johnston.

¹²⁶ Sue Himelick Nutty, "John Sartain and Joseph Harrison, Jr.," in *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*, eds. Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000), 59.

Critical responses to the Sanitary Fairs tended to be highly favorable, and most praises sounded the naïve nationalistic pride that some critics would bring to the Centennial Exhibition. One writer effused of the American art at the Metropolitan Fair, “the result of the comparison [with European artists] was so satisfactory to most observers, that one constantly heard the most hopeful auguries respecting our artistic future, and the assertion often made before, now came to be commonly believed, that in landscape painting, our National Academicians were in advance of all Europe, to say nothing of the rest of the world.”¹²⁷ Most reviews rhapsodized on the achievements of American art, with special praise for historic and patriotic themes -- one critic called Leutze’s *Washington Crossing the Delaware* (figure I.10) “a good picture for faint hearts in these times.”¹²⁸ The only exception was Clarence Cook of the *New-York Daily Tribune*, who lauded the effort behind the exhibition, then launched into a harsh diatribe, calling Leutze’s *Pro Patria – Florence Nightingale in the Hospital at Scutari* (unlocated) “beneath contempt, “absurd in conception” and “melodramatic in treatment,” and Thomas Hicks’ *Iago* (Sotheby’s, 1974, sale 3596, lot 550) “painted in the coarsest, crudest way, without any technical skill.”¹²⁹ His comments spurred a wave of vehement responses from New York artists and critics. Cook would take a similar approach to American art at the Centennial Exhibition.

Many Sanitary Fair organizers, both collectors and artists, were later involved in the Centennial’s American art exhibition, such as Henry Kirke Brown, Claghorn, Thomas

¹²⁷ *A Record of the Metropolitan Fair* (New York: Hurd & Houghton, 1867), 99; quoted in Savidou-Terrono, 486.

¹²⁸ “Recollection of the Fair in New York,-No. 2.” *Our Daily Fare* (Great Central Fair, Philadelphia), 8-21 June 1864; quoted in Savidou-Terrono, 298.

¹²⁹ [Clarence Cook], “The Exhibition of Pictures at the Metropolitan Fair,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 9 April 1864, 12.

Hicks, Thomas F. Hoppin, Huntington, Johnston, Jervis McEntee, Rothermel, Sartain, J.Q.A. Ward, Whittredge, and others. These men applied the principles that had guided them during the Civil War to the 1876 fair; however, times and goals had changed drastically. The Sanitary Fairs advanced a political agenda that was unwanted at the Centennial. As the Sanitary Commission's aim was to support Union troops, fair organizers encouraged pro-Union artworks such as Louis Lang's *The Soldier's Widow* (unlocated), Francesco Augero's *The Goddess of Union attended by Peace and Plenty, Dismissing the Fury of Rebellion and her Victims* (unlocated), and Henry Peters Gray's *America in 1862* (unlocated), which depicted a slave looking up into the eyes of the "genius of America." In some instances these works depicted actual battles, such as Victor Nehlig's *Gallant Charge of Lieutenant Henry Hidden, at Sangster's Station, Virginia* (New-York Historical Society). The Centennial Exhibition, however, was conceived as an opportunity to heal the wounds of the Civil War and reunite the North and South, so Civil War subjects were officially proscribed, though there would be notorious exceptions.

The Sanitary Fairs also set the stage for civic rivalries that would complicate the creation of a unified national art display in Fairmount Park, as cities compared the size, attendance, and financial success of their own fairs and competed to surpass each other. Another unintended effect of the inter-city competition was that attempts to offer the largest number of artworks resulted in huge displays that overwhelmed visitors -- a problem that would mark the Centennial Exhibition's art department.

Commerce was at the heart of the Sanitary Fairs (though for the Union cause), and they offered artists much-needed exposure and income in a period when their work

was difficult to sell. This openly mercantile orientation would cause practical and philosophical difficulties at the Centennial Exhibition as the organizers, and particularly Art Bureau department chief John Sartain, attempted to frame the American art display as a didactic exercise. As he repeatedly insisted, he planned for “an exhibition, not a bazaar.”¹³⁰

The representation of American art at world’s fairs leading up to the Centennial ranged from obscure to embarrassing; their numbers were small and their representation far from comprehensive. Meanwhile, lessons were also learned through fairs at home, as artists became more insistent on their role in shaping the exhibition by selecting works, and in assuring that those works would be distinguished from the manufactured goods on display. The Centennial Exhibition offered the first opportunity to present a broad, sweeping view of American art to a national and international audience, and members of the American art community must have felt they had much to prove. Modern scholar Linda Docherty commented of this period, “No modern nation in the western world has rivaled the United States for national self-consciousness,”¹³¹ and this impending scrutiny must have made the artists and collectors forming the exhibition feel as people do when expecting an important visitor to their home -- they see the place with fresh eyes, the eyes of an outsider, anticipating their response. The unique aims and tensions of this world’s fair made the formation of an American canon inevitable, and highly charged.

¹³⁰ JS to William E. Marshall, New York, 12 December 1875, reel 4562, frame 1289; JS to Oscar Marshall, New York, 3 March 1876, reel 4563, frame 104; JS to L. Prang & Co., [no city], 10 March 1876, reel 4563, frame 144, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Sartain Family Papers (Phi 1650). Reel and frame numbers refer to microfilm in the Archives of American Art. All letters from John Sartain (JS) originate in Philadelphia.

¹³¹ Linda Jones Docherty, “A Search for Identity: American Art Criticism and the Concept of the “Native School” (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1985), 71.

The Centennial Exhibition marked a moment of both celebration and national reckoning when the nation confronted not only itself and its past, but also its cultural antecedents. One of the most interesting pieces of “Centennialiana” is Nathan Appleton’s 1877 play *The Centennial Movement*. This comedy of manners introduces an international cast of characters who articulate the tensions surrounding issues of American identity and European influence. The protagonist, the conservative old Philadelphia merchant James Everton, represents nativist conservatism, and grudgingly admits “I suppose we must have progress and ‘movement,’ as an eccentric Yankee named Whirligig said.” Everton complains of the well-traveled young Josiah Whirligig, “how I do hate these so-called cosmopolitans, with their pretended knowledge of everything, and their real ignorance of most things, certainly most good things!” Everton uses the term “cosmopolitan” to describe the rising generation of worldly, sophisticated young men who value contemporary European culture. He is bewildered by Whirligig, who seems to believe in change for its own sake, whether good or bad. When hearing that Everton’s brother might be in financial trouble, Whirligig blithely responds, “Oh yes! That won’t do him any harm. There is nothing in the world like change and movement. Give me movement.”¹³² As the story progresses, Everton coerces another Yankee into asking Everton’s three daughters to marry him in order to “save” them from their foreign suitors, in town for the fair. These transatlantic entanglements are wonderfully analogous to the issues at play between some members of the Hudson River School tradition, who showed concern about foreign influences, and the cosmopolitan expatriates who embraced them.

¹³² Nathan Appleton, *The Centennial Movement* (Boston: Lockwood, Brooks, and Company, 1877), 7, 9, 30.

These tensions would come to a boil during preparations for the American exhibition, as the two camps contended to present the story of the nation's art.

Chapter One: The Struggle

A year before the Centennial the critic Clarence Cook declared that “we are in the midst of an era of revolution.”¹ He referred to the rising popularity of the “new men” studying in Europe, such as William Merritt Chase, Walter Shirlaw, and Frederic Bridgman. In the years leading up to the Centennial, aspiring artists flocked to Europe in growing numbers. They studied in the art schools of Düsseldorf, Munich, and increasingly, Paris. European schools emphasized technique and based their study on the nude, resulting in figural works that were esteemed purely for their own artistic merits. The European approach was at odds with the reigning movement in New York, where artists of the “Hudson River School” such as Albert Bierstadt and Worthington Whittredge painted landscapes that glorified American subjects.²

Modern scholar Linda Docherty employed two terms, “native” and “national,” to describe efforts toward an American school during this period. The term “native” suggests the inward gaze of the Hudson River School that valued indigenous American subjects and ideals. The term “national” on the other hand, brings to mind the outward gaze of expatriates, one that suggests a distinct cultural character but is not necessarily restricted to those forms and ideas unique to one country. Cook’s “revolution” was played out at the Centennial Exhibition, as opposing camps of artists struggled to present their visions of the country’s art, both past and present.

¹ Clarence Cook, “Fine Arts: The National Academy of Design,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 29 April 1875, 7.

² The name “Hudson River School” was itself a sign of the movement’s decline. Its origins are uncertain, but it was coined as a pejorative term not earlier than 1877. Though the term did not exist in the Centennial year, it endures as the common identifier for the movement, and as such, I will use it in reference to the group of artists that included Albert Bierstadt, Frederic E. Church, the long deceased Thomas Cole, Jasper Francis Cropsey, Sanford R. Gifford, John Frederick Kensett (who died in 1872 but was represented at the Centennial Exhibition), Jervis McEntee, Thomas Moran, and Worthington Whittredge. See Kevin Avery, “A Historiography of the Hudson River School,” in *American Paradise: The World of the Hudson River School*, ed. John K. Howat (exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1987), 3-4.

In spite of early planning for a fine arts exhibition, practical preparations were not underway until late 1875. In several hurried months before the Centennial Exhibition's May 10 opening, artists of widely diverging points of view were recruited to choose and arrange the first nationally-recognized canon of the country's art. The abbreviated time frame only exacerbated the tensions between the two groups, and these tensions exploded in the selection and hanging processes.

As the members of what was proudly acknowledged as the first American school of art, Hudson River School painters considered their work representative of a national school with patriotic and religious overtones. The ideals of the Hudson River School artists had ruled the "zealously nativist" National Academy of Design for decades, and throughout the 1870s pictures of American scenery dominated the Academy's exhibitions, but the institution was growing stagnant.³ In fact, the American landscape school based in New York was unquestionably waning by the time of the Centennial, and the artists themselves were increasingly aware of it. Worthington Whittredge, President of the National Academy of Design, lamented in the mid-1870s that after all the work and funds expended on its new P.B. Wight building of 1865, "we were living in a beautiful shell but no life in the shell"⁴ (figure 1.1).

The Hudson River School faced growing criticism in the 1860s,⁵ and its decline in the 1870s was sudden and swift. Key figures began to disappear, as its patriarch Asher B. Durand retired from painting in 1869, Kensett died in 1872, Frederic E. Church

³ Jennifer A. Martin Bienenstock, "The Formation and Early Years of the Society of American Artists: 1877-1884" (Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1983), 2, 11.

⁴ John I.H. Baur, ed., *The Autobiography of Worthington Whittredge, 1820-1910* (Brooklyn Museum Journal, 1942), 43-4.

⁵ Doreen Bolger Burke and Catherine Hoover Voorsanger, "The Hudson River School in Eclipse" in *Howat*, 71.

developed inflammatory rheumatism in 1876, and, as Anthony Janson has observed, the work of Sanford Gifford and Jasper Francis Cropsey became mannered, eccentric, and uninspired. Other cultural shifts militated against the movement. Industrialization introduced a new attitude toward nature on the part of patrons. Darwin's theory of natural selection shook faith in the moral foundations of the universe that their paintings expressed. Increased travel after the Civil War introduced American artists and collectors to contemporary European styles, particularly that of France, and the same period saw the burgeoning popularity of the Munich School and the Barbizon style.⁶

The artists themselves sensed the change, even if they could not explain it. Jervis McEntee complained that Euro-centric dealers formed public opinion and American artists could not get fair treatment. James Smillie vaguely cited the war, changes in the financial world, and the new accumulation of wealth as causes of the new sensibility. Whittredge in particular displayed the intense resentment that would erupt at the Centennial when he wrote in 1871, "all I care about Europe is its art and artists and what they are doing. I am forced to admire it while I don't like it. I admire their knowledge but despise their souls if one can speak so."⁷

Tensions had been growing for some time between Academy's old guard and the new generation of European-trained cosmopolites. For instance, the Barbizon-influenced painter George Inness was not elevated to National Academician until 1868, long after

⁶ Anthony F. Janson, *Worthington Whittredge* (Cambridge University Press, 1989), 153, 176-7. It is important to remember that though the Hudson River School is heavily emphasized in modern narratives of American art from the 1820s to the 1870s, it was concentrated in the New York area. It had few adherents in Philadelphia and Boston, where collectors and artists were much more interested in the European manner, notably the Barbizon style popularized in Boston by William Morris Hunt, and the figural subjects embraced by Philadelphians. See Sally Webster, *William Morris Hunt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991) and David Sellin, *The First Pose. 1876: Turning Point in American Art* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975).

⁷ Worthington Whittredge to James Pinchot, 21 September 1871; quoted in Janson, 153-6.

his more conservative contemporaries Church, Cropsey, and Gifford. In 1874 eight works by John La Farge were rejected from the Academy's annual exhibition for a perceived lack of line, detail, and "sentiment."⁸ The following year marked the advent of the "new coalition," a group of mostly Munich-based artists that included William Merritt Chase, Wyatt Eaton, and Toby Rosenthal, as well as Frederick Bridgman, who was trained in Paris. Chase's work was seen at the National Academy of Design for the first time, as was that of Frank Duveneck, the leader of the Americans in Munich.⁹ However, paintings by students of the Boston-based, Barbizon-influenced William Morris Hunt and John La Farge were marginalized. The works of Helena de Kay Gilder, Maria Oakey, and Frances Lathrop, along with Albert Pinkham Ryder, were poorly hung, and other works were rejected outright.¹⁰

In response, Lathrop and La Farge organized a "protest exhibition" later in 1875 at the Cottier Gallery in New York. It was billed as an exhibition of independent artists, perhaps in imitation of the infamous 1874 Salon des Independents in Paris that marked the debut of the Impressionists. The exhibition was dominated by Barbizon-influenced works, making it the first such display in the United States. In order to distinguish it from Academy exhibitions, La Farge insisted on decorative works, such as his *Fish* (figure 1.2), rather than landscapes and portraits. It was a huge critical success, and in response, the leaders of the National Academy promised fair treatment of the younger artists. Modern scholar Jennifer Bienenstock has suggested that the Academy's promise, and anticipation of the Centennial Exhibition, caused the "new coalition" to delay further

⁸ Bienenstock, 15.

⁹ Margaret C. Conrads, *Winslow Homer and the Critics: Forging a National Art in the 1870s* (exh. cat., The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, 2001), 65, 73.

¹⁰ Bienenstock, 19.

action until after 1876.¹¹ This implies that there were specific expectations for the American art exhibition in Philadelphia, and that perhaps the Centennial Exhibition played a role in the conflict between the two factions. By this time the group referred to as the “new men” (with slightly inaccurate gender specificity) had expanded to include more Paris-trained artists, including Edward Moran, Daniel Ridgeway Knight, Thomas Hovenden, and Maria Oakey.¹²

Clarence Cook’s review of the 1876 National Academy of Design exhibition, just a few months before the opening of the Centennial Exhibition, acknowledged the accumulated stresses of the moment in his comment, “probably some of the painters at present represented on the walls of the Academy do feel that now or never is the time to justify the wishes and expectations that have been formed for them.”¹³ The actions of the younger men were later called “the rebellion of 1876.”¹⁴ The following year a group of these artists and sympathetic critics would form a breakaway group, the Society of American Artists. But during the Centennial year, this unresolved conflict would color the creation of the American art display at Fairmount Park, and these problems were only intensified by the late start on planning, which began when tensions were at their highest.

Centennial organizers anticipated a fine arts display from the fair’s inception; however, there is no record of any planning activity for the art exhibition itself until

¹¹ Bienenstock, 18-23.

¹² Margaret C. Conrads, “‘In the Midst of an Era of Revolution’: The New York Art Press and the Annual Exhibitions of the National Academy of Design in the 1870s,” in *Rave Reviews: American Art and Its Critics, 1826-1925*, ed. David B. Dearing (exh. cat., National Academy of Design, New York, 2000), 94.

¹³ *New York Evening Telegram*, 3 February 1876, 3; quoted in Conrads, *Winslow Homer and the Critics*, 88.

¹⁴ William Peirce Randel, *Centennial: American Life in 1876* (Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company, 1927), 385.

1875.¹⁵ Instead, attention was lavished on Memorial Hall, the facility that would house it.¹⁶ The Centennial Exhibition was the first international exposition to include a significant permanent structure dedicated to painting and sculpture, and most future world's fairs would follow suit.¹⁷ Indeed, it was referenced time and again in the press as the structure's defining feature. The Mitchell Bill, signed on March 27, 1873, authorized a \$500,000 appropriation for the Centennial Exhibition, and included a provision that "the edifice" would become an art museum.¹⁸ The language of the provision reflects the original plan that the art exhibition be contained within the Main Building. Plans for buildings on the grounds expanded and contracted over the next several months, and by November 1873 the Centennial Committee designated a separate structure, Memorial Hall, as the art gallery.¹⁹

An architectural competition yielded designs that were far too expensive to implement, and the task of designing Memorial Hall, as well as most of the other buildings on the fairgrounds, fell to Hermann J. Schwarzmann, the head of Fairmount Park's department of Engineering.²⁰ Ground was broken on July 4, 1874, and work was

¹⁵ John Sartain, "Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Art," in *International Exhibition, 1876. Report of the Director-General, Including the Reports of Bureaus of Administration*, vol. 1, United States Centennial Commission (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 135.

¹⁶ Memorial Hall will be discussed here only briefly, and as it relates to American art exhibition. Bruno Giberti's *Designing the Centennial: A History of the 1876 International Exhibition in Philadelphia* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2002) discusses in depth the development of the design plans and the building.

¹⁷ Robert W. Rydell, John E. Findling, and Kimberly D. Pelle, *Fair America: World's Fairs in the United States* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000), 21.

¹⁸ John Henry Hicks, "The United States Centennial Exhibition of 1876" (Ph.D. diss., University of Georgia, 1972), 43.

¹⁹ Bruno Giberti, "The Classified Landscape: Consumption, Commodity Order, and the 1876 Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1994), 67, 86.

²⁰ Giberti, "Classified Landscape," 98.

finished at the late date of March 1, 1876, little more than two months before the exhibition's opening.²¹

An address dated March 27, 1875 from a "Philadelphia Committee of Artists" announced that Memorial Hall was to become a national museum.²² The idea was discussed further that summer, and the Pennsylvania Museum was chartered in February of 1876.²³ At this time the Corcoran Gallery in Washington D.C. and the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York had been operating for six years, and the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston would open its new building in the Centennial year. Clearly Philadelphians planned to overtake all three in creating an institution that would represent the entire country, and these ambitions may have distracted them from the task of planning the first exhibition that the structure would contain.

Schwarzmann's Memorial Hall was built from brick, granite, glass and iron in the "modern Renaissance" style.²⁴ It has been said that the design did little to advance the progress of American architecture, and has in fact been traced to an 1867 Prix de Rome architectural project by Nicolas Felix Escalier.²⁵ It was impressive, however, for its sheer size and capacity, and its statistics were trumpeted proudly by newspapers and magazines. Erected at a cost of \$1.5 million, the building (still extant) measures 365 feet long and 210 feet wide.²⁶ The central hall and galleries combined can hold eight thousand

²¹ Rebecca Trumbull, *Memorial Hall: A History* (Philadelphia: Fairmount Park Council for Historic Sites, 1986), 2.

²² Sartain, "Report of the Chief," 148.

²³ *First and Second Reports of the Board of Trustees of the Pennsylvania Museum and School of Industrial Art, 1876-77* (Philadelphia: Review Printing House, 1878), 7.

²⁴ Giberti, "Classified Landscape," 103.

²⁵ John Maass, *The Glorious Enterprise: The Centennial Exhibition of 1876 and H.J. Schwartzmann, Architect-in-Chief* (Watkins Glen, NY: American Life Foundation, 1973), 50.

²⁶ "The Centennial Exhibition," *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 162, 164.

people, making it almost twice the size of the largest hall in the country at that time.²⁷ It also sounded a challenging note to other East Coast cities as an aspiring “national” museum. It was considerably larger than New York’s Metropolitan Museum of Art’s modest quarters at 128 West Fourteenth Street (figure 1.3), several times larger than Washington D.C.’s Corcoran Gallery, and half again as large as the Boston Art Museum (now known as the Museum of Fine Arts).²⁸

The building’s central location on the fairgrounds evidenced the high expectations for the fine art exhibition. One of the principal entrances to the fairgrounds was directly in front of the Main Building, and a walk through its central corridor would deposit the visitor squarely in front of Memorial Hall (figure 1.4). The opening and the closing ceremonies were held in the space between the two buildings, with stages positioned at each entrance (figure 1.5).²⁹ This ceremonial space paralleled the conceptual space being traversed from the commercial realm of the Main Building with its manufactures, to the “sacred ground” of Memorial Hall. The art exhibition could be seen as the fulfillment of all the activity that had produced the dazzling array of goods in the Main Building. However, the proximity of the buildings also held the risk of conflation, making the fine arts display merely an extension of the productions available in the Main Building. The problem of maintaining the distinction between the two would generate considerable debate.

²⁷ K., “Centennial Exhibition,” *Journal of the Franklin Institute* 70 (July 1875): 18; Maass, 46.

²⁸ Memorial Hall’s footprint measured approximately 76,650 square feet, the Corcoran Gallery’s measured approximately 12,500 feet, and the Museum of Fine Arts’ covered approximately 58,000 square feet. See Alan Wallach, *Exhibiting Contradiction: Essays on the Art Museum in the United States* (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998), 34 and Walter Muir Whitehill, *Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: A Centennial History* (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1970), 23-5.

²⁹ United States Centennial Commission, International Exhibition, 1876, *Reports of the President, Secretary, and Executive Committee, Together With the Journal of the Final Session of the Commission*, vol. 2 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 27.

“We regret that we have not done more”: Preparations for the Fine Arts Exhibition

President Ulysses S. Grant’s remarks at the opening of the Exhibition included this apology for the United States’ lack of cultural progress.³⁰ His regrets could have been just as aptly applied to the slow start on the fine arts exhibition that was meant to show that progress. The Centennial Exhibition was an undertaking of unprecedented scope in the United States, and in spite of earlier experiences with smaller fairs, Americans were not prepared for its size and complexity. Organizers had to learn by doing, and as a result, the groups governing and planning the exhibition evolved over the years. In its early stages, exhibition planning was undertaken on a volunteer basis. Prominent citizens of major cities had become accustomed to working together on community projects, particularly for the Sanitary Fairs held during the Civil War that raised funds for the relief of Union troops. However, these were generally local events restricted to one city. Organizing a national event proved to be far more difficult.

Two Centennial Commissioners were appointed from every state, and this distinguished assembly met for the first time on March 3, 1872. It quickly became clear that the group would accomplish little, since most lived far away. An Executive Committee of thirteen was formed to carry out their duties. Most of them were Philadelphians, owing to the need for a quorum at meetings.³¹ Philadelphians arranged

³⁰ Dee Brown, *The Year of the Century: 1876* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1966), 127.

³¹ Faith K. Pizop, “Preparations for The Centennial Exhibition of 1876,” *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 94 (April 1970): 218-9. The group met twice more in 1872, then only once each year until the opening of the Exhibition. See United States Centennial Commission, *Appendix to the Reports of the United States Centennial Commission and Centennial Board of Finance* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1879), 1.

most of the financing and accomplished the lion's share of the organizational tasks, so that in very real ways, the exhibition reflected their view of the world.³²

The logistical needs of the art exhibition were similarly complex, and like the fair as a whole, its organization was a muddled, catch-as-can affair in the years leading up the Exhibition opening. Various official and unofficial groups attempted to make plans and facilitate arrangements, including artist organizations, established civic groups, state boards, and informal committees of artists. Though these efforts were well-intentioned, little progress was made until September 1875 with the formal appointment of an Art Bureau Chief and paid staff who could dedicate themselves entirely to the art exhibition. However, the activities of these groups in the months and years preceding were not fruitless. They galvanized artists and began preparations at local levels, while also reinforcing strong feelings about each city's contribution, and setting into motion one of the American art exhibition's greatest controversies.

In the absence of action from the Centennial Exhibition's Commissioners or its Executive Committee, it might be expected that Philadelphia artist organizations would provide leadership. The Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts would seem to be the obvious candidate to fill such a role, paralleling the strong part played by the National Academy of Design in New York. However, the Pennsylvania Academy had very little to do with the organization of the Centennial Exhibition's fine art display.³³ Its members and supporters were among those best suited and most needed for the Centennial Exhibition, but as an institution they were working frantically to fund and build the

³² Rydell et al., 19.

³³ In fact, the Pennsylvania Academy's archivist attests to regular requests for information on the Centennial Exhibition that cannot be honored, since they hold no records on the event.

Pennsylvania Academy's elaborate new High Victorian Gothic building that opened that year (figure 1.6).

Some individual Philadelphia artists made attempts to help, however feeble. An informal group known as the "Committee of Philadelphia Artists" consisted of the painters W.J. Clark, Jr., F.O.C. Darley, Peter Rothermel, F.B. Schnell, Christian Schussele, and P.F. Wharton, the sculptors J.A. Bailly and Howard Roberts, the architect Henry C. Sims, and the engravers J.W. Lauderbach and John Sartain, all of the Philadelphia Sketch Club.³⁴ On March 27, 1875 the group issued a circular "to the artists of the United States," exhorting them to participate:

As contributions to the Exhibition will undoubtedly be made by the most celebrated foreign artists...it is peculiarly important that American painters, sculptors, architects, engravers, and other art-workers should use every endeavor to...do honor to the country and to the occasion.³⁵

The artists complained that their inspiring but vague call received no reply, and it appears that the group made no further efforts, though some of its members would later serve on official committees.³⁶

Into this void stepped the Fairmount Park Art Association, a little-known civic organization whose modest efforts for the American art exhibition would have a decisive effect. In 1870 the Fairmount Park Commissioners expressed a need for a free art gallery in the city, and as a result the Fairmount Park Art Association was established the following year. The group quickly grew to thirteen hundred members. The city government authorized the Fairmount Park Commissioners "to construct within the Park a suitable fire-proof building for a Public Art Gallery and Museum, for free exhibition at

³⁴ Sartain, "Report of the Chief," 148-9; Sellin, *The First Pose*, 44-5.

³⁵ Sellin, *The First Pose*, 45.

³⁶ "Art at the Centennial," *The Evening Post* (New York), 30 August 1875, 2.

all times.”³⁷ The gallery was built between 1872 and 1873 by the ubiquitous Schwarzmann.³⁸ It was an unassuming 140’ x 43’ structure comprising a cast-iron skeleton with masonry construction, skylights, plastered walls, and a cement floor (figure 1.7).³⁹

The gallery was created with the Centennial Exhibition in mind; a contemporary writer connected the Park Art Gallery to the state appropriation for Memorial Hall.⁴⁰ However, unlike Memorial Hall, the Park Art Gallery would not be permanent, and it was understood that the materials for the building would be used in other structures “when this temporary building may no longer be necessary.”⁴¹ A Centennial guidebook describes the Fairmount Park Art Association’s mission as an interim repository for works of art, “forming a nucleus to the more elaborate exhibition in the Memorial Art Gallery.”

The Park Art Gallery was defined by one particular work: Peter Rothermel’s *The Battle of Gettysburg* of c. 1870 (figure 1.8). The minutes of the Fairmount Park Commission record their resolution of May 10, 1873 to accept and display Rothermel’s behemoth, along with four smaller accompanying scenes. The largest American painting ever created, it measures over thirty-one feet wide, and it would have dominated an entire wall of the gallery. The minutes noted parenthetically that the group planned to display other history paintings there too, including Benjamin West’s *Christ Rejected* (Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts), Ferdinand Pauwel’s *New Republic* (unlocated),

³⁷ Philip Quilibet, “Drift-Wood: The Centenary,” *Galaxy* 20 (July 1875): 120.

³⁸ Maass, 21.

³⁹ Donald A. Winer, “Rothermel’s Battle of Gettysburg: A Victorian’s Heroic View of The Civil War,” *Nineteenth Century* 1 (Winter 1975): 9.

⁴⁰ Quilibet, July 1875, 120.

⁴¹ Winer, 9.

which depicted the past and future progress of the United States, and other works which are known only by their titles, such as *Orestes Pursued by the Furies*, and *The Proclamation of Emancipation*.⁴²

Rothermel's painting was well known far beyond Philadelphia, but it lacked a permanent home. The State of Pennsylvania had commissioned Rothermel to paint *The Battle of Gettysburg* in 1866. United States governmental bodies were (and are) often castigated for their reluctance to patronize the arts, and it is astonishing that a state government bearing up under the financial and emotional toll of a costly war would spend \$25,000 (\$282,500 today) to commemorate its bloodiest battle. The decision was probably meant to honor General George G. Meade, the Philadelphian hero of Gettysburg and a founding commissioner of Fairmount Park, and also to memorialize a pivotal battle that took place on Pennsylvania soil. The city's own patronage of history painting and the presence of a renowned history painter probably helped inspire the idea. The prominent Philadelphia collector Joseph Harrison held an extensive collection of history paintings, and opened his galleries to the public.⁴³ Moreover, though he is not widely known today, Rothermel was intensely admired in Philadelphia as a traditional history painter in the grand manner.

The Battle of Gettysburg may well have been Rothermel's first attempt at rendering a contemporary event, as his subjects were generally taken from literature, the Bible, or early American history. Rothermel was not at Gettysburg -- he did not serve in

⁴² Minutes of Meeting of the Commissioners of Fairmount Park, 10 May 1873, Fairmount Park Commission Archives, n.p.; Winer, 9; *Hand-Book to the Centennial Grounds and Fairmount Park: Where to Go and What to See* (Philadelphia: John E. Potter & Company, 1876), 18; John C. McIlhenny and Martha Halpern, Philadelphia, to Donald Winer, Harrisburg, PA, 25 June 1984, Fairmount Park Commission Archives, 1.

⁴³ Jochen Wierich, "The Domestication of History in American Art" (Ph.D. diss., College of William and Mary, 1998), 101.

the army -- but he made every effort at a historically accurate rendering. The artist spent three years conducting interviews and making sketches. Given the extent of Rothermel's preparations, it is surprising that his research did not extend to checking on size limitations: the final canvas was too large for its intended home in the state capitol building. The legislature agreed that the artist could exhibit the painting, and after an initial showing in Philadelphia, *The Battle of Gettysburg* was displayed in Boston, Pittsburgh, and Chicago.⁴⁴

Sometime after that, Rothermel secured permission to show the painting at Fairmount Park, a logical choice given Meade's involvement as a Park Commissioner.⁴⁵ Some accounts posit that the Park Art Gallery was built for this specific purpose. Keeping in mind its other stated function, to house works that would be included in the Centennial Exhibition, it can be argued that the Fairmount Park Art Association thrust *The Battle of Gettysburg* into the American art exhibition in spite of an official ban of Civil War subjects -- an inclusion for which Sartain was later blamed. It does not appear that the Fairmount Park Art Association made any other planning efforts for the American art exhibition, but their actions with regard to Rothermel's painting were sufficient to lay the groundwork for the political and artistic controversy that followed, as his bloody painting loomed over an event billed as a celebration of national peace and unity.⁴⁶

⁴⁴ Mark Edward Thistlethwaite, *Painting in the Grand Manner: The Art of Peter Frederick Rothermel (1812-1895)* (exh. cat., Brandywine River Museum, Chadds Ford, PA, 1995), 21-2.

⁴⁵ *Fairmount Park Art Association: An Account of its Origin and Activities* (Philadelphia: Fairmount Park Art Association, 1922), 32.

⁴⁶ Centennial regulations prohibited "articles that are in any way dangerous or offensive." See United States Centennial Commission, *International Exhibition, Fairmount Park, 1876: Acts of Congress, Rules and Regulations, Description of the Buildings* (Philadelphia: U.S. Centennial Commission, 1875), 26. In a letter to Centennial Exhibition Director-General Goshorn, Sartain mentioned Goshorn's "decided objection to all that class of pictures that were calculated to awaken ill feeling in our Southern visitors, such as the Battle of

In the absence of official leadership for the Art Department, state and local groups outside of Philadelphia formed to organize their contributions, strengthening each one's particular identity. The State Boards for the Centennial Exhibition were composed of civic leaders who oversaw their state's entire contribution, and under their auspices, artists also formed committees to monitor their community's participation. These groups were so active in fact, that an early Centennial scholar would claim that the art department was "handled" by state committees.⁴⁷

The New York contingent was of course led by National Academicians. This group issued a circular dated January 24, 1875 over the names of Worthington Whittredge, Daniel Huntington, and Frank Leslie, Chairman of the New York State Centennial Board. The notice outlined three desired classes of works: those by living artists, those by deceased American artists, and those by foreign artists belonging to United States residents.⁴⁸ Whittredge and Huntington had decided that a defining feature of the exhibition would be early American works. Later accounts attest to New Yorkers' continued enthusiasm about the retrospective: in February of 1876 the *New-York Times* reported with excitement that Leverett Saltonstall, State Art Commissioner for Massachusetts was "ransacking" the state for works by Copley and West, Philadelphia was searching out Gilbert Stuart portraits, and it was hoped that the New York State Commissioner would find some works by John Trumbull to contribute.⁴⁹

Gettysburg." Such a frank acknowledgement that the picture went against Goshorn's regulations suggests that Sartain was not responsible. See JS to Director General A.T. Goshorn, Philadelphia, 21 July 1876, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Sartain Family Papers (Phi 1650), reel 4563, frame 221. Reel and frame numbers refer to microfilm in the Archives of American Art. All letters from John Sartain (JS) originate in Philadelphia.

⁴⁷ Mildred Byars Matthews, "The Painters of the Hudson River School in the Philadelphia Centennial of 1876," *Art in America* 34 (July 1946): 147.

⁴⁸ Sartain, "Report of the Chief," 152-3.

⁴⁹ "Art and the Centennial," *New-York Times*, 5 February 1876, 5.

In addition, they asked for foreign works owned by Americans. The “special regulations” for the Centennial Exhibition affirmed that “works of foreign artists belonging to residents of the United States will be admitted, on the approval of the Committee of Selection, for exhibition in a special gallery.”⁵⁰ Organizers were eager to assure foreign visitors of Americans’ discriminating taste, and this part of the exhibition, known as the “Loan Collection,” was intended to demonstrate that the collectors of the United States were not only aware of European art, but were also sophisticated enough to choose the finest works from among the masses of dubious old masters and the rafts of canvases, good and bad, by contemporary painters.

Massachusetts artists were particularly well organized. Three subcommittees were formed, one as a clearinghouse and point of distribution for information, consisting of Gilbert Attwood, B.C. Porter, Dr. J.H. Wright, and Charles C. Perkins, ex officio. The second subcommittee included artists Walter M. Brackett, William Allan Gay, George Inness, William E. Norton, Alfred Ordway, Thomas Robinson, Frank Hill Smith, and Charles C. Perkins, ex officio. This group was in charge of “the collection of the works of Contemporary Artists of Massachusetts, and supervision of the duties connected with the Exhibition of all the Massachusetts collection, and the packing and transportation of the works Art to and from Philadelphia.”

The third committee included artists, architects, and collectors Edward C. Cabot, Ernest W. Longfellow, Augustus T. Perkins, Henry Sayles, Andrew C. Wheelwright, Dr. J.H. Wright, Roger Wolcott, and once again Charles C. Perkins, ex officio. This group was to collect works of deceased Massachusetts artists “in order to form as far as possible a chronological series from our earliest Artists to the present time.” Massachusetts artists

⁵⁰ Sartain, “Report of the Chief,” 147.

too took for granted that the exhibition would be largely historical in character. This charge received the most attention in their circular, and flowered into a patriotic appeal:

The material exists in our community; there are willing hands to do the work; there is no element wanting for its entire success save a ready response to this circular. Does any one pride himself upon the possession of a historical painting? He is already a lover of Art. Let him reflect what pleasure he would experience in seeing a collection of such works brought together for the first time. Let him consider the pleasure and instruction which such an Exhibition will give to thousands in our midst who have no such treasures of their own, but whose hearts will swell with gratitude for such an opportunity.⁵¹

The Massachusetts group demonstrated its pride in its contribution with an exhibition at the Boston Art Club of works bound for the Centennial. Proceeds from the event defrayed the expenses of packing, shipping and insurance.⁵² Bostonians also published a folio commemorating the works sent to Philadelphia entitled *Massachusetts Artists' Centennial Album*.⁵³ The book even includes sketches of the paintings contributed, and stands as a unique document of the exhibition.

In January 1875 A.T. Goshorn, Director-General of the Centennial Exhibition, took what appears to be one of the first official actions toward organizing the art exhibition, as he displayed the foresight to plan for the shipping of works from American artists abroad. Also, in March of that year he issued a circular of “special regulations” for the art exhibition:⁵⁴

Works of Art will be admitted for exhibition whether previously exhibited or not. No charge will be made for space....All works of Art must be of a high order of

⁵¹ Sartain, “Report of the Chief,” 154.

⁵² Alex., “Massachusetts Artists and the Centennial,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 13 March 1876, 6. When Worthington Whittredge later complained about these costs for the New York contingent, Art Bureau Chief John Sartain referred to Boston’s foresight in a not so subtle dig, asking whether “is here [in New York] public spirit so much less than that of Boston.” See JS to Worthington Whittredge, [no city], 14 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1276.

⁵³ James Wells Champney, *Massachusetts Artists' Centennial Album* (Boston: J.R. Osgood & Co., 1876).

⁵⁴ Hicks, 164.

merit, and those produced by citizens of the United States will be admitted to the exhibition on approval of the Committee of Selection, composed of artists.⁵⁵

This circular delineates a few important guidelines that speak to early aspirations for the exhibition. Works would be held to a high standard, and most importantly, they would be judged by professional artists, rather than collectors.

Exhibition officials finally created a Bureau of Fine Arts as of April 30, 1875, just one year before the opening. No Bureau Chief or staff of any kind was named, but a volunteer “Fine Arts Committee” was formed.⁵⁶ The group was composed of prominent collectors and artists from New York and Philadelphia. Including artists on this committee was somewhat unusual, and probably a response to problems with earlier fairs. The *New-York Times* complained about the long-standing problem of exhibitions being dominated by collectors, artists rebelling and refusing to lend, and patrons in turn being forced to draw only from their own collections, and not from artists’ studios, thus limiting the works available. Interestingly, Boston was not represented at this stage, perhaps because the committee represented a compromise between the city that had won the Centennial site and its fiercest competitor.⁵⁷

New York and Philadelphia had competed intensely to host the exhibition. Not only were tremendous financial benefits at stake, but also the honor of representing the country’s past, and more importantly, its future. After the choice of Philadelphia was announced, the *New-York Times* was barely conciliatory, writing that “New-York tenders the hand of good fellowship, and gives unmistakable token that she will do honor to herself and the exhibition by taking that important and prominent part to which her

⁵⁵ “In the Studios: The Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 1 (1875): 383.

⁵⁶ “Centennial Monuments,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 30 April 1875, 2; “An American Artist,” “Art at the Centennial,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 16 September 1875, 5.

⁵⁷ “American Art,” *New-York Times*, 12 December 1875, 6.

history and position as the foremost commercial City of the Union so well entitles her.”⁵⁸ Even the writer only known as “Bricktop” managed a jab at Philadelphia in his farcical guide to the Exhibition, hinting that his readers might not even have heard of it. He wrote of getting to the Centennial Exhibition, “Of course everybody knows where New York is...but as there is a great show going on at Philadelphia (a large city in the State of Pennsylvania), the author thinks that a few illustrated hints relative to getting there from the metropolis would not be out of place.”⁵⁹

The chairman for the Fine Arts Committee was Philadelphian James L. Claghorn, who started his career at the family auction house of Myers, Claghorn & Co., and later became President of Commercial National Bank. He was a longtime art enthusiast who wished to encourage “native talent”; at one point he owned over two hundred paintings by American artists, including Philadelphia history painters Peter Rothermel and Christian Schussele, landscapist Herman Herzog, and the figure painter Thomas Sully, as well as New York-based landscape painters Albert Bierstadt, Jasper Francis Cropsey, Asher B. Durand, William Trost Richards, and Worthington Whittredge. He was among the founding commissioners of Fairmount Park, and a member of its Committee on Works of Art.⁶⁰ As President of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts he had the experience to lead a large and complex enterprise.

Unfortunately Claghorn was a leader in name only. His interest in American art may have been merely patriotic, since it was noted that “many pictures he bought to help

⁵⁸ “New-York’s Centennial Appeal,” *The New-York Times*, 25 December 1874, 3.

⁵⁹ Bricktop, *Going to the Centennial and A Guy to the Great Exhibition* (New York: Collin & Small, 1876), 3.

⁶⁰ *Fairmount Park Art Association: An Account*, 33, 87-9; James Lawrence Claghorn papers, Archives of American Art, reel 4131, frame 329-35, and scrapbook, pp. 78-9 (no frame numbers).

the artist, rather than for his own gratification as a collector.”⁶¹ His real love was European prints, and in the 1870s he was said to have the country’s largest collection, ranging from the old masters Dürer and Rembrandt to the contemporary artists Whistler and Fortuny.⁶² His interest in painting must have been on the wane during this period, because five months after the Centennial closed, the *Philadelphia Press* announced that Claghorn would sell all of his paintings and devote himself completely to engravings and etchings.⁶³ In addition, during the summer of 1875, which should have been a period of intense activity and planning for the Centennial, Claghorn was overwhelmed with work on the Pennsylvania Academy’s new building.⁶⁴ Little is known of the other Philadelphia collector on the committee, Henry C. Gibson, beyond his service as a founding trustee of the Fairmount Park Art Association and Chair of its Committee on Works of Art.⁶⁵ The remaining Philadelphia committee member was the artist Peter Rothermel.

The New York contingent of the Fine Arts Committee included such luminaries as John Taylor Johnston, President of the Central Railroad of New Jersey and founding President of the Metropolitan Museum of Art. He was a generous philanthropist and an active collector: he and his fellow Advisory Committee member William Tilden Blodgett scouted out and secured the group of Dutch and Flemish paintings that formed the core of the Metropolitan’s collection. He built two galleries onto his house at 8 Fifth Avenue, and opened his collection to the public one day a week. As an enthusiastic collector he

⁶¹ *Fairmount Park Art Association: An Account*, 87-9.

⁶² Helena E. Wright, “Prints in the Sartains’ Circle” in *Philadelphia’s Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*, eds. Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000), 27-8.

⁶³ Dorothy E. C. Ditter, “The Cultural Climate of the Centennial City: Philadelphia, 1875-1876” (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1947), 153, 166.

⁶⁴ JS to Emily Sartain, Philadelphia, 3 July 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 738.

⁶⁵ *Fairmount Park Art Association: An Account*, 33, 38.

seemed well-suited for the committee, but like Claghorn, Johnston sold his collection soon after the Centennial Exhibition closed.⁶⁶

William Tilden Blodgett owned a varnish manufacturing concern and was the principal founder of the popular periodical *The Nation*. He was a generous supporter of the National Academy of Design and an active trustee of the Metropolitan, working with Johnston to establish its collection. In the 1850s he began to form a gallery of American art, collecting the work of Eastman Johnson, Sanford Gifford, and Daniel Huntington, and most notably, Frederic Church's *Heart of the Andes* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art). He was also part of the selection committee for American art at the Exposition Universelle of 1867. However, in the years after the Civil War he began to pursue paintings by fashionable French artists such as Jean-Léon Gérôme, Thomas Couture, Ernest Meissonier, and Rosa Bonheur.⁶⁷ Blodgett passed away and was replaced in 1875 by New Yorker William J. Hoppin, who was a well-traveled lawyer, diplomat, and writer, though he was not noted as a collector.⁶⁸ The artist representative from New York was Worthington Whittredge, prominent Hudson River School painter and long-time President of the embattled National Academy of Design.

No records have been found of the Fine Art Committee's activities. However, it is known that a retrospective of American art was discussed early on, and the Fine Arts Committee officially decided in late October of 1875 to include art of the previous century "to impart a historic value to the Exhibition."⁶⁹ The *New York Evening Post*

⁶⁶ John A. Garraty and Mark C. Carnes, *American National Biography*, vol. 12 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 155.

⁶⁷ S.H. Tyng, *Address on the Occasion of the Funeral of William T. Blodgett* (n.p., 1875), 31-4, 44, 61, 63-4.

⁶⁸ See William J. Hoppin papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

⁶⁹ "Art at the Centennial," *New York Herald*, 23 October 1875, 5.

approved the idea, commenting “we are sure that no feature of the exhibition will prove more attractive,” but warned that “there is none, certainly, that calls for more intelligent supervision.”⁷⁰ The writer, along with many others, recognized that such a presentation would be of great import. An official announcement encouraged American artists to help:

Patriotism demands that American Artists should use their utmost efforts to make the Art Department of the Exhibition fully equal in all respects to the other departments by the contribution of works which will show the advancement of art in the United States during the past hundred years, and display to the best advantage the peculiar characteristics of American art.⁷¹

Aside from sanctioning the retrospective, the collector members’ interest in American art seems lukewarm at best. With the members living in two different cities and occupied with projects of more intense local interest, it is not surprising that little was accomplished.

All the groups working on behalf of the American art display hoped that artists would prepare works especially for the Centennial Exhibition. However, in September 1875 the *New York Evening Telegraph* scolded artists for their apathy toward the Centennial, writing that “they talk of it as if it were a joke or a dream.”⁷² Some may have feared that the exhibition was mainly a commercial enterprise, and that their work would be placed on a footing with manufactures. On a practical level, time constraints may have presented a problem. Information on the fine arts exhibition was distributed a year in advance; however, a working staff was not appointed for the art department until only eight months before the opening. Those waiting for some confirmation that the exhibition would actually happen found themselves with little time to prepare.

⁷⁰ “American Art at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 24 September 1875, 2.

⁷¹ Sartain, “Report of the Chief,” 148.

⁷² “Art Apathy,” *New York Evening Telegram*, 1 September 1875, 2.

Some artists were reported to be creating works with the American art exhibition in mind. Interestingly, most accounts discuss the work of expatriates; perhaps their activities were more likely to be covered in art journals, whereas the work of resident artists could be seen with a visit to their studios. In addition, expatriate artists were familiar with world's fairs in Paris and London, and they could approach the idea with greater confidence. Centennial Commissioner John W. Forney noted the presence of *Hiawatha* (on loan to The Metropolitan Museum of Art) in Augustus Saint-Gaudens' studio in Rome, and mentioned that the sculptor "contemplated an appropriate contribution to our Exposition" (though in the end he sent not *Hiawatha*, but his bust of the Hon. William Evarts [The Metropolitan Museum of Art]).⁷³ In Florence sculptors Pierce Francis Connelly, Thomas Gould, Larkin Mead, H.R. Park, Preston Powers, and William G. Turner were preparing pieces for the Centennial.⁷⁴ Sculptor Harriet Hosmer reportedly stayed in her studio all through the heat of the Roman summer to work on her contributions, which she sent to the Women's Pavilion.⁷⁵ The Philadelphian sculptor Howard Roberts was working in Paris on his *La Premiere Pose* (figure 1.9) for the Centennial as early as 1873,⁷⁶ perhaps motivated by civic loyalty. James Crawford Thom was preparing two large French river scenes at morning and evening.⁷⁷ Other American artists reported to be taking "a deep interest" in the exhibition included Daniel Ridgeway

⁷³ John W. Forney, *A Centennial Commissioner in Europe* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1876), 116.

⁷⁴ David Sellin, "The Centennial," in *Sculpture of a City: Philadelphia's Treasures in Bronze and Stone* (New York: Walker Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), 85.

⁷⁵ "Miss Hosmer's Work for the Centennial Exhibition," *The Evening Post* (New York), 20 March 1876, 2.

⁷⁶ Sellin, *The First Pose*, 41.

⁷⁷ "Fine Arts," *The Evening Post* (New York), 18 October 1875, 2.

Knight and G.P.A. Healy.⁷⁸ The *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* patriotically reported on several Philadelphia artists submitting paintings.⁷⁹

A few painters were said to be working on the type of large-scale historical themes that organizers hoped for. Edwin White, then residing in Florence, attempted a piece on “The Signing of the Compact on the Mayflower,” but ill health forced him to forego the project, and he sent three small pictures instead.⁸⁰ Paris expatriate Henry Bacon was working on a “historical picture” as well, probably his *The Boston Boys and General Gage* (figure 2.28), which appeared at the Centennial Exhibition.⁸¹

There was little news of resident artists’ efforts, but one Philadelphian painter had ambitious plans. After his *Schreiber Brothers* (Yale University Art Gallery) was rejected by the National Academy of Design in 1875, Thomas Eakins submitted his work to exhibitions abroad in Paris and London.⁸² However, he had great intentions for the Centennial Exhibition in his large *portrait d’apparat* of Dr. Samuel Gross. It was not a commission, but was begun at his own behest, and he set aside virtually all his other projects that year to concentrate on *The Gross Clinic* (figure 1.10), his first large-scale canvas. Eakins wrote to Earl Shinn in April 1875, “I have just got a new picture blocked in and it is far better than anything I have ever done...I have the greatest hopes of this

⁷⁸ Forney, 34-5. No pictures by Knight appeared at the Centennial Exhibition, but several by Healy were included.

⁷⁹ “Art Notes: Centennial Work by Philadelphia Artists,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 20 March 1876, 1.

⁸⁰ “Fine Arts,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 15 March 1876, 1.

⁸¹ “Art and Artists,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 14 December 1875, 6.

⁸² Sellin, *The First Pose*, 54.

one.”⁸³ He no doubt realized that the Centennial Exhibition offered unprecedented exposure for a young artist.⁸⁴

Complaints about the Fine Arts Committee’s inaction mounted in the late summer and early fall of 1875, particularly (and not surprisingly) in the New York press. The *New York Herald* decried the lack of progress on August 17, 1875, and suggested the formation of a national committee to collect and arrange works. The writer also joined the growing chorus calling for a display of paintings by earlier American artists.⁸⁵ On August 26 both the *New York Evening Post* and the *Daily Tribune* complained that nothing seemed to be happening.⁸⁶ The *Boston Daily Evening Transcript* joined the fray five days later with the comment that “there is little doing, it is said, toward a systematic representation of American art at the Centennial exhibition.”⁸⁷ Even the *Philadelphia Inquirer* admitted that nothing had been done “in order that the Art Department should be fairly representative of the rise and progress of American art,” while other nations were well advanced in their preparations. The same article referenced an open letter from a Mr. Lambdin (probably the artist George Cochran Lambdin) offering the assistance of the National Academy of Design.⁸⁸ This indicated the Academy’s lack of confidence in the organizers, but also their recognition of the exhibition’s importance.

By September 1875 the complaints reached a fever pitch. The *New-York Daily Tribune* reported a feeling among artists at home and abroad that “American Art is totally

⁸³ The Cadbury Collection, Friends Historical Library, Swarthmore College, PA; quoted in Sellin, *The First Pose*, 45.

⁸⁴ Darrel Sewell, “Thomas Eakins and American Art,” in *Thomas Eakins*, ed. Darrel Sewell (exh. cat., Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2001), xvii.

⁸⁵ “American Art at the Centennial,” *New York Herald*, 17 August 1875, 6.

⁸⁶ “American Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 26 August 1875, 2; “The Centennial Exhibition,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 26 August 1875, 2.

⁸⁷ “Art and Artists,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 31 August 1875, 6.

⁸⁸ “American Art at the Centennial,” *Philadelphia Inquirer*, 31 August 1875, 4.

and designedly ignored.”⁸⁹ The *Evening Post* explained that artists needed some indication of the jurying, the criteria, and whether current or past art would be included.⁹⁰ A letter to the editor of the *Daily Tribune* outlined the neglect of American artists, noting that in the fall of 1874 a committee of the National Academy of Design had conferred with the Centennial Commissioners to discuss their plans, but nothing had been done. The writer continued that about six months later a committee was formed of “four or five unsuccessful businessmen and two artists.” Members of the Academy had urged the appointment of a committee of artists several months previous, but were met with indifference.⁹¹ The barrage of criticism finally spurred the Fine Arts Committee to appoint a Chief for the Fine Art Bureau.

“Almost too late to pull the chestnuts out of the fire”

In a letter of August 1875 the Philadelphia engraver John Sartain wrote to his daughter Emily, “Since I declined the Superintendence of the Art Department of the Centennial it now must be six weeks or two months...Goshorn desired to have a talk with me and I went yesterday, and I think it possible I might occupy that honored position after all.”⁹² Apparently the Fine Arts Committee had been pondering the appointment at leisure for some time. Sartain accepted the position and began his work in mid-September,⁹³ just eight months before the exhibition opening, and as modern scholar David Sellin put it, “almost too late to pull the chestnuts out of the fire.”⁹⁴

⁸⁹ “American Art at the Centennial,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 6 September 1875, 4.

⁹⁰ “American Art at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 16 September 1875, 2.

⁹¹ “An American Artist,” “Art at the Centennial,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 16 September 1875, 5.

⁹² HSP, Sartain Papers; quoted in Sellin, *The First Pose*, 45.

⁹³ JS to Thomas Moran, Newark, NJ, 23 September 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1085.

⁹⁴ Sellin, *Sculpture of a City*, 85.

Sartain was undoubtedly Claghorn's choice. As President of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Claghorn was busy with fundraising for the new building, and he left most of the Academy's art business in the hands of Sartain, who was a board member, Secretary, and chair of several committees.⁹⁵ In fact, it appears that the two all but ran the organization themselves; Sartain noted that "so much of the Academy business is carried on by Mr. Claghorn and myself, knowing the Board would approve."⁹⁶

Sartain brought considerable administrative experience and a wealth of contacts and energy to his new position. Born in London in 1808, Sartain's family emigrated to the United States in 1830. Sartain established himself in Philadelphia as a successful engraver and shrewdly associated himself with art engravings, rather than commercial printing. His work encompassed a variety of subjects, including genre scenes of American family life, portraits of historical figures, and fine art reproductions, and he also painted in oil and watercolor.⁹⁷

Sartain was remarkably active in the Philadelphia art community. He spent twenty-two years on the Board of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts and was responsible for resurrecting the institution after a dormant period following the fire of 1845. He spent fourteen years as Vice President of the Philadelphia School of Design for Women, was manager of the Art Union of Philadelphia, and served as an officer of the Artist's Fund Society. Most importantly, he organized the art exhibition of Philadelphia's 1864 Great Central Fair for the United States Sanitary Commission.⁹⁸

⁹⁵ Sellin, *The First Pose*, 7.

⁹⁶ JS to William D. Lewis, 23 October 1876, [no city], HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 384.

⁹⁷ Katharine Martinez, "A Portrait of the Sartain Family and Their Home" in *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*, eds. Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000), 1-5.

⁹⁸ Martinez, "A Portrait of the Sartain Family," 12; Sellin, *The First Pose*, 26.

A prolific writer and publisher, he issued *Sartain's Union Magazine* from 1849 to 1852 and contributed a regular column entitled "Notice of Art and Artists." However, American art works were rarely illustrated; he found it difficult to translate American paintings to engraving because of deadline pressures.⁹⁹ He edited compilations of art reproductions and in 1848 published *The American Gallery of Art*. In the preface he stated his intentions: "It has long been the wish of the Editor to present a work on the 'Painters of America,' richly embellished with engraved specimens from the labors of all the meritorious artists of the country." He hoped to create a series that would form "a gallery of characteristic specimens from the works of the 'Painters of America,' where every artist of merit in the country will be represented."¹⁰⁰ The first volume was less than inspiring; as with Sartain's magazine, the illustrations were dictated by convenience. It included a hodge-podge of engravings of works that seem to have been chosen simply because they were close at hand. The artists represented were for the most part Philadelphians, including Rothermel, Sully, and John Neagle, and several of the paintings were from Sartain's personal collection.¹⁰¹ There was not enough interest to continue the enterprise, but Sartain's work on the Centennial Exhibition offered him the opportunity to realize his "American Gallery of Art" on a larger scale than he would have dreamed possible.

⁹⁹ Ann Katharine Martinez, "The Life and Career of John Sartain (1808-1897): A Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia Printmaker" (Ph.D. diss., George Washington University, 1986), 147-9.

¹⁰⁰ John Sartain, ed., *The American Gallery of Art* (Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1848), iii, iv.

¹⁰¹ Martinez, "Life and Career of John Sartain," 44-5. Sartain was himself a collector of varied tastes. He had an extensive collection of engravings of European paintings by Thomas Lawrence, Leonardo, John Martin, Raphael, and Wilkie that he often drew upon as illustrations for his publications. He owned paintings by such Americans as James Hamilton, Charles L. Leslie, Joshua Shaw, and Thomas Sully. Sartain's tastes did not exclude the Hudson River School; he owned paintings by Thomas Birch and Thomas Doughty. He also owned works in various media by progressive painters including Mariano Fortuny and J.M.W. Turner, and paintings attributed to such old masters as Sir Godfrey Kneller, Claude Lorrain, Michelangelo, Poussin, and Vernet. See Wright, 29-30; Martinez, "Portrait of the Sartain Family," 23; Martinez, "Life and Career of John Sartain," 42.

Sartain believed strongly in art's ability to elevate moral values and cultivate taste. He saw artists as "divine chemists of all spiritual affinities around them." While he was well-versed in the ideals of the art world, he was ultimately a businessman. He showed a keen interest in the art market, and often noted the insurance values assigned to paintings. A master of self-promotion, he frequently welcomed the press into his home and shared stories of himself and his fellow artists.¹⁰² Sartain was a complex and sometimes contradictory figure, by turns idealistic and pragmatic, a fervent supporter of progressive young artists, but not above extending special favors to his personal friends who were of a more conservative bent. Above all, he had a strong idea of what the American art exhibition should look like, and he was willing to bend the rules of propriety to bring it to fruition.

Sartain took up his new position with great fervor, writing to a colleague that "the art exhibition is going to be superb, and my heart is in the American division of it."¹⁰³ He was quick to grasp the historical significance of the exhibition, exhorting Worthington Whittredge that

It is desirable that all artists of merit should send, and I wonder that anyone should be indifferent as to whether his name should be in the Catalogue or not. When the second Centennial arrives [in 1876] that catalogue will become a book of great historic interest, and not a few will be remembered only by the recording type of that singularly interesting volume.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² Martinez, "A Portrait of the Sartain Family," 1, 12. In 1899 Sartain would publish *Reminiscences of a Very Old Man* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1899), a series of self-congratulatory, name-dropping anecdotes from his life. He speculated on the insurance value of Gilbert Stuart's Landsdowne portrait of George Washington, which was shipped from England for the Centennial Exhibition, and he noted that Rothermel's *The Battle of Gettysburg* was insured for \$30,000 in 1886. See Sartain, *Reminiscences*, 255.

¹⁰³ JS to T. Addison Richards, 20 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1230.

¹⁰⁴ JS to Worthington Whittredge, [no city], 14 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1279.

Sartain's charge to organize the United States' art display embraced three categories: works by living American artists, "historical" works by deceased American artists, and a "loan collection" of paintings by foreign artists residing in United States collections. Sartain was particularly enthused about the retrospective that would be formed from the historical works. He wrote to Frank Leslie, Chairman of the New York State Board of Centennial Commissioners to ask that they select "good examples of the work of deceased artists of the century just closing," and suggested a friendly competition between New York and Boston.¹⁰⁵ Notably, he did not suggest a competition between New York and Philadelphia, since competition already existed and it was anything but friendly.

On November 22, 1875, the *New-York Daily Tribune* anxiously asked "Are we to have an embarrassment of riches, or an embarrassment of poverty?"¹⁰⁶ Sartain had taken on an enormous task whose success was far from assured. As Chief of the Bureau of Art he was responsible not only for organizing the American art exhibition, but also for making logistical arrangements for the fine arts contributions of all participating countries. He had eight months to prepare an overall exhibition exceeding seven thousand paintings by nearly twenty-five hundred artists from twenty-nine countries at a time when it took six weeks to exchange a letter with Europe.¹⁰⁷

Sartain inherited all the business that had been neglected by the Fine Arts committee. He diplomatically described how Claghorn passed on to him papers and letters that "appear to have been accumulating on his hands for some time past."¹⁰⁸ A

¹⁰⁵ JS to Frank Leslie, New York, 11 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1195.

¹⁰⁶ "The Great Exhibition: Department of Art," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 22 November 1875, 3.

¹⁰⁷ Maass, 73.

¹⁰⁸ JS to James D. Smillie, Montrose, PA, 14 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1126.

sampling of Sartain's correspondence shows his immediate concerns with securing sufficient space, distributing information, and encouraging artists to participate. Several missives illustrate the broad range of issues that he had to address: a letter to a W. Grut in Patterson, New Jersey suggested that he might inquire with the department of industrial art to submit his "Portrait of Washington made up of the hairs of distinguished men."¹⁰⁹ Sartain's exasperation is evident in a letter dated October 16, 1875 asking an aspiring exhibitor, "Will you please inform me what description of 'Portrait of Washington' yours is, that requires one hundred and ninety two (192) square feet of table space."¹¹⁰

Among his greatest challenges was dealing with New York's art community. New Yorkers considered Philadelphia a provincial outpost, so any Philadelphian named as Chief would have been disdained, and as a practitioner of the "minor art" of engraving, Sartain's appointment was greeted with utter scorn. In New York matters Sartain worked largely through the National Academy of Design, though his relationship with the Academicians was strained. Sartain initially made light of the situation, writing "The fish wife said that eels were used to skinning, but if she had said it of me there would have been more truth in it."¹¹¹ But he worried about its effects in a letter to Advisory Committee member Henry Gibson, writing that "dissatisfaction among the artists prevails throughout the land, and increases daily, and it finds vent through the public press, to the serious detriment of public interest in the Centennial."¹¹² Even the *Boston Daily Evening Transcript* acknowledged the centrality of the New York art community, complaining

¹⁰⁹ JS to W. Grut, Patterson, NJ, 27 September 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1088.

¹¹⁰ JS to August Morand, Germantown, PA, 16 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1128.

¹¹¹ JS to James D. Smillie, [no city], 28 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1311. His eventual bitterness remained over twenty years later, as he recalled the "jealousies and selfishness of those with whom one has to deal." See Sartain, *Reminiscences*, 265-6.

¹¹² JS to Henry C. Gibson, [no city], 6 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1110.

that Centennial Exhibition authorities “have given no notice to the New York artists as to what will be expected from them as representatives of American art.”¹¹³ Sartain’s relations with his New York colleagues grew steadily worse, leading to Clarence Cook’s wish for everything he thought Sartain was not: “If it had been our lot to have had the director of the Art Department put into hands fit to wield it – a man of education, capable of seeing how wide the plan should be to suit the time, and with organizing power to carry out a scheme nobly conceived.”¹¹⁴

Simply distributing information on the exhibition was an enormous task, and Sartain began by writing to various prominent figures such as the Chair of the Committee on Fine Arts at the Boston Athenaeum and William P. Blake of Chicago asking for lists of “artists of repute” so that he could mail them circulars.¹¹⁵ However, Sartain was not content to send information and wait for artists to respond. He had a particular vision in mind for the exhibition, and he actively solicited certain artists. The most striking example is his well known encouragement of his friend the Hudson River School painter Albert Bierstadt. Within a month of his taking office, Sartain allotted Bierstadt fifty-four by twelve feet (a remarkable 648 square feet) of space and wrote the artist that if his pictures exceeded those measurements, “don’t stand on modesty” (which Bierstadt surely would not), as “the largest surface covered should be by the best artists of the country.”¹¹⁶

¹¹³ “Art and Artists,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 5 October 1875, 6.

¹¹⁴ [Clarence Cook], “The Fine Art Department: American Pictures: First Notice,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 1 June 1876, 8.

¹¹⁵ JS to Col. Edward Perkins, Boston, 5 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1100; JS to William P. Blake, Chicago, 4 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1099.

¹¹⁶ JS to Albert Bierstadt, Irvington on Hudson, 29 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1156.

Prominent artists gradually began to submit their applications, and by December 9, 1875 Sartain could affirm that based on the submissions to date, “the success of the American portion of the Art Department is assured.”¹¹⁷ By that time he had the luxury to write petulantly to Academy President Worthington Whittredge of those yet to apply: “If they do not see their interest in contributing and are too indifferent on the patriotic side of motives to help, it is their own affair.”¹¹⁸

In the meantime Sartain faced a decision that would define the character of the exhibition. It was expected that Memorial Hall would include seven large central galleries surrounded by twenty-one smaller ones, and pictures from all participating countries would be hung in a fourteen foot band beginning 2 ½ feet from the floor and extending to 16 ½ feet high. The four main galleries would also include screens 12 ½ feet high to provide additional space.¹¹⁹ It quickly became clear in the fall of 1875 that the structure would not accommodate the number of works anticipated. Sartain envisioned unlimited space for the United States contribution, and he bargained with Great Britain, Germany, and Austria to cede some of their space for American art,¹²⁰ but even these measures did not meet his requirements. Rather than decreasing the number of artworks exhibited, Sartain called for even more space, and in November 1875 his request to build an annex behind Memorial Hall was approved.¹²¹

The Art Annex was an undistinguished brick building hastily designed by Schwarzmann and destroyed after the Exhibition (figure 1.11). It provided sixty thousand

¹¹⁷ JS to Benjamin Durham, Chicago, 9 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1266.

¹¹⁸ JS to Worthington Whittredge, [no city], 14 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1278.

¹¹⁹ John Sartain notes dated 7 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1114.

¹²⁰ JS to John Taylor Johnston [no city], 4 January 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 16; Sartain, “Report of the Chief,” 135, 144.

¹²¹ JS to Worthington Whittredge, New York, 5 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1184.

additional square feet of wall space and accommodated some sculpture as well.¹²² While Sartain was appointed too late to be involved in the design of Memorial Hall, he had a decisive voice in the plans for the Annex. The galleries were forty feet square, “the dimensions Mr. Sartain considers best for showing pictures to good advantage,” according to the *New-York Daily Tribune*.¹²³ In contrast to Memorial Hall’s long corridors flanked by galleries, the Annex was a beehive of thirty square galleries. Sartain maximized wall space by placing the doorways in the corners rather than in the middle of the walls.¹²⁴ The *Daily Tribune* paused its stream of complaints on art exhibition preparations long enough to praise this plan for the lengthwise and diagonal vistas it would create.¹²⁵ Unfortunately these views were not realized, as screens were placed in the Annex galleries to accommodate still more paintings.

The addition of the Annex had two critical effects on the American art exhibition. Sartain decided to allow more pictures, rather than limiting the numbers. This resulted in a profusion of works that overwhelmed visitors and critics, and muddied the impact of the canon that he and his colleagues were trying (and vying) to formulate. At the same time, the second, more modest venue received fewer visitors and drew less attention, thereby privileging the works displayed in Memorial Hall.

Forming the Committees: A Call to “National Service”

Sartain recognized the importance of including artists in planning the exhibition, and he set a precedent for the United States’ involvement in world’s fairs by transferring the decision-making process from collectors to artists. However, whether for personal or

¹²² S. Edgar Trout, *The Story of the Centennial of 1876: Golden Anniversary* (Lancaster, PA, 1929), 90.

¹²³ “The Great Exhibition: Department of Art,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 22 November 1875, 3.

¹²⁴ Sartain, “Report of the Chief,” 137.

¹²⁵ “The Great Exhibition: Department of Art,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 22 November 1875, 3.

practical reasons, he often bypassed the committees that he himself created. His frustrations began with the moribund Fine Arts Committee, which he diplomatically renamed the “Advisory Committee.” He charged the group with forming a “Committee on Selection,” comprising artists who would choose the works to be displayed, and a “Committee on Arrangement” made up of the heads of leading arts institutions to oversee the hanging of the exhibition. Convening the Advisory Committee, a group of businessmen from different cities, proved difficult. Sartain regretted that he had to wait for their approval of his plans while artists’ complaints mounted, lamenting that “red tape ties my hands.”¹²⁶ His unilateral actions in later months are foreshadowed in his early comment that “the delays of Committees and the torture of red tapes [sic] makes one think better of one man power, notwithstanding the danger of its abuse.”¹²⁷ He presciently remarked that “in my anxiety for a display of art that shall be a national credit, I find myself constantly on the brink of overstepping the bounds of my duty.”¹²⁸

Sartain’s correspondence from mid-October through late November of 1875 documents his travails prodding the Advisory Committee to invite artists to join the Selection Committee, and cajoling artists to participate. He planned to include five members from New York, four from Philadelphia, and two from Boston.¹²⁹ The cavalcade of declines from artists began with the Philadelphia landscapist William Trost Richards.¹³⁰ Two prominent New York artists soon demurred, the landscape painter Sanford Gifford and the venerable portraitist Daniel Huntington. Sartain begged both of

¹²⁶ JS to John Taylor Johnston [probably New York], 30 September 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1095; JS to A.G. Heaton, New York, 6 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1109.

¹²⁷ JS to R.W. Moore, New York, 3 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1174.

¹²⁸ JS to Charles C. Perkins, Boston, 3 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1176.

¹²⁹ “The Great Exhibition: Department of Art,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 22 November 1875, 3.

¹³⁰ JS to W.H. Willcox, [no city], 27 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1153.

them to reconsider, assuring them that it wouldn't take much time and asking, "Is it not worth while to make the sacrifice to a national service?"¹³¹ Sartain anticipated that the exhibition would be of profound and lasting significance for American art, and wanted others to feel the same. In a bit of political maneuvering, he turned to Advisory Committee members and New York collectors John Taylor Johnston and William Tilden Blodgett, asking them to persuade both artists to reconsider.¹³² Huntington relented and agreed to serve.

Then came what must have been a maddening web of declines, suggestions and rejections: William Morris Hunt of Boston declined and suggested Thomas Robinson and sculptor Truman Howe Bartlett.¹³³ Peter Rothermel suggested Russell Smith, who declined.¹³⁴ Sartain wrote that Worthington Whittredge "objects positively to Bartlett being on the Committee" and that he wanted Richard M. Staigg of Boston, rather than Thomas Robinson, whom the other committee members had approved.¹³⁵ Rothermel objected to Staigg as a replacement for Robinson.¹³⁶ In the end Staigg was invited to join the committee, declined, and accepted only after persuasion from Whittredge.¹³⁷ In the meantime, John Taylor Johnston was able to convince Jervis McEntee to serve, though he joined reluctantly, and only because so many others had backed out.¹³⁸

¹³¹ JS to Sanford R. Gifford, [no city], 22 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1144; JS to Daniel Huntington, [no city], 22 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1143.

¹³² JS to William Tilden Blodgett [no city], 22 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1146; JS to John Taylor Johnston, [no city], 22 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1145.

¹³³ JS to John Taylor Johnston, [no city], 30 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1157.

¹³⁴ JS to Peter Rothermel, [no city], 4 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1176; JS to Peter Rothermel, Philadelphia, 19 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1220.

¹³⁵ JS to Peter Rothermel, Philadelphia, 12 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1197.

¹³⁶ JS to James L. Claghorn [no city], 13 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1205.

¹³⁷ JS to Worthington Whittredge, [no city], 30 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1250.

¹³⁸ "Jervis McEntee's Diary, 1874-1876," *Archives of American Art Journal* 31 (January 1991): 8-9.

It must be kept in mind that these deliberations were carried out by mail, and each candidate had to be approved by each member of the Advisory Committee. Sartain complained that “According to the Jews it took but a tenth of the time to make the Universe as it has taken to make this Committee,” but by late November the roster was complete.¹³⁹ Recounting this tedious process demonstrates artists’ ambivalence about the exhibition.¹⁴⁰ There were still considerable doubts about whether the undertaking would be successful, but absolute certainty that the work would be time-consuming, in spite of Sartain’s reassurances. However, once committed to the project, artists and collectors alike had strong feelings about who would be on the Selection Committee; that is, who would choose the works that would represent the nation.¹⁴¹

The final committee comprised ten members, five from New York, three from Philadelphia, and two from Boston -- one more from New York and one less from Philadelphia than Sartain had planned. The New York members were Daniel Huntington, portraitist and past President of the National Academy of Design; landscape painter Jervis McEntee; portraitist Thomas Hicks; and naturalist sculptors Henry Kirke Brown and John Quincy Adams Ward.¹⁴² Of this group only Hicks and Brown had received their training

¹³⁹ JS to Peter Rothermel, [no city], 19 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1220; JS to Worthington Whittredge, [no city], 23 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1236.

¹⁴⁰ Centennial organizers had a similar difficulty recruiting writers to compose commemorative poems. William Cullen Bryant, Oliver Wendell Holmes, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, and James Russell Lowell were approached unsuccessfully before the committee finally secured the services of Sidney Lanier, Bayard Taylor, and John Greenleaf Whittier. Like some members of the Selection Committee, Whittier initially declined and only agreed upon persistent urging from the Centennial Committee. He sighed to a friend, “I shall try to fix up something, I suppose.” See Brown, 42-4.

¹⁴¹ Even after it was formed, the issue of the Selection Committee remained a volatile one. In mid-December, the *New-York Times* incorrectly reported that the Selection Committee had been abandoned and that artists must apply individually for space or try to “pull strings” or themselves. The article blamed this erroneous situation on a conflict between artists and patrons, saying that the Advisory Committee wished to appoint the Selection Committee, but that the artists wanted to form the group themselves through the National Academy of Design. See “American Art,” *New-York Times*, 12 December 1875, 6.

¹⁴² Sartain, “Report of the Chief,” 142.

abroad, and Brown was a strong advocate of American subjects.¹⁴³ Representing Philadelphia were figures less familiar to modern scholars, with stronger European ties. Howard Roberts had trained at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts, and Samuel B. Waugh had studied in France, England, and Italy. Little is known of William H. Willcox, a landscape painter and illustrator who exhibited frequently at the Pennsylvania Academy of Design in the 1850s and 1860s.¹⁴⁴ From Boston came the contested Thomas Robinson and Richard Staigg. The former was a landscape and animal painter who had studied with Courbet and was a great friend of William Morris Hunt, Boston's foremost advocate of the French Barbizon style. The latter was also a colleague of Hunt's.

The Selection Committee was distinctly divided by city and by style. The New York contingent represented the nativist school, disdaining foreign influences and valuing indigenous American themes. The Philadelphia members, particularly Roberts and Waugh, had trained extensively abroad, and supported the work of their expatriate colleagues. The two Boston artists could be seen as stand-ins for William Morris Hunt in bringing a French aesthetic to bear on the committee's deliberations. This group would be responsible for choosing paintings and sculpture submitted within the United States' borders.

The selection of works by Americans living outside the country was of increasing concern in the press and the artistic community. Almost a year before the opening, the *New York Commercial Advertiser* opined that if the art exhibition accomplished nothing else, it would hopefully acquaint Americans with their artists working abroad. The writer

¹⁴³ Natalie Spassky, *American Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, vol. II (Princeton University Press, 1985), 180.

¹⁴⁴ Peter Hastings Falk, ed., *Who Was Who in American Art, 1564-1975*, vol. III: P-Z (Madison, CT: Soundview Press, 1999), 3484, 3573.

pointed out that their work was often “snatched up” by European buyers so they were little known in the United States, and that “like the prophets, they are not without honor, save in their own country.”¹⁴⁵

During this period a number of American artists were returning from Europe, particularly from Paris and Munich, and tensions between many of them and the National Academy were reaching the boiling point. Given the pivotal moment at which the Centennial occurred, the selection of expatriate paintings and sculpture was critical, and unfortunately it is not at all clear how these works were chosen. Official reports include no definitive record of the selection process for American works abroad; perhaps it was a sensitive subject that the organizers wished to downplay. Sartain’s official report explained that expatriate works were judged by European committees of American artists which, if true, would be entirely satisfactory.¹⁴⁶ However this official report, compiled years after the exhibition, may not be entirely accurate. A guidebook from 1876 reported that

By permission of the State Department our Ministers at Rome and Munich were empowered to decide what pictures by American artists in the countries to which they are accredited may be forwarded for exhibition, and a committee was appointed by the American artists in Paris themselves to make there the same decision.¹⁴⁷

Other language in this guidebook is similar to phraseology Sartain used in his letters, so it is likely that this is a direct quote from Sartain and a more accurate account of the selection process.

¹⁴⁵ “American Art and the Centennial,” *New York Commercial Advertiser*, 28 July 1875, 2. In May of 1876 the *Galaxy* considered the opposite point of view, commenting that the Centennial Exhibition would show foreign visitors that American artists working in the United States were just as good as the Americans working overseas. See Philip Quilibet, “Drift-Wood,” *Galaxy* 21 (May 1876): 698.

¹⁴⁶ Sartain, “Report of the Chief,” 134.

¹⁴⁷ *What is the Centennial? And How to See It, 1776-1876* (Philadelphia: [T.S.] Dando, 1876), 17.

Before Sartain took his office, Director-General Goshorn had asked government officials in Rome and Munich to appoint committees on selection for American art. It is not clear who was on these committees, or whether they included American artists. Sartain wrote to a J.S. Dumaresq in Rome discussing logistical arrangements; Dumaresq was probably the person appointed to take care of American submissions there. Rome and Florence sustained a thriving community of American sculptors, and as might be expected, their submissions consisted mostly of sculpture. Sartain advised artists in Germany to inquire for information with the Honorable G. Henry Horstmann, Consul General for the United States resident at Munich. Sartain mentioned a Committee on Selection for Munich, but did not name its members (though from his letter it sounds as if Horstmann was not a member, and served only as a clearinghouse for information).¹⁴⁸ At least one artist expressed dissatisfaction with the Munich committee, as Sartain corresponded with Frederick Volck on more than one occasion, replying primly to his complaints about selection that “it was reasonable to expect from such persons that the choice would be made with judgment. If not, it is simply unfortunate, and past remedy;” and later, “I regret that the full strength of Munich art is not to be seen at the International Exhibition of Philadelphia, -- always -- at every Exposition preceding it, there has happened some unfortunate occurrence to mar one or another portion of the display.”¹⁴⁹

Unlike the case of Rome and Munich, a committee of American artists was appointed in Paris. By this time Paris officials had presented several world’s fairs, and

¹⁴⁸ JS to Frederick Volck, Munich, 21 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1141.

¹⁴⁹ JS to Frederick Volck, Munich, 6 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1259; JS to Frederick Volck, [no city], 8 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 134.

were no doubt aware of the pitfalls and conflicts inherent in the selection process.¹⁵⁰ Perhaps they wisely declined to be involved, leaving the business to the American artists. The Paris committee was chaired by Regis Gignoux, a student of the French academic painter Delaroche, and briefly a teacher of George Inness.¹⁵¹ The other members were Henry Bacon, who studied at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts and in the atelier of Alexandre Cabanel; and E.H. May, who exhibited at the National Academy of Design before studying with Thomas Couture in Paris, which became his permanent home.¹⁵² An article in the Boston *Daily Evening Transcript* reported that as late as March 2, 1876 Paris artists had not received specific instructions for packing and shipping, and many were reluctant to send their works. The *Transcript* account shows how sensitive the issue had become, concluding “either that the fine-arts department...is badly managed, or that the Centennial directors do not care for contributions from American artists in France.”¹⁵³

In an omission that would have significant consequences for the exhibition, no official representative was appointed to oversee submissions for American artists in London. In March of 1876 Sartain lamely protested that Director-General Goshorn was to have appointed an agent, and that Sartain was barred from corresponding abroad -- though this had not stopped him from writing letters to Europe in the preceding months.¹⁵⁴ In fact, just a few weeks previous he had sent circulars to Wickham Hoffman, Secretary of the United States Legation in London, asking him to inform any artists he

¹⁵⁰ See Patricia Mainardi, *Art and Politics of the Second Empire: The Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987).

¹⁵¹ Linda Jones Docherty, “A Search for Identity: American Art Criticism and the Concept of the ‘Native School’” (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1985), 98.

¹⁵² “Art and Artists,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 14 December 1875, 6; JS to Hon. Joseph R. Hawley, Philadelphia, 28 July 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers; reel 4563, frame 233; George C. Groce and David H. Wallace, *Dictionary of Artists in America, 1564-1860* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966), 433-4.

¹⁵³ “Paris Echoes,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 2 March 1876, 6.

¹⁵⁴ JS to William D. Lewis, [no city], 6 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 123.

might know about shipping arrangements. Unfortunately, his attempt came very late, giving artists only a few weeks to prepare their works.¹⁵⁵

The American press responded with indignation. The *New York Herald* predicted that if American artists in Paris and Rome experienced the same neglect as those in London, “the representation of American talent in the Art Department will be lamentably unfair and inaccurate.”¹⁵⁶ The *Philadelphia Press* reported from London that American artists there were praised abroad, but went unappreciated by the United States, particularly by its government. The writer also noted that though expatriates were interested in the exhibition, many were busy with commissions and contributions to the Royal Academy exhibition. Others had requested that their works in European collections be lent to the exhibition, and were refused by the owners.¹⁵⁷

The British government came to the aid of the United States, offering to send American pictures along with their contribution. In this way, G.H. Boughton submitted *The Pilgrims' Sunday Morning* (New-York Historical Society). However, other artists declined, most notably James McNeill Whistler, who reportedly wanted to exhibit in the United States department, but as of late March had no information on how to do so.¹⁵⁸ From an early stage expatriate artists were at a distinct disadvantage to those residing in the United States, creating the possibility that their work, already warily viewed by many, would be underrepresented in the Centennial Exhibition's American school.

¹⁵⁵ JS to Wickham Hoffman, [no city], 21 February 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 77.

¹⁵⁶ “American Artists in London,” *New York Herald*, 10 April 1876, 5.

¹⁵⁷ E.D.M., “Arts and Artists Abroad,” *The Press* (Philadelphia), 18 February 1876, 2.

¹⁵⁸ “American Artists in London,” *New York Herald*, 10 April 1876, 5. As a result, the first major showing of Whistler's work in the United States was delayed until 1881, when Whistler's *Arrangement in Grey and Black: Portrait of the Painter's Mother* was displayed in Philadelphia. See Nicolai Cikovsky, Jr. with Charles Brock, “Whistler and America” in *James McNeill Whistler*, Richard Dorment and Margaret F. MacDonald (exh. cat., Tate Gallery, London, 1995), 33.

The Selection Process and the “Committee of Rejection”

The Committee on Selection for artists residing in the United States was composed entirely of professional artists, an innovation that should have boded well for the jurying process. Their official charge according to department regulations was that “all works of art must be of a high order of merit,” and by citizens of the United States, without regard to whether they had been previously exhibited.¹⁵⁹ Sartain elaborated while recruiting John Quincy Adams Ward for the committee: “It is important that American Art be creditably represented, and by its best and not its inferior work. The duty of this Committee is to see that it is so.”¹⁶⁰

The media anxiously echoed these sentiments. The *New York Herald* explained the selection process and the emphasis on a high standard, since America must be able to “hold up her head unabashed” before other countries.¹⁶¹ The *New-York Daily Tribune* wrote that “it will be their duty to see that no work is admitted which falls below a standard of merit established by themselves.”¹⁶² *Appleton’s Journal* noted the many paintings awaiting the decision of the judges in Philadelphia and worried, “there is much reason to fear that it will be impossible to keep out a great many that, for the honor of the country, we could wish were anywhere else than in Memorial Hall.” The writer posed his view of the Committee’s dilemma: “if a rigid rule of exclusion is adopted, there will be very little native art to show, for our really good artists are few in number, and yet any relaxation in behalf of these ambitious attempts will be sure to let in a flood of loud and

¹⁵⁹ Sartain, “Report of the Chief,” 147, 150.

¹⁶⁰ JS to J.Q.A. Ward, [no city], 23 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1147.

¹⁶¹ “Art at the Centennial,” *New York Herald*, 23 October 1875, 5.

¹⁶² “The Great Exhibition: Department of Art,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 22 November 1875, 3.

vulgar pictures that will do our art-reputation great injury.”¹⁶³ The community of critics, along with artists, was beginning to realize that the American art exhibition would be evaluated by a national and international audience, and they placed their hopes in the Committee on Selection to assure its quality.

However, the committee’s standards were compromised when Sartain made a subtle distinction: he directed that in the tradition of the Paris Salon (as he understood it), they should reject inferior work, rather than actively choose superlative work.¹⁶⁴ Sartain of course expected that the committee would hone to a certain standard and would have to reject many works from applicants who were “mere beginners, who have had a few lessons from the drawing master.”¹⁶⁵ Nonetheless, he made it abundantly clear that “the Committee’s work is not to select but to reject inferior work,”¹⁶⁶ and peremptorily wrote to Daniel Huntington, “Permit me to remind you that it is understood that the office of your Committee is ‘simply to reject work of insufficient merit.”¹⁶⁷ This allowed Sartain to exercise his own discretion; for example, he assured J.F. Weir that since the committee’s task was really only to reject inferior works, Weir could forego the selection process in New York and send his paintings directly to Philadelphia.¹⁶⁸

The Selection Committee’s task was a daunting one. The group met for the first time on February 12 in New York. The attendees were Robinson of Boston, Waugh and Roberts from Philadelphia, Huntington and McEntee from New York, and Director-

¹⁶³ “Editor’s Table,” *Appleton’s Journal* 15 (15 April 1876): 504.

¹⁶⁴ Susan Hobbs, *1876: American Art of the Centennial* (exh. cat., National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., 1976), 8. No evidence has been found, however, that this was the Salon’s policy, and Dr. Patricia Mainardi suggests that the approach depended on the individual juror. Sartain may have misunderstood the Salon’s policy, or perhaps he simply invoked its name to support his own preferred method.

¹⁶⁵ JS to Lloyd Mifflin, [no city], 29 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1248.

¹⁶⁶ JS to John F. Weir, New Haven, CT, 17 February 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 69.

¹⁶⁷ JS to Daniel Huntington, [no city], 17 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 164.

¹⁶⁸ JS to John F. Weir, New Haven, CT, 17 February 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 69.

General A.T. Goshorn, who assured the group that the character of the American art department was entirely in their hands. Huntington was appointed chair of the committee, Hicks the secretary, and Roberts the treasurer.¹⁶⁹ The *New York Herald* reported that beginning on February 21, the committee met every Wednesday.¹⁷⁰ It is unlikely that the Boston and Philadelphia members could travel to New York every week, so future meetings were probably dominated by the New York members, allowing them to consolidate their own plans for the exhibition.

Sartain was careful not to place himself on the Committee of Selection and claimed not to have seen any of the works the committee rejected, only those that they approved, so he probably did not participate in the selection process.¹⁷¹ However, he regularly circumvented the committee, and his blithe indifference to their authority bespeaks his sublime confidence in his own vision. In October of 1875 Sartain wrote to W.H. Machen of Toledo that all pictures must go through the Committee on Selection “so that none below a certain standard of merit can mar the character of the Exhibition.”¹⁷² But even after the Committee had been appointed, he continued to solicit works outside its auspices. In December he wrote to William Page, asking for his portrait of Shakespeare, and assuring him it would be hung however Page would like.¹⁷³ He worked (though without success) to secure William Henry Powell’s *Battle of Lake Erie* and Robert Weir’s *Embarkation of the Pilgrims* from Congress.¹⁷⁴ He assured a collector, Mrs. A.E. Slocum, that “Pictures by such names as these of yours need hardly pass under

¹⁶⁹ “Jervis McEntee’s Diary,” 12.

¹⁷⁰ “Fine Arts,” *New York Herald*, 21 February 1876, 10.

¹⁷¹ JS to W.J. Burton, 27 September 1876, [no city], HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 349.

¹⁷² JS to W.H. Machen, Toledo, OH, 15 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1127.

¹⁷³ JS to William Page, [no city], 3 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1255.

¹⁷⁴ JS to W.H. Powell, New York, 11 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1268; JS to Hon. R.L. Gibson, [no city], 22 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1293.

the scrutiny of the ‘Committee on Selection’...I will assume the responsibility of its being all right.”¹⁷⁵ There are numerous other examples throughout the spring of 1876.¹⁷⁶

In the meantime he continued to write to others that “no definite allotment of space is ever made to anyone” before passing through the Committee on Selection.¹⁷⁷ It is probably no coincidence that he defended the sanctity of the Committee most strongly against unknown artists from the Midwest and lithographers and engravers, that is, his professional competitors. His audacity is startling and almost amusing. He wrote on March 6, 1876 to his old friend Thomas Moran that the painter should bypass the selection process and send his work directly to Philadelphia, “only ‘tell it not in Gath, nor publish it by the Gates of Ascalon’ as it would offend the dignity of the Committee;” and the very next day he regretfully explained to T.W. Noble of Detroit “I have no authority to take any part of the business out of the hands of the gentlemen composing the ‘Committee on Selection.’”¹⁷⁸

Like Sartain, the Committee members were confident of their vision of an American school and made similar exceptions to the process. At the end of March, Jervis McEntee tried to cajole William Henry Osborne, the chief patron of Frederic Edwin Church, to send a painting for the committee’s approval. Osborne objected on the grounds that Church’s work was above such scrutiny. McEntee made it clear to the

¹⁷⁵ JS to Mrs. A.E. Slocum, [no city, probably New York], 24 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1304.

¹⁷⁶ JS to Messrs. Myers and Hedian, Baltimore, 19 January 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 39; JS to A. & C. Kaufmann, [no city], 3 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 106; JS to Henry E. Alvord, Easthampton, MA, 8 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 131; JS to Daniel Dougherty, [no city], 14 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 153.

¹⁷⁷ JS to W.H. Machen, Toledo, 4 February 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 65; JS to Forbes Lithographic Mfg. Company [no city], 22 February 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 83.

¹⁷⁸ JS to Thomas Moran, [no city], 6 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 118. Sartain had a long history of working relationships with the Moran family as a mentor in etching to Thomas Moran; JS to T.W. Noble, Detroit, 7 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 128.

“fussy” owner that the work must be approved by the entire committee, but he wrote in his diary that there was no need to send the picture on to Philadelphia until the galleries were ready, thus sanctioning its admission without the committee’s judgment.¹⁷⁹

Sartain’s and McEntee’s conviction that some works were universally approved and need not be juried recalls the concept of *hors concours* of the Paris Salons. After artists had received certain honors, they were exempt from jury selection in future exhibitions, so that in effect their work took its place in the canon.¹⁸⁰ The National Academy of Design attempted to implement such a policy for its members at its own exhibitions during these years, much to the consternation of non-member artists. In the case of the Centennial Exhibition’s American art display the *hors concours* list existed nowhere but in people’s minds, and those lists differed from one artist to the next. In the absence of a national authority like the Salon, the Centennial Exhibition witnessed the convergence of a large number of personal canons, all the more freighted for being unspoken, and making conflict inevitable.

The committee was scheduled to meet for selection in Boston on March 27 and 28, in New York on March 29 through 31, and in Philadelphia on April 2 and 3.¹⁸¹ No notes have been found from these sessions, and there appears to be no record of works that were rejected. Fortunately, committee member Jervis McEntee was a conscientious diarist, and Henry Kirke Brown wrote several letters to his wife during these weeks, and their accounts offer some insight into the process. McEntee wrote upon meeting his fellow members that he was not impressed with the “Philadelphia men” (Waugh and

¹⁷⁹ “Jervis McEntee’s Diary,” 14.

¹⁸⁰ Lois Marie Fink, *American Art at the Nineteenth-Century Paris Salons* (Washington, D.C., National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, 1990), 116.

¹⁸¹ JS to John F. Weir, New Haven, CT, 17 February 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 69.

Roberts), and he liked the “Boston man” (Robinson) better.¹⁸² McEntee identified them by their towns, suggesting once again that city rivalries colored the committee’s work.

The *New-York Daily Tribune* provided a long list of Boston artists intending to contribute, and noted that many were “ladies”; this is not surprising, given William Morris Hunt’s legions of female students during the period.¹⁸³ As it turned out, about seventy works were rejected from a group of over two hundred. Brown wrote that the committee took longer than expected to view all the Boston pictures and “it was a pretty poor lot of stuff we had to judge of with a few exceptions.” He added, however, that “we are having a very good time – all our decisions are arrived at with unity of judgment.”¹⁸⁴ Some members of the public expressed dissatisfaction with the result and the jury was charged with “favoritism and unfairness.” However, the Boston *Daily Evening Transcript* defended the committee, arguing that to include large amounts of amateur work (presumably that which was rejected) would reflect poorly on the display.¹⁸⁵ Afterward, Sartain instructed Staigg and Robinson that for paintings submitted after the jurying, those they thought good enough should be sent on to Memorial Hall, and those they thought inferior should be rejected on the grounds that it was too late to be considered.¹⁸⁶

¹⁸² “Jervis McEntee’s Diary,” 12.

¹⁸³ “Boston Artists at the Centennial,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 20 March 1876, 8. The artists listed included Henry Bacon, E.M. Bannister, S.G.W. Benjamin, Elizabeth Boott, Walter Brackett, George L. Brown, Edward Burrill Jr., H.R. Burdick, E.T. Billings, W. Warren Brown, E. Carlsen, J.W. Champney, J.J. Enneking, Robert C. Hinkley, Ellen Day Hale, George Inness, Millicent Jarvis, Helen M. Knowlton, Imogene Robinson Morrell, F.D. Millet, B.C. Porter, Charles S. Pearce, Thomas Robinson, R.M. Staigg (the former two of the Committee on Selection), F. Hill Smith, T.L. Smith, William Willard, and E.L. Weeks.

¹⁸⁴ HKB to Mrs. HKB, New York, 30 March 1876, Henry Kirke Brown Papers, vol. VIII, 2210, Yale University Library.

¹⁸⁵ “Art and Artists,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 31 March 1876, 6.

¹⁸⁶ JS to Massachusetts State Commission, [no city], 31 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 203.

The Committee met in New York “behind closed doors” to make its choices.¹⁸⁷ To no one’s surprise, the New York contribution was dominated by landscapes. One article complaining about the poor quality of the landscapes in the 1876 National Academy exhibition theorized that artists had held back their best paintings for the Centennial Exhibition.¹⁸⁸ A modern scholar has suggested that Worthington Whittredge packed the New York contribution with the work of his Hudson River School friends.¹⁸⁹ Though he was not a member of the Selection Committee, Whittredge was head of the New York state delegation, as well as President of the National Academy of Design, so he held considerable influence. This may be true as Brown wrote on April 1, “I have had some entertainment in observing the different characteristics of our Committee.... Their arguments in favor or against a work arise from personal consideration; consequently, we have many works which should have been rejected.”¹⁹⁰

Resentment grew between Sartain and members of the New York contingent, particularly in relation to Bierstadt’s submission. Sartain had assured his friend of all the space he wished, and Bierstadt did not send any works to the Selection Committee, expecting the group to examine them in his studio. Bierstadt and his aggressively self-promoting ways were held in low esteem by the New York art establishment.¹⁹¹ McEntee fumed, “Bierstadt has had fair warning that his pictures will not be examined at his rooms and defies the committee who are resolved to oppose his presumption to the bitter end,”

¹⁸⁷ “American Artists in London,” *New York Herald*, 10 April 1876, 5.

¹⁸⁸ “The National Academy of Design,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 157.

¹⁸⁹ Janson, 152. New York landscapists were not averse to exhibiting other genres of painting, but it is easy to imagine that, for an exhibition of representative art of the United States, they would want to assure that American landscapes were present in force.

¹⁹⁰ HKB to Mrs. HKB, New York, 1 April 1876, Henry Kirke Brown Papers, vol. VIII, 2212-3, Yale University Library.

¹⁹¹ Nancy K. Anderson and Linda S. Ferber, *Albert Bierstadt: Art and Enterprise* (exh. cat., Brooklyn Museum of Art, 1990), 31.

adding later that “if Bierstadt gets ahead of us he will be pretty smart.” Bierstadt indeed sent his paintings directly to Philadelphia, as McEntee recorded that one of his works, *Spring in California* (unlocated), was rejected by the committee there, though several other works were grudgingly admitted, with McEntee’s comment that they “looked particularly poor and certainly do him no credit with intelligent people.”¹⁹² In spite of the committee’s vote, *Spring in California* was included in the exhibition, no doubt with Sartain’s intervention and to the boundless consternation of McEntee and his colleagues. It has even been speculated that the paintings of Sartain’s son William were excluded because of the committee’s ill will toward his father, though this seems unlikely, as his daughter Emily’s painting *The Reproof* was accepted.¹⁹³

By the time the committee convened in Philadelphia, the members were exhausted and tensions were high. McEntee called the Committee’s two days in Boston and its two days in New York “the most fatiguing work I ever did.”¹⁹⁴ Brown reported to his wife that he was on his way to Philadelphia after “a most fatiguing and wearisome examination” of pictures in New York.¹⁹⁵ He was in Philadelphia April 4 through 8 and pictures were still arriving when the committee adjourned. The group met again on May 1 and 2, just days before the opening of the exhibition, to finish the task.¹⁹⁶

At this time the Philadelphia members’ attention may not have been entirely focused on the exhibition in Fairmount Park, as the Centennial year marked the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts’ first exhibition in six years, timed to coincide with the opening of its new building. The Academy’s exhibition was originally scheduled

¹⁹² “Jervis McEntee’s Diary,” 14-5.

¹⁹³ Sellin, *The First Pose*, 17.

¹⁹⁴ “Jervis McEntee’s Diary,” 14.

¹⁹⁵ HKB to Mrs. HKB, 4 April 1876, Henry Kirke Brown Papers, vol. VIII, 2213, Yale University Library.

¹⁹⁶ “Jervis McEntee’s Diary,” 14, 15.

to close before the May 10 opening of the Centennial Exhibition, and Sartain's correspondence makes it clear that he intended for the contents of the exhibition to simply be transferred in its entirety Memorial Hall after its close at the Academy – and presumably before the Selection Committee's arrival in Philadelphia.¹⁹⁷ However, delays in the completion of the building pushed the close of Pennsylvania Academy's exhibition to June 3, nearly a month after the opening of the Centennial Exhibition, and the Academy works were indeed examined by the Committee.¹⁹⁸ It appears that the Selection Committee rejected almost all of the works, since only a handful appear in both the Pennsylvania Academy's exhibition catalogue and the Centennial Exhibition catalogue.¹⁹⁹ In fact, Brown called the pictures he examined at the Academy "the worst lot of trash I ever looked at," and added that he expected "no statuary of any account by American sculptors at the [Centennial] Exhibition."²⁰⁰ Sartain probably intended that the Academy's exhibition would comprise the bulk of Philadelphia's artistic representation at Fairmount Park. That the Pennsylvania Academy's paintings and sculpture were deemed unworthy of the Selection Committee's approval was surely an affront to Philadelphian taste, an insult that Sartain would later redress.

The selection process was simplified for sculpture. Artists were instructed to forward their work directly to Philadelphia rather than to Boston or New York, to be judged by the Selection Committee there.²⁰¹ The intention was to spare artists the expense and inconvenience of shipping their works to a point of selection and from there

¹⁹⁷ JS to T. Addison Richards, [no city, National Academy of Design], 16 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1213.

¹⁹⁸ JS to S.R. MacKnight, New York, 21 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 178.

¹⁹⁹ Examples are sculptor J.W. Bailly's *Spring*, and the bas-reliefs *Rose-bud* and *Inspiration* by Joseph C. Gordon. Paintings included H. Merle's *Charity*, Walter Shirlaw's *Feeding the Poultry* and *Toning the Bell*, W.H. Weisman's *Cape Ann Rocks*, and G. Wolf's *Portia*.

²⁰⁰ HKB to Mrs. HKB, 5 April 1876, Henry Kirke Brown Papers, vol. VIII, 2213, Yale University Library.

²⁰¹ JS to Messrs. Bailey & Co., [no city], 4 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 113.

to the exhibition. However, it was a considerable financial risk for sculptors to send their work to Philadelphia from wherever they might be, not knowing whether their works would be accepted. It is not surprising that the number of submissions in sculpture was relatively modest. The Committee accepted 154 works from 64 artists, mostly comprising large groups of sculpture from artists working in Rome and Florence, such as P.F. Connelly, M. Dickerson Eyre, J.H. Haseltine, Edmonia Lewis, and R.H. Park.

Conflicts were bound to erupt in the selection process among these men of widely different perspectives from proudly distinct cities. The controversy best known to modern scholars was the committee's rejection of Thomas Eakins' monumental painting *The Gross Clinic* (figure 1.10). Eakins was a lifelong friend of John Sartain's son William, and was well known to Sartain himself.²⁰² Sartain clearly approved of the painting, writing to his daughter Emily in August of 1875, "Tom Eakins is making excellent progress with his large picture of Dr. Gross, and it bids fair to be a capital work."²⁰³ Eakins' official application to the exhibition bears the note "not enough space," a rather bland and inoffensive reason for excluding a controversial painting. Scholars have advanced a number of other, more specific possibilities, suggesting that it was rejected by the conservative New Yorkers Hicks and Huntington with the influence of Whittredge, noting that New Yorkers were hostile toward it when it was exhibited there later in 1879. Other theories range from the sickening blood on Gross' hands to simple professional jealousy. William J. Clark wrote in the Philadelphia *Evening Telegraph*,

It is rumoured that the blood on Dr. Gross' fingers made some of the members of the committee sick, but, judging from the quality of the works exhibited by them we fear that it was not the blood alone that made them sick. Artists have before

²⁰² Sewell, xiv.

²⁰³ JS to Emily Sartain, Philadelphia, 20 December 1874, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 750.

now been known to sicken at the sight of pictures by younger men which they in their souls were compelled to acknowledge were beyond their emulation.²⁰⁴

The committee's decision garnered the painting some notoriety; it was exhibited as "rejected" in Salon des Refusées fashion at Charles F. Haseltine's gallery the day after it was presented to the committee.

As it happened, the United States government wished to show portraits of prominent men in all its departments. Dr. Samuel Gross had written a Centennial history of medicine and a "Manual of Military Surgery" used by both the Union and Confederate armies during the Civil War, as well as being President of the Medical Congress in Philadelphia in 1876. Eakins' painting was placed on view in the United States Army Post Hospital by late May, probably due to the efforts of Dr. Gross himself (figure 1.12).²⁰⁵

Much has been made of *The Gross Clinic*'s rejection, and it is rarely mentioned that Eakins submitted three other paintings that were not only accepted, but two of which were displayed in prominent galleries. *The Chess Players* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art) hung in Memorial Hall in the Central West gallery among works by American "old masters" such as Copley, Allston, and Stuart, as well as the great figures of the Hudson River School. His portrait of Dr. Benjamin Rand was placed nearby in Memorial Hall gallery C, known as "the Saloon of Honor," with similarly prominent names. One more portrait, *Lady at a Piano (Elizabeth Crowell at the Piano)* (Addison Gallery of American Art), was located in the Art Annex in gallery thirty. For an artist who had just completed his training two years previously, the location of the paintings was a glowing

²⁰⁴ William J. Clark, *Evening Telegraph*, 16 June 1876, n.p.; quoted in Julie S. Berkowitz, "Adorn the Halls": *History of the Art Collection at Thomas Jefferson University* (Philadelphia: Thomas Jefferson University, 1999), 202-6.

²⁰⁵ Sellin, *The First Pose*, 14; Conrads, *Winslow Homer and the Critics*, 33; Berkowitz, 202-3.

endorsement, and critics lauded them with such comments as “rich color,” “strongly painted,” and “one of the best contributions to the section.”²⁰⁶

In spite of this praise, it must have been a great indignity for Eakins to see his *chef d’oeuvre*, his largest and most ambitious work to date, exhibited among papier-mache patients, rubber spittoons and a photographic pathology exhibition,²⁰⁷ and it would have seemed yet another insult to Sartain and his Philadelphia colleagues as well. This slight, along with the committee’s rejection of so many of the Pennsylvania Academy’s works, may have prompted Sartain to take the action that inflamed the art exhibition’s greatest controversy, an incident little known to modern scholars but widely discussed by contemporary artists and critics.

One of the handful of articles protesting the exclusion of *The Gross Clinic* also mentioned the rejection of another painting by Harry Humphrey Moore called *Almeh*, and reported that “two large American pictures entitled admission to the Exhibition...were rejected by the committee for reasons which had nothing to do with the artistic merit of the works themselves.”²⁰⁸ Unfortunately the painting was destroyed in a warehouse fire in 1881. A wood engraving from *Frank Leslie’s Popular Monthly* shows Moore’s masterpiece on the back wall of his studio (figures 1.13, 1.14). His painting *A Moroccan Guard* of 1876 (figure 1.15) conveys a sense of his typical style.

Moore was born into a wealthy New York family and was deaf from age three. In the early 1860s he studied in Philadelphia with Samuel Waugh (who later served on the Centennial Exhibition’s Selection Committee), and at the Pennsylvania Academy of the

²⁰⁶ Conrads, *Winslow Homer and the Critics*, 2; “Centennial Exhibition Art Department,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 17 May 1876, 1.

²⁰⁷ Sellin, *The First Pose*, 52.

²⁰⁸ “Our Great Show,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 17 May 1876, 1.

Fine Arts with fellow student Thomas Eakins. The two became close friends and trained side by side in the Paris atelier of Jean-Léon Gérôme. They traveled in Spain in the winter of 1869-70 with another Philadelphian, John Sartain's son William. Moore remained there to study with yet another successful European academic, Mariano Fortuny, and made a study of Moorish life.²⁰⁹

Moore's large-scale painting, entitled in full *Almeh, A Dream of Alhambra*, was one of the works from the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts' 1876 exhibition that was rejected by the Selection Committee. *The Aldine* noted that the rejection of "Almet" [sic] was greeted with vociferous public complaints by Moore's friends.²¹⁰ The *New-York Times* reported that according to Claghorn, the work was rejected for "indecenty," probably referring to the scantily-clad figure and her sensual pose -- though neither he nor Sartain had any objections to it. The writer regretted the action and thought *Almeh* would have been "one of the great pictures of the exhibition."²¹¹

Sartain was well acquainted with both Eakins and Moore, given their study at the Pennsylvania Academy and his son William's travels with the two in 1869-70 in Spain. Sartain probably knew of Moore's plans for *Almeh*, and he was certainly well aware of *The Gross Clinic*. The rejection of most of the Pennsylvania Academy's paintings and sculpture was an affront to Philadelphian taste, and Sartain must have been further insulted by the refusal of *The Gross Clinic*. The rejection of *Almeh* would have been the final straw. While *The Gross Clinic* was little known beyond Philadelphia, Moore's

²⁰⁹ Guilbert C. Braddock, *Notable Deaf Persons* (Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet College Alumni Association, 1975), 85; Eugene A. Hajdel, *Harry H. Moore, American 19th Century* (Jersey City, NJ: [no publisher], 1950), 7; Susan James-Gadzinski, "Harry Humphrey Moore," in *Paris 1889: American Artists at the Universal Exposition*, Annette Blaugrund et al. (exh. cat., Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, 1989), 190-1.

²¹⁰ Sears, 196; "An Opinion," *The Aldine* 8 (September 1876), 293-4.

²¹¹ Gar., "Something About Memorial Hall," *New York Times*, 7 May 1876, 2.

Almeh had already garnered acclaim, not in Philadelphia, but in New York. In January of 1876, a writer for the *New York Evening Post* saw *Almeh* in Moore's studio and praised it even while it was still in progress.²¹² The *New-York Times* expected the painting to fulfill Moore's early promise. The writer lauded Moore's mastery of the figure, a quality that distinguished many foreign-trained artists, and declared that "so far as can be judged by the condition in which painting now is, no finer example of anatomical drawing and flesh modeling has ever been produced by an American artist." He enthused that "it cannot fail to create a sensation," and "if it can be finished in time it will be exhibited at the Centennial."²¹³

After months of frustrations and then this barrage of insults, Sartain responded by surreptitiously transferring *Almeh* and seven other works from Pennsylvania Academy into the American art exhibition in Fairmount Park. He defended his actions to Director-General A.T. Goshorn, explaining that the paintings he spirited into Fairmount Park had been approved by the Pennsylvania Academy's exhibition committee, and that group included half of the members of the Centennial Selection Committee – an exaggeration on Sartain's part, since the Academy's exhibition committee included only two of the Centennial Selection Committee's ten members.²¹⁴ Sartain claimed that the Centennial Selection Committee's rejections "had elicited earnest and indignant remonstrance from influential and impartial judges and lovers of art" including highly placed Centennial Exhibition officials, "urging the necessity of repairing the injustice resulting from the haste or the want of impartiality of the Committee."

²¹² "Fine Arts," *The Evening Post* (New York), 17 January 1876, 1.

²¹³ "The Fine Arts: Some New and Striking Pictures," *New-York Times*, 2 January 1876, 10.

²¹⁴ *Catalogue of the Forty-Seventh Annual Exhibition of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, 1876* (Philadelphia: Collins, 1876), 2.

Sartain further explained to Goshorn that the pictures he admitted represented only a fraction of the more than three hundred pictures that the committee had rejected, and that he had hung them in gallery forty-two of the Art Annex. He justified his actions by quoting Daniel Huntington, President of the Selection Committee, who said that “I think they acted too much in a hurry in Philadelphia, there was such a crowd of works and we heard that there would not be room for half of them.” Sartain reasoned that if the Committee members had rejected the Academy’s works because of a lack of space, they should be happy that he found room for some of them. Sartain carefully added “They were placed there by me without your [Director-General Goshorn’s] concurrence, because I thought it better to keep you clear from the complication and trouble that I had reason to expect this action would involve.”²¹⁵

Of all the paintings that Sartain admitted, the rejection of *Almeh* received the most media attention, no doubt because of its decidedly French style and its sensational subject. Objections focused on Moore’s choice of a nude figure in a sensual orientalist setting, a subject strongly identified with foreign-trained artists, and particularly with Moore’s teacher Gérôme. The rejection of the painting parallels the struggles of foreign-trained artists to have their works displayed at the National Academy of Design (of which all the New York Selection Committee contingent were members). In fact, the Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin* reported that the stalwart Academician Thomas Hicks “cast the first vote against Moore’s ‘Almeh.’”²¹⁶ The fracas over *Almeh* represented the most public confrontation yet between the opposing camps of New York and Philadelphia, facing off supporters of native training against those advocating European study, and

²¹⁵ JS to Director General A.T. Goshorn, [no city, probably Philadelphia], 29 July 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 235.

²¹⁶ “The Centennial Art Show,” *Evening Bulletin* (Philadelphia), 14 November 1876, 2

putting, as it were, the landscape against the figure. Sartain's bold action anticipated, and perhaps even helped to catalyze the formation of the Society of American Artists the following year, as foreign-trained artists put their work on public view over the objections of the National Academy.

In addition to Moore's *Almeh*, the following works from the Pennsylvania Academy's spring exhibition appeared in gallery forty-two: F.T.L. Boyle's *The Prayer of Judith* (unlocated), G.L. Brown's *Niagara by Moonlight* (unlocated), Theodore Kaufmann's *Influence of Electricity on Human Culture* (unlocated), Clarence M. Johns' "To Tubal-Cain Came Many a One" (unlocated), Carl Raupp's *Approaching Storm* (unlocated), Henry Ulke's *Portrait – General Grant* (Orange County Museum of Art), and Oregon Wilson's *Woman's Devotion* (unlocated). It is notable that six of these artists had their training abroad, and some were particularly noted for working in European styles.²¹⁷ While the rejection of these works from the Centennial Exhibition does not connote an active conspiracy, it is in keeping with the New York contingent's distaste for foreign styles, and Sartain's advocacy of them.²¹⁸

When they learned of Sartain's action, Thomas Hicks and Daniel Huntington sent a letter of protest to Director-General Goshorn dated June 21. They reminded him of his promise that only works approved by the committee would be admitted, and delicately suggested that "Your committee, all of whom entertain for you the highest regard and respect, feel that if their decisions are to be thus despised, it will be necessary for them in

²¹⁷ The exceptions are Boyle, who studied with Henry Inman, and Carl Raupp, for whom no information could be found. Kaufmann's *Influence of Electricity on Human Culture* is not listed in late versions of the Centennial Exhibition catalogue, but its presence there was noted in "Ruhamah," "Art at the Centennial," *National Republican*, 15 June 1876, 1.

²¹⁸ "The Great Fair Closed," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 11 November 1876, 2. Sartain also installed two other works in the Art Annex's gallery 42 that the Selection Committee had rejected: Bierstadt's *California Spring* and Thomas Satterwhite Noble's *The Tramp*. *The Tramp* may possibly be the Yale University Art Gallery's painting *Blind Man of Paris*, but their files include no information to confirm this.

their own defense to make a public protest.”²¹⁹ They received no official response. The makeup of the American art display was important enough that they sent another indignant letter on November 2, even though the exhibition would close just a week later. They declared that “we disclaim all responsibility for the mass of crude and ill-arranged works which lower the tone of the American art exhibit.”²²⁰ It seems that the two conservative New York painters wanted to make their protest seem more universal and less partisan, as this letter was signed by the other members of the New York contingent and Thomas Robinson of Boston, but he vehemently denied that he had authorized his signature.²²¹

Sartain wrote to a colleague that the New York contingent denounced him and threatened to make the matter public. He commented, “they threaten to publish me. I am inclined to interpret it rather that they publish themselves.”²²² Sartain was aware that “Messrs. Hicks and Co. of New York” wrote to Goshorn “expressing their disgust and indignation” and he added sarcastically, “I expect nothing short of utter annihilation.”²²³ To the contrary, he was confident that if the incident was brought to light, it would only expose the New York artists’ lack of judgment. In response to the committee’s protests, Sartain placed cards on the works he admitted that said “Accepted on the Authority of the Chief of the Art Bureau.”²²⁴ In his mind this advanced his case, as he explained to Goshorn that the paintings’ “character and quality will be the justification of my course of action with the public, who can there compare them with other works in the same and

²¹⁹ D. Huntington and Thomas Hicks to A.T. Goshorn, New York, 21 June 1876, Director-General Correspondence Received, 1876 (2), United States Centennial Commission Correspondence and Papers, Philadelphia City Archives.

²²⁰ “The Centennial Art Exhibition,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 4 November 1876, 2-3.

²²¹ “The Centennial Art Show,” *Evening Bulletin* (Philadelphia), 14 November 1876, 2.

²²² JS to George L. Brown, [no city], 11 August 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 259.

²²³ JS to F. Boyle, [no city], 11 August 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 257.

²²⁴ JS to Theodore A. Kaufmann, 21 August 1876, [no city], HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 279.

adjoining rooms whose merit (or lack of merit) had satisfied the same Committee that rejected these.”²²⁵ He was only too pleased to have his own stamp on the American canon and to have his version compared to that of his New York colleagues.

Sartain was indeed “published,” as the disgruntled New Yorkers made their complaints public, and he faced serious opposition. By this time artists and the public had come to perceive the American art exhibition as an official version of the American school, and as such it was not to be created by personal fiat, but by the careful deliberation of a group of highly regarded experts. Violating the sanctity of the process put the canon in jeopardy. Sartain came to regret his decision to “right a wrong” by including the rejected works: “My persistent determination defeated much of [the New York contingent’s] selfish planning and I am not to be forgiven, but abused with virulence in the New York papers continually.”²²⁶ The *New-York Daily Tribune*’s official guide castigated Sartain, who “not only arbitrarily consulted his own taste,” but “even personally accepted some pictures after their rejection by the Commission.”²²⁷ Sartain’s crime was not that he chose poorly, but that he relied on his personal judgment when the display was expected to be the result of a group of experts -- once again affirming the high public expectations for the exhibition.

Sartain did have his defenders. He thanked the artist Theodore Kaufmann for commenting in print on his behalf.²²⁸ His hometown newspaper the *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* agreed with Sartain that public response would vindicate him, and

²²⁵ JS to Director General A.T. Goshorn, [no city, probably Philadelphia], 29 July 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 237.

²²⁶ JS to W.J. Burton, 27 September 1876, [no city], HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 349.

²²⁷ *New-York Tribune Guide to the Exhibition* (New York: New-York Daily Tribune, 1876), 60.

²²⁸ JS to Theodore Kaufmann, 11 December 1876, [no city], HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 461 and “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 12 July 1876, 2.

skewered the New York artists with the suggestion that Hicks and Huntington “neglected the little obvious act which would have raised the tone of the American exhibit, which was to withdraw their own pictures.”²²⁹ Even the *New-York Daily Tribune*, after its earlier scathing comments, admitted upon the closing of the Exhibition that the rejected pictures that Sartain had included were better than many of those that the committee had accepted.²³⁰

Though no records can be found of the Selection Committee’s deliberations, Sartain commented that they rejected about three hundred works. Against the approximately 850 paintings and sculpture that appeared in the exhibition, this results in a “rate of refusal” of about twenty-six percent. The committee was far less selective than the Paris Salon that Sartain claimed as a model; Salon juries rejected over half the works submitted to their exhibitions in the early 1870s and into the 1880s.²³¹ New York Selection Committee member Henry Kirke Brown expressed his disgust and disillusionment with the breakdown of the canon that he had expected the committee to form:

The work which we are about seems like a waste of time to me. For one who strives to realize the best and the true, and the true only, and finds himself held back and thwarted by the shallow and temporizing policy of the world, it is hard and up-hill work. I find that men's minds are so easily turned aside by personal considerations, that in a body constituted by such varied natures and habits of judging, it is very difficult to reach a satisfactory result. We have admitted a great many poor pictures, because painted by someone's acquaintance, or someone of repute; but on the whole, it is thought that we have done about what was expected of us.²³²

²²⁹ “The Centennial Art Show,” *Evening Bulletin* (Philadelphia), 14 November 1876, 2.

²³⁰ “The Great Fair Closed,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 11 November 1876, 2.

²³¹ Fink, 115, 121.

²³² HKB to Mrs. HKB, April 1876 (n.d.), Henry Kirke Brown Papers, vol. VIII, 2214, Yale University Library.

The Selection Committee was less than selective, resulting in a United States exhibition of approximately 850 works. This overwhelming quantity created serious problems, first and foremost, where and how all these works would be displayed in a limited space. This concern was complicated by the period practice of hanging paintings nearly from floor to ceiling. Some privileged works would be placed “on the line” at eye level, where they were easily seen. Many more would be hung at higher and higher levels, until the works near the ceiling, those that were “skied,” were hardly discernible at all. This style of arrangement was widespread in the United States and Europe, and was satirized by Georges du Maurier in the London magazine *Punch* (figure 1.16). As a result, visitors and critics would naturally focus on the more prominently displayed works. In the face of such profusion, the hanging of the paintings would be very important in determining which were seen, remembered, and entered into the canon. Sartain formed a “Committee on Arrangement” toward this end, and this group proved just as contentious and just as fraught with civic and stylistic rivalries as the Selection Committee.

The Committee on Arrangement: Sartain’s “Assistants”

Sartain began thinking about the arrangement of the exhibition as early as November of 1875 when he wrote to James Smillie: “One of the duties of my own office is the ‘allotment of space’ which it would seem includes the individual location. This involves the right to deputise [sic] others to assist,” though Sartain added that he preferred that one person (namely him) should do the work.²³³ Shortly after, Sartain explained to Smillie his plan to appoint “as my assistants in the arrangement” the presidents of the major artist organizations of New York, Philadelphia and Boston, in

²³³ JS to James D. Smillie, New York, 1 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1163.

order to alleviate complaints from artists.²³⁴ If this arrangement sounds like a formality, it is because that is exactly how Sartain saw it. Over the months leading up to the exhibition he remarked that “As allotter of space in large and in detail I am the hanging committee” and “The arrangement of the pictures on the walls rests with me.”²³⁵ The *New-York Daily Tribune* approvingly described how “Mr. Sartain is officially alone responsible. He has wisely concluded, however, to call in assistance.” Sartain’s official report later insisted, in self-justifying fashion, that “nothing more impartial could be desired.”²³⁶ However, he had already promised preference to particular artists. Sartain told Bierstadt “[I] will watch your interest in arrangement,” and he allocated the “most important position” in the Annex to James Rogers Rich, a wealthy amateur artist from Boston.²³⁷

When inviting presidents of organizations to participate, Sartain described their duties helping to create a national presentation of American art, and affirmed that they should also look to their own city’s success: “The duties of the Committee are combined, not local, only it is intended, as it is right, that each part would especially care for his own region” so it would “appear to the best advantage.”²³⁸ This mandate caused the ruckus that ensued.

The process of appointing the Committee on Arrangement was considerably smoother than that for the Selection Committee, as Sartain simply invited presidents of key artist organizations to participate. The committee comprised seven members that

²³⁴ JS to James D. Smillie, New York, 4 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1178.

²³⁵ JS to Charles C. Perkins, Boston, 24 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 192; JS to R.W. Moore, New York, 3 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1174.

²³⁶ “The Great Exhibition: Department of Art,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 22 November 1875, 3; Sartain, “Report of the Chief,” 143.

²³⁷ JS to Albert Bierstadt, Irvington on Hudson, New York, 12 October 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1124; JS to J. Rogers Rich, Boston, 3 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 100.

²³⁸ JS to Charles C. Perkins, [no city], 24 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 192; JS to Charles C. Perkins, [no city], 25 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 191.

represented a shift from New York's domination of the Selection Committee: four came from Philadelphia, two from New York, and one from Boston.²³⁹

Christian Schussele was the Board President of the Pennsylvania Academicians. A native of Alsace who had studied in Strausbourg and Paris, he was a venerated teacher and history painter.²⁴⁰ Isaac L. Williams was a Philadelphia-trained landscape painter who served as President of the Artists' Fund Society of Philadelphia. The Paris-trained sculptor Howard Roberts was President of the Philadelphia Sketch Club. Thomas U. Walter was President of the American Institute of Architects in Philadelphia.²⁴¹ The landscape painter Worthington Whittredge, with whom Sartain had already exchanged barbs, was President of the National Academy of Design in New York. The painter and engraver James D. Smillie was President of the Society of Painters in Water-Colors in New York. Finally, Boston was represented by Charles C. Perkins, a wealthy amateur who wrote and lectured on art, and served as President of the Boston Art Museum.²⁴² The committee convened on April 27, 1876. The group nominated Smillie as chair, who declined. Then the group elected Sartain, who "absolutely refused," and Smillie finally agreed to serve as temporary chairman.²⁴³ It is puzzling that Sartain would decline the chairmanship of a committee he clearly felt he was in charge of. Perhaps it was a gesture (though an empty one) to give the members a sense of their importance. In any case, Smillie was a fortunate choice for posterity, as he kept a journal that provides glimpses into the committee's fractious labors.

²³⁹ Sartain, "Report of the Chief," 142-3.

²⁴⁰ Falk, 2944-5.

²⁴¹ Falk, 3454. Ustick was a highly successful architect who had directed the construction of the wings and dome of the United States Capitol. He was only responsible for hanging the architectural drawings, which are not part of this discussion.

²⁴² Samuel Eliot, *Memoir of Charles Callahan Perkins* (Cambridge: J. Wilson and Son, 1887), 223-6, 234, 236; Falk, 574.

²⁴³ James D. Smillie diary, Smillie Family Papers, Archives of American Art, reel 2850, no frame number.

Sartain planned to use the United States' space in Memorial Hall for a general representation of the most meritorious American art from every part of the country -- that is, the canon that was universally anticipated.²⁴⁴ The great west hall designated as gallery C would function as a "Saloon of Honor" including one picture by each eminent artist, "his largest and best," and more than one if every meritorious artist was represented.²⁴⁵ Sartain further expected to group an artist's pictures together if the works were small, to provide a fuller picture of his place in history.²⁴⁶ Sartain insisted that in spite of the huge number of works he would "refuse to hang pictures in lofty rooms higher than 16 ½ feet, and even that is far too high, and 2 ½ feet from the floor is quite low enough."²⁴⁷ Only after the paintings and sculpture designated for Memorial Hall were installed would the Annex be hung, and there works would be displayed by city, principally New York, Boston, and Philadelphia, "or any other special section."²⁴⁸

Plans to allow ample time for hanging fell by the wayside as the opening neared. World's fair planners always experienced a mad rush of preparation in the last few weeks, and most exhibitions up to this point had opened either late or incomplete. Sartain originally planned to take the entire month of April to arrange the works, but as a result of delays in finishing both Memorial Hall and the Art Annex, works arriving late at Philadelphia, and the Selection Committee's difficulty finishing its task, the arrangement

²⁴⁴ Sartain, "Report of the Chief," 143.

²⁴⁵ JS to Charles C. Perkins, Boston, 24 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 193; JS to Thomas Moran, [no city], 4 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 115.

²⁴⁶ JS to Worthington Whittredge, [no city], 14 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1277.

²⁴⁷ JS to Col. J. Edwards Clarke, [no city], 31 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 11.

²⁴⁸ Sartain, "Report of the Chief," 143. Sartain's qualification was a polite recognition that other cities had contributed, but the vast majority of works came from the three metropolitan centers.

took place in one frenzied week before the May 10 opening.²⁴⁹ Construction of the Art Annex was not complete until a month after the opening, so the hanging of those galleries was further delayed. For this reason the committee concentrated its efforts on the works in Memorial Hall, those that were intended to represent the American canon of the past and the American school of the present. Time pressure, simmering rivalries, and Sartain's presumption of total authority proved disastrous.

Smillie's diary records a remarkably contentious few weeks. He arrived with Worthington Whittredge in Philadelphia on April 24. The very next day he noted that "The antagonism of Whittredge and Sartain [is] very apparent." The following day Smillie wrote that he was losing patience with Whittredge, who seemed "impracticable [sic] and bad-tempered." By May 2 he reported that "Whittredge and Sartain are by the ears and quarrel all the time."²⁵⁰ For Whittredge's part, he recalled the entire year of 1876 as one of "unremitting labor" for the Centennial Exhibition, and was probably quite fatigued at this point.²⁵¹

Modern scholar Anthony Janson records the source of the trouble in Sartain's refusal to compromise on the poor placement of Whittredge's and other Hudson River School artists' paintings, as it would interfere with Sartain's plan to give European artists the best locations.²⁵² This makes little sense, since Sartain was not responsible for the arrangement of works from other countries. It is probably a reference to Sartain's

²⁴⁹ JS to Leverett Saltonstall, Boston, 9 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1192; JS "Report of the Art Department," handwritten draft, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4564, frame 796; Janson, 153; Sartain, "Report of the Chief," 143. A story in the *New York Herald* even reported acrimony between the Selection and Arrangement Committees, with members accusing each other of throwing out works that were better than their own, or admitting works that had been rejected. See "Condition of the Art Department at the Centennial," *New York Herald*, 5 June 1876, 8.

²⁵⁰ James Smillie diary.

²⁵¹ Janson, 44.

²⁵² Janson, 153.

partiality for American artists working in European styles -- once again, the conflict centered on the opposition between the nativist landscape school and the cosmopolitan school based on figure painting. Smillie confirmed that Sartain tried to place the work of Whittredge and several of his compatriots in an obscure part of Memorial Hall. He wrote that on May 5 Sartain had “put [Whittredge] out of Mem. Hall (practically) and things had reached such a crisis that something had to be done.” Smillie and Perkins tried to convince Sartain to let Whittredge hang one of the Annex galleries, but “he refused as it would interfere with his plan.”²⁵³

It is astonishing that in just a few months the exhibition had become so important to its organizers that Sartain all but locked his adversary out of the proceedings in order to control the shape of the American school. Though he refused the chairmanship of the committee, Sartain was determined to create his own version of American art through the arrangement of the works, with only token participation from his “assistants.” Smillie, Perkins, and Whittredge decided to resign, and Smillie protested to Director-General Goshorn on May 6 that Sartain’s handling of the hanging “must inevitably disgrace us.” Four days before the opening Goshorn surely had larger issues on his mind, and Smillie reported that he “was very quiet and begged that I would go on with the work as best I could.”²⁵⁴ Some compromise may have been reached, as official reports of the Centennial Exhibition noted that the President of the National Academy of Design (that is, Whittredge) hung the New York paintings, the President of the New York Society of

²⁵³ James D. Smillie diary.

²⁵⁴ James D. Smillie diary.

Painters in Water-Colors (Smillie) hung the New York watercolors, the President of the Boston Art Museum (Perkins) hung the Boston works, and so on.²⁵⁵

In spite of the committee's (or more accurately, Sartain's) efforts, the hanging was far from complete for the May 10 opening, and in fact became something of a spectator sport. The *New-York Daily Tribune* wrote on opening day that the American exhibition was so incomplete that a review was not yet possible.²⁵⁶ This was due in part to the late arrival of the ship *Supply* with the works of Americans in Europe. In May of 1875, months before Sartain was appointed, Goshorn applied to the United States government for ships to transport artworks from Americans abroad back to the United States, and his request was quickly approved. The ship *Supply* would sail to Civita Vecchia and Leghorn in Italy to collect works, and the *Franklin* was to take on works from Cherbourg, France and Southampton, England. The *Franklin* would meet the *Supply* at Gibraltar to transfer its cargo, and the *Supply* would proceed to Philadelphia.²⁵⁷

Sartain's official report reprinted correspondence of January 1876 between Goshorn and George M. Robeson, Secretary of the Navy, outlining their plans. The report describes the chronology of the ships departing in January and February of 1876 and of Goshorn's announcements to artists to have their works ready.²⁵⁸ It seems odd to include brief, seemingly inconsequential letters in a report of facts and figures. Sartain no doubt wished to prove his good faith and disclaim responsibility for the furor that ensued when the works did not arrive until after the opening. John Sears reported in *The Aldine* that the *Supply* was "one of the dullest old sailing vessels in the navy" and that several artists

²⁵⁵ Sartain, "Report of the Chief," 143. It is unclear, however, whether this is in reference to paintings in Memorial Hall or the Annex.

²⁵⁶ "Department of Fine Arts," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 10 May 1876, 2.

²⁵⁷ Sartain, "Report of the Chief," 134-5, 142, 149.

²⁵⁸ Sartain, "Report of the Chief," 151-6.

declined to send their works when they heard which ship would transport them. Sears blamed the Art Bureau for not requesting a more capable vessel.²⁵⁹ Both ships were ordered to wait for each other at Gibraltar, causing further delays.²⁶⁰

The *Supply* finally arrived in Philadelphia around May 13 and began the weeks-long process of unloading the works and transferring them to Fairmount Park.²⁶¹ The *New York Herald* reported that the unpacking was still incomplete on May 27, commenting that where the works would be hung in an already crowded art department was a mystery.²⁶² Indeed, it is hard to imagine that expatriate works could be given their due when they had to be wedged into leftover spaces in the display.

Critics and artists awaited the works from Europe with great anticipation. As late as June 1, Cook hesitated to begin his review as he was waiting for a promised “infusion of new life” that had not yet materialized.²⁶³ The “new life” he awaited was no doubt the paintings and sculpture of the expatriates. The *New-York Times* spoke of expatriate works “which some idiot endeavored to have excluded, and some other idiot endeavored to have displayed apart.”²⁶⁴ While there is no evidence of this, the writer’s strong choice of words indicates how important they were considered to a proper and complete presentation of American art.

Newspaper accounts described the American exhibition as a work in progress for an amazingly long time. As of May 17 the annex was still in “a very confused condition,

²⁵⁹ Sears, 199.

²⁶⁰ Sellin, *The First Pose*, 46.

²⁶¹ “Art Arrivals,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* 13 May 1876, 2.

²⁶² “The Exhibition,” *New York Herald*, 29 May 1876, 11.

²⁶³ [Clarence Cook], “The Fine Art Department: American Pictures: First Notice,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 1 June 1876, 8.

²⁶⁴ Gar., “The Art of America,” *New-York Times*, 9 June 1876, 1.

a large proportion of the pictures being not even unpacked.”²⁶⁵ Finally on May 27 *The American Architect and Building News* announced that the American pictures were in place.²⁶⁶ The *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* did not feel such a declaration could be made until June 17, and even then noted that the sculpture was in disarray and that the Annex was not quite complete.²⁶⁷ The *New York Herald* reported in mid-June, “nearly every day additions and changes are being made.”²⁶⁸ Not surprisingly, Sartain was behind many of these changes. He admitted works into the exhibition as late as October, just a month before its close.²⁶⁹ The evolving state of the exhibition drew the attention of critics and magnified the significance of every addition and every absence, particularly that of expatriate artists, focusing even more intense attention on the picture of American art emerging from the works on display.

As the exhibition opened, it must have seemed that the dream of a history of American art had collapsed under the weight of poor planning, civic rivalries, ideological conflicts, and individual egos. Among artists, initial indifference had exploded into heated conflict between two diametrically opposed schools of thought. The open aggression between Sartain and his New York counterparts, particularly Whittredge, suggests the intensity of the debate. Artists had become convinced of the exhibition’s importance to articulating a unified history of American art and a national school, and they believed that they had a vital interest in assuring that their own work was presented

²⁶⁵ “Our Great Show,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 17 May 1876, 1.

²⁶⁶ Untitled (“The exhibition of paintings is as yet...”), *The American Architect and Building News* 1 (27 May 1876): 169.

²⁶⁷ “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 17 June 1876, 1.

²⁶⁸ “The Changes Made in the Art Department of the Exhibition During the Past Week,” *New York Herald*, 19 June 1876, 9.

²⁶⁹ JS to Leonard W. Volk, 16 September 1876, [no city], HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 321; JS to Mrs. A.G. Thorpe, 3 October 1876, [no city], HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 360.

as a significant part of the display. The next chapter will discuss what kind of exhibition emerged from these contentious beginnings.

Chapter Two: Exhibiting History

East Coast readers followed with interest notices in journals and newspapers describing the debates over the United States art display at the Centennial Exhibition. The controversies leading up to its opening no doubt piqued the curiosity of artists, collectors, and critics, and led them to wonder what kind of display would represent the United States to the world, and to its own citizens. The experience of walking through Memorial Hall and the Art Annex was meant to provide viewers with an American canon of the past, and an American school of the present that would affirm the country's cultural progress. After the unresolved struggle among the artists, viewers (and critics in particular) were called upon to interpret the exhibition's canon of American art and determine whether the American school was embodied in Hudson River landscapes or European-influenced figure paintings.

By their nature, exhibitions are temporally limited, and their afterlives in memory and commentary are their most lasting legacy. But those written traces are shaped by the writers' physical experience of the exhibition. Visitors' perceptions were affected by the environment of the galleries, including the lighting, the temperature, and the sounds they heard there. Fairgoers were often stymied by the American art display's overwhelming size and confusing catalogue, and distracted by commercial encroachments. Even other visitors' behavior affected their experience. They attempted to discern the exhibition's meaning from the arrangement of the paintings and sculptures as they traveled through the galleries. Some were disappointed by the absence of well-known American works, due in many cases to New York's ultimate answer to the Centennial rivalry – a

competing exhibition. Finally, as the exhibition came to a close, many were incensed by the jurying process which, rather than clarifying the canon, only muddied it further.

Recreating the circumstances of the American art display gives a sense of how the public and critics perceived the paintings and sculpture they saw as they wandered from gallery to gallery. Many would be mindful of the comparison with the nation's earliest works, and surprised to see the American landscape school giving way to a progressive new style.

Experiencing the Exhibition

The Centennial Exhibition buildings were open every day until 7:30 p.m.; it was decided that the buildings would be closed in the evening because lighting them by gas lamps ran the risk of fire.¹ The fair was closed on Sundays, in spite of protests that it was the only day when workingmen could visit. The Fine Art exhibition triumphantly opened on the appointed day of May 10 -- an accomplishment that many international exhibitions did not achieve. But the Art Department was far from complete, and promptly "closed for repairs" the following day.² As of May 16, several rooms in Memorial Hall were not yet open to public, and more than half the galleries in Annex "present[ed] a chaotic tableau of boxes and litter."³ It was reported that the Austrian art exhibition did not open until May 17, and the German exhibition was closed that same day for unspecified reasons.⁴ Eventually the various art exhibitions were open continuously, but in the meantime

¹ John Henry Hicks, "The United States Centennial Exhibition of 1876" (Ph.D. diss., University of Georgia, 1972), 127; John Maass, *The Glorious Enterprise: The Centennial Exhibition of 1876 and H.J. Schwartzmann, Architect-in-Chief* (Watkins Glen, NY: American Life Foundation, 1973), 117-8.

² "American Artists," *The Evening Post* (New York), 30 November 1877, 1.

³ "Centennial Art: Glimpses at the Philadelphia Art Collections," *The Boston Globe*, 16 May 1876, 5.

⁴ "The Centennial Fair: Novelties Added Daily," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 17 May 1876, 1.

visitors witnessed a gradual transformation in the galleries as late arriving works were added.

Memorial Hall itself provided an impressive backdrop for the art displays. The floor plan comprised a central square gallery leading to three rectangular galleries on each side which constituted the most prominent display spaces. The outer walls were lined with smaller galleries and punctuated by domed corner galleries. The United States occupied two of the central rectangular galleries, and a few of the outer galleries (figure 2.1). The interior of the great south hall was embellished with wainscoting of colored marble, but the rest of the ornamentation was white, crowned with a magnificent crystal chandelier.⁵ Early observers anticipated complaints that the interior was not enhanced with gilding, mosaic or murals.⁶ No such contemporary criticisms have come to light, and while the lack of colorful decoration was probably connected to reasons of economy, it lessened distractions from the art itself. The color scheme in the Art Annex was more familiar to viewers of the period; Sartain ordered the ceilings and cornices to be painted greenish-grey, and the walls in Indian red.⁷ The Annex was laid out as a honeycomb of square galleries arranged in a Greek cross format. Works from the United States filled fourteen of forty-five galleries (figure 2.2).

Lighting was the subject of some discussion. In Memorial Hall the galleries and the central hall were lit by skylights, and the pavilions around the perimeter from windows along the sides.⁸ The annex was lit by skylights as well. Natural light is usually

⁵ S. Edgar Trout, *The Story of the Centennial of 1876: Golden Anniversary* (Lancaster, PA, 1929), 90-1.

⁶ "The New-York Centennial Board," *The New-York Times*, 16 March 1876, 2.

⁷ JS to Thomas Cochran, [no city, probably Philadelphia], 25 March 1876, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Sartain Family Papers (Phi 1650), reel 4563, frame 196. Reel and frame numbers refer to microfilm in the Archives of American Art. All letters from John Sartain (JS) originate in Philadelphia.

⁸ "Centennial Fine-Arts Gallery," *The Art Journal* 1 (1876): 86.

most desirable for exhibitions; however, a few problems were noted. *Scribner's Weekly* complained that in the rotunda the white glare of light from the dome made the sculpture indistinguishable from the walls and surfaces of the room (figure 2.3).⁹ The *New York Evening Post* expected that in the galleries, the wide spring of the roof from the side wall to the skylight sashes would cast a perpetual shadow on the works hung on the upper line.¹⁰ If their prediction turned out to be true, it rendered many paintings virtually invisible to viewers and critics. Only a few pictures exist to document the galleries, and the top row of works is perfectly legible, but they may have been artificially lit for photography.

The summer of 1876 was unusually hot, so that for much of the period of the Exhibition paintings and visitors were exposed to extremes of temperature and humidity.¹¹ It was hoped that Memorial Hall would be one of the coolest buildings on the fairgrounds and would serve as a refuge during warm weather. Unfortunately the opposite was true, as it was reported that in July and August the large buildings on the grounds were all shady and airy – except the art galleries.¹² Visitors to the Annex suffered the same fate, as the *New-York Daily Tribune* commented that “temperature and ventilation [are] as bad as they can be.”¹³ The *New York Evening Mail* warned that during very dry weather water was sprinkled on the floors in the Annex early in the morning, so that by noon the atmosphere was like a hothouse.¹⁴ This can be seen in a stereographic

⁹ “In and About the Fair: Dinners, Plants and Pictures,” *Scribner's Weekly* 13 (November 1876): 120.

¹⁰ “Fine Arts,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 15 March 1876, 1.

¹¹ In fact, attendance slumped during the unusually hot summer months and increased significantly when the fall brought cooler temperatures. See Hicks, 114-6.

¹² Mary A.K. Wager, “Paintings and Statuary: The Annex to Memorial Hall,” *The Daily Graphic: New York*, 18 May 1876, 8; “Characteristics of the International Fair: V,” *Atlantic Monthly* 38 (December 1876): 734.

¹³ *New-York Tribune Guide to the Exhibition* (New York: New-York Daily Tribune, 1876), 60.

¹⁴ E.A.C., “Fine Arts at the Centennial,” *New York Evening Mail*, 10 August 1876, 2.

image of the Art Annex that shows water streaks on the floor (figure 2.19). The conditions of the galleries for the middle months of the exhibition made extended viewing an uncomfortable experience, and did not encourage the kind of prolonged contemplation that the organizers hoped for.

The most striking first impression of the galleries was the overwhelming quantity of works on display. The Selection Committee's "rejection" process resulted in a group of over 700 paintings and 150 sculptures.¹⁵ Francis A. Walker, Chief of the Awards Bureau, made the biting observation that "it did not seem to occur to the Administration that an American citizen had no more natural right to hang his canvas on the walls of Memorial Hall than to hang his linen on the gates of the park."¹⁶ The process of rejection requires one to look for the very worst instead of the very best, and the Selection Committee, perhaps because of the lack of time, or because of the personal considerations that Henry Kirke Brown cited, seems to have set its standard for rejection too low.

As Art Department Chief John Sartain had planned, paintings were hung virtually from floor to ceiling, according to the practice of the period.¹⁷ Official reports note that in order to accommodate the huge number of paintings, partitions were installed in the four main galleries, and paintings were hung on them.¹⁸ This further overwhelmed viewers and divided the grand galleries into smaller, more crowded spaces. Numerous writers

¹⁵ Many editions of the catalogue were produced and none was complete; and further, works were added throughout the course of the exhibition, making it impossible to tally a definitive number of works present. By way of comparison, at present it is rare to see an exhibition of over two hundred works.

¹⁶ Francis Amasa Walker, *The World's Fair. Philadelphia, 1876. A Critical Account* (New York, Chicago: A.S. Barnes & Co., 1877), 51.

¹⁷ S.N.C., "Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition," *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 283.

¹⁸ John Sartain, "Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Art," in *International Exhibition, 1876. Report of the Director-General, Including the Reports of Bureaus of Administration*, vol. 1, United States Centennial Commission (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 137.

complained that because of the partitions the main galleries were “wanting in grandeur,” there were “no impressive perspectives,” the architectural effects of the interior were “seriously impaired,” and the overall effect produced “cultural indigestion.”¹⁹ These partitions do not appear in official photographs of the galleries (figure 2.13). Their absence points up the difference between the actual experience of the exhibition, and how it would be remembered and documented. It also parallels the selective memory that critics would be forced to employ to extract a narrative of American art from the Centennial Exhibition.

After dramatic disputes over hanging the works, the arrangement of the American exhibition was a disappointment. The French visitor L. Simonin quipped, “Do you love disorder? You will find it everywhere.”²⁰ Clarence Cook wrote of the Annex that “a more dreary, aimless, and bewildering place...cannot be imagined.”²¹ The display was called “a hopeless jumble of pictures of every epoch, hung only in respect to their size and shape, mak[ing] the inspection task of little pleasure and much mental effort, to say nothing of the physical discomfort.”²² One guide to the exhibition referred to “the inevitable fatigue of picture-seeing” and Charles Briggs of *The Independent* remarked on “the bewilderment which so great a number of pictures causes.”²³ These remarks illustrate how the physical conditions of the exhibition affected the viewer, and in

¹⁹ Phillip T. Sandhurst, *The Great Centennial Exhibition* (Philadelphia: P.W. Ziegler & Co., 1876), 25; “The New-York Centennial Board,” *The New-York Times*, 16 March 1876, 2; “American Artists,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 30 November 1877, 199; Sartain, “Report of the Chief,” 137; William Pierce Randel, *Centennial: American Life in 1876* (Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company, 1927), 383.

²⁰ L. Simonin, *A French View of the Grand International Exposition of 1876* (Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen and Haffelfinger, 1877), 16.

²¹ [Clarence Cook], “The Fine Art Department: American Pictures,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 1 June 1876, 8.

²² “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (19 August 1876): 269.

²³ *New-York Tribune Guide to the Exhibition*, 58; Charles F. Briggs, “Centennial Paintings: The American Department,” *The Independent*, 13 July 1876, 4.

particular, the critic. Faced with a confusing morass of pictures in an acutely uncomfortable atmosphere made great demands on the goodwill of one trying to understand the display and discern some pattern or narrative.

The problem of profusion was endemic to the entire Centennial Exhibition. Statistics on the accumulation of objects and the impossibility of seeing them all were flaunted in the media with a kind of pride. One writer observed that it would require a walk of two miles to see all the works in Memorial Hall.²⁴ Another marveled at the fact that “if each object [in the whole exhibition] were examined but two minutes, the entire exhibition would require a century.”²⁵ Contemporary reactions to the Exhibition show an ambivalence between wonder at the abundance of things to see, and horror at the thought of having to see them all. As a writer for the *Galaxy* observed, “this crowd was left quite without guidance; not so much indeed as to what they should see as to what they should *not* see.”²⁶ Stories circulated of fairgoers dying from “overexcitement of the brain” from trying to process all the information and stimuli that the displays provided.²⁷

Throughout the nineteenth century, viewers underwent a transition from a culture of intensive experience to one of extensive experience. Jonathan Crary has noted that “the observer of paintings in the nineteenth century was always also an observer who simultaneously consumed a proliferating range of optical and sensory experiences,” and new ways of seeing developed to “recode the activity of the eye, to regiment it, to

²⁴ David Bailey, “*Eastward Ho!*” Or *Leaves from the Diary of a Centennial Pilgrim* (Highland, Ohio: David Bailey, 1877), 45.

²⁵ *The Centennial Eagle*, 25 July 1876; quoted in Adam Kaufman Goodheart, “Last Summer of the Republic: The Centennial Exhibition as Experiment and Experience” (A.B. Honors Thesis, Harvard University, 1992), 90.

²⁶ Titus Munson Coan, “People and Pictures at the Fair,” *Galaxy* 22 (December 1876): 763.

²⁷ Clemmer, “A Woman’s Letter from Philadelphia,” *The Independent* 28 (26 October 1876); quoted in Goodheart, 91.

heighten its productivity and to prevent its distraction.”²⁸ Another modern scholar, Adam Goodheart Kaufman, agreed that viewers were “learning to process information and sensations as selectively as one must in an environment of excess rather than shortage.”²⁹ This new mode of selective vision was called for at the Centennial Exhibition, where the overwhelming number of objects forced visitors to choose for themselves what they would pass over quickly and what they would pause to contemplate. Many published guides included advice on the foremost attractions of the exhibition and, more important, which displays could be skipped without great loss.³⁰ The Centennial Exhibition was an exercise in selective vision for the entire nation, as fairgoers were compelled to look and think independently. Viewers, and critics in particular, were forced to make their own choices of which works to linger at and which to pass by. These acts of selection were instrumental to building the American canon and American school that resulted.

The official exhibition catalogue was of little assistance. The concession for the catalogue was originally given to the Philadelphia publisher Nagle and Co., which proved unable to accomplish the task. The Centennial Commission took over, contracting out various aspects of the work to different firms.³¹ The catalogue received scathing comments from the press, including “wretchedly bad” and of “miserable character,” and containing one page of advertising for every two of catalogue content. It was considered overall a “useless and irritating performance.”³² In the defense of its creators, the

²⁸ Jonathan Crary, *Techniques of the Observer* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992), 20, 24.

²⁹ Goodheart, 90.

³⁰ For examples, see *New-York Tribune Guide to the Exhibition; What is the Centennial? And How to See It* (Philadelphia, [T.S.] Dando, 1876); and *Hand-Book to the Centennial Grounds and Fairmount Park: Where to Go and What to See* (Philadelphia: John E. Potter & Company, 1876).

³¹ Bruno Giberti, *Designing the Centennial: A History of the 1876 International Exhibition in Philadelphia* (Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2002), 30.

³² “The Awards at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Nation* 23 (23 November 1876): 310; [Clarence Cook], “The Fine Art Department. American Pictures. First Notice,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 1 June 1876, 8.

Centennial Commission had great difficulty getting timely and accurate information from exhibitors.³³ The first version included dozens of pictures that were not in the art galleries, no doubt works that were promised but for whatever reason were not delivered. After the opening, work began immediately on a corrected second version that was expected in mid-June.³⁴ New editions continued to appear throughout the run of the exhibition. Various accounts note “new and correct” editions and “complete official” versions available on July 24, August 2, August 22, and as late as October 10, one month before the Exhibition’s close.³⁵

In the end, at least fourteen editions were printed, and in comparing the later versions to newspaper accounts, even they remained incomplete.³⁶ Besides being incorrect, the first edition of the catalogue was difficult to use. No more than a list of works in alphabetical order by artist, it required visitors to look at the number designated to the painting or sculpture and leaf through the listings for more information; *The Boston Globe* complained that “the arrangement is such that it takes the visitor five minutes to find any given title or proper name.”³⁷ Later editions wisely listed artworks by gallery.

Most of the paintings and sculpture in the galleries were identified only by number, and even the numbered labels identifying the works of living artists were poorly organized. Clarence Cook heaped his characteristic scorn on the “shabby bits of paper,

³³ Bruno Giberti, “The Classified Landscape: Consumption, Commodity Order, and the 1876 Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia” (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1994), 32.

³⁴ “Vandalism at the Exhibition,” *New York Herald*, 20 May 1876, 7.

³⁵ Trout, 146, 182; JS to Walter McMichael, [no city], 24 July 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 225; JS to Charles H. Delavan, New York, 22 September 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 337.

³⁶ Except where noted, for references to works in the exhibition and their gallery locations, I have used the fourteenth edition of the United State Centennial Commission’s exhibition catalogue, which is the latest version that I have encountered. The confusion surrounding the catalogue, as well as Sartain’s unilateral additions, renders a truly accurate listing of works impossible, and the appendices listing works in the American art exhibition are constructed from several sources, including catalogues, newspaper accounts, and Sartain’s correspondence.

³⁷ “Centennial Art: Glimpses at the Philadelphia Art Collections,” *The Boston Globe*, 16 May 1876, 5.

apparently torn from an old newspaper, on which all the American pictures are numbered.”³⁸ It brings to mind an image of Sartain and (if he was lucky) a few of his Philadelphia colleagues from the Committee on Arrangement madly tearing up small pieces of paper, scribbling numbers on them, and jamming them into picture frames in the wee hours of the night before the exhibition opening; and indeed, many of the labels were illegible.³⁹ In an interesting exception, works by deceased artists were labeled with the artist’s name, in yet another testimony to the importance placed on the retrospective aspect of the exhibition.

By early August with the release of a new and “reasonably correct” catalogue, the New York *Evening Post* announced that the “infamous little scraps of paper” had been replaced with yellow cardboard tags.⁴⁰ Critics would have certainly purchased catalogues in order to determine artists and titles, as would many other visitors, but it is unclear how many would have stopped to consult them for pictures other than such attention-getting works as Rothermel’s *Battle of Gettysburg*. For many the lack of descriptive labels probably made the exhibition an exercise in purely visual connoisseurship, unaided by the most basic information. It helped to develop one’s eye, but it left most viewers without the names of artists or works that moved them, leaving them dependent on critics to explain which were noteworthy.

In addition to the monumental number of works, visitors to the art exhibition were overwhelmed by mercantile encroachments. Accounts of the Centennial Exhibition as a whole often note instances of commercialism run amok, such as “the so-called bazaars

³⁸ C.C. [Clarence Cook], “The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: Second Notice,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 3 June 1876, 2.

³⁹ “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 21 June 1876, 2.

⁴⁰ “A New Centennial Art Catalogue,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 3 August 1876, 4.

outside the Exhibition buildings at Philadelphia, in which thinly-disguised Germans or Irishmen sold sacred relics or the characteristic wares of various oriental countries, of which John Street and Maiden Lane afforded an unfailing supply on the shortest notice.” William Dean Howells cynically observed “yonder are a Norwegian bride and groom in their wedding-gear, the bride wearing a crown and ornaments of barbaric gold, -- which in this case were actual heirlooms descended from mother to daughter in one peasant family through three hundred years. All was for sale.”⁴¹ The ever-vigilant *International Review* said in the Art department, “the commercial interest...takes its lowest form, in a desire to obtain a purchaser for the article immediately exhibited.”⁴² The *American Architect and Building News* concurred that “Nowhere...is the commercial spirit more obtrusive.”⁴³

An article in the *New-York Times* warned visitors against uniformed men and boys at the entrance of Memorial Hall selling so-called “official catalogues” that were incomplete and otherwise merely full of advertisements.⁴⁴ Sartain complained of a man who claimed to have a concession to sell “napkins and other shabby trash” in Memorial Hall, and he begged Director-General Goshorn to at least locate him in the corridor of the Art Annex.⁴⁵ Vendors of medals, photographs, flowers, and opera glasses “loudly hawked their wares” in the galleries.⁴⁶ Two Philadelphia porcelain dealers set up advertising displays in the Art Annex, much to the dismay of the *New-York Daily*

⁴¹ William Dean Howells, “A Sennight of the Centennial,” *Atlantic Monthly* 38 (July 1876): 98.

⁴² Francis A. Walker, “The Late World’s Fair. Part II – The Display,” *International Review* 4 (July 1877): 508.

⁴³ “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – I,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (1 July 1876): 213.

⁴⁴ “Art,” “An Exhibition Swindle,” *The New-York Times*, 25 June 1876, 8.

⁴⁵ JS to A.T. Goshorn, 27 September 1876 [no city], HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 348.

⁴⁶ Ethan Robey, “John Sartain and the Contest of Taste at the Centennial,” in *Philadelphia’s Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*, eds. Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000), 89.

Tribune critic, who proclaimed that they had no right to be there. The same writer observed that “Not even the sacred precincts of art escape the invasion of the sizzling soda fountain, with its tawdry embellishments and fly-frequented gildings and marbles.”⁴⁷ It seems that Sartain himself had little control over these intrusions. He joined the chorus of protests that the various stands in Memorial Hall made it “more like a Bazaar than an Art Exhibition” and that the building was “filled with a swarm of men and boys who shout continually The Art Catalogue for sale [sic].”⁴⁸

It is not surprising that some enterprising artists should also try to take advantage of the best-attended American art exhibition ever, as the regulations for the Art Department provided that works of art intended for sale would be so indicated in the catalogue.⁴⁹ The potential commercial advantages of exhibiting in Fairmount Park were obvious to even the most established and high-minded artists. Jervis McEntee wrote in his diary “My pictures at the Centennial exhibition have had a number of very favorable notices...I only wish it would induce our picture buyers to think more of my work, and I think it will in time.”⁵⁰

It is clear though, that the United States art exhibition was less a commercial endeavor than those of other countries. The exhibition catalogue lists 235 United States paintings and sculpture for sale, less than one-third of the total. This may seem like a large proportion, but for some countries such as Sweden and Austria, nearly all the paintings and sculpture on display were for sale.⁵¹ Surprisingly, the catalogue does not

⁴⁷ “Art Notes,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 19 August 1876, 2.

⁴⁸ JS to Committee on Concessions, 17 August 1876, [no city], HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 271.

⁴⁹ “In the Studios: The Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 1 (1875): 383.

⁵⁰ “Jervis McEntee’s Diary, 1874-1876,” *Archives of American Art Journal* 31 (January 1991): 16.

⁵¹ Of the Swedish works, 51 of 73 were for sale, and of the Austrian paintings and sculpture, 114 of 121 were for sale.

note any objects for sale at all in the English, French or Italian displays, when the contemporary press confirms that many were available for purchase. The British section of the catalogue specifies the lenders for each work, including many distinguished public and private collections, so it is unlikely that many were for sale. The French and Italian sections, however, did not list owners. Italian and French works may have been marked for sale in the galleries, rather than more discreetly in the catalogue. If Austria and Sweden are any indication, nearly all of the French and Italian works may have been for sale, making the American display look restrained and dignified by comparison.

Americans were particularly sensitive to such forays by foreign exhibitors. As early as November of 1875 the *New-York Daily Tribune* assured its readers that foreign countries would participate in the art exhibition because “the current belief among foreign artists [is] that America is a very Eldorado of a market for their productions,”⁵² but as the opening day approached, Philip Quilibet of the *Galaxy* reported fears about whether foreign painters and sculptors would find the American market worth sending to.⁵³ After the opening of the exhibition another writer for the *Galaxy* observed that the best foreign exhibitions had come from countries where Americans traveled the least, as opposed to France and Italy where the American tourist “is at once a joy and a profit to the natives.”⁵⁴

The foreign art exhibitions in particular came to be considered a test of American taste. Many of the Italian sculptures were for sale, sent by dealers and stone-cutters, not sculptors, and it was considered that “the commercial venture of Italy exceeds that of any

⁵² “The Great Exhibition: Department of Art,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 22 November 1875, 3.

⁵³ Philip Quilibet, “Drift-Wood: Come Over and Help Us,” *Galaxy* 21 (February 1876): 271.

⁵⁴ Coan, 767.

other country.”⁵⁵ Joaquin Miller of *The Independent* huffed that “The Italian pictures and statues were sent over here to sell” and that the pictures were “cut down to the level of the American understanding” in an insulting manner.⁵⁶ It appears that Americans behaved creditably by not purchasing inferior foreign works in great numbers, and newspapers and journals echoed with self-congratulation. The *New-York Daily Tribune* explained that “it should be written down to our credit, not that our merchant princes have had the money to buy any pictures offered in the European markets, but that they have so soon learned what to buy,” and observed the “gratifying fact” that “none of the trashy works sent from Europe have found purchasers.”⁵⁷ The *American Architect and Building News* wrote that “this country, which has so long had the reputation of an easy picture-market, is fast gaining credit for the taste and good judgment of its citizens in the selection of foreign works of art.”⁵⁸ Even into 1877 the *Art Journal* would still note proudly that “it seems to have been thought that everything which would not sell in Europe would be welcome in America. It is a satisfaction to know that this speculation was a failure.”⁵⁹

Sartain worked assiduously to protect the outward appearance of propriety for the United States exhibition. He refused an inquiry about installing a stand for the sale of an artist’s prints with the familiar protest that “the Commission makes an exhibition and not a Bazaar.” He ordered Messrs. Weiner & Co. to remove from Memorial Hall an

⁵⁵ E.A.C., “Fine Arts at the Centennial,” 2.

⁵⁶ Joaquin Miller, “The Great Centennial Fair and Its Future,” *The Independent*, 13 July 1876, 1.

⁵⁷ “A Suggestion for the Centennial Summer,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 2 March 1876, 4; “The Great Fair Closed,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 11 November 1876, 2.

⁵⁸ “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (12 August 1876): 261.

⁵⁹ T.C. Archer, “On the Probable Influence Which the Centennial Exhibition Will Have on the Progress of Art in America,” *The Art Journal* (London) 16 (January 1877): 8.

unauthorized table selling objects inappropriate for the art galleries. He complained about a photography company that was allowed to sell pictures of Italian sculpture outside the Italian department -- given the sensation caused by the quantities of Italian “boudoir” sculpture, the photographs were probably popular items indeed.⁶⁰

However, there were inherent conflicts in trying to present a didactic exhibition in a highly commercialized context, and Sartain’s pragmatic nature often found him paying mere lip service to his ideals. In the months leading up to the exhibition, he explained to various inquirers that there would be no salesman in the galleries, and that no one would be hired to sell works on commission, but that he himself would do his best to facilitate sales at no charge “out of goodwill to the artistic profession.”⁶¹ By August of 1876 he had apparently reversed his policy. He wrote to James Smillie that “measures have been taken to provide facilities for selling pictures and other works of art,” and he suggested to the owner of a mosaic table that she engage a young man stationed nearby to broker its sale for a commission.⁶² A few months later he made reference to a Mr. H. Teubner as agent for the sale of paintings in the Art Department, asking that he be allowed to bring potential buyers into the galleries when Sartain was out of town, presumably on Sundays, when the exhibition was closed.⁶³

⁶⁰ JS to William E. Marshall, New York, 21 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1289; JS to Messrs. Weiner & Co., 31 August 1876, [no city], HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 298; JS to Signor Giuseppe Dass [no city], 22 July 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 224.

⁶¹ JS to R.W. Moore, New York, 3 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1173; JS to Hon. George P. Marsh, [no city], 25 January 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 57; JS to J.S. Dumaresq, Rome, 22 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frames 1295-6.

⁶² JS to James Smillie, [no city], 5 August 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 250; JS to Mrs. J Francis Fisher, [no city], 15 August 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 265.

⁶³ J.V.P. Turner, Secretary of Art Department, to Thomas Cochran, 20 October 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 379.

There are hints that Sartain also tried to create a commission arrangement for himself. In February of 1876 he wrote regretfully to John Carbutt of Philadelphia that Director-General Goshorn was “so averse to infringing the principal that all persons employed and paid by the Commission must abstain from receiving commissions and fees from Exhibitors for services rendered, that I fear it will bar the arrangement we were planning.”⁶⁴ He may have pursued the possibility with someone else however, as several months later he wrote mysteriously to Geo. A. Leavitt & Co. that they should not include his name on an unspecified circular of theirs, since “my position is peculiar and I am obliged to be very discreet.”⁶⁵

Bruno Giberti has observed that at the Centennial Exhibition art objects “flickered back and forth between commodity and object lesson,” creating a volatile situation for their special status in comparison to the manufactured goods that surrounded them on the fairgrounds.⁶⁶ Collectors and the public in the United States were still undecided about the position of art in the marketplace (or out of it). The Centennial Exhibition proved to be an exercise in defining that status. The commercial and commemorative natures of the exhibition presented practical and philosophical difficulties that highlighted questions about art’s place in American society.

In spite of efforts to reduce the exhibition to a business proposition, even by Sartain, its chief, the relatively small number of artists submitting works for sale shows that they considered the Centennial Exhibition’s art display not a sales outlet, but a

⁶⁴ JS to John Carbutt, Philadelphia, 24 February 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 90.

⁶⁵ JS to George A. Leavitt & Co., [no city], 31 July 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 241. After all these machinations, it is not clear how many works were sold, as records are spotty at best. Sartain reported vaguely that more works had been sold than was expected, and that many of them were American. See “The Great Fair Closed,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 11 November 1876, 2.

⁶⁶ Giberti, *Designing the Centennial*, 173.

statement about American art. They submitted their works not for financial gain (which was of course necessary for their survival), but to make their place in history. The complaints about commercialism were warning shots of a public battle that would be waged throughout the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries over the relationship between art and commerce and the awkward status of art as a salable commodity.⁶⁷ This debate would manifest itself in other, even more visible ways when the time came to judge the Centennial Exhibition's art display.

A guidebook for the 1901 Pan-American Exposition in Buffalo warned visitors, "please remember when you get inside the gates you are part of the show."⁶⁸ The admonition was just as fitting a quarter century earlier in Philadelphia. The United States display in Fairmount Park has been aptly called "the first real introduction of American artists to the American public."⁶⁹ The *New-York Daily Tribune* recognized that "full of defects as was the art exhibit in the eyes of critics and connoisseurs, to the great majority of visitors it was a new revelation of beauty."⁷⁰ It was expected that while the Centennial Exhibition would teach foreign visitors about American industry and manufacturing, Americans would learn about art, taste, and culture.⁷¹ Many of the visitors who thronged the galleries were United States citizens from beyond the East Coast who had few opportunities to see original works of art, by Americans or otherwise. Lacking local galleries, museums, or artists' exhibiting organizations, most were unfamiliar with art

⁶⁷ For further discussion, see Kimberly Orcutt, "Buy American? The Debate Over the Art Tariff," *American Art* 16 (Fall 2002): 82-91. The debate continues into the present day on various levels; complaints about the vendors and soda fountains at the Centennial Exhibition are familiar to modern museum-goers who decry the ubiquitous gift shops and cafes there.

⁶⁸ "Short Sermon to Sightseers at the 1901 Pan-American Exposition;" quoted in Tony Bennett, "The Exhibitionary Complex," *New Formations* 4 (Spring 1988): 81.

⁶⁹ Christine Hunter Donaldson, "The Centennial of 1876: The Exposition, and Culture for America" (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1948), 103.

⁷⁰ "The Great Fair Closed," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 11 November 1876, 2.

⁷¹ Donaldson, 88.

beyond a few prints that might have decorated their walls. The art exhibition stood as an evaluation of the general public's level of sophistication, and their behavior in the galleries quickly became another test.

Edward C. Bruce wrote expansively in his 1877 book *The Century: Its Fruits and Its Festival* of the visitor's experience of the art exhibition:

We are all dwellers in a vast picture-gallery, with frescoed dome above and polychromed sculpture and mosaic pavement on the floor below. Its merits we perceive, enjoy and interpret according to our individual gifts and education. But it makes amateurs in some sort of every mother's son or daughter of us; and we hasten to plunge, confident each in his particular grammar of the beautiful, into the study of what imitative gallery may be offered us [sic].⁷²

Bruce's idyll was at odds with other contemporary accounts of visitor behavior, particularly in its leisurely tone. Fukui Makoto, the Japanese commissioner to the Exhibition, offered his impressions of the opening day crowd: "The first day crowds come like sheep, run here, run there, run everywhere. One man start, one thousand follow. Nobody can see anything, nobody can do anything. All rush, push, tear, shout, make plenty noise, say damn great many times, get very tired, and go home."⁷³ Titus Munson Coan of the *Galaxy* agreed that "Everybody was walking, running, or riding; everything was seen by glances, and but few were attentively looking at what they had come to see. I might say rather that people seemed to be looking at everything and seeing nothing."⁷⁴ The humor writer "Bricktop" concurred in his illustration "The chap who attempts to do the Exhibition in one day" (figure 2.4).

⁷² Edward C. Bruce, *The Century: Its Fruits and Its Festival: Being a History and Description of the Centennial Exhibition, with a Preliminary Outline of Modern Progress* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1877), 47.

⁷³ *Harper's Weekly*, 15 July 1876, 579; quoted in Dee Brown, *The Year of the Century: 1876* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966), 131.

⁷⁴ Coan, 762.

If fairgoers were in a hurry, perhaps they were hurrying to see the art exhibition, as numerous accounts attest that the galleries were “really thronged” and “crowded to excess,” particularly the Italian galleries with their many nude figure sculptures (figure 2.5).⁷⁵ One visitor threw up her hands and wrote home that “it is ridiculous to attempt to view the paintings; the crowd in the Art Gallery is a pushing, jamming, seething one.”⁷⁶ With several million attendees, the art displays in Memorial Hall and the Art Annex represented, in a sense, the nation’s first blockbuster exhibition.

As always, civic and regional differences were noted. The *Atlantic Monthly* described how to determine the origins of American visitors from their comments: “the New Yorkers could have done it so much better, the Bostonians would not have done it at all; the real admirers are the Southerners and Westerners.”⁷⁷ It is no accident that the writer attributed more admiration and less discrimination to the visitors from beyond the East Coast. The country had only founded its major museums in the last six years. The Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Boston Art Museum, and the Corcoran Gallery, along with most academies and private galleries, were concentrated on a small strip of land along the Atlantic. The majority of Americans were unschooled in how to behave and look at art. The flow of fairgoers from the western United States was described as “the migration of races,” as “farmers came in great bands.”⁷⁸ Marietta Holley’s fictional character Samantha Allen typified these visitors. She decided that she would call Memorial Hall the “Artemus Gallery,” since “when any man takes such pains as Artemus

⁷⁵ Howells, 93; Coan, 762; Maass, 76; See also “Characteristics of the International Fair: Closing Days,” *Atlantic Monthly* 39 (January 1877): 99; *New-York Tribune Guide to the Exhibition*, 58; “Characteristics of the International Fair,” *Atlantic Monthly* 38 (July 1876): 89.

⁷⁶ Brown, 135.

⁷⁷ “Characteristics of the International Fair: II,” *Atlantic Monthly* 38 (August 1876): 234.

⁷⁸ Coan, 761-2.

has, to git such a splendid assortment of pictures and statues together for my pleasure, and the pleasure of the Nation,” she must pay him the respect of using his full name.⁷⁹ It was these presumably unsophisticated naifs to the art world whose reactions were observed and interpreted to evaluate the country’s overall cultural progress.

Elizabeth Johns’ study *American Genre Painting* traces the evolution of collectively constructed types that Americans used to assuage their anxieties about the nation’s changing social order. One of these Johns identified as the “yeoman,” the idealized independent farmer who was seen to form the backbone of the country, and was looked to with fondness and nostalgia in changing times. The other was the “Yankee” type familiar to East Coast writers, who was “insular, socially clumsy, and peculiar in his dialect.”⁸⁰ Lampoons of Centennial Exhibition audiences elided the two types.

John Sears of *The Aldine* noted with alarm the lack of safeguards for paintings, suggesting that masterworks such as Eastman Johnson’s *Old Kentucky Home*, hung at shoulder height in a crowded area, should be corded off.⁸¹ Exhibition regulations prohibited glass over any paintings so that they and sculptures too were at risk, and periodicals of the day began to report all kinds of abuses.⁸² Toes were broken off of marble sculptures and the Austrian gallery was temporarily closed in May after an important painting was cut with a knife. Signs were installed imploring people to not

⁷⁹ Marietta Holley, *Josiah Allen’s Wife as a P.A. and a P.I. Samantha at the Centennial* (Hartford, CT: American Publishing Company, 1877), 473. Holley did not satirize only naïve provincials. She also struck at oversophisticated eastern critics when Samantha’s husband Josiah explained that “runnin’ things down is always safe; *that* never hurts anybody’s reputation. The pint is, they say, in not bein’ pleased with anything, or if you be, to conceal it; look perfectly wooden, and not show your feelins’ a mite; that is the pint they say,” 482.

⁸⁰ Elizabeth Johns, *American Genre Painting: The Politics of Everyday Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991), 12-5.

⁸¹ John Sears, “Art in Philadelphia,” *The Aldine* 8 (June 1876): 196.

⁸² “In the Studios: The Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 1 (1875): 383.

touch the paintings with canes or umbrellas (as can be seen in figure 2.19), and the *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* decried the “Poking Propensity of People.”⁸³

These offenses were met with a veritable media campaign of ridicule against the country “hick” who was presumably responsible (figure 2.6). The typical vandal was described as “the Western statesman of the Democratic type, [who] wanders through the Art Department, punching the Madonna’s nose with his umbrella by way of emphasizing his opinion that ‘thisyer woman ain’t no beauty.’”⁸⁴ “Bricktop” related seeing a man “evidently fresh from Memorial Hall where he had been ‘testing’ things with his big hickory walking club,” who described his attempts to determine whether the statue of George Washington outside Philadelphia’s Independence Hall was of brass or marble: “If it’s made of marble I can knock one of his fingers off with this ‘ere stick; if it’s brass I can’t.”⁸⁵ Another article entitled “The Centennial Pawnees” plainly labeled such visitors “savages” and “clumsy, rustic, uncouth” people who “wandered in from the outlying reservations of the interior” and used their “long and ugly paws” to mutilate everything within their reach, “especially infesting the Art Galleries.”⁸⁶ The *New-York Times* suggested that the problem could be solved if each offender was “caught, labeled, and exhibited for twenty-four hours on a conspicuous pedestal” and was “constantly prodded with a sharp umbrella by some loud-voiced lecturer upon his moral and physical peculiarities.”⁸⁷

⁸³ JS to A.T. Goshorn, 28 August 1876, [no city], HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 288; “The Centennial Problem,” *New-York Times*, 26 May 1876, 4; Clay Lancaster, “Taste at the Philadelphia Centennial,” *Magazine of Art* 43 (December 1950): 295; “The Fine Arts: Department of Sculpture,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 20 May 1876, 1.

⁸⁴ “The Centennial Problem,” *New-York Times*, 26 May 1876, 4.

⁸⁵ Bricktop, *Going to the Centennial and A Guy to the Great Exhibition* (New York: Collin & Small, 1876), 47.

⁸⁶ “The Centennial Pawnees,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 20 May 1876, 4.

⁸⁷ “The Centennial Problem,” *New-York Times*, 26 May 1876, 4.

Such measures proved to be unnecessary, according to reports that problems waned as the exhibition progressed. Titus Munson Coan reported for the *Galaxy* that time seemed to be checking audiences' tendencies toward "squeamishness and vandalism."⁸⁸ Amazingly, the constantly changing crowds in the galleries seemed to learn, whether by word of mouth, social pressure, or outright ridicule, how one acted in an art gallery. The lessening "squeamishness" referred to reactions to the many nudes in the galleries, particularly, but not exclusively, in the Italian galleries (figure 2.7). Reception of the nude can be considered a historical barometer of American openness to art, as even the most sophisticated East Coast audiences had a longstanding reluctance to see the nude figure as art, rather than merely a prurient naked body. The change in public behavior suggests that American audiences were learning to look beyond surfaces and curiosities.

Journalists' careful study of the crowds in Memorial Hall reflects the stock-taking inspired by both the Centennial moment and the prospect of foreign scrutiny. Just as one looks with fresh eyes upon one's home when visitors are coming, Americans looked at themselves and each other anew in anticipation of the European eyes that were expected to observe them, though in the end, most visitors to the Fairmount Park, and therefore to the art display, were American.⁸⁹ Memorial Hall became a great national classroom for behavior and connoisseurship. It readied the broader public to take a serious, considered view of American art, and prepared them for the telling of its history that the exhibition inspired.

⁸⁸ Coan, 764.

⁸⁹ Hicks, 4.

Perusing the Galleries in Memorial Hall and the Art Annex

The United States display of paintings and sculpture occupied several galleries in Memorial Hall and the Art Annex. Floor plans of the buildings (figures 2.1, 2.2) informed visitors which spaces were designated for each country, with letters denoting Memorial Hall galleries and numbers for Art Annex galleries. In the privileged space of Memorial Hall, two prominent central galleries were used to form the much-anticipated canon of American art and to shape a presentation of an American school. One was the long, narrow space that appears on the left half of the Memorial Hall ground plan sandwiched between galleries C and D. It is designated only as “U.S.,” in an exception to the rule of naming those galleries by letter.⁹⁰ For lack of a better name, it was known as the Central Gallery West (figure 2.8), and included many works by widely recognized American “old masters,” including John Singleton Copley’s portraits of Mrs. Thomas Boylston (figure 2.9) and John Adams; four portraits by Gilbert Stuart; four paintings by Washington Allston, including *Rosalie* (Society for the Preservation of New England Antiquities) and *Spalatro’s Vision of the Bloody Hand* (unlocated); and three portraits by Samuel F. B. Morse.

After months of tensions between Sartain and the New York art community, and his violent squabbles with Worthington Whittredge about the arrangement, it is of interest that in addition to early American paintings, the Central Gallery West also included a large body of contemporary works by New Yorkers. Hudson River School artists such as Asher B. Durand, Jasper Francis Cropsey, Sanford Gifford, and John Frederick Kensett (recently deceased in 1872) were abundantly represented. Other New Yorkers were

⁹⁰ Though the opposite gallery on the right side of the ground plan is also designed “U.S.,” there is no evidence that American works were displayed there, suggesting that arrangements were altered after the plan was printed.

prominently featured: Daniel Huntington of the Selection Committee showed two portraits, and Whittredge himself was present in force with four pictures, including *A Home by the Sea* (figure 2.10) and *A Hundred Years Ago* (unlocated). Other notables were Eastman Johnson with four paintings, including his widely-acclaimed *Old Kentucky Home* (figure 2.11). Numerically, contemporary New York artists were preeminent, with eighty-four of 141 works in the gallery, in contrast to twelve from Philadelphia and just three from Boston.

Some European-influenced painters were also represented there, for example, John La Farge, working in a Barbizon-inspired style; Eugene Benson, an expatriate in Rome; and Thomas Eakins, whose *Chess Players* (figure 2.12) there provided something of an antidote to *The Gross Clinic*'s ignominious relegation to the United States Army Post Hospital display. Other expatriate artists in the Central Gallery West were A.F. Bunner of Munich, Regis Gignoux from the Paris Selection Committee, Frederic A. Bridgman of Paris, and George H. Boughton of London.

The United States' most prominent space in Memorial Hall was gallery C, the large gallery in the lower left part of the ground plan (figure 2.1). Known as the "Saloon of Honor," its purpose was to showcase the nation's most highly-esteemed artists. Sartain planned to include one painting by each eminent artist ("his largest and best"), and more than one only if every meritorious artist was already represented.⁹¹ Sartain may have felt every worthy artist was indeed included, as there are several who are represented with multiple works. The south and west walls of this gallery were photographed (figure 2.13) and David Sellin has identified the paintings there (figure 2.14), so that the arrangement can be studied as a representative example of the hanging for the rest of the exhibition. In

⁹¹ JS to Charles C. Perkins, Boston, 24 March 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 193.

general paintings were arranged in period style, with large pictures “on the line” at eye level and smaller works in rows above and below. Contrary to Sartain’s plan, paintings by one artist were generally not grouped together, and no purpose or pattern can be discerned in their arrangement. Though some conclusions can be drawn from which paintings and sculptures were selected for these important spaces, little can be inferred from their actual placement in the galleries. This is not surprising, given the short time frame and difficult circumstances surrounding the hanging process.

The Central Gallery West included twenty-eight works by artists of the past, that is, deceased artists, suggesting that that this gallery represented the historical canon. By contrast gallery C, the Saloon of Honor, included only twelve works by dead artists and of those, most were recently deceased, such as John F. Kensett, Emanuel Leutze, Thomas Sully, and J.A. Suydam.⁹² Gallery C included many more works by emerging young American painters. For instance, while there were no paintings by Winslow Homer in the Central Gallery West, two were hung in the Saloon of Honor, *Snap the Whip* (figure 2.15) and *The American Type* (unlocated).⁹³ Four paintings by Eastman Johnson were there, including *The Old Stage Coach* (Milwaukee Art Museum) and the figure piece *Catching the Bee* (figure 2.16). While the Central Gallery West represented the nation’s history, Gallery C was dominated by artists of the present day.

It is noteworthy that Gallery C included more than twice the number of paintings by artists from Boston and Philadelphia than did the Central Gallery West. It also displayed a strong representation of artists who had either trained abroad or still resided

⁹² Kensett died in 1872, Leutze in 1868, Sully in 1872, and Suydam in 1865.

⁹³ *The American Type* was described as showing “a rustic youth and a maiden in a cornfield. Before them lie a pile of ripe and ruddy ears, and the maiden has turned her pouting, coquettish face away from the earnest gaze of her admirer.” See “Ruhamah,” “Art at the Centennial,” *National Republican*, 15 June 1876, 1.

in Europe, such as Bridgman, Benson, Eakins, G.P.A. Healy, Hunt, La Farge, H.H. Moore, H.M. Nilson, Charles S. Pearce, and Toby Rosenthal. Sculpture in that gallery was of course dominated by such expatriates as P.F. Connelly and Howard Roberts. This emphasis on foreign-trained artists is confirmed by the fact that the only prominent painting in the room by a long-deceased American “old master” was John Vanderlyn’s *Ariadne* (figure I.15), a nude painted by the country’s first well-known expatriate to Paris. This inclusion connected the works of foreign-trained painters to the early history of the country’s artistic development.

While the Central Gallery West was dominated by the paintings of deceased artists and the Hudson River School, the Saloon of Honor represented the young artists of the day, with a high proportion of foreign-trained painters and works from Philadelphia and Boston, cities known for their sympathies to those influences. It seems that Sartain cleverly linked the New York landscapists to the past, and European-influenced figure painters to the present. In this way, the Hudson River School artists could not inherit the mantle of history – they already were history. The two galleries subtly conveyed the message that the time of the New York landscape school had passed, and the expatriates’ time had come.

The Grand Central Hall, also called gallery B, was a large square space in the middle of the building. It included a few paintings and forty-five pieces of American sculpture. Its central location and the concentration of works made it the organizers’ most visible statement on the nation’s sculpture. As might be expected, the sculptors represented were almost entirely expatriates, since at that time instruction, resources, and opportunities were still most easily found abroad. Most were originally Philadelphia

natives whose work was in local collections.⁹⁴ The neoclassical style, though quickly falling out of vogue, still held sway in Rome and Florence, and gallery B included large groups of neoclassical works such as P.F. Connelly's *Thetis* (figure 2.17), William W. Story's *Medea* (Peabody Essex Museum), and Vinnie Ream's *The West* (Wisconsin State Capitol, Madison). Even the young Augustus Saint-Gaudens, who would soon bring the Parisian Beaux-Arts style to the United States, contributed his bare-shouldered bust *Hon. William J. Evarts*, which showed the effects of his time in Rome.

The remaining United States spaces in Memorial Hall were smaller and less prominent. Gallery K, in the southwest corner of the building (and the lower left of the ground plan, figure 2.1), was filled with a miscellaneous assortment of sculptures by artists less familiar to modern scholars, such as Joseph Graef and H. Meyer. Naturally most were expatriates, including Margaret Foley and A.E. Harnisch.

The most popular work by far in this gallery was *Death of Cleopatra* (figure 2.18) by Edmonia Lewis, a half African-American, half Chippewa Indian orphan. *Cleopatra* caused a stir because it showed the Egyptian queen in her death throes, rather than in her more composed state just before being bitten by a poisonous snake, as in William Wetmore Story's famous version of 1858.⁹⁵ The *New-York Daily Tribune* noted that a brightly colored canopy had been erected over *Cleopatra*, and that the artist appeared at 6:00 p.m. every day to dust the statue and cover it with a cloth.⁹⁶ The *New York Herald* reported that Lewis was also present daily at a stand in the Annex near her *Old Arrow Maker* (Smithsonian American Art Museum) and her busts of the abolitionists John

⁹⁴ David Sellin, *The First Pose. 1876: Turning Point in American Art* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975), 48.

⁹⁵ Stephen May, "Succeeding Against the Odds: Recognition at Last for Edmonia Lewis," *Sculpture Review* 44 (Fall 1995): 7, 9.

⁹⁶ "Art Notes," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 2 September 1876, 2

Brown and Charles Sumner (both unlocated).⁹⁷ Lewis received considerable media notice, not only for her gender and her novel origins, but also for her sensational sculpture and her striking presence at the exhibition, and it has been suggested that she may have exploited her heritage and courted attention with her unconventional methods.⁹⁸ Such efforts, whether intentional or not, were necessary for her to break through the race barriers that normally hampered black artists, regardless of the merits of their work. Lewis succeeded in drawing the critical attention that was necessary to establish a reputation, and she was included in nineteenth-century canons of American art ranging from Henry Tuckerman's 1867 *Book of the Artists* to Lorado Taft's 1903 *The History of American Sculpture*.⁹⁹ The need for such extraordinary efforts is affirmed in the case of another black artist to be discussed later in this chapter who did not have the advantage of novelty, and was not as successful.

Gallery Y was a small room along the back wall of Memorial Hall (in the upper right of the ground plan) which housed twelve American works, most by obscure painters listed as residents of Paris and Munich, along with one from Rome.¹⁰⁰ They were probably early arrivals to the exhibition and were hung before the Art Annex was completed. The group of Munich works was owned by the dealer Stroefer and Kirchner, and the Paris-dominated group was owned by M. Knoedler and Co. All were listed for sale in the exhibition catalogue. Their location in a far corner of the building suggests that

⁹⁷ "Condition of the Art Department at the Centennial," *New York Herald*, 5 June 1876, 8.

⁹⁸ See also J.S. Ingram, *The Centennial Exposition* (Philadelphia: Hubbard Bros., 1876), 372; John Thomas Dale, *What Ben Beverly Saw at the Great Exposition* (Chicago: Centennial Publishing Co., 1876), 188; Lynda Roscoe Hartigan, *Sharing Traditions: Five Black Artists in Nineteenth Century America* (exh. cat., National Museum of American Art, Washington, D.C., 1985), 91.

⁹⁹ Henry T. Tuckerman, *Book of the Artists* (New York: G.P. Putnam & Son, 1867), 603; Lorado Taft, *The History of American Sculpture* (New York: Macmillan Co., 1903. Reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1969), 212.

¹⁰⁰ The Munich residents were A.L. Mayer, A. Schworer, A. Wagner, F. Kockert, E. Kayser, and R. Epp. Those in Paris were A. Moreau, H. Merle, and E. Fichel.

their presence in Memorial Hall did not make them part of the canon of American art, and they were strictly segregated from works submitted for less mercantile purposes. Nonetheless, they bolstered the expatriate presence in the prestigious, highly-trafficked spaces of Memorial Hall.

While the major United States spaces in Memorial Hall were used to create a unified, national American school, in the Art Annex, civic identity was still firmly entrenched. The United States occupied several rooms on the west side of the Annex, or the left hand side of the ground plan (figure 2.2). Galleries were arranged for the most part, by city. In contrast to Memorial Hall, where Sartain appears to have dominated the arrangement, the Annex galleries were arranged by the Presidents of representative organizations from each city. In at least this aspect of the United States exhibition, Sartain's New York colleagues agreed with his plan; as early as December 1875 members of the National Academy of Design expressed the preference that their work be hung together in one room, with the exception of the works needed for the main gallery in Memorial Hall.¹⁰¹ While they realized that Memorial Hall would be reserved for a display of the great masters of American art, they also wished to preserve their distinctiveness as New York artists.

Galleries 6 and 14 in the lower left part of the ground plan were the United States spaces closest to the main entrance. They were arranged by Worthington Whittredge and largely comprised more paintings by the old guard of the National Academy of Design, including two each by Bierstadt, Cropsey, Durand, and Kensett, three by Whittredge, and five each from Gifford, Huntington, and McEntee, as well as sketches for Cole's

¹⁰¹ JS to Worthington Whittredge, [no city], 14 December 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1271.

unfinished *The Cross and the World* series (unlocated) -- but it also included three works by the more progressive John La Farge. A stereographic view (figure 2.19) shows gallery 14 with Chauncy Ives' sculpture *Nursing the Infant Bacchus* (unlocated) at the far left, G. Turini's sculpture *The Rainbow* (unlocated) in the foreground, Huntington's *Philosophy and Christian Art* (Los Angeles County Museum of Art) in the lower left corner, and Henry Peters Gray's *The Wages of War* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art) diagonally above it on the right. Another view of gallery 14 (figure 2.20) shows Ives' sculpture from the rear, and Bierstadt's *The Great Trees, Mariposa Grove, California* (private collection) slightly cropped at the extreme right.

Gallery 28, just across the transverse corridor (see figure 2.2) was arranged by Charles C. Perkins, President of the Boston Art Museum. It contained pictures by Boston's "old masters" Allston and Stuart, and multiple works by less familiar names such as W.M. Brackett, along with Boston Selection Committee members Thomas Robinson and R.M. Staigg. It included a healthy representation of artists who worked and studied abroad, such as J. Foxcroft Cole, Frank D. Millet, and most notably, Hunt's *The Boot Black* (unlocated). In terms of sculpture, Daniel Chester French's bronze *The Minute-Man, 1775* (figure 2.21) provided a rare glimpse of the naturalistic style that would characterize American sculpture in the coming decades.

Gallery 30 next door included paintings by Philadelphia luminaries such as Peter Rothermel and Christian Schussele, and may have been hung by Sartain himself. The gallery also held works from painters residing in Paris, Rome and Munich, and a handful of paintings from artists of Chicago, Baltimore, and outlying cities. In addition, it

included three paintings by Sartain's friend Thomas Moran who, as a resident of Newark, New Jersey, might otherwise have been seen in the New York gallery.

Overall, only about one hundred paintings of approximately seven hundred in Memorial Hall and the Art Annex were from Philadelphia artists, compared to 252 from New York and ninety from Boston. The host city's representation was less than half that of New York, no doubt because the Selection Committee had rejected most of the works at the spring Pennsylvania Academy exhibition. In terms of sheer numbers, New York artists dominated the exhibition, and Sartain may have anticipated this relatively slight showing of Philadelphia works when he spirited in his eight unapproved paintings from the Academy into Fairmount Park.

Gallery 10, on the leftmost edge of the ground plan (figure 2.2) held for the most part paintings from Americans in Rome, Paris, and Munich. Many of these came from stateside collections and so were probably available for hanging at an early point, but others may well have been late arrivals that were shipped from Europe. Most notable among these were Chase's "*Keying Up*" – *The Court Jester* (figure 2.22), owned by S.M. Dodd, and Shirlaw's *Toning the Bell* (figure 2.23), from the collection of J.F. Gookins. Though not prominently located, it is significant that in the flurry of hanging the American exhibition a gallery was set aside especially for expatriate works.

The remaining United States galleries, 40, 42, and 44 in the upper left of the ground plan (figure 2.2) seem to have functioned as a catch-all in the farthest reaches of the hive-like Art Annex. Gallery 40 included a mix of works from farther-flung cities such as New Orleans, Minneapolis, St. Louis, and San Francisco (lest viewers forget that art was being created outside New York, Philadelphia, and Boston). Gallery 42 became

infamous for housing the works that Sartain smuggled in from the Pennsylvania Academy, in particular H.H. Moore's *Almeh, A Dream of Alhambra* (figure 1.14). Gallery 44 contained eleven sculptures by R.H. Park of Florence, and what appear to be the "leftovers" of the American retrospective in Memorial Hall. It included miscellaneous works by earlier American painters such as William Dunlap (considered the first historian of American art), John Wesley Jarvis, Charles Willson Peale, Thomas Sully, John Trumbull, Samuel Lovett Waldo, and Benjamin West. Their placement indicates that they were considered secondary to the sacred triumvirate of Allston, Copley and Stuart, who were abundantly represented in Memorial Hall. In addition, in gallery 22 sculptures by Edmonia Lewis and John Rogers were installed among etchings and lithographs.

Gallery 12, in the lower left of the ground plan, housed the "Loan Collection" that was called for in the New York circular of January 1875, and affirmed in the Centennial Exhibition special regulations. It comprised works by European masters of the past and present, borrowed from American private collections and gathered together as a testament to United States collectors' discriminating taste. The display was meant both to educate American fairgoers and to repudiate the persistent belief that Americans lacked culture. Unfortunately the display consisted of only forty-three paintings. The artists listed in the catalogue include Domenichino, Dürer, Murillo, Andrea del Sarto, and VanDyke.¹⁰² Also included were a handful of works by well-known contemporary academics such as Hans Makart of Austria (whose *Venice Rendering Homage to Catherine Coronaro* was a highlight of his country's display), Alexandre Cabanel, and interestingly, four paintings by Gustave Courbet from the collection of an A.H. Reitlinger, entitled *The Huntsman*,

¹⁰² Attributions of old master paintings were sometimes overly optimistic during this period and must be approached with caution.

The Bather, and two works listed as *Castle of Chillon*, *Lake Lemman*. The loan collection did little to honor American taste, and its small size and obscure location attracted minimal attention from the press. It might have been a greater success, but it was eclipsed by New York's crowning gesture of cultural superiority, which will be discussed below.

In addition to the paintings and sculpture in the United States galleries of Memorial Hall and the Art Annex, some American works appeared in other countries' galleries as well. American artists working in London did not receive sufficient or timely information about the exhibition, so the United States galleries included few paintings by expatriates there. One of the handful represented was George H. Boughton, whose *The Pilgrims' Sunday Morning* (New-York Historical Society) and *Going to Seek His Fortune* (unlocated) were lent by American collectors and displayed in the United States galleries. At the same time, the English delegation invited the artist to send his paintings to the exhibition as part of their department, so that his *God-Speed* (Van Gogh Museum, Amsterdam) hung in the British display.

The British exhibition also included paintings by deceased Americans from English collections. Benjamin West's famous *Death of General Wolfe* of 1770 (figure 2.24) was sent from Britain. Long considered a monument in the history of art, it was a compelling complement to the American canon in the United States display. At a time when European influence on American art was a sensitive issue, West's triumph over the English was reassuring. Earl Shinn asserted the United States' cultural independence from Britain by proudly recounting the story of the revered English artist Sir Joshua Reynolds advising West against portraying soldiers in contemporary dress, then admitting the American's victory when West persevered in his own way. Strahan crowed

that though Reynolds was a superior portraitist, “in history West was able to read a lesson to Reynolds.”¹⁰³

Another epochal American work coming by way of London was Gilbert Stuart’s Landsdowne portrait of George Washington (National Portrait Gallery, Smithsonian Institution). According to Sartain, a William D. Lewis arranged for the loan from his English cousin, J. Delaware Lewis, Esq. It was shipped with the British works, but officials refused to release it to the American exhibition until Lewis and Sartain came personally to insist. By this time the only space left was in the rotunda, where it commanded considerable attention as one of very few paintings among masses of sculpture.¹⁰⁴

As artists worked to organize a display of an American school, these overlaps between British and American art clearly demonstrated the permeability of geographic and cultural boundaries. They must have been an irritating reminder to nativist artists of Americans’ long history of studying and working abroad, from West and Stuart, the “founding fathers” of the nation’s art, up to the Centennial year.

The nation’s continued ties across the Atlantic were further demonstrated in Great Britain’s own contribution. One of the Centennial Exhibition’s most anticipated features was the comparison of American painting and sculpture to that of the rest of the world. Substantial displays ranging in number from one hundred fifty to five hundred works were sent from Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Austria, Spain, Belgium, the Netherlands, and Canada, with smaller groups contributed by Denmark, Sweden,

¹⁰³ Edward Strahan, *The Art Gallery of the Exhibition: A Selection from the Paintings and Sculpture Exhibition by Alma-Tadema, Bierstadt, Huntington, Moran, with Introduction and Descriptive Text by Edward Strahan* (Philadelphia: Gebbie, 1877), 67-8.

¹⁰⁴ John Sartain, *The Reminiscences of a Very Old Man* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1899), 268.

Norway, Russia, Mexico, Brazil, and the Argentine Republic.¹⁰⁵ Most attention was concentrated on the contributions of France, Britain, Italy, and Germany, the countries considered most influential for American art. The English contribution was thought to be the greatest by far, including not only the best paintings of living artists such as Lawrence Alma-Tadema and Frederick Lord Leighton, but also works by revered masters such as Joshua Reynolds, John Constable, and J.M.W. Turner, generously lent from the Royal collection, as well as that of the Royal Academy and private collectors.¹⁰⁶

Unfortunately, the other foreign exhibitions were bitterly disappointing. Writing for *Appleton's Journal*, Susan Nichols Carter remarked in disgust, "we ourselves could probably have made a much better exhibit of Continental pictures than could possibly have been brought from the other side."¹⁰⁷ The French exhibition was far from representative, lacking works by its greatest names. Earl Shinn summed up the omissions: "It is painful to pass to the French rooms, deprived of all the classical names – without a single example of Ingres, Gleyre, Millet, Rousseau, Gérôme, Baudry, Flandrin, Delaroche, Hébert, Meissonier, Corot, Daubigny pere, Couture, Regnault, Bonnat; without even the new and rising names, such as Delaunay, Gustave Moreau, Vollon, and Laurens."¹⁰⁸ The Italian sculptures were overwhelmingly characterized as "boudoir art,"¹⁰⁹ and the forest of lasciviously posed nudes made the Italian exhibition quite popular, and fodder for humorists (figure 2.7). The German exhibition was called "totally

¹⁰⁵ Sartain, "Report of the Chief," 160.

¹⁰⁶ E.S. [Earl Shinn], "The International Exhibition – II: British Paintings," *The Nation*, 22 (1 June 1876): 347.

¹⁰⁷ S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], "Art at the Exhibition," *Appleton's Journal* 15 (3 June 1876): 725.

¹⁰⁸ E.S. [Earl Shinn], "The International Exhibition – No. XVI: French Art," *The Nation* 23 (28 September 1876): 193.

¹⁰⁹ "Notes: From Rome," *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 127-8; E.S. [Earl Shinn], "The International Exhibition – XIII: Italian Sculpture," *The Nation* 23 (August 17, 1876): 104.

uninteresting.”¹¹⁰ As Americans realized that the Centennial Exhibition would not provide a proper comparison of United States and European art, they were left to scrutinize the United States display even more closely and try to divine its meaning.

Discerning an American School in Memorial Hall

The modern scholar attempting to analyze the American art display encounters the same difficulty as did the viewers and critics who saw the exhibition in person. The vast number of works discourages close study of individual pieces or the relationship between one work and another. However, distinct themes do emerge from careful observation.

Earlier scholars often characterized the American contribution to the Centennial Exhibition in terms of the Hudson River School’s dominance. The foundational work in this arena is Mildred Byars Matthews’ 1946 article “The Painters of the Hudson River School in the Philadelphia Centennial of 1876.” Matthews’ assessment of the Hudson River School’s supposed dominance is echoed in later scholarship. In 1976 Susan Hobbs acknowledged that the Hudson River School’s popularity was on the wane in the Centennial year, but she positioned the American landscape school as the main feature of the exhibition in terms of quantity.¹¹¹ In 1987 Doreen Bolger Burke and Catherine Voorsanger cited both Matthews and Hobbs in affirming the Hudson River School’s “overwhelming numbers” at the Centennial Exhibition.¹¹² Recently, Ethan Robey also noted the dominance of landscapes and linked them to such nativist artists as Church,

¹¹⁰ S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], “Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 285.

¹¹¹ Hobbs, 12.

¹¹² Doreen Bolger Burke and Catherine Hoover Voorsanger, “The Hudson River School in Eclipse,” in John K. Howat, ed., *American Paradise: The World of the Hudson River School* (exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1987), 89.

Gifford, and Bierstadt.¹¹³ However, a close investigation of Matthews' work and of the paintings listed in the catalogue shows that the New York landscapists' presence was far from overwhelming.

Matthews conducted a statistical analysis of the Hudson River School contribution that would seem a model of scientific method. However, the subjective nature of Matthews' assumptions clouds her seemingly objective formulae, and mathematical errors weaken her conclusions. Her definitions of what constitutes a Hudson River School artist and a Hudson River School painting bear close examination. She was guided by the list of artists included in the 1945 exhibition *The Hudson River School* organized by the Art Institute of Chicago and the Whitney Museum of American Art, and she added Richard W. Hubbard, Jervis McEntee, and J.A. Suydam, who were considered to be of that school by their peers. Her criteria cast a wide net indeed, as the exhibition she drew from included such painters as Washington Allston, George Catlin, William Dunlap, Henry Inman, Emanuel Leutze, Samuel F.B. Morse, William Sidney Mount, John Neagle, John Trumbull, and John Vanderlyn,¹¹⁴ artists who are not usually identified with the Hudson River School or the landscape genre.

Even if this group of artists is accepted as representative, mathematical errors skew some of her conclusions. She counted 236 Hudson River School entries -- this includes George Catlin's 126 Indian pictures, which hardly qualify -- and she asserted this number as "one-third of the total pictures in all media in the American Section." However, according to her own statistics, the American art section included 760 oils and

¹¹³ Robey, 90.

¹¹⁴ Mildred Byars Matthews, "The Painters of the Hudson River School in the Philadelphia Centennial of 1876," *Art in America* 34 (July 1946): 148, 150, 156-7.

186 watercolors, resulting in an actual proportion of one quarter.¹¹⁵ Her most plausible conclusion is that the Hudson River School, as she defines it, contributed ninety-eight oils, or only one-seventh of the total paintings. But subtracting the artists who were not predominantly landscapists brings the total of Hudson River School oils to seventy-eight, or a little more than one-tenth of the total.

As for expatriate works, the Centennial Exhibition took place the height of the Munich School's popularity. Eighteen canvases from expatriates in Munich were displayed, and while not large in number, the contribution included the best works of its most esteemed painters, including Chase's "*Keying Up*" – *The Court Jester* (figure 2.22), Shirlaw's *Toning the Bell* (figure 2.23) and Toby Rosenthal's large narrative work *Elaine* (figure 2.25), which was prominently displayed in Memorial Hall's "Saloon of Honor."

Paris was just beginning to emerge as a center for Americans studying abroad, and it was astoundingly well represented at the Centennial – though its strong presence was not immediately apparent. According to the exhibition catalogue, seventeen artists contributing twenty-five works listed their residence as Paris, including E.F. Andrews, Henry Bacon, Elizabeth Jane Gardner, and Clementina Tompkins. The catalogue provided somewhat misleading information for another eleven artists with an additional thirty paintings. They were designated as United States residents, but the cities listed appear to be simply their homes when stateside, rather than their current location, since these artists, including E.H. Blashfield, Bridgman, Healy, and Pearce, all exhibited paintings at the Paris Salon of 1876 and listed Paris addresses in the Salon catalogue.¹¹⁶

Most of these works were submitted to the Centennial Exhibition not by the artists

¹¹⁵ Matthews, 147-8.

¹¹⁶ Lois Marie Fink, *American Art at the Nineteenth-Century Paris Salons* (Washington, D.C., National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, 1990), 315-409.

themselves but by collectors who, for whatever reason, perhaps nationalistic pride, listed the artists' stateside homes as their residences. These artists were known for their embrace of orientalism and the Beaux-Arts ideal, and provided a strong cosmopolitan counterpoint to the Hudson River School presence in Memorial Hall and the Art Annex.

Overall, paintings by expatriate artists totaled 106, far exceeding the adjusted total of seventy-eight that Matthews claimed for the Hudson River School.¹¹⁷ Of course they were displayed less advantageously, since only twenty-two were installed in Memorial Hall, but as has been discussed, many were in the "Saloon of Honor," a space prominently devoted to the artists of the present. This suggests that expatriate artists were a strong and respected part of the American art display. It can be safely argued that the expatriate presence rivaled that of the resident landscapists, setting up a tension in the American art display that critics did not fail to notice.

Specific presences, and just as important, certain absences at the exhibition deserve special notice. The overwhelming majority of paintings and sculpture were from eastern states, with only about thirty works from the Midwest, mostly Chicago and Cincinnati, four from the west (namely San Francisco), and a handful from such southern cities as Lenoir, North Carolina and Louisville, Kentucky. Most of the remaining works (excepting the expatriates) were from the large East Coast cities of Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, with a handful from Washington, D.C. The Centennial Exhibition was a graphic demonstration of the East Coast's continued cultural hegemony, and art history would continue to be written from its point of view for many decades to come.

¹¹⁷ As expected, expatriate artists made a strong showing in the sculpture selection with 71 sculptures of 154. However, if anything, this reflects the opposite trend of that in painting. Whereas painters were going abroad in increasing numbers, sculptors, who had long been expected to study in Rome or Florence, were beginning to find training options in the United States.

The most notable void in the display was the lamentably minimal showing of the American Barbizon landscape school, whose two chief practitioners were George Inness and William Morris Hunt. Inness was broadly recognized in 1876, and had been a member of the National Academy of Design for several years. Unfortunately, during 1875 and 1876 he was involved in a lawsuit with the Doll & Richards gallery that tied up his paintings with the plaintiff.¹¹⁸ None of his works appeared at the Centennial Exhibition, and he did not contribute to the National Academy of Design exhibition that year either, so he may have been distracted from painting by his difficulties, and unable to lend any finished works.

William Morris Hunt was Boston's greatest advocate of the Barbizon school, and he was still active in these years. However, Hunt was a famously insular painter with a growing cantankerous streak, and he had little interest in being involved in the Centennial art exhibition. When queried, he answered,

I don't know why I should take the time and trouble to go about and collect my pictures, and send them off at my own risk. I have nothing in my studio that I care to send. If those who own pictures of mine would send them, I should not object to it, but I don't care enough about the matter to waste time over it.¹¹⁹

Hunt was probably not exaggerating when he said he had nothing that he wished to send, as a fire in 1872 tragically destroyed the contents of his studio, and his recent works were on exhibition at the Boston Art Club.¹²⁰ He was represented by two loans from collectors, but neither was a landscape. His portrait of Barthold Schlesinger was contributed by the sitter and hung in Memorial Hall's gallery C along with other foreign-influenced works,

¹¹⁸ Lillian B. Miller, "Engines, Marbles, and Canvases: The Centennial Exposition of 1876," in *1876: The Centennial Year* (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1973), 7, 9.

¹¹⁹ Henry C. Angell, *Records of William M. Hunt* (Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1881), 88.

¹²⁰ Sally Webster, *William Morris Hunt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 125.

and the genre painting *The Boot Black* was lent by J.H. Wright and appeared in the Annex in gallery 28, which showcased Boston artists.

Homer Dodge Martin, who would become one of the leading exponents of the new landscape school, was that very year on a pivotal trip to Europe that would convert him to the new aesthetic. His *Adirondacks*, lent to the Centennial Exhibition by the Century Club, reflected his earlier, more traditional style, not the one that would characterize his work from 1876 on. The exhibition did include a few Barbizon-influenced works, such as John La Farge's *Bishop Berkeley's Rock, Newport* (figure 2.26), but overall, the unfortunate confluence of circumstances surrounding Inness, Hunt, and Martin left a void in representation of the Barbizon style in the United States, giving the representation of American landscape an even stronger, but inaccurate, visual impression of the Hudson River School's dominance.

The conception of the Centennial Exhibition was rooted in the commemoration and exploration of early American history. However, it has been observed that the Exhibition itself contained scant few references to the colonial era, with the well-known exception of the model house called the "New England Farmer's Home of Ye Olden Time."¹²¹ By contrast, Memorial Hall was full of art works paying homage to the celebrated period. Several European artists contributed themes from the United States' revolutionary history. For example, H. Cassinelli of Nice, France sent *Decatur leaving the harbor of Tripoli, February 1804, after having set fire to the Frigate "Philadelphia."* Charles-Edouard Armand-Dumaresq, a French painter known for modern historical

¹²¹ Goodheart, 55.

scenes sent his *Surrender at Yorktown* and *Declaration of Independence*.¹²² The Milan, Italy artist Pietro Guarnerio's *Apotheosis of Washington* (figure 2.27) caused a stir; in the words of Susan Hobbs, "Americans were unaccustomed to seeing their leader portrayed as a Roman emperor and carried aloft by Jove's eagle."¹²³ As Philip Sandhurst dryly commented in his 1876 book *The Great Centennial Exhibition*, "it is possible to have too much of a good thing."¹²⁴ The United States' revolutionary period was the one best known to European artists, and certainly its most heroic, so it lent itself to historical and allegorical treatment.

Naturally, a number of such themes appeared in the American section as well. They were created for the most part by artists little known to modern scholars, but their numbers, and the ambitious size of their works, attest to a strong interest in American history. Examples include Archibald M. Willard's *The Spirit of '76*, which was listed in the catalogue as *Yankee Doodle*,¹²⁵ Henry Bacon's *The Boston Boys and General Gage, 1775* (figure 2.28), Daniel Chester French's *The Minute-Man, 1775* (figure 2.21), W.G. Heaton's *Washington as Ambassador at Fort Duquesne* (unlocated), E.A. Kretschman's *The "Continental" Soldier* (probably a medallion and unlocated), A.J. Lewis' *Colossal Statue of Washington* (unlocated), G.W. Maynard's *1776* (private collection), W. McDonald's *Bust of Washington*, Mrs. I. Robinson Morrell's *Washington Welcoming the Provision Train* (unlocated), and Schussele's *Zeisberger Preaching to the Indians*

¹²² E.S. [Earl Shinn], "The International Exhibition – No. XVII: French Art – II," *The Nation* 23 (12 October 1876): 226.

¹²³ Hobbs, 7.

¹²⁴ Sandhurst, 25.

¹²⁵ Several versions of *The Spirit of '76* exist; the one most probably displayed at the Centennial Exhibition is at Abbot Hall, Marblehead, Massachusetts.

(Archives of Moravian College, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania).¹²⁶ Other works looked to the country's Puritan origins, such as George H. Boughton's *The Pilgrims' Sunday Morning* and Mrs. I. Robinson Morrell's *First Battle of the Puritans, Won by Miles Standish* (La Tour Camoufle Gallery, Paris). Still others explored the daily life of the colonial era, such as A. Wordsworth Thompson's *Virginia in the Olden Time* (unlocated), W.H. Willcox's *One Hundred Years Ago* (National Flag Foundation, Pittsburgh), and Frank D. Millet's *Lady in Costume of 1740* (unlocated).

Artists came forward to not only commemorate the nation's signal moments, but also to take their place in its cultural history. Grand manner history painting was on the wane in both the United States and Europe, as new patterns of patronage made such large and time-consuming works impractical. However, on an occasion of national import this revered genre of art, long considered the highest branch of painting, was briefly revived. Artists knew that in the past a successful history painting could leave a lasting mark and secure one's place in the pantheon of artists, as was amply demonstrated by West's *The Death of General Wolfe*. But while the lingering genre could address events long past, history painting was inadequate to the needs of more recent history, both political and cultural.

The Revolutionary War, distant and noble, was certainly a more palatable subject than the country's most recent conflict. The Civil War's legacy underlay the mood of the Exhibition, and the Centennial was intended to showcase national harmony and healing. The Centennial Committee prohibited the display of battle flags from the ceremonies.¹²⁷

¹²⁶ W. McDonald's *Bust of Washington* may be the New-York Historical Society's *George Washington* by James Wilson Alexander MacDonald, but their records include no information on its presence at the Centennial Exhibition.

¹²⁷ Hicks, 19.

Poetry and music composed for the exhibition included such highly-wrought and reassuring lines as “toil, when wild brother-wars new dark the Light/Toil and forgive, and kiss o’er, and replight;” “softly they murmur, the palm and the pine/Hushed is our strife in the land of the free;” and “in our nation’s heart embedded/O’er our Union newly wedded.”¹²⁸ In the last act at the closing ceremonies, officers from the Union and Confederate armies drank from a memorial cup, and the *New-York Daily Tribune* complacently reported that the Centennial “has united us a nation – revived to a great extent the old genial feeling of good fellowship among natives of different sections.”¹²⁹

In spite of northern sentiments and pronouncements, the desired reconciliation could not be accomplished without the South, and the Southern absence at the Centennial was palpable. Official guides to the exhibition exhorted Southerners specifically, “it is our Centennial as well as the Centennial of the Northern people. We are part of the Union...let all bitter memories be forgotten.”¹³⁰ A publication entitled *The International Exhibition Guide for the Southern States* (with “by a Southern Editor” conspicuously noted on the cover) began with the question “that is asked probably in the South thousands of times a day – ‘Shall we go to the Centennial?’” and predictably concluded that the answer should be yes.¹³¹

However eager northern states might be for southern participation, it must be remembered that in 1876 Union troops still occupied much of the South. Interestingly, Arkansas, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Tennessee, and West Virginia sponsored

¹²⁸ USCC, *Reports of the President, Secretary, and Executive Committee*, from Sidney Lanier’s “Cantata,” 35; from Oliver Wendell Holmes’ “Welcome to All Nations,” 46; and from Dexter Smith’s “Our National Banner,” 55.

¹²⁹ Giberti, “The Classified Landscape,” 41; “The Past Exhibition,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 16 November 1876, 4.

¹³⁰ Sylvester W. Burley, *American Enterprise. Burley’s United States Centennial Gazetteer and Guide, 1876* (Philadelphia: S.W. Burley, 1876), 5.

¹³¹ *The International Exhibition Guide for the Southern States* (Raleigh, N.C.: R.T. Fulghum, 1876), 6.

state buildings, representing about one-third of the total, but only 37 of 2,751 exhibitors in the Main building were from the South.¹³² Much was made of the great disparity in material progress between the two regions and of Southerners' amazement at northern industrial development and manufacturing.¹³³ The *Atlantic Monthly* "reported" a Southern visitor at the "New England Farmer's Home of Ye Olden Time," "looking on all sides for what drew the crowd; he could see nothing but what he had seen all his life...suddenly a Yankee remarked, 'And this was the sort of house we lived in two hundred years ago.'"¹³⁴ Whether or not the incident was genuine, the author's point was clear.

The French writer L. Simonin wrote poignantly that "only the cities of the South were silent amidst all these evidences of joy."¹³⁵ Even the President of the Centennial Exhibition, Joseph Hawley, had to admit that the lack of a Southern presence was the only way that the "Exhibition did not quite come up to our expectations."¹³⁶ The Centennial emphasis on healing and national unity was merely a facade. The South was not present at Fairmount Park in any significant way, and history was being written by the victorious North. This was true in the American art exhibition as well, where southern artists were represented by six paintings and one sculpture from Baltimore, Maryland, and one painting each from Lenoir, North Carolina and Louisville, Kentucky.

Black Americans too hoped that the Centennial Exhibition would represent a moment of reconciliation and national acceptance of their nascent freedom, and they too

¹³² Robey, 90; Goodheart, 77.

¹³³ Randel, 69.

¹³⁴ "Characteristics of the International Fair: V," *Atlantic Monthly* 38 (December 1876): 737.

¹³⁵ Simonin, 67.

¹³⁶ "Address of Joseph Hawley" in *The Illustrated History of the Centennial Exhibition*, James D. McCabe (Philadelphia: The National Publishing Company, 1876), 895; quoted in Goodheart, 77.

were disappointed. Publications such as the *New National Era* encouraged black citizens to ensure a proper representation at the world's fair. The 1875 Convention of Colored Newspaper Men in Cincinnati envisioned an eighteen-volume "Centennial Tribute to the Negro," and commissioned a statue of Bishop Richard Allen, founder of the African Methodist Episcopal Church, from Edmonia Lewis. Women were invited to help plan the Women's Pavilion. However, nothing came of the published tribute, the statue of Allen was not unveiled until November 2, a week before the Exhibition closed, and black women had to fight the exclusionary tactics of the Women's Centennial Committee. On opening day, Philadelphia police barred the black abolitionist Frederick Douglass from taking his designated place on the main platform of dignitaries, and he was only admitted after being vouched for by a white Senator. Finally, in a time of high unemployment, it appears that no black workers were employed to help construct the buildings or serve as guards for the fair.¹³⁷

It is a curious contradiction that in spite of attempts to play down Civil War subjects in the art department, the emphasis on postwar reconciliation made it a strong, if largely unacknowledged presence. In fact, such themes were officially prohibited in the art department. In a letter to Director-General Goshorn, Sartain referred to Goshorn's "decided objection to all that class of pictures that were calculated to awaken ill feeling in our Southern visitors."¹³⁸ Modern scholar Kirk Savage has pointed out that the massive changes caused by the Civil War demanded that the country and its population "reimagine themselves." In the post-war decades, public monuments proliferated as

¹³⁷ Philip S. Foner, "Black Participation in the Centennial of 1876," *Negro History Bulletin* 39 (1976): 533-5.

¹³⁸ JS to Director General A.T. Goshorn, [no city, probably Philadelphia], 21 July 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 222.

citizens attempted to understand the new country that emerged from the Civil War. The War and its aftermath “forced itself into the domain of memory, there to be reckoned with in one way or another – suppressed, integrated, romanticized.”¹³⁹

Such a fundamental national issue could not be repressed. However well-intentioned, the attempt to bar the specter of the Civil War from Memorial Hall was unsuccessful. The War was still a fresh wound, and artists and audiences alike sought some type of healing and commemoration through the art exhibition. African-American ties to the northern states were emphasized in Thomas Waterman Wood’s triptych *A Bit of War History: The Contraband, The Recruit, and The Veteran* (figures 2.29, 2.30, and 2.31), showing an escaped slave’s transformation from fugitive to Union soldier to proud veteran, having lost a leg in the fighting, but proudly saluting, as if to affirm that any sacrifice was justified by the cause of freedom that he (and by extension, the north) had fought for. One of the most visible and highly praised American paintings was Eastman Johnson’s *Old Kentucky Home* of 1859 (figure 2.11), now seventeen years old, but still reassuring viewers of black peoples’ humanity and familial ties, as was so strongly demonstrated in Harriet Beecher Stowe’s famous novel *Uncle Tom’s Cabin*.

In spite of General-Director Goshorn’s dictum, there were even more pointed references to the Civil War in prominent galleries. In a “place of honor” in Memorial Hall hung Thomas Hicks’ portrait of General George G. Meade, the hero of Gettysburg and Philadelphia’s foremost soldier.¹⁴⁰ It is not surprising that an exhibition in Philadelphia

¹³⁹ Kirk Savage, *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997), 5.

¹⁴⁰ “The Changes Made in the Art Department of the Exhibition During the Past Week,” *New York Herald*, 19 June 1876, 9.

would pay tribute to its greatest military leader.¹⁴¹ The heroism of the opposing army was represented as well, as the *New York Herald* took note of a nearly full-length portrait of Robert E. Lee by an artist identified as Albert Gmerry in gallery C of Memorial Hall.¹⁴² This work does not appear in the exhibition catalogue, so it may be a later, unofficial addition. In this way, the two generals who met at Gettysburg were reunited at the Centennial Exhibition in the same gallery, and the political implications were greatly heightened by the presence there of the exhibition's most controversial painting.

The portrait of Meade was placed opposite Peter Rothermel's *The Battle of Gettysburg*, and Sartain mentioned it as a particular example of the type of work that Director-General Goshorn worried might "awaken ill feeling."¹⁴³ As has been discussed, Rothermel's monumental work, along with four accompanying studies, may have been there at the behest of the Fairmount Park Art Commissioners, many of whom were integrally involved in the Exhibition. It is not clear whether Sartain approved of the inclusion or whether he acquiesced to the wishes of prominent Philadelphians, but he certainly had a financial stake in the painting's success. Sartain and Rothermel had a working relationship that extended over fifty years, with Sartain engraving at least twenty-six of his paintings.¹⁴⁴ Rothermel contracted with Sartain in 1875 to engrave *The Battle of Gettysburg* in time for sale at the Centennial, a venture that must have seemed

¹⁴¹ The Fairmount Park Art Association had been raising funds for a statue of General Meade since his death in 1872, and their annual report for 1877 appealed to citizens not to put the war behind them: "It is becoming popular, and perhaps it is proper, to forget the acrimonious issues and to cover up the wounds of civil strife, but there is no patriot who can wish to extend this oblivion to the memories of the heroism displayed in that fearful contest." See *Fairmount Park Art Association: An Account of its Origin and Activities* (Philadelphia: Fairmount Park Art Association, 1922), 44.

¹⁴² "Condition of the Art Department at the Centennial," *New York Herald*, 5 June 1876, 4.

¹⁴³ JS to Director General A.T. Goshorn, [no city, probably Philadelphia], 21 July 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 222.

¹⁴⁴ Mark Thistlethwaite, "John Sartain and Peter F. Rothermel" in *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*, eds. Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000), 39-43.

like a potentially lucrative one. However, not only was the engraving not finished in time for the exhibition, Sartain did not complete work until 1879, leaving Rothermel to bitterly denounce him as someone whose “word of honor is useless.”¹⁴⁵

In any case, the engraving would probably have been a financial failure. The condemnations that rained down on Rothermel’s painting will be discussed in the next chapter, but *The Art Journal*’s assessment speaks to its relevance as a reminder of the Civil War: “Our space forbids us to dwell much on the ill taste, to say nothing of the bad art, of such pictures as the ‘Battle of Gettysburg,’ which, even if it were a fine picture, which it is not, would be an unsuitable reminder, at this Centennial time, of discords that are past and troubles which will scarcely be renewed.”¹⁴⁶

A few European artists submitted works on Civil War themes as well. The best-known example was Francesco Pezzicar’s statue *The Abolition of Slavery in the United States, 1863* (figure 2.32) in the Austrian section, purported to be modeled from a former slave who worked on a United States ship that docked in Trieste in 1873 (interestingly, on its way to drop off a shipment for the Vienna Exposition).¹⁴⁷ But the sculpture’s theatrical pose and anglicized, overly classicized form did not resonate with literal-minded Americans. Edward C. Bruce pointed out the absurdity of Pezzicar’s negro “with a frontal development worthy of the most gifted poet or statesman...brandishing aloft a written document which he never read.”¹⁴⁸ William Dean Howells called the figure “most offensively Frenchy” and was so put off by its melodrama as to write that “one longs to

¹⁴⁵ Rothermel Papers, Pennsylvania State Archive, Harrisburg, MG-108, n.p.; quoted in Thistlethwaite, “John Sartain and Peter Rothermel,” 41.

¹⁴⁶ S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], “Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 284.

¹⁴⁷ “Memorial Hall and the Fine Art Exhibits,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 11 May 1876, 8.

¹⁴⁸ Bruce, 174.

clap him back into hopeless bondage.”¹⁴⁹ Mark Twain’s *The Gilded Age* included a character who mistook the *Abolition* for Hiram Powers’ famous idealized *Greek Slave* and declared: “Well now, I heerd that was purty; but I swan, I don’t see that it is.”¹⁵⁰

The Battle of Gettysburg and other works demonstrated that when it came to Civil War subjects, art and history were at odds with one another. Where an outmoded genre could be used to commemorate events of a century before, it would not convey or assuage the wounds of the recent conflict. Allegory, in the case of Pezzicar’s sculpture, seemed ridiculously inadequate, and the realism that Rothermel attempted in *The Battle of Gettysburg* was an all too harsh reminder of loss. For centuries history painting had stood for art history and the canon, but the marriage of art and history at the Centennial Exhibition proved to be an awkward one. In an era of cultural change, history would not be written in the traditional realm of history painting, nor by its creators, artists. The canon attempted at the Centennial Exhibition was affected by changes in such subtle factors as forms of authority and the means of writing history, and it was also shaped by a more prosaic problem. The canon was riddled with absences because some important works were simply not available to be included in the exhibition.

The New York Loan Exhibition

The Centennial Exhibition’s “Loan Collection” assembled in the Art Annex’s gallery 12 comprised foreign paintings owned by United States collectors, and was meant to demonstrate Americans’ sophisticated taste. Unfortunately it proved to be embarrassingly small -- with just forty-three paintings, it did not even completely fill one gallery. Sartain had difficulty obtaining many great European works from American

¹⁴⁹ Howells, 93.

¹⁵⁰ Bailey, 48.

collections, and he was also unable to secure some key American works for the United States exhibition. In both cases, many fine paintings were already committed to a competing display. New Yorkers consummated the Centennial rivalry between the two cities by organizing a concurrent exhibition of superb foreign and American works from their own private collections.

In November of 1875, when Sartain was in the midst of his difficulties with New York artists, the Metropolitan Museum of Art passed a resolution supporting the Centennial Exhibition, and Sartain wrote a letter of thanks to John Taylor Johnston, President of the Metropolitan and a member of the Centennial's Fine Arts Advisory Committee.¹⁵¹ However, discontentment still simmered in the artistic community, and it was not long before New Yorkers began to consider an exhibition of their own, not in Philadelphia, but in their hometown. The following month the *New-York Times* assured its readers that most foreign art lovers would come to New York as well when they visited the Centennial Exhibition, and that the National Academy of Design's exhibition for the coming spring would be "truly national."¹⁵² In February of 1876 the New York publication *Appleton's Journal* suggested that the city should organize an exhibition of works from its private collections, reasoning that "it would be something to the glory of our city, and of great value to those of our people who long to see examples of foreign artists but cannot go abroad to do so," adding "there is no reason why Philadelphia should have a monopoly of Centennial attractions."¹⁵³ That month the *Art Journal* and the *New*

¹⁵¹ JS to John Taylor Johnston, [no city], 20 November 1875, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4562, frame 1227.

¹⁵² "American Art," *New-York Times*, 12 December 1875, 6.

¹⁵³ "Editor's Table," *Appleton's Journal* 15 (12 February 1876): 215.

York Evening Post echoed the sentiment.¹⁵⁴ The *New-York Daily Tribune* chimed in that New York's private galleries should be opened to the public, as was being done in Philadelphia.¹⁵⁵

A committee was formed with John Taylor Johnston as its chair. The long list of members included the distinguished collectors Parke Godwin, Henry G. Marquand, Mrs. A.T. Stewart, Catherine Wolfe, and many artists, such as Albert Bierstadt, John G. Brown, Seymour Joseph Guy, Daniel Huntington, Eastman Johnson, William Page, and Worthington Whittredge.¹⁵⁶ In fact, when the collector Parke Godwin suggested the idea to Whittredge, he hurried back to New York from his work on the Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia in order to begin the arrangements.¹⁵⁷ It was hoped that such an exhibition could raise money for the debt-ridden National Academy of Design, but one wonders whether the acrimony between Sartain and Whittredge had already ignited, and whether Whittredge was only too happy for an opportunity to trump the Philadelphia exhibition.

Forming an exhibition drawn from New York collections was much simpler than creating a comprehensive display from all over the country and across the Atlantic. The *New-York Daily Tribune* exulted that within a few days the organizers had secured as many pictures as could be hung.¹⁵⁸ In particular, John Taylor Johnston, untroubled by his commitment to the Philadelphia exhibition, contributed just five American paintings to the Centennial, and offered the balance of his vast collection to the New York

¹⁵⁴ "Notes: The Centennial Loan Exhibition, New York," *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 256; "Fine Arts," *The Evening Post* (New York), 15 March 1876, 2.

¹⁵⁵ "A Suggestion for the Centennial Summer," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 2 March 1876, 4.

¹⁵⁶ *New York Centennial Loan Exhibition* (exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1876), 4; "Notes: The New York Centennial Loan Exhibition," *The Art Journal* 3 (1876): 32.

¹⁵⁷ John I.H. Baur, ed., *The Autobiography of Worthington Whittredge, 1820-1910* (Brooklyn Museum Journal, 1942), 44.

¹⁵⁸ "Art Treasures at Home," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 17 June 1876, 3.

exhibition.¹⁵⁹ Clearly New York collectors were eager to showcase their city's culture and sophistication.

Even the name of the exhibition was similar to the Centennial Exhibition's Loan Collection, and was no doubt meant to draw comparisons between the two displays. The New York Centennial Loan Exhibition, as it was called, was presented from July through November 1876 and comprised three parts: a display of 398 paintings at the National Academy of Design, 182 paintings at the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and an unknown number of works in the private gallery of collector August Belmont.¹⁶⁰ As was appropriate for an exhibition meant to show the participants' advanced taste, the majority of the works were by contemporary European painters, and specifically French academics such as Jules Breton, Alexandre Cabanel, whose *Echo* was on view (figure 2.33), Jean-Baptiste-Camille Corot, Jean-François Millet, and Constant Troyon.¹⁶¹ August Belmont's collection included more French works by Rosa Bonheur, Adolphe-William Bougereau, Jean-Léon Gérôme, Ernest Meissonier, and Horace Vernet, as well as the Düsseldorf painter Andreas Achenbach.¹⁶²

At a total of 580 works from fifty-eight collectors, if the New York Centennial Loan Exhibition did not rival Fairmount Park's art exhibition in size, it did in overall quality. The exhibition consisted largely of modern French artists, whose work centered on the figure -- exactly the kind of style and subject matter being taught to Americans abroad. Ironically, the paintings that graced the walls of the Metropolitan Museum of Art

¹⁵⁹ "The New-York Centennial Board," *The New-York Times*, 16 March 1876, 8.

¹⁶⁰ Randel, 384; "Art Treasures at Home," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 17 June 1876, 3; "The Belmont Gallery," *The Evening Post* (New York), 21 June 1876, 2.

¹⁶¹ "Notes: The Centennial Loan Exhibition, New York," *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 256.

¹⁶² "Metropolitan Museum of Art: The New York Centennial Loan Exhibition," *The Evening Post* (New York), 20 June 1876, 4.

and the National Academy of Design were the models for the expatriate paintings under bitter dispute by many Academicians at that very moment. The New York exhibition affirmed collectors' interest in this kind of art, and it brought modern French painting to a broad public; the business manager of the exhibition claimed that ninety of every hundred visitors to the exhibition were "strangers," that is, newcomers to the art world. *The Aldine* obliquely commented that the exhibition would "support and encourage artists both at home and abroad; and home artists all the more, perhaps, because of what has been done for those abroad."¹⁶³ The writer may have considered the exhibition an affirmation of foreign training that would benefit those "at home" struggling for the acceptance of their elders at the National Academy of Design.

The emphasis of the New York Centennial Loan Exhibition was on European art. However, the display also included eighty-six works by Americans, most of them living in New York.¹⁶⁴ The Hudson River School painters Asher B. Durand, Sanford Gifford, and John F. Kensett were represented, and Frederic E. Church's very important *Twilight in the Wilderness* (Cleveland Museum of Art) and *Niagara* (figure I.6) were on display. Eastman Johnson's *The Pension Agent* (Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, Palace of the Legion of Honor), and William Morris Hunt's *Marguerite* (unlocated) were included, as well as Homer's extremely popular *Prisoners from the Front* (The Metropolitan Museum of Art), a Civil War subject that raised no objections in this context. Since these works were included in the New York exhibition, they were not available to be included in the United States display at the Philadelphia Centennial Exhibition. A few of these paintings, such as those by Church and Homer, had already reached the status of icons,

¹⁶³ "The Loan Exhibition," *The Aldine* 8 (August 1876): 241.

¹⁶⁴ "The Art Exhibition," *Newark Daily Advertiser*, 13 July 1876, 1.

and their absence from the Centennial Exhibition diminished its comprehensiveness and its impact.

New York accounts of their exhibition's success were full of superlatives and jabs at the display in Philadelphia.¹⁶⁵ The New York catalogue claimed that this exhibition of paintings "has never been surpassed on the continent."¹⁶⁶ The *Newark Daily Advertiser* commented that the "general public have never before had an opportunity of examining a collection of pictures belonging so exclusively to the higher realms of art."¹⁶⁷ The *New York World* reported that the best art exhibition in the country at that time was not the one in Philadelphia but the one in New York "as an intellectual pleasure" -- another reference to New York's sophistication.¹⁶⁸ Even Boston's art journal *The Aldine* readily acknowledged that "no city in the whole world could show so fine an exhibition of contributions from modern artists as the one of which we are now speaking."¹⁶⁹ Ironically, Susan Nichols Carter of *Appleton's Journal* noted the deficiencies in the Philadelphia loan exhibition and took collectors to task for not contributing important works, after her editor was the first to suggest that New York mount a collection of its own.¹⁷⁰

¹⁶⁵ The New York exhibition was also a tremendous financial success. Admission was 25 cents at the National Academy of Design and 25 cents at the Metropolitan Museum of Art (the total admission equaling the cost to attend the entire Centennial Exhibition). The exhibition closed on November 10, the same day as the end of the Centennial, with \$51,205.75 from 154,441 paid admissions. A profit of \$37,907.08 was split between the Academy and the Museum. See "The National Academy of Design: The New York Centennial Loan Exhibition," *The Evening Post* (New York), 19 June 1876, 4; "Notes: The New York Centennial Loan Exhibition," *The Art Journal* 3 (1876): 32; and "The Centennial Loan Collection," *Newark Daily Advertiser*, 25 November 1876, 2.

¹⁶⁶ "Notes: The Centennial Loan Exhibition, New York," *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 256.

¹⁶⁷ "The Art Exhibition," *Newark Daily Advertiser*, 13 July 1876, 1.

¹⁶⁸ Untitled ("The review of the Centennial Art Exhibition..."), *New York World*, 24 July 1876, 4.

¹⁶⁹ "The Loan Exhibition," *The Aldine* 8 (August 1876): 241.

¹⁷⁰ S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], "Art at the Exhibition," *Appleton's Journal* 15 (3 June 1876): 725.

New York's loan exhibition was a strong gesture in response to the Philadelphia display. New York's exhibition was rooted in ostentation, and it proved exceedingly effective as a show of that city's power and its continued authority as the center of the American art world. In contrast, the United States display in Philadelphia was intended to represent the country's artistic past and present. Where Sartain put the Centennial Exhibition's American art display in the hands of artists, selection for the New York Loan exhibition was conducted by collectors. In a more important contrast, the hanging at Memorial Hall, for all its flaws, was intended as a history of American art, and the New York exhibition was grouped by collector, making it clear that the display glorified the connoisseurship skills of the owners, rather than the merits of the artists represented, or their place in history.

The organizers of the American art exhibition in Fairmount Park may have been less than successful in reaching their aims, but there was one more opportunity to recognize the preeminent achievements of American artists. In an exhibition whose aim was to display the best of American art, bestowing awards would seem the most obvious way to enshrine objects and artists into the canon. Sartain's guideline of merely rejecting inferior works, and the committee's complicity, resulted in an overwhelmingly large display. They surrendered the opportunity to make a careful selection, and effectively passed their authority on to the jury to choose the key works from the hundreds on display.

Awards: A Final Attempt to Set the Canon

Awards played an important role in world's fairs; for exhibitors of manufactured goods, they were valuable endorsements that led to increased sales. They also had a

history of controversies. At the 1867 Exposition Universelle, organizers and exhibitors protested that since jurors were unpaid, they were not always experts in their field, they could not be counted on to finish their work, and some felt that their responsibility was simply to secure as many medals for the own country as was possible. Further, the makeup of juries was weighted toward countries who occupied the most floor space, and awards were made anonymously, with no explanation.¹⁷¹ The awards at the Vienna Exhibition were vilified as “tardy and slovenly” and jurors protected themselves from criticism by “scattering their awards in reckless profusion.”¹⁷²

In response to these complaints, a new “American System” of awards was created for the Centennial Exhibition. The Bureau of Awards was headed by Francis A. Walker, a noted economist, Civil War General, and Director of the United States Census.¹⁷³ Under the new system, the award consisted of a written report that the exhibitor could reproduce in advertising, and one type of medal, rather than graduated bronze, silver, and gold medals. The report, to be signed by one judge but agreed upon by a majority, was considered the real award, and it was hoped that having to write such reports would stimulate juries to seriously consider each object.¹⁷⁴ The media were quick to recognize the enormity of such a task, as the writer for the *Journal of the Franklin Institute* noted that “the anticipation that the power of permutation of adjectives might be exhausted in the 700 favorable reports on art subjects, is quite pleasant to entertain, or at least entertaining to suppose,” and the French critic L. Simonin bemoaned the “unhappy labor

¹⁷¹ Giberti, “The Classified Landscape,” 150.

¹⁷² “Vienna and the Centennial,” *The International Review* 2 (January 1875): 4.

¹⁷³ Maass, 37.

¹⁷⁴ United States Centennial Commission, *International Exhibition, 1876. Report of the Director-General, Including the Reports of Bureaus of Administration*, vol. 1 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 565-7.

of the juries, who must fill up in blank thousands of forms, without scarcely knowing how to vary the eulogium.”¹⁷⁵ The standards for judging included “originality, invention, discovery, utility, quality, skill, workmanship, fitness for purpose, adaptation to public wants, economy, and cost.”¹⁷⁶ As modern scholar Bruno Giberti has pointed out, such criteria were ill-suited to art.

A corps of 233 judges was recruited from experts in each field, approximately half of them American and half foreign (a more equitable proportion than in previous fairs), and they were paid a substantial \$1,000 each for their service (the equivalent of \$16,000 today).¹⁷⁷ Twenty judges were appointed for group 27, the Fine Arts jury. Nine of these were designated as experts in painting: Charles West Cope of England, Carl Schlesinger of Germany, J. Emile Saintin of France, the Count Donadio of Spain, Guglielmo de Sanctis of Italy, Kruseman van Elten of the Netherlands, and from the United States, George Ward Nichols, Frank Hill Smith, and John F. Weir.¹⁷⁸ Such a composition assured that American artists would be judged by a truly broad and international group, free of the local prejudices and disputes over training and style that had divided the East Coast art establishment. But subjecting American art to international scrutiny must have made some artists tremble, and wonder whether the awards would be

¹⁷⁵ “Motive Power of the International Exhibition.” *Journal of the Franklin Institute* 103 (January 1877): 2; Simonin, 18.

¹⁷⁶ Giberti, “The Classified Landscape,” 153-4.

¹⁷⁷ Giberti, “The Classified Landscape,” 153-4. The jury comprised 118 foreign judges and 115 American judges, with the largest foreign representations from Great Britain, France, and Germany. See USCC, *Report of the Director-General*, 567.

¹⁷⁸ G.W.N. [George Ward Nichols], “Correspondence: The Centennial Painting Awards,” *The Nation*, 23 (12 October 1876): 227. Sartain asserted that he was not involved with the jurying in any way, and that he studiously kept away from the jury and its activities. See JS to Max Mittermaier, [no city], 1 August 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 243; JS to Messrs. Hollenbach and Diffenbach, New York, 27 September 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 353.

based on how well they had assimilated foreign styles, or how well they had managed to create their own distinctive national school.

A system of awards created with manufactured goods in mind was bound to be incompatible with the evaluation of fine art. As early as September of 1875 the *New York Evening Post* warned, “in our judgment it would be better to leave the fine arts out in any scheme of awards. Verdicts of this kind are always invidious and rarely just...we cannot see the propriety of subjecting [art] to an arbitrament which seems to belong to the judicial sphere of the Patent Office.”¹⁷⁹ This assessment correctly anticipated that a set of utilitarian and objective criteria would be entirely irrelevant to art, and to apply them would threaten the special status of fine art as a unique branch of human “production.”

The Fine Arts judges began their task on May 25 and worked daily for four weeks.¹⁸⁰ It soon became clear that the procedures given them could not be applied to the “goods” they were being asked to judge. George Ward Nichols related how “It was found that no two of the judges could agree in all respects in a criticism of a work of art, while it was not difficult to agree as to its *general artistic character*.”¹⁸¹ Frank Hill Smith concurred that the group could not agree on the various qualities of a work of art, even though they might assent to its overall merit. As a result, the group decided to limit the written report to the phrase “for artistic excellence.”¹⁸² In addition, the paintings judges agreed that one would write an opinion and the majority would sign it, rather than having only one judge sign, according to official procedure.

¹⁷⁹ “Another English View of American Art,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 30 August 1876, 2.

¹⁸⁰ USCC, *Report of the Director-General*, 576.

¹⁸¹ Quoted in “Centennial Awards. The Art Department List,” *Evening Telegraph* (Philadelphia) 20 October 1876, 1.

¹⁸² Frank Hill Smith, “Correspondence. The Centennial Art Awards,” *The Nation* 23 (7 December 1876): 340.

In another departure, the paintings judges agreed to limit the number of awards given, and set a fixed number that they would not exceed.¹⁸³ This was in response to the super-profusion of awards given at the 1873 Vienna Exhibition, which diluted their value and made them next to meaningless.¹⁸⁴ Indeed, in other areas of the Centennial Exhibition the judges were later criticized for giving too many medals, and the *New-York Times* sarcastically concluded that “the tradesman without a medal must be the one who was selected from among the multitude of Centennial exhibitors as the fittest person to receive the rare honor of no medal whatsoever.”¹⁸⁵

The paintings jury wrapped up its work on June 25, and its foreign members returned home, while the judging for most of the other groups dragged on through mid-September. Complaints surfaced, and the committee’s liberties with the rules came to light. The judges were accused of refusing to consider any more paintings after reaching their limit of medals, and indeed, the official report claims that as of June 15 they declared the awards closed and would not allow the names of “certain exhibitors” to be submitted for a vote.¹⁸⁶ Stories circulated that the judges had contacted the Duke of Richmond, President of the Royal Academy in London, and asked whether the older academicians might defer their medals so that they could be given to younger artists, all so that the judges might stay within their pre-set limit.¹⁸⁷ American judge Frank Hill Smith refuted this charge, pointing out that judges gave fewer medals than their limit, and so that they had awards to spare, and moreover, transatlantic correspondence took so long

¹⁸³ Frank Hill Smith, “Correspondence. The Centennial Art Awards,” *The Nation* 23 (7 December 1876): 340.

¹⁸⁴ G.W.N. [George Ward Nichols], “Correspondence: The Centennial Painting Awards,” *The Nation*, 23 (12 October 1876): 227.

¹⁸⁵ “The Medal Muddle,” *New-York Times*, 30 September 1876, 6.

¹⁸⁶ USCC, *Report of the Director-General*, 576.

¹⁸⁷ “The Awards at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Nation* 23 (23 November 1876): 310.

that they could not have written a letter to London and received a response in time to have any effect.¹⁸⁸

Smith further asserted in response to the *New-York Times*' article "The Medal Muddle" that "there had been no 'muddle' in this affair except that the Centennial Commission attempted to put in practice a system of awards which could not be applied to objects of art."¹⁸⁹ John F. Weir, another American judge, concurred in his official report on the Fine Arts department and suggested that "the conferring of awards in the fine arts is altogether unsatisfactory because not always properly discriminative."¹⁹⁰

Awards Bureau Chief Walker went even further, recommending that in the future, awards should only be considered for makers of objects "of a commercial character," such as an organization that could produce 200 watches a day, rather than the watchmaker who carefully crafted a few watches of great merit, that could not be reproduced. Continuing the analogy, Walker concluded that "the commercial interest is, after all, the main-spring of action" for the Exhibition.¹⁹¹ Bruno Giberti points out that this privileging of mass-produced items threatened to put all exhibits to the same measure, and to commodify art.¹⁹² The judges' recognition of this threat and their actions against it were a strong assertion of art's value and its special status as a unique and didactic object in an age of increasing mass-production.

The *Journal of the Franklin Institute* objected to the system in general that the awards were based on intrinsic merit, rather than relative merit, and that if it had been

¹⁸⁸ Frank Hill Smith, "Correspondence. The Centennial Art Awards," *The Nation* 23 (7 December 1876): 340.

¹⁸⁹ Frank Hill Smith, "Correspondence. The Centennial Art Awards," *The Nation* 23 (7 December 1876): 340.

¹⁹⁰ USCC, *Reports and Awards*, 34.

¹⁹¹ USCC, *Report of the Director-General*, 570.

¹⁹² Giberti, "The Classified Landscape," 166.

broadly known that the prizes were not comparative there would have been less “national or regional pride” among exhibitors. The writer pointed out, with the common sense of the institution’s founder, Benjamin Franklin, that “it is a prize and not a commendation that all competitors seek.”¹⁹³ The Fine Arts jury’s actions show that they agreed. In a national showcase of American art, it was expected that some artists and some works would emerge as the greatest and would take their place in the pantheon of American masters. In spite of the jury’s complaints about the impossibility of applying objective criteria to a subjective field, it seems that they could not help creating a hierarchy of awards. Most accounts state that the comments in the reports were limited to “for artistic excellence.” However there were three different standardized reports that cited “merit,” “excellence” and “eminence.”¹⁹⁴ While these words are not as instantly recognizable as third, second, and first, or bronze, silver, and gold, they clearly imply a hierarchical order. The fine arts jury streamlined the process to its basic elements and created awards that were meaningful in their scarcity, and hierarchical in their verbiage. In doing so, they insisted on the special status of art and on the selectivity needed to form a canon.

But the fine arts awards controversy was just beginning. After complaints from general exhibitors about omissions and errors in the judging process, the Centennial Commission established a committee on appeals that added a total of 628 new awards across the entire Exhibition.¹⁹⁵ Sartain, on behalf of Director-General Goshorn, attempted to reconvene the paintings committee to revisit their stringent process, but most of the members had returned home, many overseas. A group of eight met so that “further

¹⁹³ “The United States International Exhibition of 1876,” *Journal of the Franklin Institute* 102 (December 1876): 363-4.

¹⁹⁴ USCC, *Reports and Awards*, 63, 86-103, 715-6.

¹⁹⁵ USCC, *Report of the Director-General*, 571.

recommendations for awards in painting would be considered.” Frank Hill Smith and George Ward Nichols attended the meeting but refused to serve in protest. Goshorn appointed a group of three, comprising the Americans John F. Weir and Brantz Mayer, and E. van Heemskerck van Beest from the Netherlands. Of the three, only Weir served on the original jury.¹⁹⁶

This new group hastily recommended 128 more medals, more than doubling the original eighty-five awards given.¹⁹⁷ The greatest number was given to artists of the United States, bringing its total from the original thirteen to forty-one. In this way the United States conveniently pulled ahead of France and Great Britain to garner the greatest number of awards for painting. The judges for these supplementary awards must have realized how transparent was their bid for American artistic supremacy, and the storm of protests it would raise. They attempted to have all the awards signed by Director-General A.T. Goshorn and Secretary John L. Campbell rather than by themselves, to relieve them of personal accountability. Awards Bureau Chief Walker protested and the “scheme” was defeated.¹⁹⁸

The incident was front page news, and protests were many and vehement. The *New York Herald* complained that having non-artists making the awards (in reference to Mayer and van Beest) lessened their value, since the “American system” of awards was built on having each area judged by specialists.¹⁹⁹ The supplementary awards lost their

¹⁹⁶ Mayer and van Beest were appointed to the original jury, but did not appear until the last day of the original group’s work. See “Centennial Awards. The Art Department List,” *Evening Telegraph* (Philadelphia) 20 October 1876, 1.

¹⁹⁷ G.W.N. [George Ward Nichols], “Correspondence: The Centennial Painting Awards,” *The Nation* 23 (12 October 1876): 227-8; “Art at the Centennial Exhibition,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 14 October 1876, 8.

¹⁹⁸ “The Awards at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Nation* 23 (23 November 1876): 310; E.V.S., “Botching the Awards,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 27 October 1876, 1.

¹⁹⁹ “After the Centennial,” *New York Herald*, 20 February 1877, 7.

prestige and the winners of the “original thirteen” medals were quick to distinguish themselves. An anonymous artist wrote the New York *Evening Post* asking that a distinction be made between the original awards and those added later, writing that “it is proper that we should know the difference between a medal and a muddle.”²⁰⁰ John F. Weir wrote to Jervis McEntee in October reassuring him that McEntee’s award was among the original group.²⁰¹ A notice in the Boston *Daily Evening Transcript* on Anna M. Lea’s *Patrician Mother* was quick to point out that it had received “one of the thirteen medals.”²⁰² And *The Aldine* condemned H.H. Moore’s controversial *Almeh, A Dream of Alhambra* in what it considered the most damning terms possible: it was not medaled by artists, but was given a supplementary award, and “[a fact] more damaging to the reputation of a picture or an artist we could hardly imagine.”²⁰³

These complaints are entirely justified and the awards’ integrity was severely compromised. Nonetheless, an analysis of the awards is still useful. Of a total forty-one American artists receiving medals, fifteen can be identified with the Hudson River School style of landscape painting, namely, E.M. Bannister, Albert Bierstadt, J.B. Bristol, Frederic Church, F.M.H. DeHaas, Sanford R. Gifford, James Hart, Herman Herzog, David Johnson, Jervis McEntee, Edward Moran, Peter Moran, Thomas Moran, who was recognized for his *Mountain of the Holy Cross* (figure 2.34), William Trost Richards, and Worthington Whittredge.²⁰⁴ Hudson River School artists were represented by a large number of well-placed works, and received a respectable number of awards. But foreign-

²⁰⁰ “American Artist,” “The Centennial Exhibition: An American Artist on the Art Awards,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 20 October 1876, 1.

²⁰¹ “Jervis McEntee’s Diary,” 17.

²⁰² A.P., “Centennial Echoes,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 29 September 1876, 6.

²⁰³ “An Opinion,” *The Aldine* 8 (September 1876): 294.

²⁰⁴ USCC, *Reports and Awards*, 87-92.

trained artists working in the figural tradition were just as abundantly honored, receiving at least fourteen awards -- a remarkable accomplishment given their less prominent hanging. These included G.H. Boughton, Frederic Bridgman, William Merritt Chase, Elizabeth J. Gardner, R. Swain Gifford, William Morris Hunt, J.B. Irving, Anna M. Lea, H.H. Moore, Toby Rosenthal, Emily Sartain, Walter Shirlaw, Clementina Tompkins, Charles Volkmar, and P.F. Wharton.²⁰⁵ The proportions of the “original thirteen” awards are the same, with four medals going to Hudson River School landscapists DeHaas, Hart, McEntee, and Whittredge, and the same number conferred upon foreign-trained painters Bridgman, Hunt, Lea, and Rosenthal.²⁰⁶ The paintings awards, both the original and the supplementary versions, demonstrated that foreign-trained artists had come into their own and were seen on the same level of merit as the dominant school of the National Academy of Design.

The jurying of sculpture, by contrast, excited no controversy or even comment. Awards were given to five sculptors in the initial judging, and none were added by the later jury of three. The proportions were the same as those for painting. Of the five, two were firmly in the nativist camp: Erastus Dow Palmer and John Rogers, both of whom declined study abroad. Another two were Montague Handley of Rome, whose works *Diana*, *Bacchus*, and *Flora* (all unlocated) suggest the neoclassical tradition, and Howard Roberts, the Centennial’s torchbearer of the coming Parisian Beaux-Arts ideal.²⁰⁷

²⁰⁵ Munich-trained Toby Rosenthal was noted in periodicals as an award winner, though strangely he is not included in the official report. For example, see G.W.N. [George Ward Nichols], “Correspondence: The Centennial Painting Awards,” *The Nation* 23 (12 October 1876): 227-8.

²⁰⁶ G.W.N. [George Ward Nichols], “Correspondence: The Centennial Painting Awards,” *The Nation* 23 (12 October 1876): 227-8.

²⁰⁷ Mantle Fielding, *Mantle Fielding’s Dictionary of Painters, Sculptors, and Engravers* (Poughkeepsie, NY: Apollo, 1986), 370. No information could be found for the fifth honoree, Isabella Gifford, listed as a resident of New York.

The controversies surrounding the art awards succeeded in drawing attention to the differences between art objects and manufactured goods. Unfortunately, the awards' credibility was called into question by the imposition of additional medals, and they seem to have had little long-term impact. The Hudson River School awardees were already established, and the foreign-trained recipients remain, in many cases, unfamiliar to modern scholars. In addition, the written reports that were intended to serve as a time capsule, a "record of the...progress of the nations" and the "'form and pressure' of the present age," were reduced to only one line for each artist.²⁰⁸

The awards' lack of effect, and the invisible machinery of canon-building, are vividly illustrated in the case of Edward M. Bannister, a black painter who won a medal for his *Under the Oaks* (unlocated). He had established a reputation in Boston in the 1860s, where he was considered one of the town's most popular artists, and he earned similar esteem when he moved to Rhode Island in the 1870s. At the Centennial Exhibition his painting was praised for its masterful effects of light and shade; it garnered such plaudits as "admirable" and "quite a startling representation."²⁰⁹

Bannister recalled the prejudice that he faced at the Centennial Exhibition while trying to find out whether he had indeed been honored with an award. The crowds in the Awards office and even officials questioned "why is this colored person here?" On inquiring about his painting, the official responded "what's that to you?"

In an instant my blood was up. The looks that passed between that official and the others were unmistakable in their meaning. To them I was not an artist; simply an inquisitive colored man. Controlling myself I said with deliberation... "I painted

²⁰⁸ Giberti, "The Classified Landscape," 170.

²⁰⁹ "Art and Artists," *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 4 April 1876, 6; Frank H. Norton, ed., *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Historical Register of the Centennial Exposition 1876: A Facsimile of Frank Leslie's Illustrated Historical Register of the Centennial Exposition, 1876* (New York: Paddington Press, 1974), 204.

that picture.” The explosion of a bomb could not have created more of a sensation in that room.²¹⁰

Bannister appears to have been the only black painter represented at the Centennial, and the only New Englander to receive an award, and it might have been expected that such a distinction would bring him lasting recognition. But Bannister did not fit the traditional mold of the white male artist, and unlike Edmonia Lewis, he had no sensational past, and did not employ unconventional methods that drew attention to his work. In spite of his painting’s recognized merit, it did not find a place in the canon. He was quickly forgotten after his death in 1901 and his reputation was only resurrected in the last few decades.

The awards’ lack of efficacy placed the burden of documentation on the general report that was expected to summarize the Fine Arts department as a whole.²¹¹ According to American judge George Ward Nichols, this requirement was just as inappropriate as the written reports requested for individual works, as “the judges of the Group would never have consented to adopt as their collective judgment the individual opinions of any one of their members.” Instead Nichols submitted a list of awards and the group’s reasons for not following the guidelines set out by the Awards Bureau. His response echoes the protests that Sartain encountered when he admitted works to the exhibition outside the Selection Committee’s authority: a summary would necessitate the types of judgments and selections that would constitute a canon, and such assessments should be made by an

²¹⁰ George W. Whitaker, “Reminiscences of Providence Artists,” *Providence Magazine, The Board of Trade Journal* (March 1914), 207; quoted in Hartigan, 69-75.

²¹¹ This is distinct from John Sartain’s “Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Art” in the United States Centennial Commission’s *Report of the Director-General*, which is a straightforward account of Department procedures and regulations.

authoritative group -- they were too important to be made by an individual, no matter how well qualified.

General Walker, probably in the interest of practicality, asked the original chair of the Fine Arts Committee, James Claghorn, to write a general report. Given his lack of involvement to date, it was no surprise that Claghorn declined, and Walker turned to judge John F. Weir. Nichols was outraged and protested that Weir's "official report" was not their report at all.²¹² In fact, Weir's report was far more than a review of the American art department at the Centennial Exhibition; he took the opportunity to survey the entire history of American art, as would many critics when summing up the exhibition.

The American art exhibition proved to be an affirmation of the Hudson River School as American art's honored past, and also pointed to foreign-trained artists as its future. Unfortunately the impact of the historical canon and national school was diluted; many felt that the exhibition's integrity was breached by controversies over the selection of works and the awarding of medals. In allowing an overwhelming number of objects into the American exhibition, the Selection Committee ceded the cultural and curatorial authority that affirms the value of each object included in a major exhibition. Even the jurying process could not bring a sense of order or coherence to the works on display, as additional awards muddied the waters and compromised their credibility.

Visitors were left to negotiate the exhibition on their own terms, and critics as well had to determine what was most important in a sea of objects. In doing so, they were led to ponder what was most influential in the broad scope of American art. For the

²¹² "'Correspondence: The Fine Arts Group at the Centennial Exhibition,' letter from Geo. Ward Nichols, Cincinnati, 17 December 1877 and Francis A. Walker, New Haven, 24 December 1877," *The Nation* 25 (27 December 1877): 393-4.

purposes of posterity, the exhibition's most lasting expression would be in written accounts and critical responses, and like John F. Weir, many would grasp the opportunity not just to critique the objects before them, but to consider, for the first time, a grand narrative of the nation's art.

Chapter Three: Writing History

Hurried and tempestuous preparations leading up to the Centennial Exhibition produced an American art display that was rich and diverse, but also large, controversial, and confusing. Viewers and critics expected to see a survey of American art of the past, along with a representation of the art of the present day. However, the American canon and American school on display in Fairmount Park were far from complete, and their impact was muddled by the lack of preparation time and disagreements among the artists organizing them. The confusion and profusion of the United States display took the canon-building exercise out of the hands of the artists who had planned the exhibition and forced critics to pick and choose their own versions of American art, both past and present. Unlike the exhibition, written accounts by journalists and critics took a permanent form that was referenced by later scholars, so that their critical assessments of American art at the Centennial Exhibition superseded the ephemeral canon attempted in Fairmount Park. In this way, contemporary commentators seized cultural authority.

Writers addressed the United States art exhibition in all types of publications. They focused on two intertwined issues that drew artists, collectors, and the general public into a great debate: first, what was American art's proper relationship to that of Europe, and second, could the United States have a national school of its own?¹ Just as important, many critics took the opportunity to go beyond the works in the exhibition and create their own histories of American art, and their own visions of an American school. The most prominent voices in these discussions were those of two respected art critics

¹ Margaret C. Conrads, "'In the Midst of an Era of Revolution': The New York Art Press and the Annual Exhibitions of the National Academy of Design in the 1870s," in *Rave Reviews: American Art and Its Critics, 1826-1925*, ed. David B. Dearing (exh. cat., National Academy of Design, New York, 2000), 93; Margaret C. Conrads, *Winslow Homer and the Critics: Forging a National Art in the 1870s* (exh. cat., The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, 2001), 4.

with vastly different approaches. The caustic, passionate Clarence Cook of the *New-York Daily Tribune* and the reserved, deliberative Earl Shinn of *The Nation* both wrestled with the issues presented by the Centennial Exhibition's American art display. Their responses, though polar opposites in style, both illuminate the difficulty and complexity of those debates, as well as the depth of feeling attached to them.

To understand the canon building process and the transfer of cultural authority from arts organizations such as the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts and the National Academy of Design to critics like Cook and Shinn, it is helpful to turn to the methodologies of literary criticism. Frank Kermode suggests that "The work of preservation and defense [of works of art over time] is carried on by many voices cooperating, however unwillingly, to one end, and not by a central authority resisting its challengers."² This is a good characterization of the multifarious debates among artists, collectors, and critics at the time of the Centennial Exhibition, as well as the National Academy's vain attempts to beat back the encroachments of the "new men." Kermode posits dialogue, and even argument, as a means of forming a consensus, and the Centennial Exhibition produced opinions and interpretations of American art on an unprecedented scale. However, Kermode stops short of explaining how works are admitted into the canon, considering it a naturally arising occurrence.

Pierre Bourdieu's theory of cultural production offers an explanation. He argues that the "field of cultural production" is composed of relations between various "social agents and institutional components" that play a role in the "symbolic consecration" of works, citing museums and galleries, salons and academies, critics, dealers, and finally, art historians. Bourdieu emphasizes the importance of the broad cultural familiarization

² Frank Kermode, *Forms of Attention* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 79.

of a work so that over time its canonical status seems self-evident. E. Dean Kolbas elaborates, calling canon formation “an historical process of artistic production and institutional consecration.” He believes that works become canonical not based merely on familiarity, but also on the authority of the institutions evaluating them.³

Kolbas’ views have implications for the Centennial Exhibition; the conflict between expatriates and nativists that found its flashpoint between Whittredge and Sartain represented a much larger debate, and the two must have been aware that their struggle would resonate beyond the exhibition in Fairmount Park. They could not have known, however, that their dispute occurred at a unique moment when the forms of cultural authority were in flux. Artist organizations such as the National Academy of Design and the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts were respected fixtures on the East Coast, but both were preoccupied with parochial concerns: the National Academy with internal battles against young artists, and the Pennsylvania Academy with its new building. In a period marked by civic rivalries and fragmentation, neither could speak with an authoritative national voice. The great collectors of the nineteenth century were only beginning to acquire significant works in large numbers, and in any case, they had few forums for making their views and preferences public (though one exception was the New York Loan Exhibition discussed in chapter two). Major metropolitan museums were just in their formative years, and in the 1870s were far more interested in acquiring European paintings and plaster casts than American art.⁴ Critics, on the other hand, were emerging as an increasingly influential force in shaping the dialogue on American art.

³ E. Dean Kolbas, *Critical Theory and the Literary Canon* (Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001), 62, 66, 139.

⁴ The Corcoran Gallery was founded in 1861, The Boston Museum of Fine Arts opened its doors in the Centennial year, and the Metropolitan Museum’s permanent Central Park home would not be completed for four more years.

Their work was growing in importance and professionalism, and art was being covered in a variety of publications for ever-growing audiences.

In the ante-bellum period works of art were discussed primarily in terms of their subject matter and degree of moral uplift, and sentimental and literary qualities were most prized.⁵ These assessments emphasized the high character of the artist himself, and artists' biographies tended to follow a pattern of early promise and noble perseverance in the face of obstacles. In the 1850s art criticism in the United States began to grow in quantity and sophistication. The journal *The Crayon*, published from 1855 to 1861, offered serious and considered writing on art, albeit with a distinctly Ruskinian point of view. Newspapers such as the *New York Herald*, the *New-York Daily Tribune* and the *New-York Times* began to comment on fine art, and worked to develop their own styles and identities; for example, the *New York Herald* relished its reputation for a (self-described) "saucy, spicy," and "exuberant" tone.⁶

The boom continued after the Civil War, when the American art magazine emerged as an established genre; these publications grew quickly in size and quality of illustration. *The Art Journal*, founded in 1875, followed *The Crayon's* lead by offering articles on the history of art and on contemporary works. The conservative *Aldine* was established in 1871, and the more progressive *American Architect and Building News* in 1876. Just as important, general interest magazines like the *Atlantic Monthly*, *Scribner's Monthly*, *The Independent*, *The Nation*, and even the *Christian Union* printed reproductions of "masterpieces" with accompanying commentary, and began to report on

⁵ Linda Jones Docherty, "A Search for Identity: American Art Criticism and the Concept of the "Native School" (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1985), 91-2.

⁶ David B. Dearing, "An Introduction to the History of American Art Criticism to 1925," 21, 23 and "Annual Exhibitions and the Birth of American Art Criticism to 1865," in Dearing, *Rave Reviews*, 69-70.

happenings in the American art world.⁷ The increased coverage of art in popular magazines stimulated public interest, which contributed significantly to the popularity of the Centennial Exhibition's Art Department.

The Centennial Exhibition attracted a number of writers who produced commentary of widely varied scope and quality. Their efforts in exhibition guides, general interest magazines, newspapers, art journals, and souvenir books remain as documents of the United States exhibition. Their choices of objects to single out, and their interpretations of those works, provide the best record of the American art exhibition as it was experienced and understood in its time, and their comments provide fodder for future generations to continue the canon-building conversation. This was understood even as the Centennial Exhibition was in its planning stages; in 1872 Commissioner W.P. Blake observed that “printed results make the exposition a permanent one. The teachings survive the demolition of the buildings.”⁸ A century later Frank Kermode agreed that “since we have no experience of a venerable [work of art] that ensures its own perpetuity, we may reasonably say that the medium in which it survives in commentary.”⁹

The artist John F. Weir observed in relation to the Centennial's American art exhibition that “the art of a nation is a true exponent of the habits of mind and feeling peculiar to that people.” Americans were keenly aware that the nation's art exhibition

⁷ Conrads, *Homer and the Critics*, 3-5; Dearinger, “Introduction,” in Dearinger, *Rave Reviews*, 21-2; Christine Hunter Donaldson, “The Centennial of 1876: The Exposition, and Culture for America” (Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1948), 114, 116.

⁸ William P. Blake, “Previous International Exhibitions,” in United States Centennial Commission, *Journal of the Proceedings of the United States Centennial Commission at Philadelphia, 1872* (Philadelphia: E.C. Markey & Son, 1872), 63.

⁹ Kermode, 36.

would be interpreted as a reflection of its citizens and their culture.¹⁰ The display provided a mirror that would reflect the American art narrative to foreign visitors. As has been discussed, the American art exhibition inspired comparisons to Europe, and expectations of a similar evaluation from foreign visitors. This dawning awareness of oneself (or one's country) as an independent entity, and of simultaneously being observed, produced a "double consciousness" that pervaded accounts of the exhibition.¹¹ The concept was developed by the activist W.E.B. DuBois to describe the "twoness" of black Americans, their "sense of...looking at one's self through the eyes of others."¹² In fact, Americans were even more intent on observing themselves than their foreign visitors, who comprised a small fraction of total attendance. The situation brings to mind Jacques Lacan's theory of the mirror stage, in which an infant sees his own reflection and for the first time is aware of himself as a separate being. The United States was awakening to the distinction between itself and the other; that is, mother Europe. The Centennial Exhibition provided a mirror for the country to see itself as a historical and unified entity, distinct from its European antecedents. For this reason, critics were especially sensitive to questions of foreign influence and American identity; they realized that this new awareness required identification and consolidation in an American canon and an American school.

More than any other critics, Clarence Cook and Earl Shinn understood what was at stake in the Centennial Exhibition's American art display. Their responses, though

¹⁰ John F. Weir, "Group XXVII: Plastic and Graphic Art," in *International Exhibition, 1876. Reports and Awards*, vol. 7, Groups XXI-XXVII, United States Centennial Commission (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 4.

¹¹ Donaldson, 81, 101.

¹² W.E.B. DuBois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (1903: reprint, New York: Bantam Books, 1989), 3. While DuBois was writing very specifically about the plight of black Americans, his ideas have been helpful in illuminating other situations.

quite different in tone, are united in recognizing the chance to “revise history” via a critique of the Centennial Exhibition’s American art canon, and to discuss how foreign influences were shaping the American school of the present day.

Cook (figure 3.1) was among the most prolific and influential critics of the nineteenth century. He joined the *New-York Daily Tribune* in 1864, when it was regarded as the most prestigious newspaper in the country; his forthright, provocative style was considered a good fit. Cook quickly became notorious for an authoritative and caustic style that earned him his own share of criticism. He left in 1870 and rejoined the newspaper in 1875, remaining there until 1883.¹³ Cook was a practical thinker; for instance, he wished to delay discussing the United States art exhibition until installation was complete, wanting to see the display in full before forming an opinion.¹⁴ With regard to foreign influences, he wished for a distinctive American school, but realized that artists must take their opportunities where they could be found, even if that led them abroad. As he conceded, “Art, like every pursuit of man, has and must have, its bread-and-butter side; and artists will go, and have a right to go, not only where they can find an atmosphere that suits their temperament as artists, but where they can make [the] most money.”¹⁵ He formed strong opinions quickly and cut great swaths with his bombastic pronouncements. His strong convictions reflect the intensity of the discussions about American art at the time of the Centennial Exhibition.

¹³ John P. Simoni, “Art Critics and Criticism in Nineteenth Century America” (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1952), 142-7, 150, 176.

¹⁴ [Clarence Cook], “The Fine Art Department: American Pictures: First Notice,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 1 June 1876, 8.

¹⁵ Clarence Cook, “Fine Arts: The National Academy of Design,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 29 April 1875, 7.

Earl Shinn (figure 3.2) produced art criticism for several publications and authored a number of books, in spite of being handicapped by weak eyes and colorblindness. He wrote under numerous pseudonyms, but most commonly as Edward Strahan. At the time of the Centennial he wrote for the respected conservative journal *The Nation*, which featured articles on current events, politics, and literary criticism for an intellectual audience.¹⁶ In contrast to Cook's slashing prose, Shinn was even-handed and deliberative, and often ambivalent. He exposed his thought process to his readers, probing the subtleties of the questions under discussion. Shinn was more abstract in his approach and willing to tolerate ambiguity. His work mirrors the art world's uncertainty about the complex issues at play during a transitional moment.

Just how much ambiguity and speculation Shinn could bear is illustrated in his book *A Century After: Picturesque Glimpses of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania*. The work was published in 1875, and was no doubt meant to be sold before and during the Centennial year to capitalize on the growing interest in the Exhibition. Shinn narrated a fanciful first person plural stroll with the reader through the fairgrounds, which was necessarily vague because the book was written a year before the Exhibition's opening. His careful phrasing reflects the widespread anxiety over what the Centennial exercise in self-scrutiny might show. The strain of anticipation was apparent in his "description" of sculpture in Memorial Hall: "We walk through this avenue of statuary, passing from shape to shape. Can we retain what we receive and reproduce it in words? We cannot and we shall not attempt to." He expressed his worries about the expected comparison with

¹⁶ Frank Luther Mott, *A History of American Magazines*, vol. 3 (Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957-68), 31, 331.

Europe, writing “Is America inferior to Europe in sculpture? The judges must decide that; we merely decide for ourselves that she is not.”

Perhaps realizing the difficulty of predicting the American art display, Shinn hurried the reader out of Memorial Hall with the excuse that “It is impressive, but it is becoming oppressive: it draws on too many moods and nerves. We can come back to it when we have rested our minds and refreshed our eyes.” He summed up his imaginary visit by apologizing in advance for American art, asserting that “We are sure of her in landscape in and in sculpture. If America has not attained her highest eminence in art she will attain it. With this cud for critics to chew, we proceed to Horticultural Hall.”¹⁷

“This cud for critics to chew”: Responses to the American Art Exhibition

The Exhibition as a whole inspired innumerable accounts from all over the country, and the American art exhibition was documented in several forms, including guidebooks to help visitors navigate the overwhelming number of exhibits, general interest periodicals, newspaper articles, a growing number of specialized journals for art lovers, and souvenir accounts published during and shortly after the Exhibition that narrated the highlights of the main buildings and provided illustrations.

Critics took a variety of approaches to their coverage of the art exhibition. Some commented on the Memorial Hall exhibition in the most general terms, observing the status of the galleries and the behavior of the visitors. Others examined the display in almost fanatical detail. The Philadelphia *Evening Telegraph* published approximately fifty installments on various aspects of the entire art department.¹⁸ The *Philadelphia*

¹⁷ Edward Strahan [Earl Shinn], *A Century After: Picturesque Glimpses of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: Allen, Lane & Scott, 1875), 350-1.

¹⁸ One late installment focusing on American art was “The Art Department. Forty-sixth Notice--American Sculpture,” *Evening Telegraph* (Philadelphia), 12 October 1876, 8.

Evening Bulletin devoted the most attention to the American art exhibition, at least in terms of sheer space. The writer recognized the uneven quality of the works in the display, calling it “rather an odd jumble of the very good and the very bad.”¹⁹ He was aware of the need to choose the best works from the overwhelming number of possibilities, describing the visitor’s task of picking out creditable works “from amidst their unfortunate surroundings.”²⁰

In most cases, this caused critics to select and discuss only the works they considered most important. The *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*’s writer, however, chose not to go through this exercise. Instead, he published a series of eighteen installments that, incredibly, cover the majority of the over seven hundred American paintings on view, and the sculpture as well.²¹ These articles read as a walk through the display. Each picture was referenced with its catalogue number and a description; most were praised, with only a few mild qualifications. A stunning amount of time, ink, and column space was expended on this type of timid, old-fashioned criticism that applauded any American effort, and failed to exercise discrimination. The *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*’s choice to abdicate its critical function and mention virtually everything was not feasible for most publications. It graphically demonstrates how the profusion of works in the American department forced most critics to dispense with old forms of criticism that deemed any effort meritorious because it was American, and compelled them to choose which pieces to include in their story of American art. Critics had to make their own selections, and hence build new versions of the American canon and an American school.

¹⁹ “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 12 July 1876, 2.

²⁰ “Our Great Show,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 17 May 1876, 1.

²¹ Articles appeared on page 1 or 2 almost daily from June 17 to 29 and from July 5 to 13. A sculpture review appeared on July 19.

The *New York World's* critic made an observation that sums up the subjective nature of interpreting the American art exhibition: "a picture gallery is, of all places in the world, the most likely to furnish you with whatever you are in search of."²² He was writing specifically about the many paeans to the perfection of American landscape artists, but the statement could be just as fitly applied to the entire United States exhibition (or any exhibition, for that matter). For many critics the display was merely a point of departure that allowed them to express their own visions of an American art history and an American school. But of course many responded directly to the exhibition as well. While writers identified shortcomings in the installation and in specific works, the overall consensus on the exhibition was far more positive than modern scholarship has indicated.

Recent assessments of the American art exhibition tend to conclude that it was negatively viewed in its time. Paul Greenhalgh wrote in 1988 that most critics were disappointed with the showing of American art, and in 2000 Ethan Robey has asserted that critics generally considered it "decidedly mediocre."²³ However, in 1970 John Maass rightly pointed out that such negative views were often based on accounts of the exhibition that were written years after the fact, and that in its time it was actually considered a good showing by Americans and foreigners alike.²⁴

A few publications had harsh words for the art exhibition as a whole. The *New York Herald* called it an "agony" containing "the most amazing collection of bad pictures

²² "American Art at the Centennial," *New York World*, 24 July 1876, 2.

²³ Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 215-6; Ethan Robey, "John Sartain and the Contest of Taste at the Centennial" in *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*, eds. Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000), 87.

²⁴ John Maass, *The Glorious Enterprise: The Centennial Exhibition of 1876 and H.J. Schwartzmann, Architect-in-Chief* (Watkins Glen, NY: American Life Foundation, 1973), 82.

ever made since men began to daub with oil on canvas.”²⁵ The *Atlantic Monthly* considered the art exhibition nothing more than a product of its time, explaining that Memorial Hall “exhibits the productions of an inartistic age.”²⁶ With regard to the American department in particular, an unsigned article in the *New-York Daily Tribune* lamented “we hesitate to speak of the American pictures, because our disappointment, our mortification, are so great and so severe.”²⁷ The harsh tone gives one reason to believe that the article was written by Clarence Cook, whose invective may be taken with a grain of salt.²⁸

In fact, there were few unreservedly negative contemporary reviews of the American art exhibition. Most commentary was carefully qualified, showing a new self-consciousness about the United States’ place in the art world, and in its own history. Earl Shinn considered it “unquestionably the grandest collection of art ever seen on the continent.”²⁹ Susan Nichols Carter of *The Art Journal* placed American art second only to the admittedly superb display of British art.³⁰

Some notices revealed the reviewers’ low expectations, along with a palpable sense of relief. The *New-York Daily Tribune*’s closing article reversed its earlier negative position saying “we have no reason to be ashamed of our American display...it contained

²⁵ “The Centennial Show,” *New York Herald*, 4 September 1876, 6.

²⁶ “Characteristics of the International Fair: Closing Days,” *Atlantic Monthly* 39 (January 1877): 94.

²⁷ “Department of Fine Arts,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 10 May 1876, 2.

²⁸ A few publications pointedly glossed over American art. The critic for the *Galaxy* addressed only foreign art and made no specific mention of the American exhibition. The writer for *Scribner’s Monthly* bemoaned the large number of works and admitted that he couldn’t tell which to exclude and didn’t care to try, so he dismissed the entire American art exhibition -- though he was able to give specific and detailed accounts of other nations’ contributions. One wonders whether these omissions were caused by embarrassment over the United States display, or unwillingness to take on the difficult task of determining which artists they thought to be the best.

²⁹ Strahan, *The Art Gallery of the Exhibition*, vi.

³⁰ S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], “Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 283.

more good pictures than any foreign country except England could show.”³¹ William Dean Howells concurred in the *Atlantic Monthly*: “We certainly had no cause...to be ashamed of the show of American paintings...there were not many positively poor, and there were many strikingly good.”³² “Ruhamah” of the *National Republican* called it “surprisingly fine.”³³ The *New York Herald* observed that “no previous collection has contained more good paintings and fewer bad ones.”³⁴ The most backhanded praise came from the *American Architect and Building News*, whose writer observed that “thus far the native pictures do not make the impression of inferiority that was naturally looked for.”³⁵

Some critics pointed out the unprecedented scale and ambition of the project. *Appleton’s Journal* called the American exhibition “the best collection we have ever had.”³⁶ The writer hinted at a condition that others addressed more explicitly: the United States’ relative youth and the early stage it inhabited in its cultural development. The *New-York Times* conceded “we have done passably well, considering all things. We are very young.”³⁷ The *New-York Daily Tribune* pointed out that American art students were at a great disadvantage, having only three or four cities in the United States where they could seek instruction and study great works of art, so the artist “has no cause to be ashamed of his progress in critical ability.”³⁸ Sylvester Burley’s *American Enterprise*.

Burley’s United States Centennial Gazetteer and Guide, 1876 began with an explanation

³¹ “The Great Fair Closed,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 11 November 1876, 2.

³² William Dean Howells, “A Sennight of the Centennial,” *Atlantic Monthly* 38 (July 1876): 95.

³³ “Ruhamah,” “An Hour’s Sojourn in the Gallery of Art,” *National Republican*, 13 June 1876, 1.

³⁴ “The World’s Display of Art,” *New York Herald*, 11 May 1876, 6.

³⁵ Untitled (“The exhibition of paintings is as yet...”), *The American Architect and Building News* 1 (27 May 1876): 169. In a more personal assessment, psychologist and philosopher William James wrote “I was very glad to notice that the American picture-show compared very favorably with that of any other Nation. Nothing very great, but a good average less positively bad stuff than elsewhere.” See Ignas K. Skrupskelis and Elizabeth M. Berkeley, eds., *The Correspondence of William James*, vol. 4 (Charlottesville: University Press of Virginia, 1992), 538, WJ to Robertson James, Cambridge, 11 June 1876.

³⁶ S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], “Art at the Exhibition,” *Appleton’s Journal* 15 (3 June 1876): 726.

³⁷ “Mechanic Arts at the Exposition,” *New-York Times*, 26 October 1876, 4.

³⁸ “A Suggestion for the Centennial Summer,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 2 March 1876, 4.

that American progress in the fine arts was slow because of the necessity of attending to the “essential comforts of life” first.³⁹ Charles F. Briggs of *The Independent* remarked on the “obvious inferiority” of the American works, but added hopefully that “there are many very admirable pictures by our own artists which afford sufficient reasons for national pride, and for encouragement in the belief that we may, sooner or later, boast of our artistic productions and feel ourselves the equals, if not the superiors, of any other peoples [sic].”⁴⁰

Comments in *Arthur’s Illustrated Home Magazine* were imbued with the sense of progress that suffused the fair: “The American paintings will compare favorably with any upon exhibition, and show an advance in art which is not only creditable but encouraging. There has never been a period when art had reached as high a stage as at present.”⁴¹ *The Independent* thought the exhibition “shows wonderful progress and great promise...there are, of course, many bad American pictures...but there are good ones enough to redeem them.”⁴² *Scribner’s Monthly* made an insightful comment that affirmed critics’ growing power and influence over that of artists:

In this day of swift traffic and intercommunication, the capacity to apprehend and comprehend good work of the highest kind, is in disproportionate excess to the capacity for actually accomplishing the work. The education that provokes good critical estimate of art-work outmarches the slower culture out of which the ripest result of art-work are evolved.⁴³

Complaints about a lack of artistic development were nothing new, but these comments showed a dawning consciousness of progress, and consequently, of history.

³⁹ Sylvester W. Burley, *American Enterprise. Burley’s United States Centennial Gazetteer and Guide, 1876* (Philadelphia: S.W. Burley, 1876), 633.

⁴⁰ Charles F. Briggs, “Centennial Paintings: The American Department,” *The Independent*, 13 July 1876, 4.

⁴¹ E.B.D., “The Great Centennial Exhibition: The Art Exhibition,” *Arthur’s Illustrated Home Magazine* 44 (September 1876): 564.

⁴² Wm. M.F. Round, “Art at the Exposition,” *The Independent*, 8 June 1876, 12.

⁴³ “In and About the Fair: Dinners, Plants and Pictures,” *Scribner’s Monthly* 13 (November 1876): 116.

While the American art exhibition as a whole exceeded observers' admittedly low expectations, writers found many specific aspects to criticize. The Selection Committee received its share of brickbats, namely for the overwhelming size of the exhibition. It was suspected that "certain professional jealousies prevented some of the best American artists from being represented in the Exposition, while inferior works secured a place on the walls."⁴⁴ The *Atlantic Monthly* gently suggested that "our own artists make a respectable show, which would be more impressive if [their numbers] could be decimated."⁴⁵ *Scribner's Monthly* noted that the huge number of works should have been culled by one quarter, and that "we have entered the race handicapped with a great burden of slovenly and inartistic work."⁴⁶ Walker expressed his dissatisfaction most pointedly in the *International Review*: "It did not seem to occur to the administration that an American citizen had no more right to hang his canvas on the walls of the Memorial Hall than to hang his linen on the gates of the park."⁴⁷

Sartain was of course a target. Cook was characteristically sharp-tongued as he lamented what might have been: "If it had been our lot to have had the direction of the Art Department put into hands fit to wield it – a man of education, with organizing power...but the choice of a director was most unfortunate and the result is as meager and misleading as might have been expected. With such material as we have, however, we must grope our way."⁴⁸ Cook was aware though, of the "inertia of the American

⁴⁴ Walker, "The Exhibition in Memorial Hall," in Steele, xli.

⁴⁵ "Characteristics of the International Fair: Closing Days," *Atlantic Monthly* 39 (January 1877): 96.

⁴⁶ "In and About the Fair: Dinners, Plants and Pictures," *Scribner's Monthly* 13 (November 1876): 123.

⁴⁷ Francis A. Walker, "The Late World's Fair. Part II – The Display," *International Review* 4 (July 1877): 509.

⁴⁸ [Clarence Cook], "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: First Notice," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 1 June 1876, 8.

Commission” that led to Sartain’s rushed preparations.⁴⁹ Cook’s description of the exhibition as “misleading” implies that he expected a certain vision of American art that he did not find. His resolve to “grope his way” with the material he was given hints at critics’ perceived duty to create visions of their own. John Sears of *The Aldine* considered Sartain unqualified for his task since he was “neither an artist, nor a layman of experience in public undertakings; but...rather, a retiring student and a devoted specialist.” However Sears also acknowledged the difficulties Sartain faced with his late appointment to the post.⁵⁰ The *New-York Times* surprisingly defended Sartain’s efforts on the American art exhibition, explaining that he had done a good job under difficult and vexing circumstances. Even more startling, the writer faulted him only for acceding too much to New York artists such as “the obstructive Whittredge and the envious Hicks.”⁵¹

Critics also harshly condemned Sartain for the paintings that he unilaterally inserted into the exhibition. The *New-York Daily Tribune*’s official guide blamed the mish-mash hanging of the works in the Art Annex partly on Sartain, who “not only arbitrarily consulted his own taste,” but “even personally accepted some pictures after their rejection by the Commission.”⁵² The *American Architect and Building News* blamed Sartain for the number and quality of works, writing that “if the decision of the committee had been final, perhaps there would have been less in the department to shock a refined taste; and certainly there would have been no necessity for crowding the pictures so abominably.”⁵³ Walker related how the decisions of the selection committee

⁴⁹ C.C. [Clarence Cook], “The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: Second Notice,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 3 June 1876, 2.

⁵⁰ John Sears, “Art in Philadelphia,” *The Aldine* 8 (June 1876): 196.

⁵¹ Gar., “The Art of America,” *New-York Times*, 9 June 1876, 1.

⁵² *New-York Tribune Guide to the Exhibition* (New York: New-York Daily Tribune, 1876), 60.

⁵³ “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (19 August 1876): 269.

were set aside and “an amount of rubbish [was] admitted to the galleries of the Exhibition of which it is difficult to speak within bounds.”⁵⁴ Their vehemence seems out of proportion to the tiny fraction of the total that the ten works represented, suggesting once again how important they considered the exhibition’s integrity to be.

Fault was found with the installation as well. Cook called the hanging “slovenly, inaccurate,” and “incomplete.”⁵⁵ The *New York World* complained that there was no system of hanging.⁵⁶ The *Newark Daily Advertiser* concurred, remarking, “the view of so many pictures huddled together with no principle of order...make it impossible to observe any settled system in dealing with them.”⁵⁷ The writer’s search for a “system” to “deal with” the works points out yet again the expectation of an official reckoning. In its absence, critics had to provide their own.

Any discussion of responses to the United States display must address critical accounts of its most written-about artwork, Peter Rothermel’s *The Battle of Gettysburg* (figure 1.8). The painting was placed in a central position in Memorial Hall’s “Saloon of Honor.” Its enormous size made it unavoidable for visitors and critics, and its prominent position strongly implied that the organizers considered it among the greatest works of American art. Its controversial subject combined with its placement to ignite a firestorm of condemnation that demonstrated critics’ newfound power to shape public opinion and in turn, the canon.⁵⁸ Rothermel’s painting polarized critics and became a point of focus

⁵⁴ Francis A. Walker, “The Late World’s Fair. Part II – The Display,” *International Review* 4 (July 1877): 509.

⁵⁵ [Clarence Cook], “The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: First Notice,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 1 June 1876, 8.

⁵⁶ “American Art at the Centennial,” *New York World*, 24 July 1876, 2.

⁵⁷ Henry U. Swinnerton, “Centennial Letters,” *Newark Daily Advertiser*, 13 November 1876, 1.

⁵⁸ Susanna W. Gold argues that *The Battle of Gettysburg* was surprisingly well-received when it was exhibited in the early 1870s, and that the painting was made more inflammatory to Centennial Exhibition audiences by its subtly anti-Confederate elements and its placement in the galleries, where the viewer’s low

for the central issues of the Centennial. Writings on *The Battle of Gettysburg* encompass the questions of mimesis versus interpretation that embodied the debate between nativists and expatriates. They also addressed questions of history and the difficulty, even the feasibility, of joining the past with the present. Examining criticism of *The Battle of Gettysburg* shows just how pervasive were the twinned issues of past and present at the Centennial Exhibition.

Predictably, Cook led the charge against Rothermel's behemoth. Even before the exhibition opened, he registered strenuous objections to rumors of the painting's placement, writing that Rothermel had "no reputation outside his native city, and only half a reputation there." In a jab at Philadelphia's lack of sophistication and an ironic reference to the painting's outlandish size, he loftily wrote of "local prejudices" and how "some pictures are thought very great in one part of the country, that are thought very small in another."⁵⁹ Cook took Sartain to task for "pushing the Gettysburg picture into the Exhibition past all remonstrances and objections, and in breaking up the wholesome rule to shut out all war-pictures from the Exhibition."⁶⁰ The *Boston Daily Evening Transcript* joined in, saying that the work's admission "does not reflect a great deal of credit upon the judgment, knowledge or technical ability of either Sartain or the Selection Committee."⁶¹ Apparently neither realized that the Fairmount Park Art Commission assumed that the painting would be included, and since many of its members were integrally involved in planning the Centennial Exhibition, Sartain and the Selection

vantage point accentuated its bloodier aspects. See Susanna W. Gold, "Imaging Memory: Re-Presentations of the Civil War at the 1876 Centennial Exhibition" (Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2004), 143-63.

⁵⁹ Clarence Cook, "A Centennial Blunder," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 4 May 1876, 2.

⁶⁰ [Clarence Cook], "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: First Notice," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 1 June 1876, 8.

⁶¹ A.P., "Centennial Echoes," *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 29 September 1876, 6.

Committee may have felt pressured to admit it. In an opposite approach, Earl Shinn made no reference at all to *The Battle of Gettysburg* in his reviews for *The Nation*. Ignoring such a large and controversial work had to have been a conscious decision. In his own subtle way, Shinn expressed his opinion that the work was not worthy of attention.

The Battle of Gettysburg quickly became the painting that critics loved to hate. Comments included, “as glaring and unfortunate as it might well be,” “bad in every sense,” “about the size and shape of a drop-curtain and of the same order of merit,” and “undeserving of its place of honor.”⁶² The *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* bravely defended the masterwork of one of its own artists, calling it one of the best in the exhibition and noting its “tremendous realism and magnificent coloring.”⁶³ Few others would commend the painting in any way, except the faint praise of Frank Leslie’s guide to the Exhibition: “This picture has been the subject of considerable severe and not a little hostile criticism on the part of the Press; yet it is perhaps the best picture that Rothermel ever painted...it is not, by any means, a discreditable battle-piece.”⁶⁴

Rothermel’s painting depicts in graphic detail the fury, carnage, and confusion of battle, and it sparked a war of words. The *American Architect and Building News* called it “repulsive with cheap patriotism.”⁶⁵ Cook condemned the inappropriateness of the subject, saying that Rothermel’s painting depicted not heroism but “horrors piled upon horrors for a central show-piece at the Centennial feast of peace and goodwill!”⁶⁶ The

⁶² “The World’s Display of Art,” *New York Herald*, 11 May 1876, 6; “Art at the Exhibition,” *Appleton’s Journal* 15 (3 June 1876): 726; John Sears, “Art in Philadelphia,” *The Aldine* 8 (June 1876): 196; Gar., “The Art of America,” *New-York Times*, 11 June 1876, 1.

⁶³ “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 22 June 1876, 1.

⁶⁴ Norton, 181.

⁶⁵ “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (19 August 1876): 270.

⁶⁶ Clarence Cook, “A Centennial Blunder,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 4 May 1876, 2.

loyal Philadelphia *Press* responded in political terms: “Mr. Clarence Cook, who sets himself up as the standard art critic of America, protests...against the presence of Rothermel’s Gettysburg in the Art Exhibition. A Democrat might as well protest against the presence of President Grant.”⁶⁷ The *Boston Daily Evening Transcript* concurred that criticizing the picture on the basis of its offensiveness to Southerners was “silly.”⁶⁸ Charles F. Briggs was most inflammatory, writing in *The Independent* that “if a Christian people are ever to be pardoned for commemorating their victories over their enemies, it may surely be done on such an occasion as this.”⁶⁹ However, *The International Exhibition Guide for the Southern States*, written to persuade Southerners to visit the Exhibition, made a point of quoting the *New-York Daily Tribune*’s assessment that “American art has never sunk lower than in Rothermel’s “Battle of Gettysburg” – a monstrous daub.”⁷⁰ That the author addressed Rothermel’s painting suggests that Southerners would have heard of it even before visiting the Exhibition, and would of course be strongly disposed against it. “Bricktop’s” satirical account of the Centennial Exhibition includes a cartoon of veterans of the two armies “Fighting the battle over again” before the painting (figure 3.3). On an uncharacteristically serious note, “Bricktop” averred, “to my thinking it is terrible enough to prevent any nation from going to war.”⁷¹

Bricktop prefaced his comment by saying that Rothermel’s painting “has created the greatest amount of controversy regarding its merits.”⁷² Indeed, the most interesting

⁶⁷ Untitled (“Mr. Clarence Cook...”), *The Press* (Philadelphia), 5 May 1876, 1.

⁶⁸ A.P., “Centennial Echoes,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 29 September 1876, 6.

⁶⁹ Charles F. Briggs, “Centennial Paintings: The American Department,” *The Independent* 13 July 1876, 4.

⁷⁰ *The International Exhibition Guide for the Southern States* (Raleigh, NC: R.T. Fulghum, 1876), 71.

⁷¹ Bricktop, *Going to the Centennial and A Guy to the Great Exhibition* (New York: Collin & Small, 1876), 32-3.

⁷² Bricktop, 31.

debate on the painting, and the one with the most lasting consequences, was over its very status as a work of art. The *New-York Daily Tribune* reported that “the blood and fury picture of the Battle of Gettysburg continues to frighten children and disgust sensible people,” and Carter maintained in *The Art Journal* that the crowds around it were attracted only by its “morbid subject and its violent detail.”⁷³ Many thought that the artist’s assiduous concern with accuracy came at the expense of artistic merit. Photography was being used to document war for the first time, and memorable images of the Civil War were produced. However, battle pictures were still the province of painters, as long exposure times and unwieldy equipment prevented photographers from capturing active scenes.

Nonetheless, the idea of photographic reportage informed criticisms of Rothermel’s painting, and caused some discussion over the nature of art. Was a painting a work of art simply because of the medium, or were there other requirements? William Dean Howells acknowledged, “I heard it said that this picture was not a work of art.” He demurred to express an opinion, writing modestly “I do not know about such things myself,” but admitted to his “horrific interest in the spectacle.”⁷⁴ *The Independent* decided that “its artistic merits are of secondary importance, be what they may.”⁷⁵ The *American Architect and Building News* referred derisively to the “map of the battle of Gettysburg,” giving it the status of a topographical report, rather than an artistic interpretation.⁷⁶ The *New York Herald* commented that Rothermel “sacrificed artistic

⁷³ “The Centennial Fair: Novelties Added Daily,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 17 May 1876, 1; S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], “Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 285.

⁷⁴ Howells, “A Sennight of the Centennial,” 94.

⁷⁵ “Fine Arts,” *The Independent*, 18 May 1876, 5.

⁷⁶ “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (August 19, 1876): 270.

effect for a realistic portrayal of the battlefield.”⁷⁷ In other words, critics called for artistic interpretation and condemned what they saw as dependence on mimesis. This tussle between the subjective and the objective parallels growing disapproval of the Hudson River School’s emphasis on detailed, faithful rendering, and affirms the looser, more personalized technique of the “new men.”

Other objections related to building a narrative of American art. *The Battle of Gettysburg* blurred the already vague boundary between art and history, between the merit of a work and the import of its subject. According to a modern scholar, such confusion was also evident also at the 1858 Manchester Exhibition. Its historical display of British art showed a disjunction between portraits of eminent Britons as important historical figures, and as great works of art.⁷⁸ Some critics of the Centennial Exhibition shared this confusion, as Briggs conceded that Rothermel’s painting was not very good, but was justified by its subject.⁷⁹ Even Sartain failed to understand the difference, as he wrote to an inquirer from Virginia, "For an exhibition of art such as the Centennial is expected to be, a mere portrait would hardly be regarded as an appropriate contribution,

⁷⁷ “The Changes Made in the Art Department of the Exhibition During the Past Week,” *New York Herald*, 19 June 1876, 9. But Rothermel had few options. Lucretia Giese points out that the Civil War did not lend itself to the usual heroic “set pieces” highlighting the heroic actions of individual leaders, but was rather characterized by mechanized, wholesale slaughter. Unlike previous wars, the North’s triumph was not due only to success in battle, but also to other strategies to ruin the southern economy and isolate it from potential international allies. The traditional formulae for making history paintings did not apply. See Lucretia Hoover Giese, “‘Harvesting’ the Civil War: Art in Wartime New York,” in *Redefining American History Painting*, eds. Lucretia Hoover Giese and Patricia M. Burnham (Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 80.

⁷⁸ Elizabeth A. Pergam, “‘Waking the Soul’: The Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857 and the State of the Arts in Mid-Victorian Britain” (Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2001), 182.

⁷⁹ Charles F. Briggs, “Centennial Paintings: The American Department,” *The Independent* 13 July 1876, 4.

but when of a prominent and distinguished individual like the subject of your picture, the case is different.”⁸⁰

History painting, traditionally regarded as the highest form of art, was caught in the interstices of the distinction, and of the change in historical consciousness marked by the Centennial Exhibition. The conventions of grand manner history painting attempted to connect the past and present in a cyclical dynamic, as artists re-used well known compositions, classical poses, and sometimes even costumes of the ancients to connect distant ideals to the present day. However, by the time of the Centennial, Americans understood history in a new way. The scholar Steven Conn has observed that during this period “historical cycles were replaced with linear, evolutionary progress as the way history was understood.”⁸¹ This was nowhere more apparent than at the Centennial Exhibition, which was itself a monument to American progress. Rothermel’s painting was a horrifying reminder of an episode that could not be easily integrated into the United States ostensible ascent to ever greater heights. By virtue of its subject, it failed utterly as a marker of American progress.

Critics were conscious of this shift. By 1876 history painting was on the wane in Europe and the United States, and Jochen Wierich argues that its declining status was partly due to prominent critics, such as Cook, Eugene Benson, and James Jackson Jarves, who grew discontented with the genre.⁸² In 1869 a writer for *Appleton’s Journal* condemned history painting, and battle scenes in particular. He acknowledged that

⁸⁰ JS to Albert Gussey, Charlottesville, VA, 21 October 1875, Historical Society of Pennsylvania, Sartain Family Papers (Phi 1650), reel 4562, frame 1142. Reel and frame numbers refer to microfilm in the Archives of American Art. All letters from John Sartain (JS) originate in Philadelphia.

⁸¹ Steven Conn, “Narrative Trauma and Civil War History Painting, or Why Are These Pictures So Terrible?,” *History and Theory* 41 (December 2002): 23.

⁸² Jochen Wierich, “The Domestication of History in American Art” (Ph.D. diss., College of William and Mary, 1998), 113-4.

“historical painting...has been chiefly devoted to illustrate wars...but has ignored the mightiest agents of change and progress in the history of the human race,” and exhorted artists to “abandon the pretension to historical painting as it is commonly understood,” and “give us art that shall become historical, not art that is intended to be so.”⁸³ These comments suggest that as a new way of perceiving history emerged in the Centennial year, critics were uncomfortably aware that old models of cyclical change must be discarded, and a new way must be found to connect past and present. Critics flexed their newfound muscles, and through their stinging commentary, demoted *The Battle of Gettysburg* from high art to reportage, while casting further doubt on the already diminished relevance of traditional history painting. They exercised a similarly strong influence in shaping perceptions of other aspects of the American art display, and among their most urgent issues was the nature of the American School.

“Artists, like fishes, go in schools”: Nativists, Expatriates, and the American School

David Solis Cohen observed in his guidebook *One Hundred Years a Republic: Our Show*, “artists, like fishes, go in schools. Masters, pupils, janitors, scrapers out and pot boilers.”⁸⁴ His facetious remark refers to the American cultural dialogue with Europe. The Centennial year occasioned questions about the possibility, even the viability, of a distinctly American school of art, as artists flocked in growing numbers to European academies and ateliers for training. In fact, an article in the *Galaxy* of June 1876 asked the burning question in its title, “Have We a National Character?”⁸⁵ Nathan Appleton’s 1877 play *The Centennial Movement* reflects these questions. The action follows the

⁸³ “Historical Art in the United States,” *Appleton’s Journal* 1 (10 April 1869): 45-6.

⁸⁴ Cohen, 54.

⁸⁵ Thomas M. Anderson, “Have We a National Character?,” *Galaxy* 21 (June 1876): 737. The author concluded that a national character did not at that time exist, but it would soon: “All we want is time for our national stream to settle...and our national character will become apparent.”

romantic machinations of several foreigners in Philadelphia for the Exhibition as they vie for the affections of three fresh young American girls, and as their skeptical father looks on.⁸⁶ The plot reflects what some perceived as the European “courting” of American artists. This raised questions about the nature and identity of American art, and the Centennial Exhibition provided an opportunity for critics to discuss those questions.

H. Barbara Weinberg has observed that art critics of the late nineteenth century can be divided into two camps: those who encouraged native efforts in the hope of an American cultural awakening, and those who admired European art.⁸⁷ Much of the writing about the Centennial Exhibition’s American display centered on these issues, which were mirrored in the decline of the Hudson River School, long recognized as the United States’ first indigenous art movement, and the accompanying anxiety that foreign influences would render a unique American school impossible in the future.

Linda Docherty has pointed out that by 1876 the concept of a distinct American school of art was discussed in increasingly complex terms. With the advent of photography, painters were expected to turn from imitating nature to showing “nature’s hidden truths.” The individual’s vision and technique grew in importance, as was demonstrated in discussions of Rothermel’s *The Battle of Gettysburg*. Docherty neatly summed up the dichotomy that defined much Centennial Exhibition criticism in her observation that most critics saw American artists as either deficient in skill (which would imply the nativist Hudson River School), or deficient in distinction (in reference to artists trained abroad who merely imitated their foreign masters).⁸⁸ Writings on the

⁸⁶ Nathan Appleton, *The Centennial Movement* (Boston: Lockwood, Brooks, and Company, 1877).

⁸⁷ H. Barbara Weinberg, “Introduction,” in *American Art and American Art Collections*, ed. Walter Montgomery (Boston: E.W. Walker & Co., 1889; reprint, New York: Garland Publishing, 1978), 3.

⁸⁸ Docherty, “A Search for Identity,” 33.

American art exhibition support her conclusions. Susan Nichols Carter of *The Art Journal* mentioned her dissatisfaction with the mimetic ideal in relation to landscape painting, asking “What are the motive and tendency of our painters? . . . the landscapes at any rate are too photographic, and fail as expressions of distinct intellectual facts. Many of the best of our landscapes appear like pictures seen in the camera, and entirely lack the quality which Emerson so pertinently applies to good delineation, as ‘Nature passed through the alembic of man.’”⁸⁹ On the other hand, the *New York World* saw a lack of individuality, stating “The majority of their many works remind one of a timid schoolboy’s exercises in composition in imitation of the great masters in style.”⁹⁰ At the root of these discontents was the desire for an American school that could turn skill to its own distinctive forms and uses.

After the intense rivalries leading up to the exhibition, it is not surprising to see expressions of civic identity among critics that underscore the nativist versus expatriate debate. *The Press* of Philadelphia commented on the success of the May 10 opening, “even the jealousy of the New Yorker and the Bostonian could go no further in the expression of Philadelphia for having secured and made a grand success of the Exposition than to ‘damn with faint praise.’”⁹¹ Sartain felt the sting of criticism more strongly, and grumbled to James Smillie “it is characteristic of [New York] to studiously ignore all the good and find all the fault possible with the exhibition.”⁹² The Philadelphia *Evening Bulletin* accused New York artists of obnoxiously overloading the exhibition

⁸⁹ S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], “Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 284-5.

⁹⁰ “American Art at the Centennial,” *New York World*, 21 June 1876, 6.

⁹¹ “Visitors Inside and Their Comments,” *The Press* (Philadelphia), 11 May 1876, 1.

⁹² JS to James D. Smillie, [no city], 5 August 1876, HSP, Sartain Papers, reel 4563, frame 250.

with their works, and asserted that “New York art has always been distinguished by oppressive, multitudinous mediocrity.”⁹³

New York and Boston traded barbs as well. The *American Architect and Building News* observed that pictures from Boston were kept to a high standard, but those from other areas were too many in number, and not of high quality.⁹⁴ The *Atlantic Monthly* was particularly pointed in its criticism of the Hudson River School, commenting “Bostonians may well laugh at the old-time niggling, the smoothly finished, highly polished surfaces and tense lines of the New York painters.” The unidentified writer went further to “notice how little their artists of to-day have veered from the method of those who first wielded the brush among them.” He went on to laud progressive Bostonians, as “every artist worth mentioning can show something *en rapport* with modern tendencies,” and further suggested that New York artists could take a hint from those of Boston and borrow “some of her finer fancy and later-day suggestiveness of treatment, thus mellowing the hardness of line.”⁹⁵

Several accounts of American art at the Centennial Exhibition have portrayed it as a triumphal moment for the Hudson River School. It was established in chapter two that the New York landscapists and expatriate artists were more evenly balanced than was previously thought in terms of the number of works displayed and awards received. However, the Hudson River School certainly carried the day in sheer quantity of notices.⁹⁶ Joaquin Miller of *The Independent* proclaimed with patriotic fervor that “the

⁹³ “The Centennial Art Show,” *Evening Bulletin* (Philadelphia), 14 November 1876, 2.

⁹⁴ “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (19 August 1876): 269.

⁹⁵ “The Contributor’s Club,” *Atlantic Monthly* 39 (May 1877): 617-8.

⁹⁶ One exception to the landscapists’ dominance was John La Farge, who had been praised by progressive critics for over a decade, and whose style had become familiar to them by the Centennial year.

best pictures to be seen here [in all the galleries of the art department] are American landscapes by American painters.”⁹⁷ Works by Bierstadt, Gifford, Kensett, McEntee, Moran, and Whittredge were most frequently acknowledged, along with Eastman Johnson, who was at the zenith of his reputation as a genre painter, and Winslow Homer, who would soon surpass him.⁹⁸ These well known artists were easily recognized in the bewildering mass of pictures and critics seized upon them eagerly, whether they were located in Memorial Hall or in the less-traversed Art Annex.

However, accounts of the American exhibition also tell a subtler story of a country in transition. Gifford’s paintings were called “exquisitely refined and perfectly finished,” and “lovely poems,” full of “completeness and repose.”⁹⁹ McEntee’s work, including his *Frosty Morning* (figure 3.4), was admired for its “fine finish, breadth of effect, and color qualities.” His work was considered “particularly pleasing,” showing sentiment without over-refinement and lack of breadth. Whittredge was considered to be “abundantly and happily represented,” and his “wonderfully luminous and delicately-painted works” were “poetical as well as realistic.” Finally, Kensett was called “charming,” for his “quiet and subdued sentiment” and “vigorous yet delicate” handling as he anticipated the movement from “realism” to “eloquence.”¹⁰⁰ These most-admired

⁹⁷ Joaquin Miller, “The Great Centennial Fair and Its Future,” *The Independent*, 13 July 1876, 1.

⁹⁸ Sarah Burns, “In Whose Shadow? Eastman Johnson and Winslow Homer in the Postwar Decades,” in *Eastman Johnson: Painting America*, eds. Teresa A. Carbone and Patricia Hills (exh. cat., Brooklyn Museum of Art, 1999), 210.

⁹⁹ “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 21 June 1876, 2; S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], “Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 284.

¹⁰⁰ “Our Great Show,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 17 May 1876, 1; “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 21 June 1876, 2; S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], “Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 284; “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 29 June 1876, 2; “Characteristics of the International Fair: Closing Days,” *Atlantic Monthly* 39 (January 1877): 96; “The World’s Display of Art,” *New York Herald*, 11 May 1876, 6; “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 26 June 1876, 2; Weir, 25; “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,”

landscapists were praised for reasons of technical mastery and evocation of mood – qualities that pointed toward the Barbizon landscape school of France, and away from the Hudson River School’s traditional qualities of topographical precision.

The luminaries of the Hudson River School’s classic “operatic” moment, with their huge canvases covered in painstaking detail, were not as well received. Shinn, standing before such large paintings as Bierstadt’s *The Settlement of California, Bay of Monterey, 1770* (figure 3.5), felt that “an admiration is expected of us which can only be felt by falsifying our point of view.” Cook was lukewarm at best; he decried the absence of such works as Bierstadt’s *Storm in the Rocky Mountains* (Brooklyn Museum of Art) and Church’s *Heart of the Andes*, but only as historical representatives of American art activity, “to comprehend all that has been doing in art in America in the last decade.” Frederick Church’s *Chimborazo* (figure 3.6) was condemned for its raw color, and was considered substandard. Albert Bierstadt’s so-called “monster scenes” included *The Great Trees, Mariposa Grove, California*, which one critic felt “challenges the admiration of the undiscerning, but it will be hard to discover in it any artistic qualities.” Thomas Moran’s *Dream of the Orient* (unlocated) was called a “hideous nightmare of conception and color” and his “*Fiercely the red sun descending burned his way along the heavens*” (North Carolina Museum of Art, Raleigh) was condemned as “simply color gone mad” and called “a complete failure.”¹⁰¹

Philadelphia Evening Bulletin, 19 June 1876, 1; “American Art at the Centennial,” *New York World*, 24 July 1876, 2.

¹⁰¹ E.S. [Earl Shinn], “The International Exhibition – XI: American Art—II,” *The Nation* 23 (3 August 1876): 72; [Clarence Cook], “The Fine Art Department: American Pictures: First Notice,” 1 June 1876, 8; Bruce, 183; Gar., “The Art of America,” *New-York Times*, 13 June 1876, 1; *New-York Tribune Guide to the Exhibition*, 62; “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 10 July 1876, 2.

Several observations on the American landscape contribution point to a growing disillusionment. The *American Architect and Building News* assured readers that “the standard works of the landscapists are all assembled” and sardonically observed how “the photographic illustrations of Bierstadt challenge the crisp, metallic studies of Thomas Hill.” The same writer noted how “The courageous and conventional attempts of a hundred aspirants to fame as disciples of the American school of landscape-painting flash out in crudely-colored sunsets, impossible perspectives of mountain-views, curious freaks of nature in rock-formation, and all the wearisome succession of map-like prospects of cultivated country.” Edward Bruce, in his book documenting the Centennial Exhibition, questioned the huge size of these works and “the necessity of placing these colossal scenes upon correspondingly colossal canvases.” The *American Architect and Building News* agreed, commenting hopefully that in the future “American landscapes shall be known by their artistic merits, and not solely by their wall-covering capacity.” The critic for the *New York World* reflected that “We have had the old story of the superiority of American landscapes, told with Centennial vehemence.” Applying the historical perspective of so many others in the Centennial year, the writer felt that “their work has never outgrown the realism of pioneer efforts...this grade of art is a preparatory one, both individually and historically.”¹⁰²

While critics were tiring of the Hudson River School, many turned their attention to the work of expatriate artists, with its attendant concerns. In the first installment of his lengthy account of the American art exhibition, Clarence Cook pointed out that he had delayed beginning his review because he was waiting for “an infusion of new life,” but as

¹⁰² “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (19 August 1876): 269-70; Bruce, 182; “American Art at the Centennial,” *New York World*, 24 July 1876, 2.

of that date (June 1), it didn't appear to be forthcoming.¹⁰³ Cook was surely referring to the late arrival of expatriate works being shipped from Europe. In calling these works “new life,” Cook echoed the widespread sentiment that these artists represented the country's future. An earlier article in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, probably by Cook, observed that “one gets a complete notion of what American art has accomplished up this time, and where it stands, if you look only at the surface. But, what is being thought, attempted, done, by the youngest is not to be known from what is seen on these walls.”¹⁰⁴

Though landscapists received the lion's share of critical notice, several young expatriates also attracted attention. The orientalist Bridgman was praised for his “skill and confidence” and his work earned such accolades as “excellent in design, color, drawing, and composition.” Charles Sprague Pearce's *L'Italienne* (figure 3.7) was commended for its grace and simplicity. Anna M. Lea, an expatriate to London, was identified as “decidedly English,” and her paintings, including *A Patrician Mother* (figure 3.8), were lauded for “unsurpassed skill with textures and flesh tints,” bold touch and free execution, and an original sense of color. William Merritt Chase's “*Keying Up*” – *The Court Jester* (figure 2.22) was singled out by several writers, and the artist was admired for his “broad, dashy style” and “love of gorgeous coloring.” Toby Rosenthal's *Elaine* (figure 2.25) was said to “attract the greatest admiration.” The *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* wished for a central arrangement of works by Bridgman (figure 3.9), Eakins, La Farge, Lea, Moore, Rosenthal, and Shirlaw, which were “fairly deserving notice among a crowd of mediocrities.” Finally, H.H. Moore's controversial *Almeh* (figure 1.14) was called “brilliantly beautiful” and “the most beautiful painting of its speciality.” The critic

¹⁰³ [Clarence Cook], “The Fine Art Department: American Pictures: First Notice,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 1 June 1876, 8.

¹⁰⁴ “Department of Fine Arts,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 10 May 1876, 2.

Earl Shinn credited Moore with an artistic maturity beyond his years and considered *Almeh* “one of the most satisfactory [paintings] in the American department.”¹⁰⁵

As has been discussed, Eakins’ paintings in Memorial Hall and the Art Annex, which still bore the influence of his years in Paris, were highly praised. However, very little was said of *The Gross Clinic* (figure 1.10). The *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin* included the painting in its review of the Department of Fine Arts, though it was displayed in the Medical Department. The writer considered it, along with Moore’s *Almeh*, among the works most entitled to be shown, explaining that it was rejected by the Selection Committee for reasons unrelated to artistic merit.¹⁰⁶ *The Gross Clinic* was addressed again in the *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*’s review of the Medical Department, where it was called “a splendid work of art in itself,” affirming its status as fine art, rather than as the large illustration it may have appeared to be among the displays of bedpans and hospital beds.¹⁰⁷ In an article in the Harrisburg *Daily Telegraph* a few days before the opening of the Exhibition, William J. Clark had high praise: “This portrait of Dr. Gross is a great work -- we know of nothing greater that has ever been executed in America.” However, beyond these few mentions, and notices in a handful of

¹⁰⁵ “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (August 19, 1876): 270; James D. McCabe, *The Illustrated History of the Centennial Exhibition* (Philadelphia: The National Publishing Company, 1876), 525; “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 19 June 1876, 1; “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 21 June 1876, 2; Norton, 204; Strahan, *The Art Gallery of the Exhibition*, 184; “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 10 July 1876, 2; Gar., “The Art of America,” *New-York Times*, 9 June 1876, 1-2; United States Centennial Commission, *International Exhibition, 1876. Reports and Awards*, vol. 7, Groups XXI-XXVII (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 631, 637; Robert Schenck Fletcher, *The Centennial Exhibition of 1876: What We Saw and How We Saw It. Part I. Art Glances* (Philadelphia: S.T. Souder & Co., 1876), 88; “Ruhamah,” “Art at the Centennial,” *National Republican*, 15 June 1876, 1; “The Centennial Art Show,” *Evening Bulletin* (Philadelphia), 14 November 1876, 2; E.S. [Earl Shinn], “The International Exhibition – XI: American Art—II,” *The Nation*, 23 (August 3, 1876): 72.

¹⁰⁶ “Our Great Show,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 17 May 1876, 1.

¹⁰⁷ “Medical Department U.S.A.,” *Philadelphia Evening Bulletin*, 30 May 1876, 5.

medical journals, it was all but ignored in the mainstream press.¹⁰⁸ Only Pennsylvania papers addressed the fate of Eakins's great work, painted by a promising young "hometown" artist with the city's great Centennial Exhibition in mind. Other critics may have simply missed the painting in its unusual location, and as a result, it received surprisingly little attention, though it would garner considerably more at future exhibitions.¹⁰⁹

At the same time that they praised expatriate works, critics expressed strong concerns about the overwhelming influence of foreign masters on their American students. The American department was called "a Paris salon with the important pictures left out."¹¹⁰ This unflattering remark acknowledged the inescapable influence of French art, which would become an increasingly common point of reference for Americans through the remainder of the century. Burley's guide to the Centennial Exhibition commented on the vogue for Gallic culture that "French paintings dominate in the private collections of the country, and French types of form, color and design have been reproduced."¹¹¹ The *New-York Daily Tribune* pinpointed a concern about expatriates' national identity when it observed in the French exhibition a work by A.F. Schenck, "an American who by long living in France has become almost a Frenchman."¹¹² The *American Architect and Building News* worried that "the individuality of the student has been lost in the struggle to follow the path beaten broadly by some one who has preceded

¹⁰⁸ William J. Clark, *Daily Telegraph*, 28 April 1876; quoted in Julie S. Berkowitz, "Adorn the Halls": *History of the Art Collection at Thomas Jefferson University* (Philadelphia: Thomas Jefferson University, 1999), 200-5.

¹⁰⁹ See Marc Simpson, "The 1870s," in *Thomas Eakins*, ed. Darrell Sewell, (exh. cat., Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2002), 33.

¹¹⁰ "The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII," *American Architect and Building News* 1 (19 August 1876): 269.

¹¹¹ Burley, 638.

¹¹² *New-York Tribune Guide to the Exhibition*, 70.

him,” and noted how easy it was to group American works together by school or master.¹¹³ The *New York Evening Mail* lamented, “we have striven in vain to find anything in the American painting which is really distinctive. We can discover only old methods and the Old World reproduced.”¹¹⁴

While Clarence Cook simply adamantly pointed out the importance of foreign-trained artists, Shinn attempted to sort out the complexities inherent in European influence and American originality. He complained that after study abroad artists lost their individuality. He called Bridgman’s *Story-Teller* (unlocated) “European and conventional” and even pointed out a European lineage in two of the painters considered most American, citing Bierstadt’s debt to the German artists Carl Friedrich Lessing and Andreas Achenbach, and Thomas Moran’s borrowings from J.M.W. Turner. Shinn declared that “we rightly wish for American originality to have an accent apart from European originality.” He observed that after study abroad each artist “seems to show himself thereafter with the mark of ‘Paris’ or ‘Munich’ sealed upon his forehead.” However, Shinn also recognized the advantages in foreign influence. His *Art Gallery of the Exhibition* praised German art, saying that it benefited anything it intermixed with, and announced that “The Teuton...in America has come to stay, and plants himself at every foot of our advance like a sheet-anchor.” He reserved his highest praise for the work of La Farge, for successfully combining his own style with that of the Barbizon: “Paintings so individual as these are what we have best to show among a crowd of works

¹¹³ “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (19 August 1876): 270.

¹¹⁴ E.A.C., “Fine Arts at the Centennial,” *New York Evening Mail*, 10 August 1876, 1.

usually betraying with the utmost pride of subserviency the influence of a particular foreign master or school.”¹¹⁵

Other writers echoed Shinn’s search and his sentiments. The *New York World* observed, “It is but here and there that one finds a trace of the American boldness – shall I say the American irreverence for established forms?”¹¹⁶ In its coverage of the National Academy of Design’s 1876 exhibition, the *Art Journal* felt that the ideal had once been found in the proverbial “good old days,” but was now lost: “Today...the visitor to the Academy, instead of meeting with a distinctive American method of treatment in the exhibited works, finds the germs of a dozen foreign schools...Every year we are departing more and more from the national standard.”¹¹⁷ These accounts demonstrate how the pendulum of foreign versus native influences swings back and forth in accounts of the Centennial Exhibition’s American art display. Where it would settle was one of the defining questions in accounting for American art’s past, and understanding its present.

The American art exhibition brought more notice to landscapists than it did to figure painters, but its real importance lay in bringing the question of an American school to a national forum. It generated a dialogue that no doubt accelerated the decline of the Hudson River School aesthetic and stimulated the rise of foreign styles, all the while searching for an ideal that would combine the two in a technically sophisticated art that could express American subjects and sensibility. The direction and weight of these arguments were decisively affected by their connection to the most-discussed issue surrounding the American art display -- that of history. The Centennial moment offered

¹¹⁵ E.S. [Earl Shinn], “The International Exhibition – XI: American Art—II,” *The Nation* 23 (3 August 1876): 72; Strahan, *The Art Gallery of the Exhibition*, 38.

¹¹⁶ “American Art at the Centennial,” *New York World*, 21 June 1876, 6.

¹¹⁷ “The National Academy of Design,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 158.

an opportunity not only to identify an American school of the present, but also to legitimize it by linking it to an American canon of the past.

Histories of Art and Imagined Exhibitions

More than any other issue, writers for all types of publications were concerned with the historical aspect of the American art exhibition. Even their derogatory remarks attested to high expectations for the retrospective. An unsigned article in the *New-York Daily Tribune*, probably by Cook, regretted that he would have liked to see what had been accomplished in the last century, but the exhibition was nothing but a profusion of “things we ought long since to have left behind.”¹¹⁸ The *New York World* called it “a real historical value, apart from whatever aesthetic value attaches to it” and allowed that it succeeded “tolerably.”¹¹⁹ Carter in particular expressed these expectations in *The Art Journal*:

It would have seemed proper that on an occasion like the present patriotic motives should have entered very largely into the choice of pictures to be sent in to this Exhibition; and that, as a history of one branch of the intellectual life of the United States during the last hundred years, the greatest possible care should have been used in the selection of the works by West, Allston, Copley, and others. But this has failed to be the case.¹²⁰

In spite of some disapproval, most writers lavishly praised the older works. Often the earlier paintings were used to express concerns about contemporary painting. Shinn touched on discussions of an American school when he noted that “The want of accent and anxious gentility of most of the modern American pictures causes us to linger with considerable tenderness among their predecessors, the colonial or early Revolutionary canvases. Here at least is the distinction of a past school of thought.” He elaborated on

¹¹⁸ “Department of Fine Arts,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 10 May 1876, 2.

¹¹⁹ Untitled (“The review of the Centennial Art Exhibition...”), *New York World*, 24 July 1876, 4.

¹²⁰ S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter], “Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition,” *The Art Journal* 2 (1876): 284.

the subject of portraiture that “the worst of these [colonial] painters was able to distinguish the fact that his age had a particular social tone...and to get it expressed on canvas.”¹²¹ The *American Architect and Building News* noted the presence of Copley and Stuart “to the great disadvantage of the feeble and uncertain efforts of all later portraiture painters.” Bruce agreed that little progress had been made in portraiture and that Stuart, Sully, Neagle, Inman, and Morse still set the standard.¹²²

Shinn’s two articles in *The Nation* took a fairly positive view of the retrospective, commenting that “the history of our painting back to the time when it was homogeneous with that of England is represented...and the successes that have become legendary are revived to the sight among fresher and more heavy-looking works.”¹²³ Though the exhibition itself was not arranged chronologically, Shinn organized his articles as a short history of American art. He devoted a great deal of space to a discussion of painting in the colonial and federal periods, including that of Allston, Peale, Stuart, Sully, and Vanderlyn. He considered Stuart’s smaller portraits “almost always masterpieces” and “a festival for the student,” emphasizing the educational value of the retrospective. One of Sully’s early works was called “portraiture in its sweetest refinement and most winning home-feeling.” Shinn’s praise for early paintings was not entirely unqualified though. He noted Peale’s “usual dried formality” and demoted Vanderlyn’s famous figure painting

¹²¹ E.S. [Earl Shinn], “The International Exhibition – XI: American Art—II,” *The Nation* 23 (3 August 1876): 71; E.S. [Earl Shinn], “The International Exhibition – IV: American Art,” *The Nation* 23 (6 July 1876): 7.

¹²² “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (19 August 1876): 270. Bruce, 183-4.

¹²³ E.S. [Earl Shinn], “The International Exhibition – IV: American Art,” *The Nation* 23 (6 July 1876): 7.

Ariadne, which was once thought to be the highest achievement of the nude, but in his opinion, was no longer.¹²⁴

Shinn expanded beyond the paintings in the exhibition and arranged his narrative in the historical terms of generations and successions. He addressed genre painting by discussing Gilbert Stuart Newton and William Sidney Mount as representatives of “the anecdote-painting of the next generation” and sighed nostalgically, “from these dead anecdotists and jesters we come down with a little fatigue to those who support the same roles at present.” He went on to dethrone Eastman Johnson as the current leader of American genre, criticizing the composition of his *Old Stage Coach* (figure 3.10), calling his *Old Kentucky Home* (figure 2.11) “positively repellent,” and pronouncing that Johnson was “not the one to stand within a doorway to challenge visitors as the Champion of American genre.” His remarks ventured up to the present day, criticizing Bierstadt and Moran, worrying about students of foreign schools becoming mere imitators, and lamenting that John La Farge was “wasting his talent on flower paintings.”¹²⁵

The year after the Centennial Earl Shinn published *The Art Gallery of the Exhibition*. The book is in a large format with gilt-edged pages, and its cover is stamped with elaborately gilded and colored patterns, along with the scene of a classically-draped maiden with a palette before a frieze with Greek urns and a bust. It was clearly meant for purchase by conservative well-to-do collectors, and Shinn tempered his approach accordingly. He began by calling the art exhibition as a whole “unquestionably the

¹²⁴ E.S. [Earl Shinn], “The International Exhibition – XI: American Art—II,” *The Nation* 23 (3 August 1876): 71-2; E.S. [Earl Shinn], “The International Exhibition – IV: American Art,” *The Nation* 23 (6 July 1876): 7.

¹²⁵ E.S. [Earl Shinn], “The International Exhibition – XI: American Art—II,” *The Nation* 23 (3 August 1876): 72.

grandest collection of art ever seen on the continent” and “a rare opportunity for comparison.” He cautioned his readers that he did not wish to present a theory or a history of art, and then proceeded to do just that. He traced a narrative that formed an unbroken line from the classical period to David and Benjamin West. He identified the inheritors of the classical tradition in such nineteenth century French academic artists as Delaroche, Gleyre, Gérôme, and Ary Scheffer, who have “not forgotten this academic influence.”¹²⁶ Shinn’s remarks affirmed and encouraged the growing taste for French academic paintings among collectors, and constituted a reversal of his calls in *The Nation* for an original school of American art.

Many critics writing histories of art based on the Centennial Exhibition tended to stop short at the recent past and refused to identify current tendencies. To his credit, Shinn attempted a few observations. He praised German art and observed its influence in America, while later wondering if the popularity of the Düsseldorf School was on the wane -- he was correct on both counts, as that decade saw the decline of Düsseldorf and the rise of the Munich School in the United States. He was also among the first to remark on the style soon to be known as Impressionism that rendered a scene as “a simple mosaic of spots” that are “not meant to be examined from the distance of a foot...but to be viewed for the whole effect and from a somewhat remote position.”¹²⁷

Beyond these remarks, the book consists of character sketches of artists and descriptions of paintings that are disappointingly banal and recall the emphasis of early art criticism on narrative subject matter; for instance, when describing Edward Moran’s

¹²⁶ Edward Strahan [Earl Shinn], *The Art Gallery of the Exhibition: A Selection from the Paintings and Sculpture Exhibition by Alma-Tadema, Bierstadt, Huntington, Moran, with Introduction and Descriptive Text by Edward Strahan* (Philadelphia: Gebbie, 1877), v-vi, 14-5.

¹²⁷ Strahan, *The Art Gallery of the Exhibition*, 14, 38, 88, 110.

New York Harbor he took the opportunity to wax eloquent on American opportunities for immigrants.¹²⁸ Shinn's observations on American art at the Centennial Exhibition are an ambivalent mixture of reverence for European tradition and urgency to be free of it. His uncertainty reflects the conflicted state of the art world of the 1870s.

Clarence Cook devoted five installments to his ostensible analysis of the American art exhibition. All were entitled "The Fine Art Department: American Pictures," but in fact, he more than any other writer departed from the American art display to develop his own history of American art. It is of note that 1877 marked the release of Wilhelm Lübke's *Outlines for a History of Art*, which Cook had translated and edited, so during the Centennial year Cook would have been particularly sensitive to art historical narratives. He took five installments to "cover" the American art display – not an entirely accurate term, since he wrote little about the actual exhibition. Cook used it as an occasion to create his own history of American art, calling it his "attempted sketch of the outlines of painting in America."¹²⁹

Cook made little pretense of writing about the exhibition itself, and instead inserted artists that he thought should have been included. He was quick to justify his exercise, writing that "this [exhibition] should have been the opportunity for a display as complete as could have been made of the rise and progress of Art in America."¹³⁰ His "should have been" of course implies that the goal had not been accomplished, and his

¹²⁸ Strahan, *The Art Gallery of the Exhibition*, 42. Moran painted several versions of *New York Harbor*. Most are currently in private collections, and sufficient information could not be found to determine which was displayed at the Centennial Exhibition.

¹²⁹ C.C. [Clarence Cook], "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: Third Notice," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 7 June 1876, 1.

¹³⁰ [Clarence Cook], "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: First Notice," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 1 June 1876, 8.

choice of words echoes the title of William Dunlap's seminal 1834 book, *History of the Rise and Progress of the Arts of Design in the United States*.

Cook included artists and works that he felt should have been part of the exhibition, such as the colonial portraitist Joseph Blackburn, the miniaturist Edward Malbone, and John Smibert's *Bermuda Group* of 1729 (figure 3.11), as well as the portraitists Henry Inman, Chester Harding, and John Wesley Jarvis. His installments comprised extensive discussions of Copley, West, Stuart, and Allston. His analysis of early American artists began with Copley, whom Cook praised for his ability with "the luster of stain, the shine of silk, the reflecting surface of a mahogany table." Cook decided that West was not truly American, as his mature work was done abroad. He called West's *Death of General Wolfe* (figure 2.24), on display in the English department, "absurdly over-praised" and "only a contribution to literature" with "no relation whatever to Art." He considered Stuart "the first real painter that our country knew after she became independent of Great Britain," and with his generation of artists who remained in America, "[art's] history in this country really begins."¹³¹

Cook's narrative was severely truncated as he moved beyond the nation's early years; he touched on the art of the mid and later nineteenth century only briefly, and then only to register his disappointment at certain absences, as if to underscore the canon that had already formed in his mind. He noted the lack of works by "men who were young in '62...working at the study of nature in a spirit of sincere devotion and with an aim far

¹³¹ [Clarence Cook], "The Fine Art Department: American Pictures: First Notice," *New York Daily Tribune*, 1 June 1876, 8; C.C. [Clarence Cook], "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: Second Notice," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 3 June 1876, 2; C.C. [Clarence Cook], "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: Third Notice," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 7 June 1876, 1; C.C. [Clarence Cook], "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: Fourth Notice," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 9 June 1876, 1; C.C. [Clarence Cook], "The Fine Art Department: American Pictures: Fifth Notice," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 17 June 1876, 2.

more scientific than artistic.” This was probably in reference to the American Pre-Raphaelite movement that he had advocated. It seems that Cook became caught up in writing his narrative and ran out of time and column space, as he did not progress much further than the colonial period. However, this only underscores his zeal for writing a thorough account of American art.

Like Shinn and Cook, many writers, especially authors of “souvenir books,” responded to the American art exhibition by thinking of the important works they themselves would have included, and creating their own “imagined exhibitions.” The writer for the New York *Daily Graphic* wished for an entire gallery of monumental American landscapes, enthusing “would not such a panorama of United States American scenery be fine, grand, super-magnificent?”¹³² For many, conveying their “imagined exhibition” was just as important as reporting on the actual one. These commentaries went beyond the works on display, as critics eagerly seized the retrospective as an opportunity, perhaps even an obligation, to write a history of American art. In keeping with the Centennial Exhibition’s apotheosis of American progress, many of these accounts took the form of narratives that treated the country’s art as yet another manifestation of its continual improvement.

Benson John Lossing’s *The American Centenary* concentrated solely on early painters, including Allston, Copley, Morse, Smibert, Stuart, and also Dunlap, Hesselius, Jarvis, Peale, Watson, Wollaston, and Williams, several of whom were not represented at the Centennial Exhibition. Lossing also mentioned major sculptors up to the present day with similar disregard for which were represented at Fairmount Park, including Joseph A.

¹³² Mary A.K. Wager, “Paintings and Statuary: The Annex to Memorial Hall,” *The Daily Graphic: New York*, 18 May 1876, 650.

Bailly, Thomas Crawford, Horatio Greenough, Harriet Hosmer, Hiram Powers, Randolph Rogers, William Wetmore Story, Launt Thompson, J.Q.A. Ward, and others.

Interestingly, he discussed the American Academy of the Fine Arts, the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, the American Art Union and the National Academy. In doing so, he took his account beyond mere lists of artists and considered how these institutions contributed to the country's cultural development.¹³³

In *The Great Centennial Exhibition* Phillip T. Sandhurst acknowledged the importance of such written accounts to posterity. He prefaced his chapter on the "Art Gallery" with the assertion that "we shall endeavor to form a permanent pictorial gallery...as a true and trustworthy guide to what it could teach." Sandhurst began his nationalistic discourse on the American art department with four pages apotheosizing West, relating the legendary account that his first teachers were Indians. Once again on a patriotic note, Sandhurst wrote of Copley's emigration to England that "another American had arrived in London to dispute the palm of victory with the English painters." Allston merited four pages as well. Sandhurst decried the absence of works by Hiram Powers and William Page and in doing so, made sure they were included in his account of American art -- though in fact Page was represented in the American galleries with his *Shakespeare* (Sotheby's, January 15, 1976, lot 157).¹³⁴

Sylvester Burley's souvenir book *American Enterprise* included a brief reckoning of American art that the author modestly prefaced with the comment that his account was "treated in somewhat popular style for the general reader and not for the art critic."¹³⁵ In fact, his essay on artists of the colonial and federal periods shows a respectable amount of

¹³³ Lossing, 552-4, 557.

¹³⁴ Sandhurst, 33, 35-9, 53.

¹³⁵ Burley, 17.

erudition; he quoted from Horace Walpole's *Anecdotes of Painting in England*, Appleton's *American Cyclopaedia*, William Dunlap's 1834 *History of the Rise and Progress of the Arts of Design in the United States*, and critical accounts from the *North American Review*. When he turned to living artists however, Burley was faced with the problem common to all those attempting to write histories of American art at the Centennial Exhibition: that of deciding which of them represented its continuation into the present day. He skirted the issue by presenting a laundry list of active artists. Burley did not consider himself qualified to write a history of American art, but he, along with other critics, recognized the importance of compiling some type of selection to guide his readers.

Edward C. Bruce published a book whose title is worth quoting in full, as it describes his and other authors' attempts to write a historical assessment of American achievements: *The Century: Its Fruits and Its Festival: Being a History and Description of the Centennial Exhibition, with a Preliminary Outline of Modern Progress*. Bruce devoted his final chapter to American art, with special attention to the Centennial Exhibition. Unlike Burley, Bruce offered his opinions freely, and showed an unusual sense of ease and unselfconsciousness. He flippantly praised West's *Death of General Wolfe*, which in his words, "established for all coming time the right of British heroes to the pictorial pursuit of life liberty and happiness in their own clothes." He believed little progress had been made since the time of Stuart, Sully, Inman, and Morse.¹³⁶

S.S. Conant touched on the recurring theme of American advancement in his essay "Progress of the Fine Arts" from the 1876 book *The First Century of the Republic: A Review of American Progress*. The book was presented as "a review of our progress

¹³⁶ Bruce, 182-4.

during the first century of our national life. . . . It connects with the outward fact its formative idea;” that is, it provided the Exhibition with a conceptual framework.¹³⁷ Conant began with an apology for the nation’s slow cultural development, and then launched into a narrative account of its fine art, beginning with Watson and Smibert. Rather than merely reciting a list of artists, Conant branched out to discuss broader issues, noting for example that the American bias against the nude was dying out. He wove into his account the effects of art institutions, including the American Academy of Fine Arts, the National Academy of Design, and the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, as well as recent developments, such as the growing popularity of watercolor. Like Burley, Conant took a scholarly turn in critically citing earlier historians: he quoted Henry T. Tuckerman’s 1867 *Book of the Artists*, and owned that of William Dunlap’s list of portraitists, “a few still merited attention.”¹³⁸

Reviews of the American art display continued after its close, and the most highly anticipated was artist John F. Weir’s report of the art department. It was included with the reports of the Centennial Commission and as such, constituted an official assessment of the American art exhibition. Those reports were not published until 1878. However, an advance copy of Weir’s report was excerpted in the New York *Evening Post* on November 30, 1877.¹³⁹ The following year Weir’s report was reprinted in *The Nation* in four monthly installments.¹⁴⁰ It is remarkable that even two years later the report was newsworthy; the country was still thinking about the great fair’s message and seeking the

¹³⁷ Rev. Theodore D. Woolsey, “Introduction,” in *The First Century of the Republic: A Review of American Progress* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1876), 8.

¹³⁸ S.S. Conant, “Progress of the Fine Arts,” in *The First Century of the Republic: A Review of American Progress* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1876), 399-408.

¹³⁹ “American Artists,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 30 November 1877, 1.

¹⁴⁰ Weir’s report was reprinted in *The Nation* in vol. 3: 26 January 1878, 28-30; 2 February 1878, 40-1; 23 February 1878, 69-70; and 30 March 1878, 111-2.

final word on its art. Weir's report served as a summation of the state of American art, and it is not surprising that he too addressed issues both of history and the American canon, and of nationalism versus foreign influences on an American school.

Weir began with the widely acknowledged point that the exhibition was marked by opportunities for comparison.¹⁴¹ His report covered all the art exhibits, both foreign and American, but it was only for the United States that Weir turned his report, as had many others, into a history of American art. He complained, with some justification, that the exhibition included no attempt to show the history, progress, and present state of sculpture.¹⁴² He addressed the omnipresent notions of progress and nationality by warning that the development of art is not always a steady forward march; however, he quickly went on to say that American art was making rapid progress, since it was built not from the slow advance of barbarism, but from a foundation of earlier civilizations. He made a rather odd response to charges that American art was overly influenced by that of Europe, writing that it was easy to distinguish between foreigners settling in the United States and Americans trained abroad; perhaps he was making a case for the enduring power of one's native roots.¹⁴³

Weir made reference to the exhibition of course; he agreed with the popular opinion that the exhibition was good overall, but was marred by the indiscriminate admission of sub-par works. Then, like many of his colleagues, he departed from the exhibition to include other paintings he considered important to the country's cultural history; for instance, he praised Winslow Homer's *Prisoners from the Front* (figure 3.12)

¹⁴¹ Weir, 3.

¹⁴² USCC, *Reports and Awards*, 638. Modern scholar David Sellin disagrees with this assessment. See his "The Centennial," in *Sculpture of a City: Philadelphia's Treasures in Bronze and Stone* (New York: Walker Publishing Co., Inc., 1974), 86.

¹⁴³ Weir, 22-5.

as “a unique work in American art.” Weir discussed at length the great names of the colonial period. He considered Copley and Stuart unsurpassed in this country and praised Allston, Morse, Newton, Trumbull, and West. He carefully built them into the international canon of great artists by emphasizing that they were as well known abroad as they were in their native countries in their day, and he was sure to add that they were as good as any of their contemporaries in Europe.¹⁴⁴ Jarvis, Inman, and Sully were lauded as well. Many critics attempting their own histories did not venture much detail beyond the colonial period; their notices became briefer and briefer until they merely listed artists’ names without additional comment. Weir, however, elaborated on mid- and late-century artists. He gave Cole and Durand accolades as the fathers of the Hudson River School, and he wrote expansively on its great names, along with Eastman Johnson.¹⁴⁵

Like many of his contemporaries, Weir connected his history of art with the much-discussed idea of a national school. He noted the growth of transportation, the dissemination of mass-produced images, and the blurring of cultural boundaries, and questioned “if, indeed, the term ‘school’ has any proper application in modern art, where such classifications are being fast obliterated.”¹⁴⁶ One would think that the growing distribution of common ideas and images would, to the contrary, contribute to the formation of a national school, but Weir did not agree. Since he had a year following the fair’s close to write his report, he may have been thinking of new developments in the New York art world in the months after the Centennial, with greater numbers of artists

¹⁴⁴ Weir, 23-4, 635.

¹⁴⁵ “American Artists,” *The Evening Post* (New York), 30 November 1877, 3. A quarter century later Weir had the opportunity to address the deficiencies he saw at the Centennial Exhibition’s American art display when he organized a historical exhibition of American art for Yale University. Unfortunately, it appears that no catalogue was published. See Susan B. Matheson, *Art for Yale: A History of the Yale University Art Gallery* (New Haven: Yale University Art Gallery, 2001), 58.

¹⁴⁶ Weir, 617.

returning from abroad, and the secession of a group of young foreign-trained artists from the National Academy of Design to form the Society of American Artists.

As Shinn, Cook, and other contemporary writers formed their histories of art, they were aware that the Centennial Exhibition, in its dual character as the country's first great world's fair and the commemoration of a historic milestone, introduced a new type of perception, the double consciousness that modern scholars have observed. Bruce commented in his 1876 *The Century: Its Fruits and Its Festival*, "We have, as it were, to stand outside ourselves – a process not to be gone through with in a stroll of a few hours through acres of novelties."¹⁴⁷ The *New-York Daily Tribune* believed that the Centennial "has achieved a great end; it has shown us ourselves as other see us...It has taken us for a season outside of ourselves."¹⁴⁸ It was expected that other nations would closely scrutinize the United States in every aspect of its production, both commercial and cultural. At the same American citizens were also watching themselves, contemplating the progress of the nation over the last century, and watching each other, as people from all parts of a country that had recently been bitterly divided, came together in unprecedented numbers.

The *New York World* writer's sage observation bears repeating: "A picture gallery is, of all places in the world, the most likely to furnish you with whatever you are in search of."¹⁴⁹ The American art display at the Centennial Exhibition generated not only a staggering amount of writing, it provided a convenient vehicle for the national self-examination that the Centennial moment demanded. Choosing works to discuss among the overabundance of the American art display forced critics to think selectively not only

¹⁴⁷ Bruce, 235-6.

¹⁴⁸ "The Past Exhibition," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 16 November 1876, 4.

¹⁴⁹ "American Art at the Centennial," *New York World*, 24 July 1876, 2.

within the exhibition, but often beyond it to develop their own narratives. At a moment when the art world was in transition, this reflection on history caused many to wonder about the significance of current developments as well. While Hudson River School painters received their expected share of praise, many critics had tired of the New York landscapists' long reign, and looked to younger foreign-trained artists with admiration and anticipation. Cook enthusiastically supported the expatriates, and Shinn equivocated, pondering the role of foreign influences on an American school. Because of this Centennial exercise, American art would be perceived differently in the coming decades, both at international exhibitions and in written accounts. The next chapter will discuss how writers, collectors, and artists would "revise history" to accommodate those changes.

Chapter Four: Revising History

Prompted by the Centennial moment of reckoning and reflection, reviews of the American art canon at the Centennial Exhibition, such as those by Clarence Cook and Earl Shinn, moved beyond the display itself and evolved into rudimentary histories of American art. These in turn inspired several comprehensive American art histories in the years following. These new accounts took a distinct turn away from the biographical approach of earlier histories, and toward the narratives of progress that the Centennial inspired. Interestingly, the critics who covered the Centennial Exhibition did not go on to write the first histories of American art; in fact, Cook's and Shinn's efforts after the Centennial year were particularly disappointing. However, they broke ground with their narratives and provided an example that was followed by others. The very fact that the new post-Centennial histories of art were produced by other writers underscores how pervasive and broad-ranging was this new way of perceiving the country's cultural history. These post-Centennial authors struggled to integrate the issues that polarized the 1876 American art display: concerns about foreign influences and calls for a national art. Their narratives swung back and forth over the rest of the nineteenth century, favoring one side or the other, until finally reaching a synthesis in the early years of the twentieth.

These writers also grappled with another fundamental difficulty encountered by organizers and critics of the 1876 exhibition: the past and the present continued to resist linkage. Post-Centennial narratives usually recounted the country's artistic beginnings in an expansive historical tone, but showed an increasing nervousness as they approached the present day. They showed an almost phobic reluctance to draw conclusions about living artists or to comment on the state of contemporary art, and often resorted to mere

descriptions of specific works, or worse yet, long unedited lists of names. While the Centennial Exhibition inspired a new way of thinking about the history of American art, the struggle it sparked between nativists and expatriates made it difficult for critics to assess the current situation, and suggested that the past and the present were better kept apart. After the Centennial, the two would be treated separately. Over the rest of the century, written histories concentrated on American art's past, re-imagining well-worn collections of biographies as sweeping narratives that identified distinct movements in the nation's cultural evolution. They addressed the effects of institutions, patronage, taste, and most important, the impact of foreign influences in relation to national identity.

The rupture between the established canon of the past and the contested national school of the present also shaped the international expositions that followed. Written histories could not effectively address contemporary movements, so world's fairs became venues to discuss the current state of the nation's art, just as the 1876 exhibition had been. Critics used these exhibitions to take stock of recent developments and to discuss crucial issues raised at the Centennial Exhibition, most importantly, how foreign influences were affecting American art, and how they might be assimilated into a distinctive national school.

The Centennial Exhibition ended on November 10, but its impact was just beginning to be felt. The fair's abiding fascination was such that over 115,000 people braved heavy rains to attend the closing ceremonies -- more than were present at the opening.¹ It was recognized, however, that the Exhibition's magic was waning and it was time for the fair to end. The *Atlantic Monthly* observed the grounds' "dust and dinginess,"

¹ "The United States International Exhibition of 1876," *Journal of the Franklin Institute* 102 (December 1876): 361.

the “grass trodden bare,” and the “flower-beds filled with litter.”² Many closing day speakers tried to articulate the meaning of the great spectacle they had witnessed. John Walsh, President of the Centennial Board of Finance, realized that the Exhibition’s effects would be felt for many years to come:

With the close of this day another International Exhibition will be concluded and added to the records of the past. But it will not be ended, -- it will rather have only begun. The real exhibition we have striven for is not limited to the display of material products...the teachings, the social and moral influences, the improvements in the productive powers of genius and inventive knowledge, constitute in part the object and aim. May these be fully realized as the legitimate results of the Exhibition!³

At 4:00 p.m. that day, President Ulysses S. Grant gave the signal for the machinery of the Exhibition to cease. The *New-York Daily Tribune* recorded the strangeness of the moment, as the Centennial spell was broken:

A few minutes after the engine had rested from its labors...an English road locomotive steamed along the main thoroughfare of the grounds to the Main Building, drawing two wagons heaped with packing boxes. This little incident was more significant than the speeches, the screaming whistles, and the chimes. It told that the end had come, and the work of pulling the Exhibition to pieces was already beginning.⁴

The paintings and sculpture in the American art display were returned to their owners, whether artists, collectors, institutions, or new owners of works purchased there.⁵ The legacy of the Exhibition would not take a physical form, but rather an intellectual one. For American artists and critics the work of “pulling the Exhibition to pieces,” of assessing its impact and absorbing its lessons, would last for decades.

² “Characteristics of the International Fair: Closing Days,” *Atlantic Monthly* 39 (January 1877): 100.

³ United States Centennial Commission, *International Exhibition, 1876. Reports of the President, Secretary, and Executive Committee, Together With the Journal of the Final Session of the Commission*, vol. 2 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 101.

⁴ “The Great Fair Closed,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 11 November 1876, 2.

⁵ Rothermel’s *Battle of Gettysburg*, now infamous, remained in Memorial Hall until 1894, when it was sent to the state capitol at Harrisburg. It is now displayed at the State Museum of Pennsylvania. See Donald A. Winer, “Rothermel’s Battle of Gettysburg: A Victorian’s Heroic View of The Civil War,” *Nineteenth Century* 1 (Winter 1975): 9.

Efforts to preserve a physical manifestation of the Exhibition proved unsuccessful, and only affirmed the importance of written accounts as its legacy. On May 10, 1877, one year after the original opening, a group of investors called the Permanent International Exhibition Company reopened the Main Building full of exhibitors in a hopeful attempt to continue the Centennial Exhibition as a profit-making enterprise.⁶ The adjacent Memorial Hall reopened as the Pennsylvania Museum. Officials made an agreement with the International Exhibition Company to place pictures and statues in certain galleries of Memorial Hall and give the Company all admission fees, and in return the Company would pay the Museum \$6,000 per year.⁷

The Pennsylvania Museum was intended to emphasize the decorative arts in the tradition of London's South Kensington Museum (now called the Victoria and Albert), which was inspired by the 1851 Great Exhibition of the Works of Industry of All Nations, better known as the Crystal Palace. A Committee of Selection for the Pennsylvania Museum was given \$25,000 to purchase works from the Centennial Exhibition, and also received gifts from foreign Commissioners and from the South Kensington Museum itself.⁸ True to its purpose, the Museum's accession books for its early years show that all of its acquisitions were decorative art objects, most of them foreign, and included no American paintings or sculpture.⁹

The International Exhibition Company was a poor business partner for the Pennsylvania Museum. As of 1878 the Company had paid only a fraction of its

⁶ Richard R. Nicolai, *Centennial Philadelphia* (Bryn Mawr, PA: Bryn Mawr Press, 1976), 90.

⁷ *First and Second Reports of the Board of Trustees of the Pennsylvania Museum and School of Industrial Art, 1876-77* (Philadelphia: Review Printing House, 1878), 11.

⁸ *First and Second Reports of the Board of Trustees of the Pennsylvania Museum*, 8, 15.

⁹ Pennsylvania Museum of Art, Accession Records, vol. 1, 1876 and vol. 2, 1877-82, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Registrar's Office.

obligation, and Museum trustees were bringing legal action.¹⁰ After several changes in management and the withdrawal of many foreign exhibitors, the Main Building was closed in 1881 and torn down, but the Pennsylvania Museum continued.¹¹ In 1893 it was transformed by a bequest from W.P. Wilstach, a Philadelphia leather manufacturer who left a paintings collection and a \$500,000 endowment to the city of Philadelphia. His gift began the institution's evolution into the Philadelphia Museum of Art, which opened in a new building in 1928. In 1954 Memorial Hall was returned to the Fairmount Park Commission, and fifteen years later it opened as a community center with a basketball court and a swimming pool.¹² At present it houses the offices of the Fairmount Park Commission. The building suffers from past renovations and lack of funds for maintenance, but many of its original elements remain, and its entrance hall, no longer in use, still conveys some sense of the grandeur that greeted visitors as they moved through its cool whiteness among the sculptures displayed there (figure 4.1).¹³

Art Bureau Chief John Sartain created his own written legacy. The Centennial Exhibition effectively marked the end of his career at the age of sixty-eight. After 1876 he stopped taking on engraving commissions, and he resigned from the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts two years later.¹⁴ In his memoir, *The Reminiscences of a Very Old*

¹⁰ *First and Second Reports of the Board of Trustees of the Pennsylvania Museum*, 11.

¹¹ Nicolai, 90-1.

¹² John Maass, *The Glorious Enterprise: The Centennial Exhibition of 1876 and H.J. Schwartzmann, Architect-in-Chief* (Watkins Glen, NY: American Life Foundation, 1973), 48-9; Rebecca Trumbull, *Memorial Hall: A History* (Philadelphia: Fairmount Park Council for Historic Sites, 1986), 5.

¹³ Memorial Hall has been cited as the first American art museum in the Beaux-Arts style, and a significant influence on the art museums of Brooklyn, Milwaukee and Chicago, as well as the fine arts buildings at the World's Columbian, Louisiana Purchase, and Panama-Pacific Exhibitions in 1893, 1904, and 1915 respectively. See Bruno Giberti, "The Classified Landscape: Consumption, Commodity Order, and the 1876 Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1994), 7, 141; Maass, 52; Clay Lancaster, "Taste at the Philadelphia Centennial," *Magazine of Art* 43 (December 1950): 294.

¹⁴ Ann Katharine Martinez, "The Life and Career of John Sartain (1808-1897): A Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia Printmaker" (Ph.D. diss., George Washington University, 1986), 5. He emerged from

Man, 1808-1897, Sartain summed up his life in the same manner as he had organized the Centennial's American art display, shaping events as best he could to assert his own vision of things. Sartain assiduously defended his role in the Centennial Exhibition: "Few could imagine the difficulties and trials that beset a man in a position of such responsibility as I had assumed...My resolve to be strictly impartial in the discharge of my arduous duties brought me into frequent antagonism with one and the other." He quoted an 1897 letter from Centennial Exhibition Director-General A.T. Goshorn, who wrote that "No one could have succeeded more acceptably in a similar position....Your mild, equable temper, modest bearing and unselfish interest in the work were admirable." Sartain mentioned his innovation of putting doors in the corners of the annex galleries to allow for more wall space, and that he was created "Officer of the Royal Equestrian Order of the Crown of Italy" for his efforts on behalf of Italian art. He quoted other high officials on the positive results of the art exhibition, and he himself considered it "on the whole, a remarkable success."¹⁵ Sartain criticized the French and German contributions, praised the English display and noted the attention attracted by the Italian exhibition – but made no mention of American art.

It is puzzling that Sartain was so eager to take credit for the foreign contributions to the exhibition, and yet so silent on the area where he once said that his heart lay. He might have been unhappy with the results of the American art display, and still stinging from the harsh criticism he had endured. His own assessment can only be gleaned from

retirement to organize an 1887 exhibition of American art in London, collecting works from Philadelphia, Boston, New York, Paris, London, Rome, and Florence. He reported that he was gratified by the English response. See John Sartain, *The Reminiscences of a Very Old Man* (New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1899), 254, 270.

¹⁵ Sartain, *Reminiscences*, 263-7; See also James D. McCabe, *The Illustrated History of the Centennial Exhibition* (Philadelphia: The National Publishing Company, 1876), 865-6.

his brief comments in his official report that “All impartial people appear to agree that it was an undoubted success, and that the American portion of it was highly creditable to a country so young in art.”¹⁶ He used the same careful, qualifying language that many other writers of the day employed to describe an exhibition that they believed merited as much apology as praise.

Just as Sartain worked, decades later, to revise the history of his participation in the Centennial Exhibition, others were inspired with a new consciousness of the nation’s place in the world, and they saw its history in a new light. United States Commissioner Daniel J. Morrell imagined that “The managers of future Centennial celebrations to be held on these grounds will see and do things more wonderful than our wildest dreams, and the remnants of our finest things may be exhibited by them as proofs of the rudeness of our early days.” Centennial Board of Finance President John Walsh observed that “It has taught *us* what *others* excel, and excited our ambition to try and equal them.”¹⁷

Writer Edward C. Bruce mused about the challenge facing the nation and what might develop from it: “Any movement which assembles from distant quarters seven or eight millions of people must have other results than those perceptible at the time or on the spot – results slow to shape and to declare themselves... We have, as it were, to stand outside of ourselves – a process not to be gone through with in a stroll of a few hours through acres of novelties.”¹⁸ Bruce’s assessment applied to the American art exhibition as well.

Its impact was felt over decades, inspiring a historical consciousness that generated a new

¹⁶ John Sartain, “Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Art,” in *International Exhibition, 1876. Report of the Director-General, Including the Reports of Bureaus of Administration*, vol. 1, United States Centennial Commission (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 145.

¹⁷ USCC, *Reports of the President, Secretary, and Executive Committee*, 97-8.

¹⁸ Edward C. Bruce, *The Century: Its Fruits and Its Festival: Being a History and Description of the Centennial Exhibition, with a Preliminary Outline of Modern Progress* (Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1877), 235-6.

consideration of its past and shaped the ways that the contemporary American school was presented to the world.

Heralding a New Period

The Centennial Exhibition was recognized as a watershed that marked a new era in American art. A writer for *Scribner's Monthly* reflected on its closing that “we look forward upon the next quarter of a century to the only general movement in art that our young country has ever known. We are ready for it, and stimulus and direction have come just when we needed it.”¹⁹ A *New-York Times* writer voiced concern about the art market for the fall of 1876, given the difficult economy. However, he noted the popularity of the art exhibition in Philadelphia and predicted that the crowds there “will surely carry to every corner of the country broader ideas of the value of art and juster notions of the relative position of American painters,” adding that the nation’s art “has every appearance of vitality and promise.”²⁰ *The American Architect and Building News* enthused that “We are now on the wave of a revival of general interest in the cultivation of the fine arts; and we may confidently expect rapid advancement in native artistic productions.”²¹ In November 1876 the *New-York Daily Tribune* assured its readers that “the Art Exhibition at the Centennial...[has] awakened a renewed interest in pictures in many, and developed a taste in others which will unquestionably bear fruit in an increased demand for good pictures.”²² A few months after the Exhibition closed, *Appleton's Journal* predicted that interest in art would grow, and in a particularly

¹⁹ “Topics of the Time: American Art,” *Scribner's Monthly* 13 (November 1876): 127.

²⁰ “Painters and Buyers,” *New-York Times*, 30 September 1876, 6.

²¹ “The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VII,” *American Architect and Building News* 1 (12 August 1876): 261.

²² “A Ramble Among the Studios,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 25 November 1876, 2.

appropriate choice of words, the writer predicted that “this class promises in the end to build up a worthy national art-history.”²³

Years later the Centennial Exhibition was still considered a moment of change. In 1879 *Harper's Monthly* marked the fair as a catalyst for the developments that followed, calling it “the occasion which set in motion or accelerated certain influences which had been gradually gathering in momentum for over twenty years.”²⁴ In 1880 a writer for *Scribner's Monthly* noted that the state of American art had changed so completely in three years that it was difficult to recall the condition of things before, and he suggested that the reader think of the American art exhibition at the Centennial to bring it to mind. He acknowledged that “The Centennial year had in many ways awakened a popular interest in art,” citing loan exhibitions springing up all over the country, particularly in New York.²⁵ The following year Dalton Dorr declared in *The Penn Monthly* that “with the opening of the Centennial Exhibition were unfolded possibilities of culture and refinement for the people never before thought of,” and he further asserted that “The era of national culture in the United States may be dated from the Centennial.”²⁶

The 1880 *Scribner's* article made another comment that demonstrates the complexities of pinpointing the Centennial Exhibition's impact on country's artistic development. The writer commented that “The annals of art in America have not been eventful, but the year 1876-7 may be said to mark the beginning of an epoch in them.”²⁷ By eliding the years 1876 and 1877, he conveniently combined two signal events of those years, rather than attempting to unravel the tangled relations of cause and effect. The

²³ Untitled article, *Appleton's Journal* 2 (March 1877): 284-5.

²⁴ “Present Tendencies of American Art,” *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 63 (March 1879): 483.

²⁵ “The Younger Painters of America,” *Scribner's Monthly* 20 (May 1880): 1-2.

²⁶ Dalton Dorr, “Art Museums and Their Uses,” *The Penn Monthly* 12 (August 1881): 562-3.

²⁷ “The Younger Painters of America,” 1.

Centennial Exhibition was of course the crucial art event of 1876, and the following year marked an event much better known to modern scholars: the formation of the Society of American Artists. As much as any other, this event evidenced the change in sensibility that the Centennial Exhibition foretold.

The tensions between the National Academy of Design and the “new men” that began during preparations for the Centennial Exhibition were noted at the fair. S.S. Conant apologized for the Academy in his souvenir book *The First Century of the Republic* for being subject to “sharp animadversion, sometimes not undeserved, from those who deem it too conservative.”²⁸ The Centennial Exhibition brought their conflict into sharp focus, as the American art display in Fairmount Park caused a widespread debate on the merits of foreign training versus the value of American character and subjects – the very issues at stake between the Academy’s old guard and the younger men. The Centennial Exhibition can only have fueled the conflict by calling for an assessment of American art at a moment when its future hung in the balance.

In 1877 the Academy attempted to reconcile its squabbles with younger artists by appointing two European-trained academicians, Charles Henry Miller and A. Wordsworth Thompson, to the hanging committee for its annual exhibition. Through their agency large works by Will Low, Walter Shirlaw, and Abbot Thayer, as well as Frank Duveneck’s *Turkish Page* (figure 4.2) were hung “on the line”; that is, in the coveted position at eye level -- to the shock of some members. President Daniel Huntington demanded that the exhibition be re-hung, but the committee refused. The group then instituted an “eight-foot rule” whereby academicians were entitled to two

²⁸ S.S. Conant, “Progress of the Fine Arts,” in *The First Century of the Republic: A Review of American Progress* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1876), 403.

works on the line measuring up to eight feet. They also changed the membership of the hanging committee and blackballed European-trained artists being considered for associate membership.

Huntington was adamant that “This battle must be maintained, there will be no truce...Foreign art will continue to pour in its forces and we shall triumph...by surpassing it.”²⁹ His actions were met with indignation, as the *New York Evening Post* raged, “what becomes of the national character of our ‘National Academy’?”³⁰ The question was particularly relevant, coming mere months after the close of an exhibition in Philadelphia that attempted to define the character of the country’s art. Huntington no doubt thought that he was helping to preserve that character by resisting foreign styles, but they were fast becoming inextricably intertwined with American art, and after seeing the work of other countries at the Centennial Exhibition, many collectors and artists were ready to embrace them.

In the end, the Academy’s 1877 exhibition included some paintings by “younger men,” but broadly-rendered works by Chase and J. Alden Weir were hung unfavorably near the ceiling, and those by foreign-trained artists that were hung on the line were more in keeping with the Academy’s emphasis on finish and detail. Among the works that were rejected outright was a plaster sketch by Augustus Saint-Gaudens, which provoked particular indignation.³¹ The acceptance of Saint-Gaudens’ work at the Centennial Exhibition must have made the Academy’s rejection seem all the more preposterous.

²⁹ Jennifer A. Martin Bienenstock, “The Formation and Early Years of the Society of American Artists: 1877-1884” (Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1983), 25, 28, 29.

³⁰ “The Mistake of the Academicians,” *Evening Post* (New York), 23 April 1877, 2.

³¹ Bienenstock, 25-7. Saint-Gaudens’ sketch, destroyed in a 1904 studio fire, was described as a “young girl lying on her face on a low couch, dandling an infant in her arms.”

These slights spurred younger artists to action, and the Society of American Artists was founded on June 1, 1877 by Wyatt Eaton, Helena de Kay Gilder, Saint-Gaudens and Shirlaw. The new group created a welcoming atmosphere for foreign-trained artists and encouraged their return to the United States. In contradistinction to the Academy, they called for national representation, and actively solicited work from Boston and Philadelphia. Their efforts echoed Sartain's for the Centennial Exhibition. They persuaded several progressive young members of the Academy to join them, including Edwin Howland Blashfield, Frederic Bridgman, Homer Dodge Martin, Frank Millet, Charles Sprague Pearce, and Louis Comfort Tiffany, all of whom were represented the previous year at Fairmount Park.³²

The Society's critical success was quick and complete. Richard Watson Gilder, husband of founding member Helena de Kay Gilder, convinced Clarence Cook to support the new contingent in the *New-York Daily Tribune*. Mrs. Gilder's brother Charles de Kay had recently been appointed to the *New-York Times*, and he too proved to be an important advocate.³³ By 1880 a writer for *Scribner's Monthly* noted a new emphasis on technique, an attribute closely associated with foreign training. He cited such artists as Chase, Duveneck, Eakins, Eaton, Albert Pinkham Ryder, and Shirlaw, and connected the change with the "Renaissance, so to speak, of 1877" at the controversial National Academy exhibition. In three short years, the writer asserted, "The new men have, indeed, not only ceased to be a sensation, but they have come to be accepted, in many quarters...with

³² Bienenstock, 30-5, 43.

³³ Bienenstock, 22, 36.

cordial unquestioningness.”³⁴ The Centennial Exhibition’s surprisingly strong representation of expatriates no doubt provided an encouraging example.

The triumph of the “new men” was also the death knell of the Hudson River School. The later career of Worthington Whittredge, Sartain’s nemesis at the Centennial Exhibition, serves as an example of how some New York landscapists responded to the change. According to modern scholar Anthony Janson, by the end of 1876 Whittredge had entered a “crisis” in his work, and the following year his friend Jervis McEntee described him as “despondent.” In a startling affirmation of the new sensibility, Whittredge emerged two years later working in a distinctly Barbizon and Impressionist-influenced style; his *Harvest of Seaweed* of c. 1884 (figure 4.3) shows his movement toward looser brushwork and away from the conventions of the picturesque. However, his style was uneven for years to come, as if he were still reluctant to accept foreign influences.³⁵ He held his nativist ideals into the twentieth century, as he remarked that schools of art were built by men who “stamp the work of their period with a national or local character different from all other schools. This would seem to have been easier in the old days than it is now when all the nations are hobnobbing together and shaking hands as if they were all of one breed.”³⁶

With a fashionable new style in the ascendancy, American art flourished in the post-Centennial years. Several new artists’ groups were formed, including the New York Etching Club, the Tile Club, and the Society of Decorative Art. More artists traveled abroad for training, and increasing numbers returned to work in the United States. These

³⁴ “The Younger Artists of America,” 2-7.

³⁵ Anthony F. Janson, *Worthington Whittredge* (Cambridge University Press, 1989), 158-61, 190-1.

³⁶ John I.H. Baur, ed., *The Autobiography of Worthington Whittredge, 1820-1910* (Brooklyn Museum Journal, 1942), 54.

artists did not hesitate to employ foreign elements from both the past and present, and spurred a movement to be later termed the “American Renaissance.” Discussions of these influences continued throughout the rest of the century, as critics debated what part they played in the country’s history, and how they affected the hope for a truly American school. As contemporary writers were quick to point out, the Centennial Exhibition marked a new period in American art, and these concerns, which would dominate the coming decades, can be traced to the Centennial impulse to “revise history,” and to understand the forces that shaped its past and its present.

New Histories of American Art

History was very much on Americans’ minds in the Centennial year, and parallels can be drawn between writing the history of the country and writing the history of its art, as critics followed historians’ techniques and methodologies. In the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, patrician men of wealth and leisure wrote American histories following what has been termed the “great man” model, glorifying the virtue and ambition of the illustrious figures who propelled wars and governments.³⁷ The eminent Boston historian Francis Parkman took this approach in his works beginning in the mid-nineteenth century and continuing to his 1865 book *France and England in North America*. His chapters are organized around the lives and deeds of key figures, and his introduction speaks of how some “men, lost elsewhere in the crowd, stand forth as agents of Destiny. In their toils, their sufferings, their conflicts, momentous questions were at stake, and issues vital to the future world.”³⁸

³⁷ John Higham, *Writing American History: Essays on Modern Scholarship* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1970), 109.

³⁸ Francis Parkman, *France and England in North America*, vol. 1 (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1865; reprint, New York: Viking Press, 1983), 13.

In similar fashion, histories of American art before the Centennial year were organized as collections of biographies. William Dunlap's 1834 *History of the Rise and Progress of the Arts of Design in the United States* piled one life story upon another, many taken directly from the subjects. As Dunlap himself wrote, "the author calls this work a history....His history shall be given by a chain of biographical notices." Dunlap considered himself a chronicler and a biographer. Emphasizing artists' character (or lack thereof) as much as their works, he spoke of Benjamin West's "unsullied life as a man" and delicately commented on Gilbert Stuart's mercurial personality, "with Stuart it was either high tide or low tide."³⁹

C. Edwards Lester acknowledged that his 1846 book, *The Artists of America: A Series of Biographical Sketches of American Artists*, followed Dunlap closely. Continuing Dunlap's biographical focus, Lester discussed artists' personalities, their own recollections, and the testimonies of friends. This emphasis is apparent in his choice of illustrations: with one exception (Henry Inman's *Mumble the Peg*), all are engraved portraits of the artists themselves, rather than images of their work (figure 4.4).

Little was written on sculpture before the Centennial year, but Pickering Dodge's *Sculpture: and the Plastic Art* of 1850 made a flying survey of American sculpture, literally skipping from Indian pottery and the Stone Tower at Newport, Rhode Island (then speculated to be from the Middle Ages) to the United States Capitol Building. He demurred that "it is foreign to our purposes to attempt anything like a criticism of the works of living American sculptors," only briefly noting the work of Hiram Powers and

³⁹ William Dunlap, *History of the Rise and Progress of The Arts of Design in the United States*, vol. 1 (New York: George P. Scott and Company, 1834; reprint, New York: Dover Publications, 1969), 9, 33, 167. For a recent analysis of Dunlap's *History*, see Maura Lyons, *William Dunlap and the Construction of an American Art History* (Boston: University of Massachusetts Press), 2005.

Thomas Crawford. Future writers would express the same worries about characterizing the work of living artists. Dodge had no hesitations however, about discussing dead sculptors, and fulminated for four pages about the recently deceased Shobal Clevenger.⁴⁰

Henry Tuckerman intended his 1867 *Book of the Artists* to go beyond the biographical model to provide a survey of American art. Its extended title is *American Artist Life, Comprising Biographical and Critical Sketches of American Artists: Preceded by an Historical Account of the Rise and Progress of Art in America*. A “Publisher’s Advertisement” at the beginning of the book asserted that “a candid and comprehensive survey of the Progress of Art in the United States has for some years appeared to be an essential want in our literature,” and assured readers that Tuckerman’s work would answer that need. However, only a few pages later the publisher tempered this claim, writing that “this work is essentially a Biographical History of American Art,” and indeed, the author continued Dunlap’s biographical model for the most part.⁴¹

Nonetheless, Tuckerman’s book showed hints of the teleological approach that marked writings on American art after the Centennial year. His introductory “historical account” provided some background on the country’s art market and discussed such institutions as the National Academy of Design and the American Art Union. But his history quickly turned to polemic, as he addressed what he considered the deficiencies of artists and patrons of the day and their preoccupation with money, as well as complaining about the lack of private and public patronage.⁴²

Most important, Tuckerman raised the possibility of an American style, and exhorted artists to draw upon their surroundings and to reflect the “national character” in

⁴⁰ Pickering Dodge, *Sculpture: and the Plastic Art* (Boston: John P. Jewett, 1850), 331-6.

⁴¹ Henry T. Tuckerman, *Book of the Artists* (New York: G.P. Putnam & Son, 1867), vii, ix.

⁴² Tuckerman, 16-24, 32-5.

their work.⁴³ He felt of the country's art, "its grand deficiency is want of character," and he rightly worried that lack of support at home was sending its best practitioners to Rome, Paris, and Düsseldorf "where ample facilities, abundant sympathy and the 'honor' which never attends 'a prophet in his own country,' await the earnest student."⁴⁴

The 1870s saw the rise of professional university-trained historians, an increased interest in teaching American history, and the formation of numerous learned societies.⁴⁵ Historians began to think in terms of a coherent, integrated narrative, not merely a chronological sequence, but growth toward the realization of an underlying principle.⁴⁶ Historical accounts of the period began to move away from the lives of "great men" and toward romantic narratives that framed history as an ascent to ever-higher levels of achievement. The Centennial was perfectly timed for this development, and in fact, probably contributed to it.

The myth of American advancement reached its zenith at the Centennial Exhibition, which is viewed basically as an "affirmation of the nineteenth century's boundless faith in progress."⁴⁷ An act of Congress required managers of the Centennial Exhibition to present full reports of its results, and the *New-York Daily Tribune* suggested several topics to make the lessons of the Exhibition available to current and future generations, one of which was the "advancement of artistic culture and in the

⁴³ David B. Dearing, "An Introduction to the History of American Art Criticism to 1925," in *Rave Reviews: American Art and Its Critics, 1826-1925*, ed. David B. Dearing (exh. cat., National Academy of Design, New York, 2000), 23; Elizabeth Johns, "Histories of American Art: The Changing Quest," *Art Journal* 44 (Winter 1984): 339.

⁴⁴ Tuckerman, 36.

⁴⁵ John Higham, *History: Professional Scholarship in America* (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1965), 4-6.

⁴⁶ Higham, *Writing American History*, 111. In the late nineteenth century and into the twentieth a growing class of professional historians would take the more scientific, positivist approach familiar to modern readers.

⁴⁷ Adam Goodheart Kaufman, "Last Summer of the Republic: The Centennial Exhibition as Experiment and Experience" (A.B. Honors Thesis, Harvard University, 1992), 6.

appreciation of art products.”⁴⁸ It was hoped that gathering accounts of all the Centennial exhibits, and the art display in particular, would produce a synthesis that could improve the general understanding of the country’s development.

The trend is also evidenced by privately-produced histories and guides sold at the Exhibition. In keeping with the mercantile nature of world’s fairs, many surveyed the past by means of commercial statistics, and concluded their accounts with a guide to the Centennial Exhibition as a visual embodiment of American progress. Benson John Lossing’s *The American Centenary* claimed to tell “a history of the progress of the republic of the US during the first 100 years of its existence.” Interestingly, the work traced the development of commercial products and industries in such chapters as “The Uses Made of Swine,” “Pins and Hooks and Eyes,” and “Fire Insurance.”⁴⁹ In like manner, Sylvester W. Burley’s *American Enterprise. Burley’s United States Centennial Gazetteer and Guide, 1876* bears the subtitle “Sketches of Progress during the Past Century in Arts, Manufactures, Literature, Education, Inventions, Railroad Facilities and Steam Navigation, etc. and Articles on the Press, Government and Laws, and other Matters of Interest to both Citizens and Visitors from Foreign Countries.”⁵⁰

This apotheosis of American progress is affirmed by the lampoons that it inspired. In his *One Hundred Years a Republic: Our Show*, David Solis Cohen gave his own account of American history, skewering civic pride, divine sanction, and Yankee thrift. He began with Columbus: Queen Isabella gave him “command of the steamer ‘Mayflower,’ with permission to row out and see what he could find. He landed at

⁴⁸ “Centennial Exhibition: Its Value to America,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 30 September 1876, 1.

⁴⁹ Benson John Lossing, *The American Centenary* (Philadelphia: Porter, 1876).

⁵⁰ Sylvester W. Burley, *American Enterprise. Burley’s United States Centennial Gazetteer and Guide, 1876* (Philadelphia: S.W. Burley, 1876).

Plymouth Rock [and] discovered the city of Boston, first, by special request” (figure 4.5). Cohen continued by mixing biblical stories with pre-Revolutionary tensions, recording when “George III of England commanded that all the male children born in the Colonies should be cast into the Atlantic ocean.” Even the liberty bell was not exempt from his wit, as he explained, “they practised economy in those brave days, and bought a cracked one, because they got it at half price.”⁵¹

In a more reflective turn, Edward Bruce, author of *The Century: Its Fruits and Its Festival* felt the call to reconsider and “revise” history: “The country is not old enough yet for a good history, or even a good biography. The historian of his own country must be born of a gestation of two or three centuries. But we can accumulate materials and practice casting and recasting them.”⁵² Modern scholar Elizabeth Johns observed that between 1875 and 1905, “the writing of American art history was a confused matter,” and writers attempted to “compartmentalize the past in the interest both of finding patterns larger than biographical and of underlining the achievements of the present.”⁵³ This perfectly describes writers’ efforts to create narratives that would bring order to the confusion and incompleteness they discerned in the Centennial Exhibition’s American art display, and to form the story of progress that they had hoped to find there.

Writings on American art before 1876 such as those of Dunlap and Tuckerman cannot properly be called histories of art in the modern sense, but are more accurately described as collections of biographies. The Centennial Exhibition inspired a new consideration of the nation’s art that resulted in the first real narrative histories that

⁵¹ David Solis Cohen, *One Hundred Years a Republic: Our Show* (Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, 1876), 9-10.

⁵² Bruce, 234.

⁵³ Johns, “Histories of American Art,” 339.

encompass trends, schools, organizations, and importantly, outside influences. The histories of art following the Centennial Exhibition present for the first time coherent narratives of American art that search for patterns and meaning, as well as answers to the questions raised by the United States art display in Fairmount Park. Some took the form of modest newspaper articles, and others, full-length books of unprecedented sophistication and nuance. These new histories turned away from Dunlap's biographical model, but his *History of the Rise and Progress* remained an important primary text that was often integrated into the new narrative vision. Writers worked to form teleological accounts of American art, creating theories of historical development and trying to identify where the United States stood within those frameworks. They also began to consider economic and sociological approaches to American art that presage current scholarly methodologies. Most important, questions of European influence and native subjects continued to loom large.

As the most notable critics of the Centennial Exhibition, Earl Shinn and Clarence Cook might have been expected to produce American art histories in the years following. However, both proved disappointing in their post-Centennial writings. In 1877 Shinn published a handsome but insubstantial collection of commentary on beautiful objects in Fairmount Park entitled *The Art Gallery of the Exhibition*. He broadened his scope, but not his depth, for similar picture books such as *The Art Treasures of America* in 1880 and *Art Triumphs of the Nineteenth Century* in 1882.

Clarence Cook fell short as well, but not for lack of trying. After using the Centennial Exhibition as an excuse to write a series of five articles about the beginnings of American art, he assessed recent developments in an article entitled "Art in America in

1883.” He called 1878 “the year of grace,” marked by the first exhibition of the Society of American Artists and the return home of several painters from France and Munich, such as Chase, Duveneck, Saint-Gaudens, Shirlaw, and Weir. He elaborated in his characteristically acrid tone that 1878 was “the first answer American artists had made to the strivings of heart excited by the Centennial Exhibition, where a picked collection of American pictures was seen for the first time in our own country side by side with pictures from the countries of the Old World, and the jejune condition of our art as a whole made thereby uncomfortably manifest.” He reflected on those halcyon days with the “new men” whose “dash and unexpectedness made the Academy seem tame, and we heard all this tameness summed up in the newly invented stigma, ‘the Hudson River School’ . . . and in truth, it was time for the Hudson River School to at least begin to die.” With this retrospective tone Cook indeed pronounced it dead, though its many still-living practitioners might have disagreed. He may have remembered the landscapes in Memorial Hall’s retrospective Central Gallery West when he declared of the movement, “it has a historical value, and specimens of it deserve to be collected in the museum of the future.”⁵⁴

Five years later Cook published the three-volume *Art and Artists of Our Time*. Approximately one third of the final installment addresses American art. Each new national section starts with a synopsis of its early history, and Cook began his explication of American art with the oft-quoted pronouncement that “The history of Art in America, from the earliest time to the present, is little more than a reflection of the art of different countries of Europe.” Cook demonstrated a surprising willingness to discuss artists that he didn’t like; his uncharacteristic mellowness acknowledged a desire for the complete

⁵⁴ Clarence Cook, “Art in America in 1883,” *The Princeton Review* 59 (May 1883): 311-2.

canon that he had hoped to find at Fairmount Park. He wrote that Smibert's work was "not of a very high quality...but he paved the way for others," and that "whatever we may think of Cole's work today, it no doubt rendered an important service at the time in keeping alive an interest in the imaginative, the poetically suggestive side of landscape painting." Of course he included expatriates readily, even Julius L. Stewart, though he "has lived so long in Paris that he is hardly known at home." In his last few pages he dashed through a handful of landscapists including the artists he had already relegated to history a few years ago, such as Church, Durand, and Kensett (Bierstadt, for whatever reason, was conspicuously absent). He ended by welcoming a new group of landscape painters including Charles Davis, Alexander Harrison, John Twachtman, and Wyant, who brought the "poetic interpretation" that he considered "from the first the one thing most lacking in the art of our Americans."⁵⁵

This sentiment represented his rather abrupt ending after a bewildering string of biographies full of quirky, insider anecdotes that are not connected by any narrative thread. As in other accounts, Cook's biographies grew much shorter when he came to such living artists as George Inness, Abbott Thayer, and Elihu Vedder. To add to the confusion, illustrations were scattered through the book in an entirely random fashion. A reproduction of Mount's *The Painter's Triumph* (Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts) appears in the midst of William Morris Hunt's biography, and a sketch for Hunt's *Anahita, Persian Goddess of the Moon and Night* is placed on a page containing Charles Willson Peale's life story. Cook's earlier interest and his fearless, decisive pen should have fitted him to write an insightful history of American art, but unfortunately he did not

⁵⁵ Cook, *Art and Artists of Our Time*, vol. 3 (New York: S. Hess, 1888), 151-2, 290-9.

develop the unifying narrative that was needed to transform a confused collection of biographies into a coherent history.

Though Cook and Shinn fell short in their attempts at an American art history, others took up the task, and more successful efforts were quick in coming. In May of 1877 Allen Thorndike Rice, the newly-minted editor of the *North American Review*, wrote an article entitled “The Progress of Painting in America.” He brought to his task a gusto and brashness that could only come with the innocent confidence of a non-expert, but he produced a surprisingly well-crafted account that addressed both foreign influences and nationalist concerns. He took a distinctly sociological and market-driven approach, observing in the public “not only a large sympathy with, but a growing interest in, the progress of the arts, and especially pictorial art.” He connected this directly to the Centennial art exhibition, describing the “sea of upturned faces which might there be seen intent on the paintings that lined the walls.” He identified three periods of American art, and he began by discussing the Puritan suspicion of art that created difficulties for early painters. He proceeded to weave the early colonial and federal figures of John Watson, John Smibert, Benjamin West, John Singleton Copley, Washington Allston (“the first colorist”), and Gilbert Stuart (“the first portrait painter”) into a story centered around the problems of the era’s lack of resources and scarce patronage. He characterized this first period by its reliance on English technique, enlivened with an American “spirit of originality and independence.”⁵⁶

He moved on to the landscape school, which was spurred by a “demand for home scenes,” led by Doughty, and punctuated by the works of Frederic Church, Thomas Cole,

⁵⁶ “The Editor,” “The Progress of Painting in America,” *North American Review* 124 (May 1877): 451, 454-5, 458.

Samuel Colman, Sanford R. Gifford, George Inness, John F. Kensett, and Worthington Whittredge. He elaborated on economic factors in this “second period,” explaining that the great fortunes made after the Civil War created a demand for pictures, so consequently a supply appeared, of however dubious quality. He observed that as a result, “paintings were turned out by the yard, good, bad, and indifferent, no matter what; but aesthetics had little to do in the selection,” as “painters were urged to turn out bad imitations and superficial reproductions of foreign and especially French schools.” Coming up to the present time, he saw the dawn of a new period, declaring “At the present moment, there are signs that indicate a new departure in American art” and adding that “we are in the midst of a renaissance which began with our school of landscape-painting, was interrupted by our civil war, but is destined, we hope, to resume its progress not only in landscape but in figure painting, till America shall not shrink from competition with the older schools of older countries.”⁵⁷

Given the secondary role that sculpture played in the American art display, it may seem surprising that the first book-length history of American art following the Centennial Exhibition was a history of sculpture, William J. Clark Jr.’s *Great American Sculptures* of 1878.⁵⁸ Modern scholar Barbara Weinberg has commented on Clark’s “great optimism and a notable, if confused, nationalism” that inspired him to declare with a simultaneous exuberance and caution that American sculpture was “second only to the very greatest masters of the art in all time.”⁵⁹

⁵⁷ “The Progress of Painting in America,” 456-9, 463-4.

⁵⁸ Clark was one of very few critics who wrote on the Centennial Exhibition and then went on to publish his own American art narrative. See his remarks on Eakins’ *The Gross Clinic* in chapter two.

⁵⁹ William J. Clark, Jr., *Great American Sculptures* (Philadelphia: Gebbie & Barrie, 1878), 43-4; H. Barbara Weinberg, introduction to Alfred Trumble, *Representative Works of Contemporary American Artists* (New York: Scribner, 1887; reprint, New York: Garland Publishers, 1978), 9.

Clark showed concerns about the importance of European acclaim in his accounts of early sculptors Hiram Powers and Horatio Greenough. He described Powers as the first American sculptor to gain a European reputation, and lamented that Greenough was not so fortunate “at a time when a European reputation was particularly well worth having.” He gave Harriet Hosmer the most thorough study of all, but treated her as a mere curiosity, regaling the reader with tales of her tomboyish nature and her (unchaperoned!) adventures in the West. More important, he discussed such issues as the debate between “realists and idealists” and the split over nature versus technique, both thinly veiled references to the conflict between nativists and expatriates. He devoted a chapter to living artists, discussing them in the careful, neutral fashion that characterizes much of the writing of the time. His exaggerated caution points up the difficulty of diagnosing trends as they were happening, and of discerning the character of contemporary art. Nonetheless, he ventured to praise Henry Kirke Brown, Erastus Dow Palmer, and John Quincy Adams Ward, acknowledging that while artists shouldn’t ignore “old world influence,” these must be credited for being “distinctly American in their culture.”⁶⁰

Clark’s book is particularly notable in his frequent mentions of the Centennial Exhibition as an event of momentous historical importance. He pointed out that Margaret Foley’s fountain in Horticultural Hall and Edmonia Lewis’ *Death of Cleopatra* (figure 2.18) were on display there. He identified it as the effective American debut for Pierce Francis Connolly, William Wetmore Story, and Howard Roberts.⁶¹ His illustrations drew heavily from works displayed in Fairmount Park, including Connolly’s *Ophelia*

⁶⁰ Clark, 45, 51, 111, 134-9.

⁶¹ Clark, 93, 104, 119, 124, 140-1.

(unlocated), Thomas R. Gould's *The West Wind* (figure 4.6), and Roberts' *La Premiere Pose* (figure 1.9).

As the century progressed, a new generation of writers emerged who were often artists themselves and were keenly interested in contemporary developments. Yet, like the artists and critics involved with the Centennial Exhibition, they realized the importance of the nation's past. These seminal histories from writers like S.G.W. Benjamin, Sadakichi Hartmann, and Samuel Isham are marked by their biases in the ongoing debate over foreign influences. It was not until 1907 that Charles H. Caffin's *The Story of American Painting* presented a summation of the developments of the previous decades in an insightful narrative history that articulated a balance between the two camps and their impact on the country's cultural growth.

Some writers published more than one narrative, producing a book and an article. This suggests their difficulty conceptualizing American art in a new way, as some worked up to their histories gradually, beginning with an article, or revised their histories later by following up with an article. One example was S.G.W. Benjamin, a painter, illustrator, diplomat, writer, and critic.⁶² Benjamin's 1880 book *Art in America: A Critical and Historical Sketch* showed a tentative, but increasing acceptance of foreign styles. In the preface he warned that he would not cover painters working abroad as "it was necessary to draw the line somewhere." He strongly favored originality in American art; he praised "our school of landscape art" for showing little foreign influence (though he admitted that that school had come to an end). He believed that "each artist has stamped upon his work the impression of the influences of the people to which he

⁶² John P. Simoni, "Art Critics and Criticism in Nineteenth Century America" (Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1952), 50.

belongs,” and he praised the native power of landscapist Alexander Wyant and sculptor Erastus Dow Palmer. He called for subjects from everyday American life, exhorting his readers that “it is only by copying nature directly under the inspirations of its own age and country, that a school has the slightest chance of immortality,”⁶³ and further admonishing artists working abroad to consider subjects from the everyday life of their home country. He acknowledged the tensions over the “new element,” writing that “it has thrown down the gauntlet to conservatism and conventionalism.”

Benjamin was particularly vexed by the liminal spaces of transition, trying to pinpoint the moment and the reason that one period ends and another begins. He considered American art to be in such a transition:

In arriving at the close of the second period of American painting, we are encouraged by abundant evidences of a healthy activity...while some phases of our art, after a growth of half a century, are passing through a transition period, and new methods or theories are grafting themselves upon the old.⁶⁴

Benjamin credited William Morris Hunt with starting the new period by bringing Parisian techniques to America, calling the painter “the most important promoter of the development of art in America,” in spite of Benjamin’s earlier endorsement of native originality. He named the New York proponents of the new movement, fondly recalling evenings in Munich with Duveneck and Shirlaw, and owning his admiration for Parisian-trained artists Louis Comfort Tiffany and William Sartain. He ended with a chapter on “Present Tendencies in American Art,” in which he admitted to the difficulty of determining when one movement ends and another begins.⁶⁵

⁶³ S.G.W. Benjamin, *Art in America: A Critical and Historical Sketch* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1880), 17-9, 72, 105, 124, 135, 145, 158.

⁶⁴ Benjamin, *Art in America*, 133.

⁶⁵ Benjamin, *Art in America*, preface, 13, 119, 164, 188, 194, 203-7.

The same year Benjamin published an article entitled “Tendencies of Art in America” that began with his theory of artistic development, progressing from imitation of earlier styles, to individuality of style, to an equilibrium of national life with thought, imagination, and the times. He posited five stages, and placed American art in the second stage. He considered American art in 1880 to be in the “imitative” period, which explained the current emphasis on style and technique, but he hoped for continued progress toward a national style: “The time is coming when the nation, settling down to a consciousness of stability...with a homogenous race evolved from the many that have landed on our shores, strong in the full ripeness of maturity...shall be moved by great thoughts and aspire to utter them in the language of art, but in a dialect of its own.”⁶⁶

Seven years later Benjamin addressed history yet again. He continued his struggle to identify the nation’s current historical phase with the article “American Art Since the Centennial.” He identified the Centennial Exhibition as an important impetus to the development of a national school of art, but felt that such a school had not yet arrived, theorizing that “great art must proceed from a great people, and this we are not yet...our national character is yet to come.” He conceded the benefits of foreign study, explaining that “originality in art...consists not so much in beginning to practice art entirely *de novo*, without relation to any other, as in assimilating borrowed suggestions, in recasting old gold and giving it the stamp of a new dynasty.”⁶⁷

In contrast to Benjamin, the writing of Sadakichi Hartmann reflects a growing nationalism, as he aggressively criticized European influences. The eccentric and

⁶⁶ S.G.W. Benjamin, “Tendencies of Art in America,” *The American Art Review* 1 (January 1880): 106-7. In *Art in America*, 187 of the same year, he wrote that instead of the second period, we “have fairly entered the third period of American art,” illustrating his difficulty in characterizing the art of the present day.

⁶⁷ S.G.W. Benjamin, “American Art Since the Centennial,” *The Princeton Review* 4 (July 1887): 15, 18-9, 30.

multitalented Hartmann inhabited the worlds of dance, drama, and art, and in the early twentieth century he wrote on behalf of the emerging Ashcan School and for Alfred Stieglitz's journal *Camera Work*. Hartmann's interest in the American avant-garde lends particular significance to his account of its past in his 1901 book *A History of American Art*. His chapter headings emphasize the development of an American school, with such titles as "American Art Before 1828," "Our Landscape Painters," "The Old School," and "The New School." Hartmann was acutely aware of the complexities of extending his history to the present day. Of the Hudson River School stalwart Jasper Francis Cropsey, who had just died the year before, Hartmann admitted, "I am well aware that his pictures have, of late, been the laughing-stock at the Academy exhibitions," and that "undoubtedly art has changed since Cropsey was elected Academician," but he warned, "I am not so certain whether many of the young men of the 'Society' [of American Artists] will not also be considered Cropseys twenty years hence." His chapter entitled "The Old School" is particularly significant, as Hartmann included living artists. In doing so, the author declared their work irrelevant to the present day and consigned them to history. He called Daniel Huntington, who had fought so fiercely against the predations of the "new men" upon the National Academy, the most successful artist of the early nineteenth century. He added parenthetically that "[Huntington] is still painting to-day, but being a pupil of Morse and Inman, he needs must be associated with the men of that period."⁶⁸

Hartmann's scorn for European training echoes throughout his account. Like Cook, Hartmann discussed well-known artists of the past that he didn't highly esteem,

⁶⁸ Sadakichi Hartmann, *A History of American Art*, vol. 1 (New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1901), 59-60, 149-50.

suggesting his awareness that the canon was set, even if he didn't approve of it. He dismissed Benjamin West, saying that he "had nothing at all in common with the development of American art" as "he left at an early age for England." He was also ambivalent about the early expatriate Allston, who he called "that sublime botcher."⁶⁹

Hartmann counted the years 1876 through 1878 as "red-letter days in the annals of American art history....One event of importance was crowding upon the other." He mentioned the Centennial Exhibition first among these events. He praised Homer and Eakins for effecting "the beginning of a native art." He noted, with palpable disappointment, "the large exodus of students to Parisian and Munich schools" in recent years, and how "its results were just returning to us in the shape of a throng of vigorous, eager, cosmopolitan young painters, all alike disregarding of older American traditions."⁷⁰

In spite of his disapproval, Hartmann quickly discussed a number of expatriate artists of the late nineteenth century, several whom appeared at the Centennial Exhibition, such as George H. Boughton, Bridgman, Toby Rosenthal, and Vedder. He castigated their lack of "Americanness," and wrote of William T. Dannat, Rosenthal, and John J. Shannon that "proving themselves in idea as well as technique the product of a foreign school, and always living abroad with unpardonable insensibility to American art, our nation has lost all claim to them."⁷¹ Hartmann's views were fully in keeping with the nationalist stance of critics at the turn of the century.

Lorado Taft was of a conservative character that is reflected in his writing. He was raised in Chicago and trained at Paris' straight-laced Ecole des Beaux-Arts. He had a

⁶⁹ Hartmann, vol. 1, 15-6, 22, 38.

⁷⁰ Hartmann, vol. 1, 189, 217-8.

⁷¹ Hartmann, vol. 2, 160-2.

successful career as a sculptor and taught at the Art Institute of Chicago and the University of Chicago. Taft's *The History of American Sculpture* of 1903 was billed by its publisher, the Macmillan Company, as the beginning of a series that "brings together for the first time the materials for a history of American Art." Taft divided the book into three sections: "Beginnings," from 1750 to 1850; the "Middle Period," from 1850 to 1876, cryptically characterized by increased commercial activity and "opulence rather than enthusiasm"; and "Contemporary Sculpture," from 1876 to 1903, described as "a new revelation of the beautiful in nature." Taft's account is something of a hybrid, combining narrative and biography, as chapters are broken down by artist. This may be partly due to his dependence on earlier books that follow the "great man" model; he quoted liberally from Dunlap and Tuckerman.⁷²

Over a quarter century later the Centennial Exhibition was still considered an epochal event, as Taft observed:

The change in American sculpture which the Centennial period ushered in was not one of name alone, but of spirit – the working of new influences now became evident. These influences were completing the exchange of a cold, impersonal classicism for an expressive and often picturesque truth, a new idealism...with the Centennial Exposition of 1876 came an artistic quickening such as our country never had known before.⁷³

Taft followed William J. Clark's lead in crediting some sculptors' fame to their representation there, such as P.F. Connolly, Margaret Foley, Edmonia Lewis, Erastus Dow Palmer, and Howard Roberts.⁷⁴

⁷² Lorado Taft, *The History of American Sculpture* (London: The Macmillan Co., 1903; reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1969), v, 10-11, for quotes of Dunlap and Tuckerman see pages 20, 21, 29, 37-9, 52, 62, and 72.

⁷³ Taft, 8-9.

⁷⁴ Taft, 140, 211, 212, 216.

Like other writers, Taft ended with the difficult task of describing the current state of American sculpture. His conclusion was noncommittal, but reflected the desire for an integrated American school that incorporated outside influences, rather than rejecting them: “in this bewildering period of American history elements new, varied, and contradictory are pouring into the national crucible; doubtless the solvent will be adequate to reduce all these to a condition of homogeneity, but no man can say just what the ultimate product will be.”⁷⁵

Samuel Isham’s *The History of American Painting* of 1905 was another of the Macmillan Company’s series that claimed to “bring together for the first time the materials for a history of art.” Like Benjamin, Hartmann, and Taft, Isham was trained as an artist. He was a member of the National Academy of Design and the Society of American Artists; the two organizations had grown more collegial over the years, and in fact became so similar that the Society would be absorbed into the Academy in 1909.

Isham declared his narrative, contextual approach early on, stating that “a history of American painting should have its importance not through its description of isolated men or their works, but a record of the growth of the country in intelligence and culture.”⁷⁶ Isham’s history is widely considered one of the most insightful and forward-looking of the period; Elizabeth Johns called it a forebear of all surveys that followed, organized as it was around institutions and trends, such as centers for training, patronage, technique, and the evolution of taste.⁷⁷ However, Isham showed a strong partiality toward foreign training that slants his account; in fact, he made foreign influence his organizing principle. Isham divided his history into three periods that describe the country’s

⁷⁵ Taft, 537.

⁷⁶ Samuel Isham, *The History of American Painting* (New York: Macmillan, 1905), v, xvii.

⁷⁷ Johns, “Histories of American Art,” 339.

changing relation to Europe: “Colonial,” “Provincial,” and “Cosmopolitan.”⁷⁸ The opening sentence of his first chapter resolutely stated,

The fundamental and mastering fact about American painting is that it is in no way native to America, but is European painting imported, or rather transplanted, to America, and there cultivated and developed; and even that not independently, but with constant reference to the older countries, first one nation or school having a preponderating influence, then another.⁷⁹

Of the Hudson River School, Isham was careful to point out that most had traveled abroad, then acridly observed, “They were patriotic, they boasted themselves to be the first really native school (which was true), and spared an incredulous Europe not one jot of the blazing vermillion of the autumn foliage.” Isham made a virtue of European training, writing of Inness, “he felt instinctively the weakness of the school, and his foreign study and personal genius led him to an ampler, completer art.”⁸⁰ He had some praise for American art in relation to that of Europe, while acknowledging the obstacles its practitioners faced in recent decades:

There was patronage for all, but already a dangerous rivalry had started, and foreign work was brought in to compete with the native product....Against this rising tide of foreign work the native painters struggled manfully, but for a while it was a losing battle....It was only after a generation of struggle and when even second-rate Barbizon pictures had been forced up to prohibitive prices that it became generally admitted that some Innesses might be as good as some Diazes.⁸¹

Isham addressed earlier histories, admiring Dunlap’s interest in accuracy. He had mixed reviews for Tuckerman’s *Book of the Artists*, but realized that Tuckerman “was not an advanced critic. His judgments are the judgments of his time, and many of them have been reversed; but for us it is rather a merit, for he voices a contemporary point of view.”

⁷⁸ Isham, xv.

⁷⁹ Isham, 3.

⁸⁰ Isham, 226-9, 235, 255.

⁸¹ Isham, 360-2.

His perspective on Tuckerman reflected his awareness of the problems inherent in writing about his own era, as he conceded of recent American art, “the perspective is lacking for definitive judgment, and little more can be done than to attempt some generalities on its dominant characteristics and to notice in some way the schools or personalities that have influenced it, without pretending to make accurate or final decisions on their relative importance.”⁸²

The histories written by Benjamin, Hartmann, and Isham reflect evolving attitudes toward European influence, and its effect on the development of a national school. These factors finally came into balance in an account written, ironically, by an English émigré. Charles Caffin came to the United States in 1892 to assist in painting murals for the World’s Columbian Exhibition in Chicago of the following year. By 1897 he began a long and fruitful career as an art critic, serving as art editor for *Harper’s Weekly* and the American supplement of *International Studio*. He wrote for such New York papers as *The Evening Post*, the *Sun*, and the *American*, and contributed to numerous other publications. He is best known to modern scholars as a champion of modernism, but he was also a perceptive historian; his *The Story of American Painting* was published in 1907.⁸³ Perhaps not being an American gave Caffin an extra measure of objectivity that helped him develop his vision of American art. But like other writers, Caffin had to come to his summation gradually.

Caffin wrote several books, and among his earliest efforts was *American Masters of Painting* of 1902. Its subtitle explained his rather modest purpose: “Being Brief

⁸² Isham, 72, 211-2, 397.

⁸³ Peter Hastings Falk, ed., *Who Was Who in American Art, 1564-1975*, vol. 1 A-F (Madison, CT: Soundview Press, 1999), 537. For more on Caffin’s involvement with modernism, see Sandra Lee Underwood, *Charles H. Caffin, A Voice for Modernism, 1854-1918* (Ann Arbor: UMI Research Press, 1983).

Appreciations of Some American Painters.” Caffin eschewed any further explanation and launched into chapters on individual artists, all either living or active in the late nineteenth century, such as Edwin Austin Abbey, George de Forest Brush, Homer, Inness, La Farge, Sargent, Dwight W. Tryon, Whistler, and Alexander Wyant. His approach foreshadows *The Story of American Painting* as he often framed his comments in terms of the old nativist versus expatriate debate, but he seemed to be working toward a resolution. He asserted that at the 1900 Exposition Universelle in Paris Winslow Homer showed Europeans that there existed distinctly American painters “that could not be lightly dismissed as but a reflex of Europe,” and he observed that Tryon’s landscapes “represent the combination of qualities that differentiate American civilization from that of other countries and of past times.”⁸⁴ Caffin ended on a startling note that shows his bent for history; after several chapters on the work of living or recently deceased artists, he ended with a chapter on Gilbert Stuart, a portraitist of the previous century. He explained that “In the story of American art he [Stuart] holds a unique and dignified position,” and called Stuart “the first of American masters of painting” because he was not a follower of others, and in fact played a leading role among his colleagues while in London.⁸⁵ He apotheosized Stuart above the living painters he had discussed because Stuart absorbed his lessons abroad, then, rather than becoming an imitator of foreign styles, developed his own manner that transcended that of his contemporaries. Caffin presented Stuart as the prototype of an artist who integrated nativist and expatriate ideals.

The year after his *American Masters of Painting* Caffin followed up with *American Masters of Sculpture*. Caffin added a few important words to the subtitle that

⁸⁴ Charles H. Caffin, *American Masters of Painting* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1902), 71-2, 167.

⁸⁵ Caffin, *American Masters of Painting*, 185-6, 195.

show his movement toward a historical narrative: “Being Brief Appreciations of Some American Sculptors *and some Phases of Sculpture in America*” (my emphasis). He included an introduction that followed the trajectory of American sculpture from the early nineteenth century classicism inspired by training in Rome and Florence to the “technical perfection” and “elegance of style” that Americans cultivated more recently at the Ecole des Beaux-Arts in Paris.⁸⁶ As before, he organized most of his chapters around living artists, discussing George Grey Barnard, Solon Borglum, Daniel Chester French, Frederick MacMonnies, Saint-Gaudens, and J.Q.A. Ward. However, in his last two chapters he contemplated broader issues, as he discussed “The Decorative Motive” and “The Ideal Motive” in sculpture.

Caffin’s increasing interest in history came to fruition in 1907 with his *The Story of American Painting*. As with his other books, the subtitle states his intention, which for this work was to show “The Evolution of Painting in America from Colonial Times to the Present.” He elaborated in an author’s note how he made his own transition from the biographical histories of earlier years to a narrative approach, while integrating the contested issue of foreign influence:

My aim has been to trace the growth of American Painting from its scanty beginnings in Colonial times up to its abundant harvest in the Present. At first the story is necessarily associated with the efforts of a few individuals. Later, however, as students in increasing numbers seek instruction abroad, it becomes concerned less with individuals than with principles of motives and method. The influence, in turn, of England, Düsseldorf, Munich, and Paris, is discussed, and allusion to individuals is introduced mainly in illustration of the general theme.⁸⁷

⁸⁶ Charles H. Caffin, *American Masters of Sculpture* (New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1903; reprint, New York: Gordon Press, 1980), v-ix.

⁸⁷ Charles H. Caffin, *The Story of American Painting* (New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1907), “Author’s Note,” n.p.

His chapters show a new integration of phases of foreign influence with periods dominated by nationalism. The sequence includes “Colonial and Revolutionary Conditions,” “The Growth of the National Spirit,” “A Native Growth of Landscape Painting,” “Remnants of the English Influence,” and “The Beginning of French Influence: The Barbizon.” In another mark of a fully realized historical narrative, he contextualized artistic developments. At the beginning of each chapter he included a short explanation of the period’s historical and political background in order to “put [artists] back in imagination into the scenes and conditions of which they were a part.” Like other writers, he included the Centennial Exhibition as a crucial historical event, calling it “a memorable landmark in our industrial and artistic development.”⁸⁸

Caffin’s narrative organized the progression of American art according to the qualities that he had admired in Gilbert Stuart a few years ago, as he traced periods of necessary learning from other cultures, to the growth of a distinctive national character, to the assimilation of both forces. He noted of colonial artists that “Wherever in the world painting has flourished, it has done so after a period of development, gradually enriched by the accumulation of local or borrowed traditions, until at length it has blossomed into independent vigor.” Caffin cited the War of 1812 and Ralph Waldo Emerson’s famous essay “The American Scholar,” which declared “we have listened too long to the courtly muses of Europe,” as the beginning of a new intellectual independence that spurred the growth of a national school of landscape painting.⁸⁹

Caffin acknowledged French influence beginning in the mid-nineteenth century, but cautioned that “this, however, is not to be understood as implying that American

⁸⁸ Caffin, *The Story of American Painting*, 44, 159.

⁸⁹ Caffin, *The Story of American Painting*, 1-2, 48.

painting is to-day merely an offshoot of French art, having no character or quality of its own.” He noted the difficulties encountered by expatriates returning from France later in the century, as figure paintings, especially nudes, by Americans sometimes did not sell well. He concluded that this was for the best, since “They headed off any tendency that might have existed to imitate the motives as well as the methods of the foreigner; brought to the surface such individuality as existed in American figure-painters, and set the current of our art in the direction of expressing what is distinctly American.” Most revealing is what Caffin did not include. He devoted an entire chapter to Whistler, and never addressed the question of his Americanness, or lack thereof. In this way he declared that the issue was resolved and no justification was needed.⁹⁰

In his final chapter Caffin presented his conclusions, and he asked the very same questions so hotly contested over thirty years before at the Centennial Exhibition: “Since our art has aligned itself with that of other countries, how does it stand in comparison with theirs? Frequently one hears the question asked in a somewhat different form. Is there yet a distinctly American school of painting; and if so, how does it compare with other schools?” He answered that there were no longer distinct schools anywhere, due to “a free-trade in motives and methods” that he attributed to the modern art movement coming out of Paris. Yet in the same breath as he acknowledged the impact of French art, he was quick to assert a distinctive American character, assuring readers, “it is unquestionably true that the local conditions of race temperament and natural environment do still stamp with a certain general distinction the work of each country.”⁹¹

⁹⁰ Caffin, *The Story of American Painting*, 121, 168, 285.

⁹¹ Caffin, *The Story of American Painting*, 332.

Over the decades following the Centennial Exhibition, writers wrestled with the same issues of American identity that dominated discussions of the exhibition in Fairmount Park. As American art developed and tastes changed over the waning years of the nineteenth century, authors' inclinations swung from Benjamin's increased acceptance of foreign influences, to Isham's fervent embrace of them, to Hartmann's aggressive nationalism. It was not until the early twentieth century that a writer like Caffin could join the two to explain how over time, American artists sometimes benefited from contact with European art, as in the years following the Centennial, but at other periods had captured a unique national spirit, such as that which informed the work of the Hudson River School. Just as critics at the Centennial Exhibition and after called for a truly American art that combined the country's native character with European art's technical sophistication, so their own histories reached an integration of the two forces that had seemed irreconcilable in 1876.

Caffin's summation paved the way for a new understanding of the nation's art, but one of the key conceptual problems of the Centennial Exhibition's American art display remained. Writers still struggled to define contemporary art in America; that is, to bring their histories up to the moment and connect the past with the present. As the modern literary scholar Steven Connor has observed,

Knowledge, it is often claimed, can only be gained and enjoyed about what is in some sense over and done with. The claim to know the contemporary is therefore often seen as a kind of conceptual violence, a fixing of the fluid and formless energies of the urgently (but tenuously) present now into a knowable and speakable form, by fundamental and irrevocable acts of choosing.⁹²

⁹² Steven Connor, *Postmodernist Culture: An Introduction to Theories of the Contemporary* (Oxford, New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989), 3.

The act of selecting the most historically significant from masses of active artists (albeit mostly from those on the East Coast) was made especially perilous since it came in an acknowledged transitional period, a time of tension between older, nativist artists and foreign-trained “new men.” These accounts show an understandable reticence, and a reluctance to plunge into writing history as it was happening. The writers discussed here, both those at the Centennial Exhibition and those working in the years following, studied earlier artists in great depth, then picked up the pace as they moved into more recent times, finally buckling under the weight of their task and resorting to short and factual accounts of living artists, and generally declining to assess their significance.

The dilemma was finally resolved, or perhaps simply avoided, by separating the past from the present. In the years after the Centennial Exhibition a number of new books concentrated solely on contemporary American art. This type of publication included biographies and engraved illustrations of the work of living painters. While not histories of American art, many of these accounts showed the narrative tone and the historical self-consciousness that the Centennial Exhibition inspired, and can be seen as attempts to ensure a place for warring factions in the annals of American art.

Like Benjamin and Caffin, Sylvester Rosa Koehler developed his view of American art in installments. Koehler explored a theory of art history in his 1879 article “The Future of Art.” He considered art as an effort to physically embody the ideal, which was hindered by a lack of unity. He decried artists studying abroad, and like Benjamin, saw the current era as a time of youth, growth, experimentation and preparation, using the then-popular comparison with the early Renaissance. He too looked forward to a national school of art that incorporated meritorious examples from abroad, writing that “although

our efforts are aided by the study of the works of those who have gone before us, we are yet striving for means of expression peculiar to ourselves.”⁹³

Koehler’s article functioned as a preface to his 1886 book *American Art*, in which he addressed the developments of the last ten years. He mentioned the Centennial Exhibition as a signal moment, and he related the story of Chase, Duveneck, and Shirlaw at the 1877 National Academy of Design exhibition as a sort of creation myth for a new period of modern art. He wrote that the previous ten years “revolutionized the technical processes of paintings in a manner which gave to the canvases of American artists an outward attractiveness and a splendor never before seen in them.” The book became a great apologia for expatriates as Koehler asserted that they had proven their technical abilities, and now they must turn to American subjects and cultivate an American art.⁹⁴

George William Sheldon’s *Recent Ideals of American Art* of 1888 is a breathless, self-congratulatory book that reads like the social pages, enumerating where artists had traveled, who had purchased their works, and for how much. It is dominated almost entirely by the work of Paris-trained artists such as Bridgman, Knight, Pearce, and Edwin Lord Weeks. Sheldon defended expatriate art and attempted to place it in a historical context. He explained that American art had improved because of the greater ease of travel to Europe for study, increased patronage, and the importation of great modern European works to serve as examples.⁹⁵ Sheldon also addressed the closely related issue of Americanness, defending expatriates and positioning them as the next development in the country’s art. He wrote that “the American spirit, wherever its activities are displayed, is still American” and “we hail with pleasure the Americans who...are sending home the

⁹³ S.R. Koehler, “The Future of Art,” *The American Art Review* 1 (December 1879): 72-4.

⁹⁴ S.R. Koehler, *American Art* (New York: Cassell and Company, 1886), 1-4, 9, 11-4.

⁹⁵ George William Sheldon, *Recent Ideals of American Art* (New York: Garland Publishing, 1888), 2, 4, 8.

masterpieces which they have painted abroad. These masterpieces are truly American as the most cherished productions of our ‘Hudson River School.’”⁹⁶

Frank T. Robinson’s *Living New England Artists* of 1888 comprises a collection of biographies combining fact and opinion that suggests a personal relationship with the artists described. His prefatory note showed concern for the posterity of his assessments: “The prophecies and authority [in his selection of subjects], if faulty, can be attributed to a love of true effort, and the individual estimate of one who is prompted by his instincts and years of intimacy with artists.”⁹⁷ On balance, his selections were weighted toward artists resident in the United States. Some are reasonably well-remembered, such as J. Appleton Brown, J. Foxcroft Cole, J.J. Enneking, Ignaz M. Gaugengigl, Childe Hassam, and Frederick P. Vinton, and others now languish in obscurity, such as I.H. Caliga, L.D. Eldred, Louis K. Harlow, and D.J. Strain.

Such inconclusive accounts of contemporary developments contributed little to the formation of the canon of the past or the current national school, as they did not have the weight and imprimatur of a historical narrative. In addition, the book form lacked the nimbleness and flexibility to respond quickly to the present moment, and did not reach a wide enough audience to spread the authors’ views. World’s fairs, on the other hand, were intended as surveys of recent art and were covered in newspapers and periodicals nationwide. International expositions over the remainder of the century continued the precedent set by the Centennial Exhibition, functioning as occasions to assess the state of the current American school and discuss the issues it encompassed.

⁹⁶ Sheldon, 145, 38.

⁹⁷ Frank T. Robinson, *Living New England Artists* (Boston: S.E. Cassino, 1888), 10.

World's Fairs: Developing and Debating an American School

At the end of Nathan Appleton's play *The Centennial Movement*, one of the Philadelphian James Everton's daughters is engaged to marry a cosmopolitan American, one will marry an Englishman, and the other is desired by the royalty of Russia, Germany, France, and Italy. Everton decides that his last daughter is too young to marry, and that the group will meet again at the 1878 Paris Exposition, where she will announce her decision.⁹⁸ The scenario is rich with parallels to the situation of the country's art, being "betrothed" to newly-sophisticated cosmopolites, naturally mindful of its English roots, and "courted" by the various influences of the continent, uncertain of which would prevail in the upcoming "marriage." It presents world's fairs as moments of stock-taking and decision. The Centennial Exhibition introduced the world's fair as a commemorative event and an occasion for reflection, and the international character of world's fairs suited them for discussing foreign influences on American art.

Over the rest of the nineteenth century critics used world's fairs as points of departure to assess the state of the American school, and explore questions raised by the 1876 Exhibition. Most fairs restricted foreign displays to recent, rather than historical works. As a result, organizers for the United States contribution to the fairs of 1878, 1889, 1893, and 1900 treated them as occasions to present and debate an officially-sanctioned version of the current American school. Critical accounts reflect a growing security in American skill, along with increased urgency to see native subjects and a national style. As with the histories of art over this period, tracing the development of these discussions provides a barometer of national feeling as it swung between anxiety over the need for increased sophistication, and fear for the loss of American identity.

⁹⁸ Nathan Appleton, *The Centennial Movement* (Boston: Lockwood, Brooks, and Company, 1877), 65.

The importance of these exhibitions is affirmed by repeated power struggles over leadership, selection, arrangement, and the conferring of awards -- all issues determining who would tell the continuing story of American art. The Centennial Exhibition demonstrated the need for a consolidated account of the country's art, as well as the power of the one who forms it, and future bureau chiefs and juries were ever more aggressive in their efforts to shape the representation of a national school. Selection committees also continued to play a decisive role. After the Centennial year, exhibitions overseas were juried by committees in New York and Paris, a clear indication of both cities' triumph as the dual centers of American art.⁹⁹ New York in particular had established its dominance in the Centennial year through its overwhelming presence in Philadelphia, and had even managed to undermine the display in Fairmount Park with its own exhibition. The number of awards to American artists skyrocketed over the last quarter of the nineteenth century. This might be cynically attributed to the organizers' understanding of how to please the judges, or it may be more optimistically viewed as evidence of the national school that was universally desired.

As the next world's fair after the Centennial year, the 1878 Exposition Universelle in Paris assumed a special significance for the United States. The 1876 fair seemed simultaneously remembered and avoided, as some lessons were observed and some mistakes were repeated. The art exhibition was to be contemporary; fair organizers stipulated that contributions should date no earlier than 1867 to show the progress made since the last Paris world's fair. David Maitland Armstrong, a stained-glass artist and

⁹⁹ Naturally the 1893 World's Columbian Exhibition was an exception. As an exhibition on American soil, it called for selection committees in all the major art centers of the country, and returned to the Centennial model of committees for Boston, Philadelphia, New York, and the vaguely defined remainder of the country.

painter who soon became a member of the Society of American Artists, was appointed Commissioner of the American fine arts section. He was assisted by the progressive sculptor Saint-Gaudens. The two, along with C.E. Detmold, a civil engineer who designed the New York Crystal Palace of 1853, functioned as the selection committee for Americans working in Europe. Perhaps remembering the overabundance of objects at the Centennial Exhibition, they were highly selective: of the 129 works they received, less than half were accepted.¹⁰⁰

The Commissioner-General of the Exposition appointed an advisory committee in New York of “public-spirited citizens,” none of whom were artists, to select works there. As with the Centennial Exhibition, selection was rushed. The New York committee was given only two months, which resulted in an exclusive and abbreviated selection process. The group sent letters to a specific list of artists inviting them to submit works, but because of the short notice and the mandate for recent pieces, far fewer responded than was hoped. The *North American Review* reported that collectors “came to the rescue” with eighty pictures for the committee’s consideration. These apparently comprised most of the approximately eighty works sent from New York, so that there was little or no actual “selection” on the part of the committee.¹⁰¹ Since the group was based in New York, it is not surprising that their contribution included only three works from

¹⁰⁰ Richard C. McCormick, “Our Success at Paris in 1878,” *North American Review* 129 (July 1879): 3; Peter Hastings Falk, ed. *Who Was Who in American Art, 1564-1975*, vol. I: A-F (Madison, CT: Soundview Press, 1999), 131; Annette Blaugrund, “Behind the Scenes: The Organization of the American Paintings,” in *Paris 1889: American Artists at the Universal Exposition*, Annette Blaugrund et al. (exh. cat., Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, 1989), 13.

¹⁰¹ McCormick, 3. The members were N.M. Beckwith, Robert G. Dun, Parke Godwin, Robert Gordon, John Taylor Johnston, H.G. Marquand, E.D. Morgan, J.W. Pinchot, John H. Sherwood, and Charles H. Smith.

Philadelphia and five from Boston,¹⁰² consolidating New York's growing hegemony in the "stateside" art world.

Estimates of the total number of American works vary from 105 to 127, with 80 to 87 from the New York Committee and the balance from the Paris committee, so that because of the latter's more rigorous selection, expatriate artists represented only one fifth of the exhibition.¹⁰³ The United States display included such familiar names as Sanford Gifford, Seymour Joseph Guy, Winslow Homer, William Trost Richards, and Worthington Whittredge, but there were also works by such progressive painters as Frederick Dielman, Wyatt Eaton, George Inness, John La Farge, Walter Shirlaw, Alexander Wyant, and J. Alden Weir.¹⁰⁴ The *North American Review* proudly noted that the United States sent twice the number of works to Paris that it had in 1867, but sculptor William Wetmore Story's official report took a more pessimistic tone, comparing the number to Italy's 644 works, England's 726, and France's staggering 2,071 works. Story's bitterness may well be due to the exclusion of his own field of work. He carefully pointed out that sculptors were forbidden to send works due to the lack of time and money.¹⁰⁵ Story, as a commissioner to the exhibition, and Saint-Gaudens, as a member of the Paris selection committee, must have found this galling indeed.

Armstrong and Saint-Gaudens were praised by the Boston *Daily Evening Transcript* for the installation of the exhibition, though some National Academy of Design members accused expatriates of using their influence to secure favorable hanging

¹⁰² "Art and Artists," *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 11 March 1878, 6.

¹⁰³ Blaugrund, 13; "Art and Artists," *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 11 March 1878, 6. Another account reported that only about one-eighth of the space was devoted to the works of American expatriates. See "Art at the Paris Exposition," *New York World*, 16 March 1878, 2.

¹⁰⁴ "American Art at Paris," *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 18 March 1878, 6.

¹⁰⁵ McCormick, 3; William W. Story, "Fine Arts," in *Reports of the United States Commissioners to the Paris Universal Exposition, 1878*, vol. II (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880), 5, 11.

for their paintings, while those of Academicians were skied.¹⁰⁶ Their complaints must have seemed ironic in light of the Academy's "eight foot rule," established the previous year. Academicians correctly discerned that their influence was waning. In 1867 the American contribution to the Paris world's fair was dominated by Hudson River School painters; in 1878 it was weighted toward figural works by French-trained painters.¹⁰⁷ The Boston *Daily Evening Transcript* concentrated its review of the 1878 American art exhibition entirely upon expatriate artists, noting paintings by Centennial Exhibition veterans Bridgman (whose work was in a "place of honor"), Eugene Benson, and Elihu Vedder.¹⁰⁸ More than ten years later the critic Theodore Child recalled that the most important American works were those by foreign-trained artists, particularly noting those above, as well as La Farge and Shirlaw.¹⁰⁹

In spite of the small number of works, Americans fared reasonably well in garnering awards, and all were given to cosmopolitan artists. F.A. Bridgman won a silver medal for his *Funeral of a Mummy* (figure 4.7), S.P.W. Dana was awarded a bronze for his *Solitude* (unlocated), and John La Farge and Walter Shirlaw received honorable mentions for *Paradise Valley, near New York* [sic, *Newport*] (private collection) and *Sheep-shearing in the Bavarian Highlands* (unlocated), respectively.¹¹⁰

Criticism of the 1878 exhibition was mixed. Richard McCormick of the *North American Review* reported that foreign critics generally called it the best display yet from the United States. He himself praised the American exhibition, but objected to its

¹⁰⁶ "Art and Artists," *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 16 May 1878, 6; Bienenstock, 89-90.

¹⁰⁷ Carol Troyen, "Innocents Abroad: American Painters at the 1867 Exposition Universelle, Paris," *The American Art Journal* 16 (Autumn 1984): 22-3.

¹⁰⁸ "The Paris Exposition," *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 2 May 1878, 5.

¹⁰⁹ Theodore Child, "American Artists at the Paris Exposition," *Harper's New Monthly Magazine* 79 (September 1889): 489.

¹¹⁰ McCormick, 3. The only American on the paintings jury was Frank Millet. See Story, 171.

“curious lack of nationality,” writing that American artists were still “too docile pupils of European teachers, and give us little that is decidedly and originally American.”

McCormick was quick to point out the short preparation time; his faint praise and apologetic tone parallel that of many critics at the Centennial Exhibition.¹¹¹ Lucy Hooper of *Appleton’s Journal* brought a similar message to a broad readership, decrying the lack of American subjects.¹¹² Story was quick to agree, pronouncing that “with all the talent here exhibited, there is no nationality of style, purpose, or sentiment. We have no American school.”¹¹³ Expatriate artists’ rising popularity exacerbated troubling questions of national identity that were raised at the Centennial Exhibition, and those questions would be the subject of even more heated debate eleven years later.

As modern scholar Annette Blaugrund has demonstrated, the 1889 Exposition Universelle in Paris marked a new high in the rancor between the nativist and expatriate camps. Like the 1876 world’s fair, the 1889 exhibition was commemorative, celebrating the centennial of the French Revolution. The French organizers elaborated on the retrospective approach that characterized the exhibition in Philadelphia; as the host country they included a “Centennale” retrospective of the last century of their own painting, and they also organized a “Decennale” exhibition of works from the past ten years for all countries.¹¹⁴ It is notable that the French were careful to separate the past from the present. Perhaps they were already aware of the difficulties and political pitfalls of attempting to link the two.

¹¹¹ McCormick, 3-4.

¹¹² Hooper was quoted in “Art and Artists,” *Daily Evening Transcript* (Boston), 25 November 1878, 6.

¹¹³ Story, 108.

¹¹⁴ Paul Greenhalgh, *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World’s Fairs, 1851-1939* (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988), 200.

The position of Commissioner of Fine Arts for the United States went to Rush Christopher Hawkins. The former commander of a Zouave regiment in the Civil War, independently wealthy and well-traveled, a collector of fifteenth-century books and engravings and author of the standard text on such works, Hawkins was the perfect cosmopolitan connoisseur. His appointment was a distinct departure from the practice of artists leading the charge. Hawkins was careful, however, to solicit their participation. He wrote to several artist organizations in the United States including the National Academy of Design, the Society of American Artists, and the Society of American Wood Engravers, asking for their advice on creating a jury for “stateside” works. The resulting jury comprised twelve artists from the Academy and five from the Society. Worthington Whittredge of the Academy, who had so vexed Sartain thirteen years before, was elected President of the jury, and Kenyon Cox of the Society served as secretary. To the Academy’s credit, they judiciously balanced the number of landscape painters with the number of figure painters. As in the 1878 exhibition, New York’s dominance of the stateside contribution was all but complete; the jury included only one artist from Boston and one from Philadelphia. A group of expatriate artists met in Paris in April 1888 and formed a committee of nineteen to judge works created by Americans abroad.¹¹⁵ Over a decade had passed since the rushed and modest American showing in 1878. With increasing numbers of Americans working and training abroad, the 1889 exhibition was a

¹¹⁵ Blaugrund, 14, 17, 21. From the stateside jury, NAD figure painters were J.G. Brown, George Maynard, Frank D. Millet, Walter Shirlaw, and Edgar M. Ward. NAD landscapists were William Hart, H. Bolton Jones, Jervis McEntee, Thomas Moran, and Worthington Whittredge. Thomas Allen represented Boston, and Thomas Hovenden represented Philadelphia. SAA delegates included J. Carroll Beckwith, William A. Coffin, Kenyon Cox, Augustus Saint-Gaudens, and J. Alden Weir. Members of the Paris jury included Paul W. Bartlett, Frederic Bridgman, William T. Dannat, Frank Duveneck, Walter Gay, Alexander Harrison, G.P.A. Healy, George Hitchcock, Henry H. Kitson, D.R. Knight, Gari Melchers, Henry Mosler, C.S. Pearce, Charles Reinhart, John Singer Sargent, Edward Simmons, Julius L. Stewart, Eugene Vail, and Edwin L. Weeks.

chance for them to compete on equal terms with their European colleagues for artistic honors, and in the international art market.

With so much at stake, it is not surprising that the months leading up to the exhibition were rife with complaints and protests from artists and the press.

“Montezuma” of the *Art Amateur* was indignant about the New York committee’s rejection of Bierstadt’s *Last of the Buffalo* (The Corcoran Gallery of Art); later scholars suggested that the committee’s rejection marked the effective end of his career.

“Montezuma’s” haughty tone implied that Bierstadt should be exempt from the scrutiny of juries, as he was already an established member of the American art canon.¹¹⁶ Jury member J.G. Brown responded that the painting was too big and it did not represent Bierstadt at his best. Even more devastating, Brown commented that the exhibition’s aim was to show the advance in American art since 1878, and this work did not. In rejecting Bierstadt’s work, the committee drew a distinct line between the past and the present and attempted to update the American school. Meanwhile, the Paris committee was being roundly criticized for favoring the work of its own members to the exclusion of other Americans working abroad. Blaugrund concluded that the jurors “claimed special privileges,” but did so partly out of a belief that their own work would best represent the country.¹¹⁷ Both committees’ seriousness of purpose shows how important such displays had become throughout the art world.

Even more controversial were Commissioner Hawkins’ efforts to represent his own version of a national school. In his official report, Hawkins called the 1889

¹¹⁶ [Montezuma], “My Notebook,” *The Art Amateur* 20 (April 1889): 99; Linda Ferber, “Albert Bierstadt: The History of a Reputation,” in *Albert Bierstadt: Art and Enterprise*, Nancy K. Anderson and Linda Ferber (exh. cat., Brooklyn Museum, 1990), 62.

¹¹⁷ Blaugrund, 20, 24.

Exposition a moment to take stock of American art as a whole, whether it was entirely present there or not. Hawkins declared, “it is our intention to speak not merely of works exhibited at the Champ de Mars, but rather of the general standing of the American painters whose names are prominently before the public at the time of this universal artistic manifestation.”¹¹⁸ Hawkins’ determination was apparent in his efforts to include the work of George Inness. The artist was gathering his paintings for a solo exhibition of his own, and so declined to submit works to the Exposition. Undaunted, Hawkins borrowed one of the artist’s paintings from a collector. An indignant Inness convinced fellow artist Alexander Wyant not to participate, and Hawkins borrowed a painting from a collector of Wyant’s as well.¹¹⁹ Hawkins explained that his purpose was to secure a proper representation of American artists, and “if any of the artists did not want to be represented, that was their lookout, not his.”¹²⁰

After much hand-wringing, the American fine art display included 572 works, among them 336 paintings and sixteen sculptures. This was a dramatic increase over United States participation in 1878, and second only to the French contribution. It was dominated by foreign-trained artists, as three-quarters of the Americans represented had studied with French masters. Hawkins diplomatically suggested that paintings by expatriate and resident artists be hung in different galleries to allow each jury to arrange its own works.¹²¹ This solution was accepted by both parties for reasons of fairness, but it also graphically demonstrated the deep rift between the two groups, perhaps never more pronounced than at this point.

¹¹⁸ Child, 490.

¹¹⁹ Blaugrund, 19.

¹²⁰ [Montezuma], “My Notebook,” *The Art Amateur* 20 (April 1889): 98.

¹²¹ Blaugrund, 7, 14, 26.

Given the popularity of French art at this time, it is no surprise that criticism ran in favor of the expatriate gallery, accompanied with now-familiar concerns about national identity.¹²² This runs parallel to Benjamin's and Hartmann's histories of American art, which bracketed the fair in 1880 and 1901 respectively. They too emphasize the importance of foreign influences on American art over time. Hawkins realized that separating stateside from expatriate artists caused a comparison that was "disastrous to the American artists resident in America, or classed as such." He praised the works of expatriates Edwin Austin Abbey and Sargent, as well as William T. Dannat's *The Quartette* (figure 4.8), claiming proudly that they could hold their own against any foreign artist.¹²³ "Montezuma" of *The Art Amateur* concurred that the expatriates "absolutely eclipsed" stateside artists.¹²⁴ Harold Frederic was measured in his praise, writing in the *New-York Times*, "the collection as a whole is, I suppose, the best thing that has ever been made of American art – or what is called American art." He explained that expatriates who assimilated foreign styles could only be called American because it was their place of birth.¹²⁵ Even a French writer tempered his praise with concern. Andre Michel noted that the American display included "good recruits for the young American school and everything tells us that we must take it more and more into serious consideration," but "what is a little wanting in this American Exhibition is native painting on native subjects."¹²⁶ The United States claimed an astounding fifty-seven awards and

¹²² Blaugrund, 26-7.

¹²³ Child, 489, 518.

¹²⁴ Montezuma, "My Notebook," *The Art Amateur* 20 (August 1889): 47.

¹²⁵ Harold Frederic, "American Art in Paris," *New York Times*, 16 June 1889, 11.

¹²⁶ Andre Michel in *Journal des Debates*, 29 September 1889; quoted in Rush C. Hawkins, "Report on the Fine Arts," in *Reports of the United States Commissioners to the Universal Exposition of 1889 at Paris* (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1891), 110-1.

twenty-four honorable mentions, so that almost half of the 189 participants were recognized. As might be expected, most of the honorees were expatriates.¹²⁷

The 1893 World's Columbian Exhibition was the first world's fair on United States soil since the Centennial Exhibition. Organizers paid close attention to the successes and failures of 1876, and the progress made since. One writer commented that "American art, in every department, was given a new impetus by the Centennial Exhibition of 1876, and it will be a special aim to show the extent of the advancement made in American art work during the past sixteen years."¹²⁸

In contrast to the Centennial Exhibition, the organizers conducted a careful two-year search for a Chief of the Department of Fine Arts and appointed Halsey Ives, director of the St. Louis Museum and School of Fine Arts, a full two years before the exhibition opening. Ives in turn appointed as his assistants the art critic Charles Kurtz and a reluctant Sarah Hallowell, who was probably still stinging from being rejected for the department chief position.¹²⁹ The American Fine Arts department consisted of the same three elements as in 1876: an exhibition of contemporary art under the rubric of American art since the Centennial, a retrospective of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century American works, and a display of nineteenth century European art borrowed from American collections. It is notable that the three exhibits were more carefully segregated than they were in Philadelphia; organizers had become aware of the seemingly unbridgeable conceptual chasm between past and present. Much to his credit, in the

¹²⁷ Blaugrund, 27.

¹²⁸ *World's Fairs from London 1851 to Chicago 1893* (Chicago: Midway Publishing Co., 1892), 53.

¹²⁹ Carolyn Kinder Carr, "Prejudice and Pride: Presenting American Art at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition," in *Revisiting the White City: American Art at the 1893 World's Fair*, eds. Carolyn Kinder Carr and George Gurney (exh. cat., National Museum of American Art and National Portrait Gallery, 1993), 68-71. Kurtz took charge of the display of contemporary American works and Hallowell of the loan exhibition of European art, leaving the responsibility for the American retrospective to Ives.

spring of 1892 Ives quashed a proposed art exhibition in New York that would directly compete with the World's Columbian, thus avoiding Sartain's difficulty securing great works because of New York's loan exhibition of 1876.

Modern scholar Carolyn Kinder Carr believes that Ives and Kurtz manipulated the selection process with impunity to align it with their vision for the contemporary art exhibition, and unlike Sartain, they appear to have gone unchallenged. A circular of summer 1891 asked artists to submit a list of paintings and sculpture they wished to exhibit, and explained that some works created since 1876 "which have passed the examination of juries of exhibition of acknowledged standing would be admitted on list, should the jury so determine."¹³⁰ This implied that a list of artworks was already under consideration, and the organizers were only waiting for artists to submit the proper ones. Indeed, Kurtz admitted in his correspondence that he had made a list of what he desired for the exhibition, including works by such Paris artists as Weeks, Gay, Dannat, and Carl Marr. He also made a list of artists to be included and names to add to the New York jury's list, probably not for their consideration, but for their acceptance.

Ives and Kurtz recruited members for selection committees in New York, Philadelphia, and Boston, as well as a "National Committee" for the rest of the United States, and committees for France, Germany, and Italy. While in 1876 Sartain eschewed participation in the selection process, in 1893 Kurtz was closely involved. Of 1,480 paintings submitted, six hundred were accepted, or about forty percent. Of those, 281 were "on list," presumably from Kurtz's predetermined roster.¹³¹ Kurtz anticipated

¹³⁰ *Information for Exhibitors and Others Interested In the Department of Fine Arts of the World's Columbian Exposition. Circular No. 2* (Chicago: Globe Lithographing and Printing Co., n.d. [1891]). Library of Congress, Paul Wayland Bartlett Papers, Box 31; quoted in Carr, 71.

¹³¹ Carr, 72, 85-6.

complaints about the selection from such older artists as William H. Beard, Bierstadt, James M. and William Hart, Enoch Wood Perry, Thomas W. Wood, and “the rest of that pre-historic crowd” -- an interesting choice of words.¹³² Perhaps he thought their work was better suited to the retrospective exhibition, in spite of the fact that the artists continued to draw breath. He did hear the expected complaints from Wood, then President of the National Academy of Design, that artists should have determined the composition of the committees, and that the New York committee was dominated by members of the Society of American Artists. The juries in other cities were similarly selective, perhaps remembering complaints about the Centennial Exhibition. Boston accepted about half the works submitted, Philadelphia a little more than a fifth, and the national jury admitted only one hundred works out of 547 submitted, citing their standards of quality against vociferous complaints in the press.¹³³

Kurtz and Ives accepted many works long after the selection was completed. They instructed all the juries to rank their choices with a 1, 2 or 3 priority for hanging, effectively allowing the two to further cull the works if space was limited. In addition, Kurtz arranged the exhibition alone, with no hanging committee.¹³⁴ It is quite remarkable that he could exercise such control over the makeup of the exhibition unquestioned; perhaps he was more subtle or more politically adept than Sartain had been. In any case, the version of American art presented at the World’s Columbian Exhibition was largely his, and given the scholarly attention paid to the exhibition, it has proven to be an enduring one.

¹³² C.M. Kurtz to Mrs. C.M. Kurtz, 19, 23 January 1893, Charles Kurtz Papers, Archives of American Art.

¹³³ Carr, 75-6, 86, 88-90. The members of the New York committee were William Merritt Chase, R. Swain Gifford, Eastman Johnson, Hugh Bolton Jones, Frank Millet, Augustus Saint-Gaudens, and J.Q.A. Ward.

¹³⁴ Carr, 80-1, 93, 95.

Unlike the 1889 Paris exhibition, pictures by expatriates were hung together with those of resident artists, but questions of comparison lingered. William Coffin suggested that “grouping would have shown us better...how the work by American artists at home compares with that by those abroad – a question in which all who are following the development of an art atmosphere in New York are keenly interested.” Sargent and Homer “carried off the honors of the exhibition.” As emblematic examples of the opposing schools, critics often contrasted the two, comparing Homer’s short-lived stint at the National Academy of Design and his intense and very personal style, demonstrated in his *The Return from the Hunt* (figure 4.9), with Sargent’s cosmopolitan life, easy bravura technique, and Parisian training as evidenced in his *Mother and Child* (figure 4.10).¹³⁵

By the time of the World’s Columbian Exhibition, the terms of the debate had changed. At this point many artists combined study abroad and at home, so it was no longer feasible to group them by their training. Instead, critics looked to where artists resided once their study was complete. William Coffin’s assessment of the 1893 display juxtaposed resident artists and with those living abroad, though most members of both groups had some training in Europe. Critics had accepted the virtues of foreign training, and turned their focus from where artists studied to where they worked and derived their subjects. Questions of current location, both of artists and their subjects, now defined national character.

Most critical assessments of the World’s Columbian Exhibition took the 1876 fair as a touchstone, focusing on the progress made since then. Writers credited the Society of American Artists and the lessons learned from study abroad, while claiming the triumph

¹³⁵ William A. Coffin, “The Columbian Exposition -- II. Fine Arts: The United States Section,” *The Nation* 57 (10 August 1893): 97-8; William A. Coffin, “The Columbian Exposition – III. Fine Arts: Pictures by American Artists – Sculptural and Pictorial Decoration,” *The Nation* 57 (17 August 1893): 115.

of American art over French art.¹³⁶ An 1893 article in the *New York Times* assured readers that the United States display “demands and will repay careful and searching study,” and concluded that with regard to French influences, “America has its own glass and drinks from it.” A writer for the *New-York Daily Tribune* concurred in a review whose subheadings included “The American School and its Brightest Ornaments,” and “What We Owe and Do Not Owe to France.” He acknowledged the influence of French training, but insisted that “our art exhibit at Chicago is still fine and still American. How fine and how national it is is surprising.”¹³⁷ Most important, the *New-York Times* recognized the value of the display as a representation of the current American school. The writer responded to anticipated objections that viewers have seen all these works at various exhibitions before, that “heretofore they have been seen piecemeal...they have not been the representative body of American art.”¹³⁸

Ironically, officials of the World’s Columbian Exhibition adopted an “American system” of awards similar to that of the Centennial Exhibition, which provoked familiar controversy among artists. They vehemently protested being evaluated by only one juror and being awarded only one type of medal with no differentiation of rank. As a result, many prominent artists withdrew their works from judging. This rendered the awards irrelevant, as they did not accurately reflect even the works presented at the Exhibition, let alone the state of American art as a whole.

The 1900 Exposition Universelle in Paris saw a shift in sentiment away from French-influenced art and toward a distinctively American art, as can also be seen in

¹³⁶ Carr, 99; Linda Jones Docherty, “A Search for Identity: American Art Criticism and the Concept of the “Native School” (Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1985), 189.

¹³⁷ “Art at the World’s Fair,” *New-York Daily Tribune* 19 June 1893, 5.

¹³⁸ E.S.C., “Art at Chicago,” *New-York Times*, 23 June 1893, 9.

Isham's *The History of American Painting* of a few years later. Criticism of expatriates took an increasingly aggressive tone, as nationalistic and perhaps even imperialistic ambitions presaged a return to the nativist ideals under discussion at the Centennial Exhibition.

Two years previous the National Academy of Design, the Society of American Artists, the American Watercolor Society, and the Society of Mural Painters met to preemptively recommend a candidate for Director of the Department of Fine Arts to the United States Commissioner. Their choice was John Britton Cauldwell, an independently wealthy "amateur" who had studied painting and belonged to several associations that promoted and included artists, such as the Century, University, and Union League Clubs.¹³⁹ The exposition organizers mandated that contributions date from May 1, 1889, the opening of the last Paris Universal Exposition.¹⁴⁰

Cauldwell convened several juries, including separate panels for paintings and sculpture in New York and Paris, but his structure was far from a repeat of 1889, when expatriate artists had dominated. He noticed that in 1889 most of the works contributed to the United States section were by expatriates and were criticized for being merely reflections of French art. His aim for the 1900 exhibition was to "place before the world...a collection of American art that could not justly be characterized in like manner."¹⁴¹ In 1889 critics had placed a premium on where artists worked and derived their subjects, and Cauldwell continued this emphasis. For the 1900 exhibition he

¹³⁹ Diane P. Fischer, "Constructing the 'American School' of 1900," in *Paris 1900: The "American School" at the Universal Exposition*, ed. Diane P. Fischer (exh. cat., The Montclair Art Museum, 2000), 5.

¹⁴⁰ John B. Cauldwell, "Report of the Department of Fine Arts, Group II," in *Report of the Commissioner-General for the United States to the International Universal Exposition, Paris, 1900*, vol. II (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1901), 528.

¹⁴¹ Cauldwell, 512-3, 530-41. Cauldwell established a paintings jury for the East Coast, a "western" paintings jury that convened in Chicago, a "national" jury for sculpture, and juries for expatriate paintings and sculpture which met in Paris.

required that seventy percent of the paintings had to have been created in the United States. He further favored resident artists by allowing them to display up to three paintings, whereas expatriates were at first limited to two, to prevent their large “Salon machines” from dominating the exhibition.¹⁴²

The United States exhibition was installed by three resident artists and three expatriates, and their works were hung together. Cauldwell’s requirements assured that there would be a larger quantity of paintings by resident artists, but as expected, the expatriate paintings were of greater size, so the overall installation seemed balanced -- though artists did not agree.¹⁴³ Royal Cortissoz reported hearing stories about conflicts between the members of the Hanging Committees from New York and Paris.¹⁴⁴ Resident artists, still bitter about the 1889 exhibition, gloated over their triumphs in the selection, while expatriates cried foul.¹⁴⁵

The American fine art exhibition included 265 works, less than in previous years due to a small allocation of space by French authorities. Cauldwell was successful in increasing the representation of American subjects. The most obvious change from the 1889 Exposition Universelle was the relative absence of foreign scenes, while American landscapes abounded, particularly by such resident American tonalists as Inness (figure 4.11), Martin, and Wyant. Figure painting nonetheless maintained a strong presence through abundant images of pure and genteel women, sometimes with healthy, cherubic children, in the secularized guises of the American Madonna or the American virgin, as

¹⁴² Fischer, 5. The committees strove to realize their vision of the American school by appointing a subcommittee to solicit particular works that had not been voluntarily submitted. Cauldwell called this feature of the exhibition, grouped under the rubric, “Specially Solicited Works,” “of the greatest importance.” See Cauldwell, 518.

¹⁴³ Fischer, 20-1, 193. The Painting Installation Committee included Charles C. Curran, Walter Gay, Francis David Millet, Walter MacEwen, Charles Sprague Pearce, and Henry B. Snell.

¹⁴⁴ “American Art in Paris,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 22 July 1900, II, 1.

¹⁴⁵ Fischer, 8.

in Abbott Thayer's *Virgin Enthroned* (figure 4.12). Seventy works of sculpture included the cowboys and Indians of Cyrus Dallin and Hermon Atkins McNeil, the animals of A. Phimister Proctor, and the Americanized Beaux-Arts style of Daniel Chester French and Augustus Saint-Gaudens, whose plaster models of *General Sherman* and the *Shaw Memorial* were prominently displayed.¹⁴⁶

Once again, criticism turned to stocktaking and assessing the health of the American school. A writer for the *New-York Daily Tribune* enthused, "that we have a school of our own is perhaps more obvious here than it has been at home since the Chicago Fair. The characteristic American seems more than ever an American when contrasted with Europeans after the manner permitted by nothing so well as by a huge international exhibition." The critic spoke of artists who "belong to America" like Homer, Inness, Martin, and Wyant, as opposed to those that "belong to France." He attempted to pinpoint Americanness with such vague descriptors as "an unusual measure of freshness and sincerity" and "the impression of general vitality and variety." He showed more certainty in condemning Americans who surrendered to the French school and "exchanged their birthright for a mess of pottage," calling them "shallow tricksters who have their day in the Salon and then are considered no more."¹⁴⁷

Ellis T. Clarke was just as vehement in his article of that year entitled "Alien Element in American Art." He criticized Americans abroad who could not resist the dominating influence of their masters and he called expatriation "a mistake, both as regards the future of the individual artist and as regards the future of American art." Clarke denounced Sargent, Whistler and several other medal winners as "self-confessed

¹⁴⁶ Greenhalgh, 215; Fischer, 6, 13, 26, 29, 47, 74.

¹⁴⁷ "American Art in Paris," *New-York Daily Tribune*, 22 July 1900, II, 1.

exiles” and called for American subjects, praising J.G. Brown’s rather retardataire *Heels Over Head* (figure 4.13) and Childe Hassam’s *A Snowy Day on Fifth Avenue* (Carnegie Museum of Art). But he showed signs of optimism as well. He called the United States display “a magnificent witness of American talent, and a prophecy of the position America will soon take in the world’s art,” though he maintained “there remains the depressing fact that its works in the main are not national, do not exemplify the American spirit or reflect American life.”¹⁴⁸

Cauldwell too extolled resident artists. In his official report he denigrated “the work of painters who have made Paris their home and who are out of touch with the character and sentiment of their own country.” Cauldwell announced that “American art has to a great degree emancipated itself from foreign trammels and entered upon a career of its own, expressing American thought and reflecting American nature,” and proudly quoted M. Benedite, Director of the Luxembourg Museum, who discerned in the United States display “a strong movement... which no doubt marks the beginning of a really national school.”¹⁴⁹ Cauldwell’s carefully engineered take on American art was effective, as the jury awarded Americans 114 medals, more than any country except France. Resident American artists won over two-thirds of the awards.¹⁵⁰

In spite of the distinctions that artists and critics made between artists working at home and abroad, the definition of an “American artist” and “American art” was slowly expanding to embrace both groups. When John Singer Sargent’s portraits at the Exposition Universelle won a grand prize, he was gladly considered a credit to the United States, despite his career abroad. Whistler, another lifelong expatriate, won a grand prize

¹⁴⁸ Ellis T. Clarke, “Alien Element in American Art,” *Brush and Pencil* 7 (October 1900): 35-9.

¹⁴⁹ Cauldwell, 512-4, 551.

¹⁵⁰ Fischer, 91.

as well, and exhibited in the American section. The British registered a protest against Abbey, Mark Fisher, Francis Millet, and Sargent for their inclusion in the United States section, and officials secured statements from each one affirming their wish to exhibit as an American citizen.¹⁵¹ Even the critic for the *New-York Daily Tribune* who denigrated expatriates who “belonged” to France was quick to claim Sargent and Whistler, asserting belligerently that if their works “are not superficially American, at least they have nothing to identify them with any other school. They are original works of genius, their authors are Americans, they belong to us, and there’s an end to it.”¹⁵² This shift foreshadowed Caffin’s broader view of American art and artists that brought together “borrowed” styles with a national spirit.

World’s fairs became an effective vehicle for examining the current state of the hoped-for American school, while the American canon of the past proved best studied by writers who could draw at will upon whatever artists and artworks the author wished. Both were increasingly individualized expressions, as authors of histories and organizers of world’s fair displays became aware of their power to shape American art’s past and present, and were increasingly eager to add their own voices to the conversation on the nation’s cultural development.

The Spoils of Cultural Authority

As historian John Higham observed, “Historians interpret the past most readily in the light of the concerns uppermost in their present.”¹⁵³ Those who were able to dictate the canon over time, whether artists or critics, had the privilege of choosing the criteria and forming the dialogue that defined it. Sartain and Whittredge recognized this when

¹⁵¹ Fischer, 6-7, 22-5.

¹⁵² “American Art in Paris,” *New-York Daily Tribune*, 22 July 1900, II, 1.

¹⁵³ Higham, *Writing American History*, 116.

each fought to present his own vision of American art at Fairmount Park. Among critics, Cook and Shinn used the United States art display as a point of reference to argue for their own views. They laid the foundation for writers like Benjamin, Isham, and Hartmann, and for world's fair organizers such as Hawkins, Ives, and Cauldwell to shape new narratives of American art. Their accounts were buffeted by the prevailing winds of their time, but they came ever closer to capturing the character of nation's artistic development -- an ideal that Caffin realized. All were flawed, complex figures with personal agendas that limited their ability to see clearly the tides of history -- a shortcoming that most people share. Indeed, just as the "great man" model of writing history with its heroes and villains became obsolete, new histories were being developed not by "great" men, but by ordinary people with a vision and a determination to share it. In spite of their imperfections, their collective efforts advanced toward a new way of perceiving and conveying history.

It is no surprise that discussions of American art at world's fairs and in the histories art following the Centennial Exhibition centered on questions of Americanness and foreign influence. The Exhibition's legacy is most apparent in these discussions, as artists, critics, writers, and a new class of curators organizing world's fairs wrestled to reconcile geography with identity, and past with present. From these debates arose a call to incorporate foreign influences into a distinctly national art that sprang from American subjects. This call, repeated with rising voices as the century progressed, reflected the same sense of nationalism and consolidation that could be seen throughout the United States as the country was transformed from a loose conglomeration of isolated cities and states, barely holding together after the Civil War, to a nation united not merely by bonds

of commerce and identity, but by the awareness of a shared history. This growing nationalism was defined in historical terms, prompted by the Centennial “discovery” of the American past.¹⁵⁴

The integration of foreign influences into history is even predicted in Nathan Appleton’s play *The Centennial Movement*. The play centers on the Philadelphia merchant James Everton and his resistance to the advances of foreign suitors on his daughters. In the beginning Everton is staunchly opposed to “cosmopolitans” who follow the ways of Europe. However, it is later revealed that Everton himself is not immune to such influences, and is perhaps even defined by them, as he spent many years in Paris. By the end of the play Everton has capitulated, giving his blessing to his daughters and their marriages, saying “As I have so often heard at the end of a French play, ‘Soyez heureux, mes enfants, soyez heureux.’”¹⁵⁵

At the turn of the century the questions raised at the Centennial Exhibition were still under discussion, and would only be more hotly debated as European modernism loomed on the horizon. The terms of the conversation continued to evolve, as did the disputants who carried on the debate and shaped the canon. As the twentieth century progressed, Sadakichi Hartmann recognized a shift in cultural authority that signaled a new period in the interpretation of the nation’s art history. In the 1934 version of his book *A History of American Art* he recognized that world’s fairs were once important, but were no longer. Private art collections had been dispersed and made their way into art

¹⁵⁴ Richard Guy Wilson, *The American Renaissance, 1876-1917* (exh. cat., The Brooklyn Museum, 1979), 28. This movement toward consolidation and integration was evident even in the seemingly polar ideals of the Society of American Artists, which emphasized the figure subjects that were linked to foreign schools; and the National Academy of Design, which was strongly associated with landscape painting. Each made a conciliatory move toward the center, as in 1883 the Academy founded the Clarke prize for figure painting by a young artist, and the Society similarly established the Webb Prize of \$300 for the best landscape painting by an artist under 45 years old. See Docherty, “A Search for Identity,” 106-7.

¹⁵⁵ Appleton, 59.

museums, which had grown considerably in size and holdings. Hartmann passed the torch of cultural authority from critics, with their independent writings and their commentary on world's fairs, on to "the true custodians of art tradition...the art museums."¹⁵⁶

If history is written by the victors, then presenting the American art display at the Centennial Exhibition as a struggle for cultural authority naturally begs the question of "who won." With the benefit of hindsight we know that the European-trained "new men" were beginning their ascendancy, and that their influence would dominate American art for decades to come, though the Hudson River School's ideal of a national style and native subjects would remain a persistent strain in art world dialogue. The development of the American canon and the American school is a continuous exchange, even a game, with a constantly changing roster of players that shifts with the tides of the reigning cultural authority. Literary critic Frank Kermode playfully asserts of the canon, "that the conversation, the game, must go on, I have no doubt at all, for it is the means by which the primary objects of my own attention have to be brought to the attention of another generation."¹⁵⁷ In this contest the game is never over, so there can be no winner. The best hope is for a collegial and creative tension among schools of thought, as individuals and institutions continue to ponder questions of influence, tastemaking, and American identity. Indeed, as Wanda Corn asserted in her 1988 article on the state of American art scholarship, "controversy is a mark of health and accomplishment."¹⁵⁸ This view was perhaps most eloquently expressed in the correspondence on canon-building between the

¹⁵⁶ Hartmann, 284-5.

¹⁵⁷ Frank Kermode, *Forms of Attention* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985), 88.

¹⁵⁸ Wanda Corn, "Coming of Age: Historical Scholarship in American Art," *Art Bulletin* 70 (June 1988): 188.

art historian E.H. Gombrich and the novelist Quentin Bell. Bell ended the exchange as follows:

A canon, taken in the sense of “the ark of the covenant” is too rigid, too absolute a structure to be accommodated to the catholicity of human taste. We must have an entity which will serve as a guide, but we cannot altogether accept it. In short, we must sit on the fence....Intellectually a fence does not make a very comfortable seat; but it affords a wonderful view of the scenery. I hope we may meet there.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁹ E.H. Gombrich, *Ideals and Idols: Essays in Values in History and in Art* (Oxford: Phaidon, 1979), 180-1.

Appendix A: Centennial Exhibition, United States Art Department, Paintings and Sculpture (by artist)

Artist names and titles appear as they did in the official catalogue, 14th edition. Some objects noted in contemporary accounts were not listed in the exhibition catalogue; if no catalogue number is noted, the contemporary citation appears in the "Location" field.

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
	Dr. Spaulding	Painting	Phila. Evening Bulletin, 8 July 1876, 2.		n/a
	Elias Howe	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613		n/a
	General R.E. Lee	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613		n/a
	Gottschalk	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613		n/a
	Portrait bust	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 28		945
	Walter Scott	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613		n/a
(Unknown)	Portrait -- Alexander Hamilton	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	E. Newland	1102
Alexander	Portrait (self-portrait)	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	W. Willard	172
Alexander	Madonna	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	James Davis	912
Allston	Head of a Jew	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Boston Athenaeum	939
Allston	Isaac of York -- "Ivanhoe"	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Boston Athenaeum	895
Allston	Landscape	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Family of Mrs. S.A. Eliot	60
Allston	Portrait of himself when young	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West		77
Allston	Rosalie	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	N. Appleton	88
Allston	Spalatro's Vision of the Bloody Hand	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	J.T. Johnston	86
Ames	Portrait -- President Felton	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Harvard University	913
Ames	Portrait -- Daniel Webster	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	B.S. Moulton & Co.	925
Anderson	Animal painting	Painting	Phila. Evening Bulletin, 27 June 1876, 2.		n/a
Anderson	Roumanian Peasant Girl	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	J.J. Milbank	70
Anderson	Scene in Cairo	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	J.J. Milbank	69
Andrews	Little Leonie	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	853
Andrews	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Dr. S.H. Linn	848

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Andrews	E.F. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	W.E. Macalister	861
Andrews	E.F. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Dr. B.J. Bing	857
Andrews	E.F. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	W.T. Carter	970
Andrews	E.F. Portrait -- General Torbert	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10		856
Armstrong	D.M. Column of St. Mark's, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	467
Armstrong	D.M. Twilight on the Harbor	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	181
Audobon	J.J. Canada Otter	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Edward Harris	30
Audubon	J.J. Covey of Blackcock	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Edward Harris	1022
Bacon	Henry The Boston Boys and General Gage, 1775	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42		961
Bailey	J.A. Equestrian statue of Antonio Guzman Blanco, President of	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1215
Bailey	J.W. Spring	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	140
Baker	G.A. Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Walter Hatch	263
Baker	G.A. Portrait -- C.L. Elliott	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	New York Academy of Design	21
Baker	George A. Portrait of a child	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mrs. D.C. Sturgis	146
Baker	Miss M.K. Azaleas	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	911
Baldwin	A.H. Baptistery of St. Mark's, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	421
Bannister	E.W. Under the Oaks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	935
Bartholdi	Proposed Monument to Washington	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 10	L.J. Workum	871
Bartlett	Jennie M. Callas and Amaryllis (two panels)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	983
Beard	J.H. "There's many a slip," etc.	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	M. Knoedler & Co.	1299
Beard	J.H. Out All Night	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	M.B. Dash	427
Beard	J.H. The Attorney and His Clients	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	G.F. Gilman	166
Beard	W.H. Lo! the Poor Indian	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	419
Beard	W.H. March of Silenus	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Buffalo Fine Art Gallery	262
Beeson	Miss E[lla].L. Ophelia	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	31

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Bellows	A.F. Sunday in Devonshire	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	26
Benson	Eugene Afternoon on the Lagoon	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	136
Benson	Eugene Interior of St. Mark's, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	839
Benson	Eugene Interior of St. Mark's, Venice	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mrs. M.L. Dickinson	144
Benson	Eugene San Giorgio, Venice	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	135
Benson	Eugene Sirocco, Venice	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	22
Benson	Eugene The Reverential Anatomist	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	877
Benson	Eugene The Strayed Masquers	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	C.H. Sneff	71
Benton	J. Dean Metal model of Independence Hall	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	E.C. Knight	1250
Bierstadt	A. California Spring	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	973
Bierstadt	A. Mt. Hood, Oregon	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40		1005
Bierstadt	A. The Great Trees, Mariposa Grove, California	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	473
Bierstadt	A. The Settlement of California, Bay of Monterey, 1770	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	207
Bierstadt	A. Western Kansas	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Walter Richmond	488
Bierstadt	A. Yosemite Valley	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	836
Billings	E.T. Portrait -- Wendell Phillips	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	916
Billings	E.T. Wheelwright Shop	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	929
Birch	Thomas Marine	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Thos. Birch	56
Birch	Thomas Perry's Victory on Lake Erie	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Thomas Birch	979
Birch	Thos. Marine	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10		823
Bispham	H.C. The Stampede	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Albert Hayden	406
Blashfield	E.H. Treasure-Trove	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	94
Bloomer	H.B. El Dorado	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	831
Bonfield	W.V. der V. Drifting Snow	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1069
Boott	Eliz. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	910

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Boughton	Going to Seek his Fortune	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Geo. Whitney	457
Boughton	The Pilgrims' Sunday Morning	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	R.L. Stuart	20
Boyle	The Prayer of Judith	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	982
Brackett	Landed	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	900
Brackett	The Last Struggle	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	899
Brackett	The Leap	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	898
Brackett	The Rise	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	897
Brenner	Landscape	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	111
Bricher	Morning at Narragansett	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	J. Suydam	486
Bridgman	Bringing in the Corn	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	A.A. Low	251
Bridgman	Flower of the Harem	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	H.E. Nesmith	170
Bridgman	Kybelian Woman	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Hon. Alex. McCue	103
Bridgman	Nubian Story-Teller	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	S.H. Keep	238
Bridgman	Women on the Nile	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	W.W. Kenyon	471
Brion	Bridal Procession in Alsace	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	M. Knoedler & Co.	791
Briscoe	Breezy Day off Dieppe	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C		158
Briscoe	Wreckers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1041
Bristol	Lake Memphremagog	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	148
Brooks	California Fish	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	A. Bierstadt	494
Broome	Base-Ball Players (Parian)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Ott & Brewer	1172
Brown	Portrait [William J. Clark, Jr.]	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	W.J. Clark, Jr.	240
Brown	Niagara by Moonlight	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	H.N. Barlow	977
Brown	Sunset -- Genoa	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	926
Brown	Venice	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	104
Brown	The East Highlands	Paintings	Annex, Gallery 10		841

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Brown	J.G. Curling Match	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Robert Gordon	95
Brown	J.H. Case of miniatures on ivory	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	133
Brown	W.W. Spurwink River	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	879
Bruerke	G. Columbus Discovering America	Painting	USCC, Reports and Awards, 693	n/a	n/a
Bunner	A.F. Bavarian Landscape	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	11
Cabanel	Alex. Francesca di Rimini	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Mrs. A.E. Kidd	777
Calverley	Bas-relief likeness of Peter Cooper	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K		1230
Calverly	C. Bronze bust of John Brown	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42	Union League Club	983a
Cameron	Miss K[ate]. Happy as a Queen	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	121
Cariss	H.T. Blind-Man's-Buff	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	134
Catlin	George Indian Gallery (126 works)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	n/a	n/a
Champney	Benjamin Artists' Brook, North Conway, N.H.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	892
Champney	Benjamin At Glenora, N.Y.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	928
Champney	Benjamin Old Willows at Manchester, Mass.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	937
Champney	J.W. "Don't Touch!"	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mr. Cheney	169
Champney	J.W. "Speak, Sir!"	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	J.L. De Wolf	936
Champney	J.W. "Your Good Health"	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	T. Wiggleworth	132
Champney	J.W. Grandma's Pet	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	T. Wigglesworth	953
Chase	W.M. "Keying Up" -- The Court Jester	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	S.M. Dodd	832
Church	F.E. Chimborazo	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6		440
Clowes	Miss C.M. Cattle at the Brook	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	191
Cobb	Darius Portrait [Cyrus Cobb]	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Cyrus Cobb	959
Cole	J. Foxcroft Coast Scene in Normandy	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	905
Cole	J. Foxcroft Cows Ruminating	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Doll & Richards	888
Cole	J. Foxcroft Pastoral Scene	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Doll & Richards	894

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Cole	J. Foxcroft Twilight, Melrose Highlands	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	J. Sayles	886
Cole	J.G. Portrait -- Commodore D. Turner	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	J.V.P. Turner	964
Cole	Thomas Kenilworth Castle	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	J.T. Johnston	210
Cole	Thomas The Cross and the World, Manhood	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Vincent Colyer	432
Cole	Thomas The Cross and the World, Old Age	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Vincent Colyer	433
Cole	Thomas The Cross and the World, Youth	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Vincent Colyer	431
Cole	Thomas The Mountain Ford	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	J. Taylor Johnston	33
Coleman	C.C. Grand Canal, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	James Bayley	1066
Coleman	C.C. Interior of St. Mark's, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	990
Coleman	C.C. Nuremburg Towers -- fifteenth century	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	H. Sampson	828
Coleman	C.C. Still Life	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	J.H. Warren	851
Coleman	C.C. The Troubador	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Henry Sampson	1056
Coleman	C.C. The Troubador	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Mrs. W. Wilkeson	446
Coleman	C.C. The Young Monk	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	J.H. Coleman	837
Coleman	C.C. Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Mrs. W. Wilkeson	1012
Colman	S. The Merchants of Laghout en route between Tell and the	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	14
Colman	Samuel Twilight on the Western Plains	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Wm. A. Hamilton	463
Colyer	V. Cascade Mountains	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	J.M. Stearns	233
Colyer	V. Pueblo -- Indian Village	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	198
Coman	Mrs. C.B. A French Village	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	869
Conarroe	G.W. Ethel	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	29
Connelly	P.F. Diana Transforming Actaeon	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1194
Connelly	P.F. Helen of Troy	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1193
Connelly	P.F. Honor arresting the Triumph of Death	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	141
Connelly	P.F. Horse's head	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1187

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Connelly	P.F. Lady Clare	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1191
Connelly	P.F. Ophelia	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	142
Connelly	P.F. Queen Philippa	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1189
Connelly	P.F. St. Martin Dividing his Cloak	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Mrs. B. Lawrence	1227
Connelly	P.F. The Thread of Life	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1195
Connelly	P.F. Thetis thinking how she may regain the birthright of her	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	New York Museum	1190
Connelly	P.F. Viola	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1196
Cooper	P.F. Madonna -- on ivory	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	133a
Copley	J.S. Portrait -- John Adams	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Harvard University	85
Copley	J.S. Portrait -- Mrs. T. Boylston	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Harvard University	83
Copley	J.S. Portrait -- T. Boylston	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Harvard University	91
Cortazzo	O. Difficult to Rhyme	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	M. Knoedler & Co.	1298
Courbet	Gustave Castle of Chillon, Lake Lemane (1)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	A.H. Reitlinger	808
Courbet	Gustave Castle of Chillon, Lake Lemane (2)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	A.H. Reitlinger	809
Courbet	Gustave The Bather	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	A.H. Reitlinger	810
Courbet	Gustave The Huntsman	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	A.H. Reitlinger	807
Craig	Thos. B. Indian Summer	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1053
Cropsey	J.F. Italy	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	James M. Mills	499
Cropsey	J.F. Old Bonchurch, Isle of Wight	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	39
Cropsey	J.F. Old Mill	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	405
Cusachs	P. Christ in the Sepulchre	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	500
Daniels	G.F. Crown Point and the Narrows, Lake Champlain	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	876
Darrah	Mrs. S.T. Lake Champlain	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	938
Darrah	Mrs. S.T. Sunset	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	821
De Blois	F.B. Licola, Italy	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	949

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
De Blois	F.B. October in Canada	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	T.F. Brooke	887
De Crano	F.F. The Celestial Model	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	120
De Haas	J.H.L. Cattle in the Meadows of Holland	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Myers & Hedian	804
De Haas	M.F.H. Brig hove to for a Pilot	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	483
De Haas	M.F.H. Moonrise and Sunset	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	E.D. Morgan	25
De Luce	P. A Dish for my Lord	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	242
Degolia	Miss Flowers	Painting	New York Herald, 10 April 1876, 5		n/a
DeHaas	M.F.H. Drifted Ashore in a Fog	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	444
Del Sarto	Andrea St. Andrew bearing his Cross/Christ stilling the Tempest	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Mrs. L.G. Franklin	803a
Dix	C. Templeton Capri	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Century Club	227
Dolph	J.H. The Antiquarian	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	2
Dolph	J.H. The Return from Pasture	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	416
Domenichino	Judith	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	G.H. Schneider	776
Du Bois	C.E. Palisades, Hudson River	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	835
Du Bois	C.E. Willows at East Hampton, L.I.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	13
Dubufe E. and Dunlap	Bonheur, Rosa Autumn (Figure by Dubufe, sheep by Rosa Bonheur) Portrait -- Thomas Eddy	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Dr. George Reuling	790
Durand	William Portrait -- Thomas Eddy	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	New York Hospital	1166
Durand	A.B. Brook study	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	474
Durand	A.B. Il Pappagallo	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	112
Durand	A.B. Kaaterskill Clove, Catskill	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	476
Durand	A.B. Portrait -- Gouverneur Kemble	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Gouverneur Kemble	59
Durand	A.B. Studies from nature	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	19
Durer	Albert St. Jerome	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	E.V. Machette	803
Duval	V. Gallery of Apollo, Louvre	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection		801
Eakins	Thomas Portrait -- Dr. Rand	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Dr. Rand	264

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Eakins	Thos. Chess Players	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	49
Eakins	Thos. Portrait [Lady at a Piano]	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1050
Eberhardt	W. Portrait -- Rear-Admiral Winslow, former commander of	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Citizens of Boston, who intend	1026
Elkins	H.R. Shasta, an extinct volcano of North California	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40		1017
Elliott	C.L. Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	E.D. Morgan	153
Elliott	C.L. Portrait -- Dr. Cheesman	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	New York Hospital	255
Elliott	C.L. Portrait -- Ex-Governor Bouck	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	City Hall, New York	854
Elliott	Charles L. The Cavalier	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	F. Carpenter	442
Elwell	D.[Jerome]. Downs near Ostend	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	893
Elwell	D.[Jerome]. Port of Antwerp	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	S.E. Sawyer	906
Enneking	J.E. Moonlight on the Giudecca, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	889
Epp	R. The Young Mother	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	Stroefel & Kirchner	1292
Eppikum	Portrait -- Madame Houssaye	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	C.B. Moore	775
Este	Mary Goddard Iolanthe, King Rene's blind daughter	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1183c
Eyre	M. Dickerson Autumn	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1261
Eyre	M. Dickerson Bust of Dante	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1260
Eyre	M. Dickerson Bust of Michael Angelo	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1258
Eyre	M. Dickerson Genius of the Vatican	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1256
Eyre	M. Dickerson Hebe	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1263
Eyre	M. Dickerson Hercules and Antaeus	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1253
Eyre	M. Dickerson Juno	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1255
Eyre	M. Dickerson Leda	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1251
Eyre	M. Dickerson Psyche	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1257
Eyre	M. Dickerson Rebecca	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1252
Eyre	M. Dickerson Ruth	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1254

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Eyre	M. Dickerson Spring	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1262
Eyre	M. Dickerson Vulcan	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1259
Ezekiel	M. Grace Darling	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 10	L.J. Workum	872
Ezekiel	M. Infant Mercury	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 10	L.J. Workum	874
Ezekiel	M. Sailor Boy	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 10	L.J. Workum	873
Fassett	Mrs. C. Adele Portrait -- Chief-Justice Waite	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1042
Fenn	Harry Old Covenant Gate	Painting	McCabe, Illustrated History, 587		n/a
Fenn	Harry Old Fireplace	Painting	McCabe, Illustrated History, 587		n/a
Fettweis	C.L., Jr. Cast Away	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1227a
Fichel	E. The Naturalist	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	M. Knoedler & Co.	1295
Fillans	Miss W. Medallion portrait	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K		1233
Fillans	Miss W. Portrait bust	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42	Chief-Justice Dixon, of	985
Fitch	J.L. In the Woods	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	117
Flagg	J.B. Portrait -- Commodore Vanderbilt	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	W.H. Vanderbilt	407
Foley	Miss M. Cleopatra	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1201
Foley	Miss M. Jeremiah	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1185
Foley	Miss M. Medallion -- Mrs. T.B. Read	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K		1244
Foley	Miss M. Two medallions of Mary and William Howitt	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1234
Fowler	T.T. Work for the Day is Over	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	971
Freeman	J.E. Study for an Angel	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	C.C. Perkins	903
French	D.C. The Minute-Man, 1775	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 28	Doll & Richards	943
French	D.M. Bust -- J.G. Whittier	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	946
Furness	W.H., Jr. Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	H.H. Furness	42
Furness	W.H., Jr. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	H.H. Furness	993
Furness	W.H., Jr. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	H.H. Furness	1011

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Furness	W.H., Jr. Portrait -- Rev. W.H. Furness	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Rev. W.H. Furness	1013
Galvan	I. Ernest Roses (two panels)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1020
Galvan	Mrs. S.M. Flowers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1016
Galvan	Mrs. S.M. Roses	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	999
Galvan	Mrs. S.M. Roses	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	996
Gardner	Miss E.J. Corinne	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	224
Gardner	Miss E.J. The Fortune-Teller	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1043
Gay	Edward Late Afternoon near Albany	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Dr. S.L. Close	455
Gay	W. Allen Windmills of Delfshaven, Holland	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	149
Gay	Walter Fall Flowers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	909
Gerardin	G. Bouquet	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K		1246
Gerry	S.L. American Tourists	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Miss E.J. Gerry	941
Ghetti	Antonio Monument to a child	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K		1245
Gifford	Miss Bust of Rev. S.J. May	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	452
Gifford	R. Swain Boats at Boulah, on the Nile	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	L. Tiffany	110
Gifford	R. Swain Egyptian Fountain	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	124
Gifford	R. Swain Mosque of Mohammed Ali, Cairo	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	475
Gifford	S.R. Bronx River	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	H.C. Fahnestock	23
Gifford	S.R. Fishing Boats of the Adriatic	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	C.S. Smith	186
Gifford	S.R. Lake Geneva	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Wm. Goddard	73
Gifford	S.R. On the Nile	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	J.J. Nesmith	24
Gifford	S.R. Pallanza, Lago Maggiore	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	M. Southwick	27
Gifford	S.R. San Giorgio, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	R. Butler	461
Gifford	S.R. Santa Maria della Salute, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Mrs. H. Salisbury	408
Gifford	S.R. Sunrise on the Sea-Shore	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Robert Hoe	498

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Gifford	The Golden Horn	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	W.J. Peake	178
Gifford	Tivoli	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	C.H. Luddington	489
Gifford	Twilight in the Adirondacks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	C.H. Luddington	404
Gignoux	Spring	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	T. Messenger	131
Gordon	Inspiration (bas-relief)	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1248b
Gordon	Rosebud (bas-relief)	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1248c
Gould	Water Babies	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 12		817
Gould	The Lily	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 12		819
Gould	The Rose	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 12		818
Gould	The West Wind	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 12	Demas Barnes	816
Graef	Infant Bacchus	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1243
Graef	Model of a monument to Dr. Wales	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K		1239
Graef	Saint Mary	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1240
Graef	The First Step	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1241
Graham	Angle Column of Ducal Palace, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	829
Granberry	Spring Flowers	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	107
Granberry	Autumn Flowers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	424
Gray	The Apple of Discord	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	R. Olyphant	200
Gray	The Model from Cadore	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	E. Mitchell	79
Gray	The Wages of War	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Metropolitan Museum	492
Greene	Ideal Head	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	National Academy of Design,	82
Gregory	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Dr. J. S. Delavan	830
Griffin	Bust of Rev. Dr. Chapin	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6		451
Gudin	Marine	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	A. Bierstadt	779
Gunnison	Portrait -- Captain J.W. Gunnison	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1001

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Guthers	"Ecce Homo"	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40		1006
Guthers	Awakening Spring	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	978
Guy	Evening	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	J.M. Falconer	63
Guy	Solitaire	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	J.M. Falconer	129
Guy	Supplication	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	J.H. Sherwood	193
Hale	Boy Reading	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Mrs. E.E. Hale	921
Hamilton	The Valley of Fountains	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	414
Hamilton	"Break, break, break, On thy cold gray stones, O sea!"	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Earle & Sons	18
Handley	America Honoring her Fallen Brave	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1204
Handley	Autumn Flowers	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1209
Handley	Giotto	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1208
Handley	Spring Crowning herself with Flowers	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1207
Harding	Portrait -- Washington Allston	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	S. Batchelder	934
Harnisch	Bust of William J. Mullen	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	W.W. Mullen	1226
Harnisch	Sketch for a monument to the Prisoner's Friend	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1242
Harnisch	Statue of Wm. J. Mullen	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	W.W. Mullen	1232
Harrison	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Miss Belle Dodd	1046
Hart	Landscape and Cattle	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	J.H. Sherwood	485
Hart	A Summer Memory of Berkshire	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	E.D. Morgan	236
Hart	Keene Valley, Adirondacks	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Rev. F.L. Robbins	145
Hartley	The Young Samaritan	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1249
Haseltine	Captivity	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1200
Haseltine	Cleopatra	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1203
Haseltine	Duke of Leuchtenberg (equestrian statuette)	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	G.H. Schneider	1210
Haseltine	Fortune	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1188

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Haseltine	J.H. Lucia di Lammermoor	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1211
Haseltine	J.H. Lucretia	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1199
Haseltine	J.H. Spring Flowers	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1198
Haseltine	W.S. Natural Arch at Capri	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1040
Haseltine	W.S. Ruins of Roman Theater, Sicily	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	265
Hays	W.J. Bison at Bay	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Mrs. W.J. Hays	441
Heade	M.J. Off the California Coast	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	248
Healy	G.P.A. Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West		1a
Healy	G.P.A. Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C		173
Healy	G.P.A. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1036
Healy	G.P.A. Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C		220
Healy	G.P.A. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	E.B. McCagg	1058
Healy	G.P.A. Portrait -- Ex-President Thiers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10		840
Healy	G.P.A. Portrait -- Hon. E.B. Washburne	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10		822
Healy	G.P.A. Portrait -- Lord Lyons	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10		834
Healy	G.P.A. Portrait -- Princess of Roumania	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	E.B. McCagg	991
Heaton	A.G. Washington as Ambassador at Fort Duquesne	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1062
Henning	H.D.A. Happy Days in the Valley of Nysa	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1183d
Henry	E.L. Morning Call in 1800	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	C.S. Smith	130
Henry	E.L. Old Clock on the Stairs	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	R. Gordon	258
Henry	E.L. Taking a Night-Cap	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	W. O'Brien	429
Herzog	H. Norwegian Waterfall in Hallingdal	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1024
Herzog	H. Sentinel Rock, Yosemite	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	228
Hess	Geo. Bust of Bayard Taylor	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1033
Hess	Geo. Lizzie's Pet	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1091

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Hess	The Water-Lily	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	501
Hetzl	Forest Scene in Pennsylvania	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	179
Hicks	E. Delafield, M.D.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	New York Society for the	456
Hicks	Portrait -- Mrs. MacDaniel	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West		8
Hicks	General Meade	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	232
Hicks	Portrait -- Dr. Gray	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mrs. B. Knower	254
Higgins	Forest Interior, Adirondacks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	M.M. Farrer	880
Hill	Donner Lake	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Hon. L. Stanford	184
Hill	Home of the Eagle	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	John A. Faul	1003
Hill	Yosemite Valley	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1019
Hinekey	End of the Chase	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	902
Holbrook	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	36
Holmes	The Adirondacks from Vermont	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	960
Homer	Snap the Whip	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	J.H. Sherwood	177
Homer	The American Type	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	267
Hubbard	Coming Storm	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	9
Hubbard	Early Autumn	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Judge Benedict	38
Hubbard	Glimpse of the Adirondacks	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	R.M. Olyphant	97
Hunt	The Boot-Black	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	J.H. Wright	923
Hunt	Portrait [Barthold Schlesinger]	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mr. Schlesinger	235
Huntington	Lake George	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	G.N. Stayner	495
Huntington	Lake George	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	D.W. Bishop	477
Huntington	Philosophy and Christian Art	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Robert Hoe	490
Huntington	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Chas. Tracey	438
Huntington	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	34

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Huntington	D. Portrait -- G.T. Trimble	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	New York Hospital	45
Huntington	D. Sowing the Word	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Anson P. Stokes	194
Huntington	D. Titian and Charles V.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	S. Hawk	454
Inman	H. Portrait -- Bishop R.C. Moore	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Trinity Chapel, N.Y.	833
Inman	Henry Hackett as Rip Van Winkle	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Miss C.C. Hackett	239
Irving	J.B. Cardinal Wolsey and his Friends	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	P. Van Volkenburg	261
Irving	J.B. The Bookworm	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	A. McL. Agnew	101
Irving	J.B. The End of the Game	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	J.H. Sherwood	187
Ives	C.B. Nursing the Infant Bacchus	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 14		504
Jacquier	Eli Bust of Shakspeare [sic]	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44		1183e
James	Frederick Interior of a Smoking Car	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	217
Jarvis	J.W. Portrait -- Commodore Macdonough	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	City Hall, New York	1169
Jarvis	J.W. Portrait -- Commodore Perry	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	City Hall, New York	1171a
Jarvis	Melicent Jeannette in her Studio	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	955
Jarvis	Melicent Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	917
John	Joseph The Minstrel	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1071
Johns	C[arence].M. "To Tubal-Cain came many a one./And each one	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	980
Johnson	David Brook study, Orange Co., N.Y.	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	245
Johnson	David Old Man of the Mountain, Franconia Notch, N.H.	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mr. Taft	221
Johnson	David Scenery on the Housatonic	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Mrs. J. Bullard	40
Johnson	David Scenery on the Housatonic	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	L.A. Lanthier	100
Johnson	Eastman Bo-peep	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	H. Richmond	462
Johnson	Eastman Catching the Bee	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Miss Jones	143
Johnson	Eastman Heel-Taps	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	na	48
Johnson	Eastman Milton and his Daughters	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	259

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Johnson	Prisoner of State	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	96
Johnson	Sabbath Morning	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	R.L. Stuart	423
Johnson	The Old Kentucky Home	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	R.L. Stuart	118
Johnson	The Old Stage-Coach	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	George Whitney	195
Johnson	The Wandering Fiddler	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	J.T. Johnston	185
Johnson	What the Sea Says	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	B. Field	72
Johnson	A Thirsty Party	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	108
Johnson	Good Weight	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	G.W. Hollis	422
Jones	The Ferry Inn	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	159
Julio	Gathering the Sugar-Cane	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1004
Kappes	Waiting	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	487
Kappler	Medallion -- Professor Agassiz	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K		1248d
Kaufmann	Admiral Farragut	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40		1009
Kaufmann	Influence of Electricity on Human Culture (ten subjects)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	974
Kayser	The Convalescent	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	Stroofer & Kirchner	1291
Kemys	Coyote and Raven	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	449
Kemys	Panther and Deer	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1029
Kemys	Playing Possum	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	450
Kendricks	Foggy Day at the Beach	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	948
Kensett	Conway Valley, N.H.	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	R.E. Moore	231
Kensett	Lake George	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	M.K. Jessup	458
Kensett	Narragansett Coast	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	R.M. Olyphant	17
Kensett	New Hampshire Scenery	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Century Club	480
Kensett	View near Northampton	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	R.L. Stuart	47
Key	The Golden Gate, San Francisco	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	901

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
King	View in the Tyrol	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1043a
Kneller	Portrait -- Lord Baltimore; presented to the City of	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	Titian R. Peale	1098
Koockert	Autumn	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	Stroofer & Kirchner	1293
Kollock	Early Morning in the Mountains	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	192
Kollock	Midsummer in the Mountains	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	190
Kretschman	The "Continental" Soldier and two portrait bronze	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42		987a
Kunath	"He won't bite"	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1063
Kunath	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1064
Kunath	Still Life	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Artist	799
La Farge	Hollyhocks	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	167
La Farge	Portrait -- Boy and Dog	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	417
La Farge	St. Paul at Athens	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	St. Paul's Church, New York	415
La Farge	Water-Lilies	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	G. V. Hecker	430
La Farge	Wreath of Flowers	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	G. V. Hecker	270
La Farge	Bishop Berkeley's Rock, Newport	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	5
Lambdin	On a Summer Sea	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1044
Lambdin	Roses	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	266
Lambdin	Roses	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	41
Lambdin	Portrait -- Bishop Alonzo Potter	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40		1002
Lang	Landing of the Market-Boat at Capri	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	845
Lawlor	The Emigrant	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1197
Lawrie	Monk playing the Violoncello	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	H. Marks	468
Lawrie	Autumn in the Hudson Highlands	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Henry Marks	99
Le Clear	Portrait -- Parke Godwin	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	226
Lea	A Patrician Mother	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1059

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Lea	Genevieve de Brabant	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1068
Lea	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mrs. Potter	202
Lea	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	F. Maccauley	992
Leland	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	C.M. Leland	1051
Leland	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	C.M. Leland	1045
Leland	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	H. Thouron	950
Leutze	The Iconoclast	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	R.M. Olyphant	229
Lewis	Colossal statue of Washington	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6	Geo. F. Gordon	448
Lewis	East Park, Philadelphia	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	164
Lewis	1876	Painting	Strahan, Masterpieces of the Centennial,		n/a
Lewis	Asleep (group in marble)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1409
Lewis	Charles Summer	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1409
Lewis	Death of Cleopatra	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1231
Lewis	Henry Wadsworth Longfellow	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1409
Lewis	Hiawatha's Marriage	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1409
Lewis	John Brown	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1409
Lewis	Old Arrow Maker	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1409
Lippincott	The Ducks' Breakfast	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	246
Longfellow	Old Mill at Manchester, Mass.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	930
Loop	Aphrodite	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	53
Loop	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mrs. Alexander	225
Maccari	Fond Memories	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	J. Raymond Claghorn	812
Maccari	Music hath Charms	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	J. Raymond Claghorn	813
Machen	Still life -- game	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	106
Machen	Still Life -- Ruffed Grouse	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1052

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
MacKnight	Mrs. S.R. "When the Cat's away," etc.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	425
MacKnight	Mrs. S.R. Winter	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	37
Madrazo	Portrait -- D.M. Barringer	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	L.M. Barringer	780
Madrazo	Portrait -- Mrs. D.M. Barringer	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	L.M. Barringer	778
Makart	Hans Abundance of the Earth	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	A. & C. Kaufmann	806
Makart	Hans Abundance of the Sea	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	A. & C. Kaufmann	781
Marchant	E.D. Portrait -- H.C. Carey	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	J.G. Fell	860
Markham	C.C. My Grandmother (93 years old)	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	269
Marshall	W.E. Portrait -- Abraham Lincoln	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6		402
Martin	H. Adirondacks	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Century Club	203
Martin	Miss L.E. Flowers (panel)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Mrs. Martin	954
Martin	Miss L.E. Flowers (panel)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Mrs. Martin	952
Mathews	W.T. Dahlias	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	428
Matthews	W.T. Globe of Fish	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	10
Max	Gabriel The Anatomist	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Demas Barnes	792
Mayer	A.L. Marguerite	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	Stroefel & Kirchner	1290
Mayer	Constant Love's Melancholy	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	S.M. Schafer	28
Mayer	F.B. (Francis) The Continentals	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	820
Mayer	F[ancis]B. The Attic Philosopher	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1055
Maynard	G.W. "1776"	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	98
Maynard	G.W. Vespers in Antwerp	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	68
McDonald	W. Bust of Washington	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44		1183b
McEntee	J. Autumn	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	George Whitney	222
McEntee	J. Frosty Morning	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	S.D. Coykendall	470
McEntee	J. November	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Henry James	436

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
McEntee	J. November	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C		155
McEntee	J. October Afternoon	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	H.G. De Forest	128
McEntee	J. Saturday Afternoon	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	M.C.D. Borden	182
McEntee	J. Scribner's Mill	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Robert Gordon	420
McEntee	J. The Woods of Ashokan	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	R. Hoe	447
McEntee	J. Virginia during the War	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Mrs. H.W. Cary	852
McEntee	J. Winter	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	J.W. Pinchot	435
McKnight	G.R. Child	Painting	Phila. Evening Bulletin, 24 June 1876, 1		n/a
Meeks	Eugene Little Nell and her Grandfather	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	855
Merle	H. Charity	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	M. Knoedler & Co.	1296
Meyer	H. Portrait of a boy	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K		1247
Meyer	H. Portrait of a girl	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K		1248
Meyer von Meynen	men The Rabbit-Seller	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	M. Knoedler & Co.	1297
Meynen	F. Statuette of the Madonna	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1237
Middleton	S.G. Sketch at Cernay, near Paris	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	864
Mifflin	Lloyd Rome, from Marino	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	174
Mignot	L.R. Snow Scene	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Century Club	493
Miller	C.H. A Long Island Homestead	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	F. Sheldon	205
Miller	C.H. High Bridge, New York	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	256
Miller	C.H. Old Mill at Springfield, L.I.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Mrs. J.M. Miller	62
Miller	C.H. Returning to the Fold	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Mrs. J.M. Miller	58
Miller	C[harles].H. The Road to the Mill	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	J.L. Melcher	127
Miller	Charles H. Sunset at Queen's, N.Y.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Robert Gordon	16
Millet	F.D. In the Bay of Naples	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	883
Millet	F.D. Lady in Costume of 1740	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Mrs. E.S. Keith	884

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Millet	Turkish Water-Seller	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	247
Mills	Eve	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1219
Minor	Daybreak	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	126
Minor	Evening	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	234
Monks	Trees in Blossom	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	891
Montalant	Constantinople	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	481
Montalant	The Parthenon, Athens	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	859
Moore	Almeh, a Dream of the Alhambra	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	976
Moore	The Moorish Merchant	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	160
Moran	Coming Storm over New York Bay	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	R.E. Moore	472
Moran	Minot Ledge Light	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Mrs. H.E. Lawrence	125
Moran	Moonlight in New York Bay	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	253
Moran	The Hawk's Nest	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Mrs. H.E. Lawrence	115
Moran	The Winning Yacht	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	W.A. Cauldwell	165
Moran	Return of the Herd	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	249
Moran	Settled Rain	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1072
Moran	The Mountain of the Holy Cross, Colorado	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	196
Moran	"Fiercely the red sun descending burned his way along the	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1039
Moran	Dream of the Orient	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1049
Moran	Valley of the Rio Virgen, Utah	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1047
Moreau	Field Flowers	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	M. Knoedler & Co.	1294
Morrell	First Battle of the Puritans, won by Miles Standish	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	157
Morrell	Washington Welcoming the Provision-Train	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	994
Morse	Portrait -- General Lafayette	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	City Hall, New York	1167
Morse	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Dr. D. Olyphant	84

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Morse	S.F.B. Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Dr. D. Olyphant	80
Morse	S.F.B. Portrait -- Major Paulding	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	New York City Hall	137
Mount	W.S. Husking Corn	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Mr. Kemble	78
Mulvaney	Trial of a Horse Thief	Painting	Steele, Popular History of Our Country,		n/a
Mundhenk	"Auld Lang Syme"	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40		1028
Munger	Geo. Nathaniel Jocelyn -- miniature on ivory	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	N. Jocelyn	133b
Muraton	A. The Devotee	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	L. Rabillon	788
Murrillo	(attr.) St. Francis in his Cell	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	E.S. Conner	787
Navelot	Victor Cavalry Charge	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Dr. George Reuling	783
Neagle	John Portrait -- Gilbert Stuart	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Boston Athenaeum	163
Neagle	John Portrait of John Taggart, First President of Farmers' and	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Farmers' and Mechanics' Bank	218
Newton	Stuart Portrait -- Washington Irving	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Mr. T.W. Storrows	90
Newton	Stuart The Impartunate Author	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	E.N. Perkins	89
Nicoll	E. Paying the Rent	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	F.O. Day	795
Niemeyer	J.H. Gutenberg Inventing Movable Types	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	114
Nilson	H.M. Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C		161
Noble	T.S. The Tramp	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	981
Norton	W.E. Fog on the Grand Banks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	927
Nys	P. Dutch Interior	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	T.C.A. Dexter	802
Oertel	Rev. J.A. The Shadow of a Great Rock in a Weary Land	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	482
Ogilvie	Clinton In the Woods	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	426
Ortmans	Miss F.A. An Opening in the Forest of Fontainebleau	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	John Welsh	814
Page	Farragut Entering Mobile Bay	Painting	McCabe, Illustrated History, 587		n/a
Page	Wm. Shakespeare [sic], after the Death-Mask	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	154
Palmer	E.D. Bronze statue of Robert Livingston	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1213

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Pardessus	Bust of Hon. E.B. Washburne	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6		453
Park	Birdie (bust)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1173
Park	First Boots	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1176
Park	First Sorrow	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1178
Park	Gardener's Daughter	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1177
Park	Good-Morning	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1181
Park	Purity	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1175
Park	Rosebud	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1183
Park	Sappho (bust)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1182
Park	Sappho (statuette)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1180
Park	Summer	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1174
Park	Sunshine	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Artist	1179
Park	The Mechanic -- bronze portrait statue	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1212
Parker	Portrait -- J.G. Whittier	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	920
Parker	Sunset in the Adirondacks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Charles Baxter	410
Parker	Portrait -- Mrs. H.W. Hills	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	844
Parton	Solitude	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Wm. D. Judson	102
Parton	Stirling Castle	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Bryce Gray	209
Passage	Return from the Boar-Hunt	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30	Mrs. J.H. Johnson	1088
Pauwels	The New Republic	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	W.S. Stewart	800
Peale	Portrait -- Mrs. General Cropper	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	J. Cropper	1163
Peale	Portrait of Washington; from life	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	Andrew L. Robinson	1095
Peale	General Cropper	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44		n/a
Peale	Portrait of the artist	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Mrs. R. Peale	1014
Peale	Washington: from life	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Chas. P. Herring	1074

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Pearce	L'Italienne	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	189
Pease	Portrait -- Hon. S. Campbell	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14		478
Perdicaris	Moorish Interior	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	7
Perry	Kept In	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	66
Perry	The Weaver	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	113
Perry	Young Franklin	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	46
Petersen	Collision at Sea	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Manufacturers' Insurance	942
Petit	Cremation of Julius Caesar	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	C.J. Harrah	1081
Pierson &	Firemen's Parade in New Orleans, 1871	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	W. McNeely	968
Pine	Portrait of Mrs. Doane	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West		15
Plantou	Triumph of America, or the Treaty of Ghent	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	Miss Plantou	1099
Pohle	The Burning Castle	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	E. Franke	3
Porporati	Adoration of the Magi	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	P.F. Cooper	806a
Porter	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	896
Porter	The Hour-Glass	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	904
Porter	Study of a Child	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1061
Powers	Bust of Charles Sumner	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1192
Rafter	String of Onions	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	401
Randle	Flowers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1060
Raupp	Approaching Storm	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Dr. George Reuling	972
Ream	Bust of a child	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K		1244a
Ream	Bust of Senator Morrell	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1224
Ream	Miriam	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1222
Ream	Spirit of the Carnival	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1218
Ream	The West	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1220

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Remiers	Bust -- Col T.A. Scott	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30		1090
Reynolds	Portrait -- Mr. Groves	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	Mrs. A.S. Hughes	1093
Richards	Disgust	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42		986
Richards	Il Penseroso	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30		1089
Richards	Portrait bust	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30	Mrs. Laird Colyer	1092
Richards	Satisfaction	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42		984
Richards	Campagna di Roma	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1065
Richards	Portrait -- Mrs. Groves	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	Mrs. A.S. Hughes	1094
Richards	The Wissahickon	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	George Whitney	188
Ritchie	Preparing Moses for the Fair	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	496
Ritchie	President Lincoln's Death-bed	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	411
Robbins	Study from Nature -- Farmington River, Connecticut	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	400
Robert	Pilgrims on their Way to Rome	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Miss S.L. Guerber	784
Roberts	The First Pose	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	139
Robinson	An Old Team	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	957
Robinson	Dog's head	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28		922
Robinson	New England Farmer	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	John Foster	907
Robinson	Sheep in Pasture	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	William Appleton	924
Robinson	Bull's head	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	H.C. Angell	843
Rogers	Hide	Sculpture	Sandhurst, Great Centennial Exh., 58, 60		n/a
Rogers	Seek	Sculpture	Sandhurst, Great Centennial Exh., 58, 60		n/a
Rogers	29 groups of plaster statuary for house and lawn (incl. the	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	Camp Fire or Making Friends with the Cook	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	Challenging the Union Vote	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	Country Post Office	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Rogers	John Taking the Oath and Drawing Rations	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	John The Council of War	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	John The Home Guard--Midnight on the Border	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	John The Picket Guard	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	John The Returned Volunteer--How the Fort was Taken	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	John The Town Pump	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	John The Wounded Scout--A Friend in the Swamp	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	John Union Refugees	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	John Wound to the Rear--One More Shot	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22		1410
Rogers	Randolph Atala	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30		1087
Rogers	Randolph Nydia, the Blind Girl of Pompeii	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	James Douglas	1223
Ropes	Randolph Ruth	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	James Douglas	1217
Rosenthal	Joseph Tivoli	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1034
Rosenthal	T.E. "Remind me not that I alone/Am cast out from the Spring."	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	W.E. Schmertz	1076
Rothermel	T.E. Elaine	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mrs. R.E. Johnson	175
Rothermel	P.F. Amy Robsart interceding for Leicester	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	C. Blanchard	216
Rothermel	P.F. Battle of Gettysburg	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Commonwealth of	168
Rothermel	P.F. Christian Martyrs in the Colosseum	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1048
Rothermel	P.F. Hypatia, the Neo-Platonic Philosopher, stripped and torn	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1010
Rothermel	P.F. Macbeth meditating the Murder of Duncan	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Thomas Dolan	989
Rothermel	P.F. The Landsknecht	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Matthew Baird	1083
Rothermel	P.F. The Virtuoso	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1054
Rothermel	P.F. Trial of Sir Harry Vane	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	J.L. Claghorn	867
Rush	E.A. Bust of Washington (clay model from life)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44	Alfred Young	1183a
Sain	E.A. Italian Girl	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Theo. Lyman	793

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Saltau	Consolation	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Mrs. E.V. Machette	796
Sargent	Portrait -- General B. Lincoln	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	Massachusetts Historical Society	1101
Sartain	The Reproof	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	260
Satterlee	Marguerite	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	241
Schidone	Charity	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Estate of Dr. Chapman	782
Schussele	The Iron-Worker	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mrs. Joseph Harrison	252
Schussele	Zeisberger preaching to the Indians	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	J. Jordan	1037
Schworer	A Surprise	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	Stroefel & Kirchner	1288
Seelig	A vase (spelter)	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1256c
Seelig	Aesculapius (spelter)	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1256a
Seelig	Cupid (spelter)	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall		1256b
Seitz	Neptune's Bridal (Loan Collection)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Myers & Hedian	825
Seitz	Faun and Nymph	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Myers & Hedian	805
Seligman	Love and Pride	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	204
Sellstedt	Portrait of the artist	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Buffalo Fine Art Gallery	403
Senat	Moonrise near Rotterdam	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	868
Shade[Schade?] W.A.	Tantalizing	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	123
Shapleigh	Kenilworth	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	J.C. Howe	882
Shapleigh	On the Seine	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	J.C. Howe	885
Shattuck	Lake Champlain	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	J.M. Telford	223
Shattuck	Sheep and Cattle	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	J.H. Sherwood	469
Shattuck	The White Hills in October	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	413
Shaw	An Illinois Prairie	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1000
Shirlaw	Feeding the Poultry	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	J.F. Gookins	863
Shirlaw	Toning the Bell	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	J.F. Gookins	862

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Silva	F.A. New York Harbor	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	J.S. Shultz	464
Simon	H. "Steady"	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1023
Smbert	J.S. Portrait -- Bishop G. Berkeley	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Massachusetts Historical Society	92
Smbert	John Portrait -- P. Faneuil	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	Massachusetts Historical Society	1097
Smillie	George H. Lake in the Woods	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	T. Robertson	208
Smith	F. Hill Sunset on the Giudecca, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	875
Smith	Miss Mary Cluck and Chickens	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42		975
Smith	R.C. Bust of President J.M Sturtevant, of Illinois College	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1221
Smith	Russell Cave at Chelton Hills	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1080
Smith	Russell Mount Vernon in 1836	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1077
Smith	T. Henry Mind and Matter	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40		1021
Smith	T. Henry Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	M. Drinker	219
Smith	T. Henry Portrait [Henry Harrison, Jr.]	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Mrs. Jos. Harrison	1057
Smith	T.L. Eve of St. Agnes	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	434
Smith	T.L. The Deserted House	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	W.H. Hamilton	466
Smith	Xanthus The Kearsarge and Alabama	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1025
Snowe	Francis A Cloudy Day	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	G.H. Chickering	956
Sonntag	W.L. Sunset in the Wilderness	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	250
Spencer	Lily Martin Earth, Air, and Water	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	846
Spencer	Mrs. Lily M. "Will you have some fruit?"	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	998
St. Gaudens	Aug. Bust of Hon. William Evarts	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1216
Staigg	R.M. Cornice Road, Italy	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	878
Staigg	R.M. Empty Nest	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	881
Staigg	R.M. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28		915
Staigg	R.M. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28		919

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Stagg	R.M. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28		914
Stagg	R.M. The Chestnut-Gatherer	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	214
Stanley	D.M. The Indian Signal	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1015
Stewart	J.L. Marie	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	W.S. Stewart	1035
Stewart	J.L. Miguel	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	W.S. Stewart	116
Stone	Horatio, Dr. Bronze vase	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	J.C. Hoadley	1205
Stone	Horatio, Dr. Two bronze vases	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	J.C. Hoadley	1214
Stone	W.O. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Union Club, New York	418
Stone	W.O. Portrait -- Charles King	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Union Club, New York	76
Story	G.H. Echoes of the Sea	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	211
Story	G.H. The Young Mother	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	213
Story	G.H. The Young Student	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	David Groesbeck	1
Story	W.W. Beethoven	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1206
Story	W.W. Medea	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1184
Stuart	Gilbert Portrait -- Bishop Chevenix	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Mrs. H. Greenough	933
Stuart	Gilbert Portrait -- Chief-Justice John Jay	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	J.C. Jay	93
Stuart	Gilbert Portrait -- Fisher Ames	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Harvard University	931
Stuart	Gilbert Portrait -- James Rivington	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	W.H. Appleton	87
Stuart	Gilbert Portrait -- Judge Story	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Harvard University	932
Stuart	Gilbert Portrait -- Mrs. E.C. Cushing	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Mrs. L.L. Chickering	940
Stuart	Gilbert Portrait -- Mrs. N. Coffin	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Nath. Appleton	75
Stuart	Gilbert Portrait -- Mrs. S. Eliot	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	C.W. Eliot	52
Stuart	Gilbert The original portrait, from life, of Washington, painted in	Painting	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	J. Delaware Lewis	1228a
Sully	Thomas Portrait -- Commodore Decatur	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	City Hall, New York	1168
Sully	Thomas Portrait -- Miss Rosalie Sully	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mrs. Darley	147

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Sully	Portrait -- Mrs. T. Sully	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Miss Sully	199
Sully	Portrait -- Mrs. T. Sully	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Miss Sully	838
Suydam	Berkeley's Seat, Newport	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	New York Academy of Design	197
Suydam	Hudson River	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Smith Cliff	183
Suydam	Twilight on the Coast	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	R.M. Olyphant	437
Swayne	Bust of Abraham Lincoln	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1031
Swayne	Bust of Salmon P. Chase	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1032
Swayne	Bust of W.H. Seward	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1030
Sword	Trenton Falls, N.Y.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	1018
Tait	Autumn	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	858
Tait	Summer	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	850
Tait, A.F.	The Portage -- Waiting for the Boats	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	J.B. Blossom	180
Tassera	Singing Angels (alto-relievo)	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Stephen H. Perkins	1238
Tenney	Portrait -- General Stark	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	City of Manchester, N.H.	1103
Thom	Day (panel)	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	James M. Burt	64
Thom	Going to Church, Christmas Eve	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	J.M. Burt	484
Thom	Night (panel)	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	James M. Burt	65
Thompson	On the Sands, East Hampton, L.I.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	67
Thompson	Virginia in the Olden Time	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	D.H. McAlphine	268
Thompson	View near Honfleur, Normandy	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	54
Thompson	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Col. Juan Lewis	162
Thompson	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	151
Thompson	The Old Oaken Bucket	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Jane M. Hodges	409
Thomson	Desolation -- St. Cloud	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Artist	439
Thorpe	Westward the Course of Empire Takes Its Way	Painting	McCabe, Illustrated History, 589		n/a

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Thouron	H. Charlotte Corday -- The Eve of her Execution	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	849
Tiffany	Snake Charmer	Painting	Steele, Popular History of Our Country,		n/a
Tiffany	A Guard at the Prison Gate, Tangier	Painting	McCabe, Illustrated History, 587		n/a
Tilton	J.R. Kem Ombres, Upper Egypt	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Hon. H.P. Baldwin	865
Tilton	J.R. The Lagoons of Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	826
Tompkins	Clementina An Artistic Debut	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	827
Tompkins	Clementina The Little Musician	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	824
Townsend	Chas. E. Lion and Lioness	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	6
Travers	W.T.K. Abraham Lincoln	Painting	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	W.P. Webster	1228b
Trotter	N.H. Wounded Buffaloes pursued by Prairie Wolves	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1038
Truman	E. Portrait -- Thos. Hutchinson	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	Massachusetts Historical Society	1100
Trumbull	G. The Critical Moment	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	W.C. Prime, L.L.D.	443
Trumbull	John Portrait -- General Washington	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	City Hall, New York	1170
Tuckerman	S.S. Beach at Hastings	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	890
Tuckerman	S.S. United States Frigate "Constitution" escaping from the	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	918
Turini	G. Angelica and Medora	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	502
Turini	G. The Rainbow	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 14	Artist	503
Turner	W.G. Fisherman's Daughter	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1186
Turner	W.G. Morning	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1236
Turner	W.G. Night	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	Artist	1235
Turner	W.G. Transition	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1202
Twibill	G.W. Portrait -- Colonel Trumbull	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	New York Academy of Design	74
Ulke	Henry Portrait -- Charles Sumner	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	965
Ulke	Henry Portrait -- General Grant	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	967
Unknown	Old Woman's Head	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	F.L. Robbins	786

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Vaini	The Jealous Duchess	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Sarony	412
Van Elten	Clearing Off -- Adirondacks	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	G. Chesterman	12
Van Elten	Russell Falls, Adirondacks	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	244
Van Elten	The Grove in the Heath	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	G. Chesterman	35
Van Reuth	Homage of America to the Spirit of her Institutions	Painting	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B	Artist	1228
Van Schendel	The Annunciation	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Demas Barnes	794
Vanderlyn	Ariadne	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	W.H. Eisenbrey	150
Vanderlyn	Portrait - General Armstrong	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	William Astor	1165
Vandyke	The Crucifixion	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Mrs. M. Garner	774
Vedder	The Greek Actor's Daughter	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	H. Sampson	842
Verboeckhove	Driving Home the Sheep	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	W.J. Bates	798
Vernet	Landscape	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	E.S. Conner	785
Volk	Bust of Douglas	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613	n/a	n/a
Volk	Bust of Lincoln	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613	n/a	n/a
Volk	In Brittany	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Artist	797
Volk	Vanity	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1086
Volkmar	The Passing Shower (near Vichy, France)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	988
Wagner	Chariot-Race	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y	Stroofer & Kirchner	1289
Waldo	Portrait -- General Jackson	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	City Hall, New York	1171
Waller	Tombs of the Caliphs, Cairo	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mrs. M. Waller	206
Ward	Brittany Peasants Washing Clothes	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Robert Gordon	479
Warner	Lilies	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6	Alex. Warner	445
Warren	Medallion of Edwin Forrest	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B		1225
Waterman	Gulliver in Lilliput	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	156
Waters	Still Life -- Mallard Ducks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1075

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Waugh	Ida	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	212
Waugh	Ida	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1078
Waugh	Ida	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K	L. de V. Judd	1248a
Waugh	S.B.	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C		152
Waugh	S.B.	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Mrs. Joseph Harrison	237
Waugh	S.B.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40		1007
Waugh	S.B.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1067
Waugh	S.B.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	50
Way	A.J.H.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1070
Way	C. Granville	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	951
Weber	Carl	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	966
Weber	Carl	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	969
Weber	Philip	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	257
Weeks	E.L.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	908
Weir	J.F.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	J.B. Caudwell	465
Weir	J.F.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30		1073
Weir	J.F.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Geo. W. Jewett	1085
Weir	J.F.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	E.E. Salisbury	870
Weir	J.F.	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	R.P. Parrott	215
Weir	R.W.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	A.C. Alden	497
Weisman	W.H.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	F. Gutekunst	61
Wertmuller		Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	S. Wagner	1096
West	Benjamin	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Dr. H. Billings	815
West	Benjamin	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44	Louis Carmick	1164
West	P.B.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Mrs. M.L. Dickinson	847

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.
Wharton	P.F. Perdita -- Winter's Tale	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	243
White	Edwin Sabbath of the Emigrant	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	105
White	Edwin The Antiquary	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	57
White	Edwin The Bargello, Florence	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	32
Whitney	Annie Roma	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	947
Whitney	Annie Sketch -- Charles Sumner	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 28	Artist	944
Whitney	Annie The Model	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42		987
Whittredge	W. A Home by the Sea	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	S.J. Harriott	109
Whittredge	W. A Hundred Years Ago	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	R.M. Olyphant	55
Whittredge	W. Rocky Mountains, from the Platte River	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Century Club	491
Whittredge	W. The Old Hunting-Grounds	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	J.W. Pinchot	119
Whittredge	W. The Pilgrims of St. Roche	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	Winthrop B. Smith	459
Whittredge	W. The Window	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	R.L. Stuart	4
Whittredge	W. Twilight on the Shawangunk Mountains	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	W.B. Smith	201
Whittredge	W. Woods of Ashokan	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14	S.A. Foot	460
Wild	H. El Majo de Granada	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	H.H. Furness	1027
Wild	H[amilton].G. Banks of the Nile	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	963
Willard	A.M. Yankee Doodle	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10	Artist	866
Willard	W. Portrait -- Charles Sumner	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	E.L. Bates	962
Willard	William Portrait [the artist's son]	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Artist	958
Willcox	W.H. One Hundred Years Ago	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	997
Williams	I.L. October	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1084
Williams	I.L. View near Meriden, Connecticut	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	176
Wilson	Oregon Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Dr. Wilson	1008
Wilson	Oregon Woman's Devotion	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42	Dr. W.A. Wilson	975a

Artist	Title	Medium	Location	1876 Owner	Cat. No.	
Winner	W.E.	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1082
Winner	W.E.	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	Artist	171
Winters	Miss Anna	Daisies	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40	Artist	995
Wolf	G.	Portia	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	Dr. George Reuling	789
Wood	G.B., Jr.	Freddy Flechtenstein's Shop	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30	Artist	1079
Wood	T.W.	The Contraband	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	C.S. Smith	51
Wood	T.W.	The Recruit	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	C.S. Smith	44
Wood	T.W.	The Veteran	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	C.S. Smith	43
Wood	T.W.	Village Post-Office	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C	C.S. Smith	230
Woodville	R.C.	Card-Players	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	W.J. Hoppin	81
Woodville	R.C.	Fancy head	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	J.T. Johnston	138
Wouermans	(attr.)	War Scene	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection	E.S. Conner	811
Wright	Geo.	One too Many	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West	Artist	122

Appendix B: Centennial Exhibition, United States Art Department, Paintings and Sculpture (by location)

As few photographs exist to document the installation, this report provides a sense of where works were located. Paintings and sculpture are listed as they appeared in the official catalogue, 14th edition. For Memorial Hall, galleries appear to be listed in order of relative importance, and in the Annex, the order simulates the path taken by a visitor walking through the galleries. Catalogue numbers generally reflect one work's proximity to the next, though it is not clear whether they were above, below, to the right or to the left of each other. At the end of the list is a small number of works noted in contemporary criticism but not listed in the catalogue.

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
1	Story	The Young Student	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
1a	Healy	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
2	Dolph	The Antiquarian	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
3	Pohle	The Burning Castle	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
4	Whittridge	The Window	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
5	La Farge	Bishop Berkeley's Rock, Newport	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
6	Townsend	Lion and Lioness	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
7	Perdicaris	Moorish Interior	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
8	Hicks	Portrait -- Mrs. MacDaniel	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
9	Hubbard	Coming Storm	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
10	Matthews	Globe of Fish	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
11	Bunner	Bavarian Landscape	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
12	Van Elten	Clearing Off -- Adirondacks	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
13	Du Bois	Willows at East Hampton, L.I.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
14	Colman	The Merchants of Laghoutat en route between Tel and the Desert,	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
15	Pine	Portrait of Mrs. Doane	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
16	Miller	Sunset at Queen's, N.Y.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
17	Kensett	Narragansett Coast	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
18	Hamilton	"Break, break, break, On thy cold gray stones, O sea!"	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
19	Durand	Studies from nature	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
20	Boughton	The Pilgrims' Sunday Morning	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
21	Baker	Portrait -- C.L. Elliott	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
22	Benson	Sirocco, Venice	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
23	Gifford	Bronx River	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
24	Gifford	On the Nile	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
25	De Haas	Moonrise and Sunset	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
26	Bellows	Sunday in Devonshire	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
27	Gifford	Pallanza, Lago Maggiore	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
28	Mayer	Love's Melancholy	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
29	Conarroe	Ethel	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
30	Audobon	Canada Otter	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
31	Beeson	Miss E[[lla],L.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
32	White	The Bargello, Florence	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
33	Cole	The Mountain Ford	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
34	Huntington	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
35	Van Elten	The Grove in the Heath	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
36	Holbrook	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
37	MacKnight	Winter	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
38	Hubbard	Early Autumn	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
39	Cropsey	Old Bonchurch, Isle of Wight	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
40	Johnson	Scenery on the Housatonic	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
41	Lambdin	Roses	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
42	Furness	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
43	Wood	The Veteran	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
44	Wood	The Recruit	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
45	Huntington	Portrait -- G.T. Trimble	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
46	Perry	Young Franklin	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
47	Kensett	View near Northampton	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
48	Johnson	Heel-Taps	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
49	Eakins	Chess Players	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
50	Waugh	The Cabinet	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
51	Wood	The Contraband	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
52	Stuart	Portrait -- Mrs. S. Eliot	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
53	Loop	Aphrodite	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
54	Thompson	View near Honfleur, Normandy	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
55	Whittridge	A Hundred Years Ago	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
56	Birch	Marine	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
57	White	The Antiquary	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
58	Miller	Returning to the Fold	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
59	Durand	Portrait -- Gouverneur Kemble	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
60	Allston	Landscape	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
61	Weisman	Cape Ann Rocks	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
62	Miller	Old Mill at Springfield, L.I.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
63	Guy	Evening	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
64	Thom	Day (panel)	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
65	Thom	Night (panel)	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
66	Perry	Kept In	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
67	Thompson	On the Sands, East Hampton, L.I.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
68	Maynard	Vespers in Antwerp	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
69	Anderson	Scene in Cairo	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
70	Anderson	Roumanian Peasant Girl	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
71	Benson	The Strayed Masquers	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
72	Johnson	What the Sea Says	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
73	Gifford	Lake Geneva	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
74	Twibill	Portrait -- Colonel Trumbull	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
75	Stuart	Portrait -- Mrs. N. Coffin	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
76	Stone	Portrait -- Charles King	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
77	Allston	Portrait of himself when young	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
78	Mount	Husking Corn	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
79	Gray	The Model from Cadore	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
80	Morse	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
81	Woodville	Card-Players	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
82	Greene	Ideal Head	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
83	Copley	Portrait -- Mrs. T. Boylston	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
84	Morse	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
85	Copley	Portrait -- John Adams	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
86	Allston	Spalatro's Vision of the Bloody Hand	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
87	Stuart	Portrait -- James Rivington	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
88	Allston	Rosalie	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
89	Newton	The Impertunate Author	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
90	Newton	Portrait -- Washington Irving	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
91	Copley	Portrait -- T. Boylston	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
92	Smibert	Portrait -- Bishop G. Berkeley	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
93	Stuart	Portrait -- Chief-Justice John Jay	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
94	Blashfield	Treasure-Trove	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
95	Brown	Curling Match	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
96	Johnson Eastman	Prisoner of State	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
97	Hubbard R.W.	Glimpse of the Adirondacks	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
98	Maynard G.W.	"1776"	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
99	Lawrie Alex.	Autumn in the Hudson Highlands	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
100	Johnson David	Scenery on the Housatonic	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
101	Irving J.B.	The Bookworm	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
102	Parton A.	Solitude	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
103	Bridgman F.A.	Kybelian Woman	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
104	Brown G.L.	Venice	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
105	White Edwin	Sabbath of the Emigrant	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
106	Machen W.H.	Still life -- game	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
107	Granberry Miss V.	Spring Flowers	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
108	Johnson Frost	A Thirsty Party	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
109	Whitredge W.	A Home by the Sea	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
110	Gifford R. Swain	Boats at Boulah, on the Nile	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
111	Brenner C.C.	Landscape	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
112	Durand A.B.	Il Pappagallo	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
113	Perry E. Wood	The Weaver	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
114	Niemeyer J.H.	Gutenberg Inventing Movable Types	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
115	Moran Edward	The Hawk's Nest	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
116	Stewart J.L.	Miguel	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
117	Fitch J.L.	In the Woods	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
118	Johnson Eastman	The Old Kentucky Home	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
119	Whitredge W.	The Old Hunting-Grounds	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
120	De Crano F.F.	The Celestial Model	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
121	Cameron	Miss K[ate].	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
122	Wright	Geo.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
123	Shade[Schade?] W.A.	Tantalizing	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
124	Gifford	R. Swain	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
125	Moran	Edward	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
126	Minor	R.C.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
127	Miller	C[hartes].H.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
128	McEntee	J.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
129	Guy	S.J.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
130	Henry	E.L.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
131	Gignoux	R.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
132	Champney	J.W.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
133	Brown	J.H.	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
133a	Cooper	P.F.	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
133b	Munger	Geo.	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
134	Cariss	H.T.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
135	Benson	Eugene	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
136	Benson	Eugene	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
137	Morse	S.F.B.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
138	Woodville	R.C.	Painting	Mem Hall, Central Gallery West
139	Roberts	Howard	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery C
140	Baily	J.W.	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery C
141	Connelly	P.F.	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery C
142	Connelly	P.F.	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery C
143	Johnson	Eastman	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
144	Benson	Interior of St. Mark's, Venice	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
145	Hart	Keene Valley, Adirondacks	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
146	Baker	Portrait of a child	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
147	Sully	Portrait -- Miss Rosalie Sully	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
148	Bristol	Lake Memphremagog	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
149	Gay	Windmills of Delftshaven, Holland	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
150	Vanderlyn	Ariadne	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
151	Thompson	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
152	Waugh	General Grant	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
153	Elliott	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
154	Page	Shakespeare [sic], after the Death-Mask	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
155	McEntee	November	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
156	Waterman	Gulliver in Lilliput	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
157	Morrell	First Battle of the Puritans, won by Miles Standish	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
158	Briscoe	Breezy Day off Dieppe	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
159	Jones	The Ferry Inn	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
160	Moore	The Moorish Merchant	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
161	Nilson	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
162	Thompson	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
163	Neagle	Portrait -- Gilbert Stuart	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
164	Lewis	East Park, Philadelphia	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
165	Moran	The Winning Yacht	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
166	Beard	The Attorney and His Clients	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
167	La Farge	Hollyhocks	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
168	Rothermel	Battle of Gettysburg	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
169	Champney J.W.	"Don't Touch!"	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
170	Bridgman F.A.	Flower of the Harem	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
171	Winner W.E.	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
172	Alexander F[francis].	Portrait (self-portrait)	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
173	Healy G.P.A.	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
174	Mifflin Lloyd	Rome, from Marino	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
175	Rosenthal T.E.	Elaine	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
176	Williams I.L.	View near Meriden, Connecticut	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
177	Homer Winslow	Snap the Whip	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
178	Gifford S.R.	The Golden Horn	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
179	Hetzel Geo.	Forest Scene in Pennsylvania	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
180	Tait, A.F. and Hart, J.M.	The Portage -- Waiting for the Boats	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
181	Armstrong D.M.	Twilight on the Harbor	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
182	McEntee J.	Saturday Afternoon	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
183	Suydam J.A.	Hudson River	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
184	Hill Thomas	Donner Lake	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
185	Johnson Eastman	The Wandering Fiddler	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
186	Gifford S.R.	Fishing Boats of the Adriatic	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
187	Irving J.B.	The End of the Game	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
188	Richards W.T.	The Wissahickon	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
189	Pearce Charles S.	L'Italienne	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
190	Kollock Miss M.	Midsummer in the Mountains	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
191	Clowes Miss C.M.	Cattle at the Brook	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
192	Kollock Miss M.	Early Morning in the Mountains	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
193	Guy S.J.	Supplication	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
194	Huntington D.	Sowing the Word	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
195	Johnson Eastman	The Old Stage-Coach	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
196	Moran Thomas	The Mountain of the Holy Cross, Colorado	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
197	Suydam J.A.	Berkeley's Seat, Newport	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
198	Colyer V.	Pueblo -- Indian Village	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
199	Sully Thomas	Portrait -- Mrs. T. Sully	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
200	Gray H. Peters	The Apple of Discord	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
201	Whittridge W.	Twilight on the Shawangunk Mountains	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
202	Lea Anna M.	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
203	Martin H.	Adirondacks	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
204	Seligman Mrs. E.	Love and Pride	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
205	Miller C.H.	A Long Island Homestead	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
206	Waller Frank	Tombs of the Caliphs, Cairo	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
207	Bierstadt A.	The Settlement of California, Bay of Monterey, 1770	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
208	Smillie George H.	Lake in the Woods	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
209	Parton Arthur	Stirling Castle	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
210	Cole Thomas	Kenilworth Castle	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
211	Story G.H.	Echoes of the Sea	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
212	Waugh Ida	An Egyptian	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
213	Story G.H.	The Young Mother	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
214	Staagg R.M.	The Chestnut-Gatherer	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
215	Weir J.F.	The Gun-Foundry	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
216	Rothermel P.F.	Amy Robsart interceding for Leicester	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
217	James Frederick	Interior of a Smoking Car	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
218	Neagle John	Portrait of John Taggart, First President of Farmers' and Mechanics'	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
219	Smith	T. Henry	Portrait	Mem Hall, Gallery C
220	Healy	G.P.A.	Portrait	Mem Hall, Gallery C
221	Johnson	David	Old Man of the Mountain, Franconia Notch, N.H.	Mem Hall, Gallery C
222	McEntee	J.	Autumn	Mem Hall, Gallery C
223	Shattuck	A.D.	Lake Champlain	Mem Hall, Gallery C
224	Gardner	Miss E.J.	Corinne	Mem Hall, Gallery C
225	Loop	Mrs. H.A.	Portrait	Mem Hall, Gallery C
226	Le Clear	Thomas	Portrait -- Parke Godwin	Mem Hall, Gallery C
227	Dix	C. Templeton	Capri	Mem Hall, Gallery C
228	Herzog	H.	Sentinel Rock, Yosemite	Mem Hall, Gallery C
229	Leutze	E.	The Iconoclast	Mem Hall, Gallery C
230	Wood	T.W.	Village Post-Office	Mem Hall, Gallery C
231	Kensett	J.F.	Conway Valley, N.H.	Mem Hall, Gallery C
232	Hicks	Thos.	General Meade	Mem Hall, Gallery C
233	Colyer	V.	Cascade Mountains	Mem Hall, Gallery C
234	Minor	R.C.	Evening	Mem Hall, Gallery C
235	Hunt	William	Portrait [Barthold Schlesinger]	Mem Hall, Gallery C
236	Hart	Jas. M.	A Summer Memory of Berkshire	Mem Hall, Gallery C
237	Waugh	S.B.	Lost Jewels found	Mem Hall, Gallery C
238	Bridgman	F.A.	Nubian Story-Teller	Mem Hall, Gallery C
239	Inman	Henry	Hackett as Rip Van Winkle	Mem Hall, Gallery C
240	Brown	C.V.	Portrait [William J. Clark, Jr.]	Mem Hall, Gallery C
241	Satterlee	W.	Marguerite	Mem Hall, Gallery C
242	De Luce	P.	A Dish for my Lord	Mem Hall, Gallery C
243	Wharton	P.F.	Perdita -- Winter's Tale	Mem Hall, Gallery C

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
244	Van Elten	Russell Falls, Adirondacks	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
245	Johnson	Brook study, Orange Co., N.Y.	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
246	Lippincott	The Ducks' Breakfast	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
247	Millet	Turkish Water-Seller	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
248	Heade	Off the California Coast	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
249	Moran	Return of the Herd	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
250	Somntag	Sunset in the Wilderness	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
251	Bridgman	Bringing in the Corn	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
252	Schussele	The Iron-Worker	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
253	Moran	Moonlight in New York Bay	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
254	Hicks	Portrait -- Dr. Gray	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
255	Elliott	Portrait -- Dr. Cheesman	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
256	Miller	High Bridge, New York	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
257	Weber	Twilight	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
258	Henry	Old Clock on the Stairs	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
259	Johnson	Milton and his Daughters	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
260	Sartain	The Reproof	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
261	Irving	Cardinal Wolsey and his Friends	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
262	Beard	March of Silenus	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
263	Baker	Portrait	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
264	Eakins	Portrait -- Dr. Rand	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
265	Haseltine	Ruins of Roman Theater, Sicily	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
266	Lambdin	Roses	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
267	Homer	The American Type	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
268	Thompson	Virginia in the Olden Time	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
269	Markham	My Grandmother (93 years old)	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
270	La Farge	Wreath of Flowers	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery C
400	Robbins	Study from Nature -- Farmington River, Connecticut	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
401	Rafter	String of Onions	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
402	Marshall	Portrait -- Abraham Lincoln	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
403	Sellstedt	Portrait of the artist	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
404	Gifford	Twilight in the Adirondacks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
405	Crosey	Old Mill	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
406	Bispham	The Stampede	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
407	Flagg	Portrait -- Commodore Vanderbilt	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
408	Gifford	Santa Maria della Salute, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
409	Thompson	The Old Oaken Bucket	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
410	Parker	Sunset in the Adirondacks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
411	Ritchie	President Lincoln's Death-bed	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
412	Vaini	The Jealous Duchess	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
413	Shattuck	The White Hills in October	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
414	Hamilton	The Valley of Fountains	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
415	La Farge	St. Paul at Athens	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
416	Dolph	The Return from Pasture	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
417	La Farge	Portrait -- Boy and Dog	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
418	Stone	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
419	Beard	Lo! the Poor Indian	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
420	McEntee	Scribner's Mill	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
421	Baldwin	Baptistry of St. Mark's, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
422	Johnson	Good Weight	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
423	Johnson	Sabbath Morning	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
424	Granbery	Autumn Flowers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
425	MacKnight	"When the Cat's away," etc.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
426	Ogilvie	In the Woods	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
427	Beard	Out All Night	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
428	Mathews	Dahlia	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
429	Henry	Taking a Night-Cap	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
430	La Farge	Water-Lilies	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
431	Cole	The Cross and the World, Youth	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
432	Cole	The Cross and the World, Manhood	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
433	Cole	The Cross and the World, Old Age	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
434	Smith	Eve of St. Agnes	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
435	McEntee	Winter	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
436	McEntee	November	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
437	Suydam	Twilight on the Coast	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
438	Huntington	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
439	Thomson	Desolation -- St. Cloud	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
440	Church	Chimborazo	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
441	Hays	Bison at Bay	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
442	Elliott	The Cavalier	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
443	Trumbull	The Critical Moment	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
444	DeHaas	Drifted Ashore in a Fog	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
445	Warner	Lilies	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
446	Coleman	The Troubador	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6
447	McEntee	The Woods of Ashokan	Painting	Annex, Gallery 6

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
448	Lewis A.J.	Colossal statue of Washington	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6
449	Kemys E.	Coyote and Raven	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6
450	Kemys E.	Playing Possum	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6
451	Griffin Julia	Bust of Rev. Dr. Chapin	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6
452	Gifford Miss	Bust of Rev. S.J. May	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6
453	Pardessus E.V.	Bust of Hon. E.B. Washburne	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 6
454	Huntington D.	Titian and Charles V.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
455	Gay Edward	Late Afternoon near Albany	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
456	Hicks Thomas	E. Delafield, M.D.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
457	Boughton G.H.	Going to Seek his Fortune	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
458	Kensett J.F.	Lake George	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
459	Whittridge W.	The Pilgrims of St. Roche	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
460	Whittridge W.	Woods of Ashokan	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
461	Gifford S.R.	San Giorgio, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
462	Johnson Eastman	Bo-peep	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
463	Colman Samuel	Twilight on the Western Plains	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
464	Silva F.A.	New York Harbor	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
465	Weir J.F.	Lago Maggiore	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
466	Smith T.L.	The Deserted House	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
467	Armstrong D.M.	Column of St. Mark's, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
468	Lawrie A.	Monk playing the Violoncello	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
469	Shattuck A.D.	Sheep and Cattle	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
470	McEntee J.	Frosty Morning	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
471	Bridgman F.A.	Women on the Nile	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
472	Moran Edward	Coming Storm over New York Bay	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
473	Bierstadt	A.	The Great Trees, Mariposa Grove, California	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
474	Durand	A.B.	Brook study	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
475	Gifford	R. Swain	Mosque of Mohammed Ali, Cairo	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
476	Durand	A.B.	Kaaterskill Clove, Catskill	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
477	Huntington	D.	Lake George	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
478	Pease	Alonzo	Portrait -- Hon. S. Campbell	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
479	Ward	E.M.	Brittany Peasants Washing Clothes	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
480	Kensett	J.F.	New Hampshire Scenery	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
481	Montalant	J.O. de	Constantinople	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
482	Oertel	Rev. J.A.	The Shadow of a Great Rock in a Weary Land	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
483	De Haas	M.F.H.	Brig hove to for a Pilot	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
484	Thom	J.C.	Going to Church, Christmas Eve	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
485	Hart	J.M.	Landscape and Cattle	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
486	Bricher	A.T.	Morning at Narragansett	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
487	Kappes	Alfred	Waiting	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
488	Bierstadt	A.	Western Kansas	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
489	Gifford	S.R.	Tivoli	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
490	Huntington	D.	Philosophy and Christian Art	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
491	Whittredge	W.	Rocky Mountains, from the Platte River	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
492	Gray	H. Peters	The Wages of War	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
493	Mignot	L.R.	Snow Scene	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
494	Brooks	S.	California Fish	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
495	Huntington	D.	Lake George	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
496	Ritchie	A.H.	Preparing Moses for the Fair	Painting Annex, Gallery 14
497	Weir	R.W.	Taking the Veil	Painting Annex, Gallery 14

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
498	Gifford	Sunrise on the Sea-Shore	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
499	Cropsey	Italy	Painting	Annex, Gallery 14
500	Cusachs	Christ in the Sepulchre	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 14
501	Hess	The Water-Lily	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 14
502	Turini	Angelica and Medora	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 14
503	Turini	The Rainbow	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 14
504	Ives	Nursing the Infant Bacchus	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 14
774	Vandyke	The Crucifixion	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
775	Erpikum	Portrait -- Madame Houssaye	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
776	Domenichino	Judith	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
777	Cabanel	Francesca di Rimini	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
778	Madrazo	Portrait -- Mrs. D.M. Barringer	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
779	Gudin	Marine	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
780	Madrazo	Portrait -- D.M. Barringer	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
781	Makart	Abundance of the Sea	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
782	Schidone	Charity	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
783	Navelot	Cavalry Charge	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
784	Robert	Pilgrims on their Way to Rome	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
785	Vernet	Landscape	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
786	Unknown	Old Woman's Head	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
787	Murillo	St. Francis in his Cell	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
788	Muratton	The Devotee	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
789	Wolf	Portia	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
790	Dubufe E. and Bonheur, Rosa	Autumn (Figure by Dubufe, sheep by Rosa Bonheur)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
791	Brion	Bridal Procession in Alsace	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
792	Max Gabriel	The Anatomist	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
793	Sain E.A.	Italian Girl	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
794	Van Schendel P.	The Annunciation	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
795	Nicoll E.	Paying the Rent	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
796	Saltiau L.	Consolation	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
797	Volk Douglas	In Brittany	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
798	Verboeckhove E.	Driving Home the Sheep	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
799	Kunath Oscar	Still Life	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
800	Pauwels F.	The New Republic	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
801	Duval V.	Gallery of Apollo, Louvre	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
802	Nys P.	Dutch Interior	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
803	Durer Albert	St. Jerome	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
803a	Del Sarto Andrea	St. Andrew bearing his Cross/Christ stilling the Tempest	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
804	De Haas J.H.L.	Cattle in the Meadows of Holland	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
805	Seitz Prof. Otto	Faun and Nymph	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
806	Makart Hans	Abundance of the Earth	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
806a	Porporati	Adoration of the Magi	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
807	Courbet Gustave	The Huntsman	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
808	Courbet Gustave	Castle of Chillon, Lake Leman (1)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
809	Courbet Gustave	Castle of Chillon, Lake Leman (2)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
810	Courbet Gustave	The Bather	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
811	Wouvermans (attr.)	War Scene	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
812	Maccari C.	Fond Memories	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
813	Maccari C.	Music hath Charms	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
814	Ortmans Miss F.A.	An Opening in the Forest of Fontainebleau	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
815	West Benjamin	Moses Striking the Rock	Painting	Annex, Gallery 12, Loan Collection
816	Gould T.R.	The West Wind	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 12
817	Gould M.S.	Water Babies	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 12
818	Gould T.R.	The Rose	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 12
819	Gould T.R.	The Lily	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 12
820	Mayer F.B. (Francis)	The Continentals	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
821	Darrah Mrs. S.T.	Sunset	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
822	Healy G.P.A.	Portrait -- Hon. E.B. Washburne	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
823	Birch Thos.	Marine	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
824	Tompkins Clementina	The Little Musician	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
825	Seitz Otto	Neptune's Bridal (Loan Collection)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
826	Tilton J.R.	The Lagoons of Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
827	Tompkins Clementina	An Artistic Debut	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
828	Coleman C.C.	Nuremberg Towers -- fifteenth century	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
829	Graham W.	Angle Column of Ducal Palace, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
830	Gregory J. Elliot	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
831	Bloomer H.B.	El Dorado	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
832	Chase W.M.	"Keying Up" -- The Court Jester	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
833	Inman H.	Portrait -- Bishop R.C. Moore	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
834	Healy G.P.A.	Portrait -- Lord Lyons	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
835	Du Bois C.E.	Palisades, Hudson River	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
836	Bierstadt A.	Yosemite Valley	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
837	Coleman C.C.	The Young Monk	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
838	Sully Thos.	Portrait -- Mrs. T. Sully	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
839	Benson Eugene	Interior of St. Mark's, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
840	Healy	Portrait -- Ex-President Thiers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
841	Brown	The East Highlands	Paintings	Annex, Gallery 10
842	Vedder	The Greek Actor's Daughter	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
843	Robinson	Bull's head	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
844	Parker	Portrait -- Mrs. H.W. Hills	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
845	Lang	Landing of the Market-Boat at Capri	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
846	Spencer	Earth, Air, and Water	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
847	West	Still Life -- game	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
848	Andrews	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
849	Thouron	Charlotte Corday -- The Eve of her Execution	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
850	Tait	Summer	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
851	Coleman	Still Life	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
852	McEntee	Virginia during the War	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
853	Andrews	Little Leonie	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
854	Elliott	Portrait -- Ex-Governor Bouck	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
855	Meeks	Little Nell and her Grandfather	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
856	Andrews	Portrait -- General Torbert	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
857	Andrews	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
858	Tait	Autumn	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
859	Montalant	The Parthenon, Athens	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
860	Marchant	Portrait -- H.C. Carey	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
861	Andrews	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
862	Shirlaw	Toning the Bell	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
863	Shirlaw	Feeding the Poultry	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
864	Middleton	Sketch at Cernay, near Paris	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
865	Tilton	J.R. Kem Ombres, Upper Egypt	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
866	Willard	A.M. Yankee Doodle	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
867	Rothermel	P.F. Trial of Sir Harry Vane	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
868	Senat	P.L. Moonrise near Rotterdam	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
869	Conan	Mrs. C.B. A French Village	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
870	Weir	J.F. The Confessional	Painting	Annex, Gallery 10
871	Bartholdi	Proposed Monument to Washington	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 10
872	Ezekiel	M. Grace Darling	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 10
873	Ezekiel	M. Sailor Boy	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 10
874	Ezekiel	M. Infant Mercury	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 10
875	Smith	F. Hill Sunset on the Giudecca, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
877	Benson	Eugene The Reverential Anatomist	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
876	Daniels	G.F. Crown Point and the Narrows, Lake Champlain	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
878	Staigg	R.M. Cornice Road, Italy	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
879	Brown	W.W. Spurwink River	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
880	Higgins	George F. Forest Interior, Adirondacks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
881	Staigg	R.M. Empty Nest	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
882	Shapleigh	F.H. Kenilworth	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
883	Millet	F.D. In the Bay of Naples	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
884	Millet	F.D. Lady in Costume of 1740	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
885	Shapleigh	F.H. On the Seine	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
886	Cole	J. Foxcroft Twilight, Melrose Highlands	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
887	De Blois	F.B. October in Canada	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
888	Cole	J. Foxcroft Cows Ruminating	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
889	Enneking	J.E. Moonlight on the Giudecca, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
890	Tuckerman	Beach at Hastings	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
891	Monks	Trees in Blossom	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
892	Champney	Artists' Brook, North Conway, N.H.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
893	Elwell	Downs near Ostend	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
894	Cole	Pastoral Scene	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
895	Allston	Isaac of York -- "Ivanhoe"	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
896	Porter	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
897	Brackett	The Rise	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
898	Brackett	The Leap	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
899	Brackett	The Last Struggle	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
900	Brackett	Landed	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
901	Key	The Golden Gate, San Francisco	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
902	Hinckley	End of the Chase	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
903	Freeman	Study for an Angel	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
904	Porter	The Hour-Glass	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
905	Cole	Coast Scene in Normandy	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
906	Elwell	Port of Antwerp	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
907	Robinson	New England Farmer	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
908	Weeks	Arab Story-Teller	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
909	Gay	Fall Flowers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
910	Boott	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
911	Baker	Azaleas	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
912	Alexander	Madonna	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
913	Ames	Portrait -- President Felton	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
914	Staigg	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
915	Staigg	R.M. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
916	Billings	E.T. Portrait -- Wendell Phillips	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
917	Jarvis	Melicent Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
918	Tuckerman	S.S. United States Frigate "Constitution" escaping from the British Fleet,	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
919	Staigg	R.M. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
920	Parker	Edgar Portrait -- J.G. Whittier	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
921	Hale	Ellen D. Boy Reading	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
922	Robinson	T. Dog's head	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
923	Hunt	W.M. The Boot-Black	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
924	Robinson	T. Sheep in Pasture	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
925	Ames	Joseph Portrait -- Daniel Webster	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
926	Brown	G.L. Sunset -- Genoa	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
927	Norton	W.E. Fog on the Grand Banks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
928	Champney	Benjamin At Glenora, N.Y.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
929	Billings	E.T. Wheelwright Shop	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
930	Longfellow	E.W. Old Mill at Manchester, Mass.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
931	Stuart	Gilbert Portrait -- Fisher Ames	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
932	Stuart	Gilbert Portrait -- Judge Story	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
933	Stuart	Gilbert Portrait -- Bishop Chevenix	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
934	Harding	Portrait -- Washington Allston	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
935	Bannister	E.W. Under the Oaks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
936	Champney	J.W. "Speak, Sir!"	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
937	Champney	Benjamin Old Willows at Manchester, Mass.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
938	Darrah	Mrs. S.T. Lake Champlain	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
939	Allston	Washington Head of a Jew	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
940	Stuart	Portrait -- Mrs. E. C. Cushing	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
941	Gerry	American Tourists	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
942	Petersen	Collision at Sea	Painting	Annex, Gallery 28
943	French	The Minute-Man, 1775	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 28
944	Whitney	Sketch -- Charles Sumner	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 28
945		Portrait bust	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 28
946	French	Bust -- J.G. Whittier	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 28
947	Whitney	Roma	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 28
948	Kendricks	Foggy Day at the Beach	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
949	De Blois	Licola, Italy	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
950	Leland	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
951	Way	An Old Friend	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
952	Martin	Flowers (panel)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
953	Champney	Grandma's Pet	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
954	Martin	Flowers (panel)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
955	Jarvis	Jeannette in her Studio	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
956	Snowe	A Cloudy Day	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
957	Robinson	An Old Team	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
958	Willard	Portrait [the artist's son]	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
959	Cobb	Portrait [Cyrus Cobb]	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
960	Holmes	The Adirondacks from Vermont	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
961	Bacon	The Boston Boys and General Gage, 1775	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
962	Willard	Portrait -- Charles Sumner	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
963	Wild	Banks of the Nile	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
964	Cole	Portrait -- Commodore D. Turner	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
965	Ulke	Portrait -- Charles Sumner	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
966	Weber	Morning in the Alleghamies	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
967	Ulke	Portrait -- General Grant	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
968	Pierson &	Firemen's Parade in New Orleans, 1871	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
969	Weber	Reichenbach Falls, Switzerland	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
970	Andrews	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
971	Fowler	Work for the Day is Over	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
972	Raupp	Approaching Storm	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
973	Bierstadt	California Spring	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
974	Kauffman	Influence of Electricity on Human Culture (ten subjects)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
975	Smith	Cluck and Chickens	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
975a	Wilson	Woman's Devotion	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
976	Moore	Almei, a Dream of the Alhambra	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
977	Brown	Niagara by Moonlight	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
978	Guthers	Awakening Spring	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
979	Birch	Perry's Victory on Lake Erie	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
980	Johns	"To Tubal-Cain came many a one,/And each one prayed/For a strong	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
981	Noble	The Tramp	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
982	Boyle	The Prayer of Judith	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
983	Bartlett	Callas and Amarylhis (two panels)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 42
983a	Calverly	Bronze bust of John Brown	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42
984	Richards	Satisfaction	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42
985	Fillians	Portrait bust	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42
986	Richards	Disgust	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42
987	Whitney	The Model	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
987a	Kretschman	E.A.	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 42
988	Volkmar	Chas., Jr.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
989	Rothermel	P.F.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
990	Coleman	C.C.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
991	Healy	G.P.A.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
992	Lea	Anna M.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
993	Furness	W.H., Jr.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
994	Morrell	Mrs. I.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
995	Winters	Miss Anna	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
996	Galvan	Mrs. S.M.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
997	Willcox	W.H.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
998	Spencer	Mrs. Lily M.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
999	Galvan	Mrs. S.M.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1000	Shaw	Annie C.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1001	Gunnison	Miss M. D.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1002	Lambdin	J.R.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1003	Hill	Thomas	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1004	Julio	E.B.D.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1005	Bierstadt	A.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1006	Guthers	Carl	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1007	Waugh	S.B.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1008	Wilson	Oregon	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1009	Kaufmann	Theodore	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1010	Rothermel	P.F.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1011	Furness	W.H., Jr.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
1012	Coleman	Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1013	Furness	Portrait -- Rev. W.H. Furness	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1014	Peale	Portrait of the artist	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1015	Stanley	The Indian Signal	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1016	Galvan	Flowers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1017	Elkins	Shasta, an extinct volcano of North California	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1018	Sword	Trenton Falls, N. Y.	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1019	Hill	Yosemite Valley	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1020	Galvan	Roses (two panels)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1021	Smith	Mind and Matter	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1022	Audubon	Covey of Blackcock	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1023	Simon	"Steady"	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1024	Herzog	Norwegian Waterfall in Hallingdal	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1025	Smith	The Kearsarge and Alabama	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1026	Eberhardt	Portrait -- Rear-Admiral Winslow, former commander of the	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1027	Wild	El Majo de Granada	Painting	Annex, Gallery 40
1028	Mundhenk	"Auld Lang Syne"	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40
1029	Kernys	Panther and Deer	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40
1030	Swayne	Bust of W. H. Seward	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40
1031	Swayne	Bust of Abraham Lincoln	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40
1032	Swayne	Bust of Salmon P. Chase	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40
1033	Hess	Bust of Bayard Taylor	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 40
1034	Ropes	Tivoli	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1035	Stewart	Marie	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1036	Healy	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
1037	Schussele	C. Zeisberger preaching to the Indians	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1038	Trotter	N.H. Wounded Buffaloes pursued by Prairie Wolves	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1039	Moran	Thos. "Fiercely the red sun descending burned his way along the heavens"	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1040	Haseltine	W.S. Natural Arch at Capri	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1041	Briscoe	F.D. Wreckers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1042	Fassett	Mrs. C. Adele Portrait -- Chief-Justice Waite	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1043	Gardner	Miss E.J. The Fortune-Teller	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1043a	King	Geo. W. View in the Tyrol	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1044	Lambdin	G.C. On a Summer Sea	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1045	Leland	Henry Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1046	Harrison	Henry Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1047	Moran	Thos. Valley of the Rio Virgen, Utah	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1048	Rothermel	P.F. Christian Martyrs in the Colosseum	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1049	Moran	Thos. Dream of the Orient	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1050	Eakins	Thos. Portrait [Lady at a Piano]	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1051	Leland	Henry Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1052	Machen	W.H. Still Life -- Ruffed Grouse	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1053	Craig	Thos. B. Indian Summer	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1054	Rothermel	P.F. The Virtuoso	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1055	Mayer	F[rancois]B. The Attic Philosopher	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1056	Coleman	C.C. The Troubador	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1057	Smith	T. Henry Portrait [Henry Harrison, Jr.]	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1058	Healy	G.P.A. Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1059	Lea	Anna M. A Patrician Mother	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1060	Randle	Fred Flowers	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
1061	Porter	Study of a Child	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1062	Heaton	Washington as Ambassador at Fort Duquesne	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1063	Kunath	"He won't bite"	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1064	Kunath	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1065	Richards	Campagna di Roma	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1066	Coleman	Grand Canal, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1067	Waugh	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1068	Lea	Genevieve de Brabant	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1069	Bonfield	Drifting Snow	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1070	Way	Grapes (two panels)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1071	John	The Minstrel	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1072	Moran	Settled Rain	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1073	Weir	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1074	Peale	Washington: from life	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1075	Waters	Still Life -- Mallard Ducks	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1076	Rosenthal	"Remind me not that I alone/Am cast out from the Spring."	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1077	Smith	Mount Vernon in 1836	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1078	Waugh	Cosette	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1079	Wood	Freddy Flechtenstein's Shop	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1080	Smith	Cave at Cheltenham Hills	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1081	Pettit	Cremation of Julius Caesar	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1082	Winner	Portrait	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1083	Rothermel	The Landsknecht	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1084	Williams	October	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1085	Weir	The Column of St. Mark's, Venice	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
1086	Volk	Vanity	Painting	Annex, Gallery 30
1087	Rogers	Atala	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30
1088	Passage	Return from the Boar-Hunt	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30
1089	Richards	Il Penseroso	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30
1090	Reniers	Bust -- Col T.A. Scott	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30
1091	Hess	Lizzie's Pet	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30
1092	Richards	Portrait bust	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 30
n/a	Catlin	Indian Gallery (126 works)	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
n/a	Peale	General Cropper	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1093	Reynolds	Portrait -- Mr. Groves	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1094	Richards	Portrait -- Mrs. Groves	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1095	Peale	Portrait of Washington; from life	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1096	Wertmuller	Portrait of Washington; from life	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1097	Smibert	Portrait -- P. Faneuil	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1098	Kneller	Portrait -- Lord Baltimore; presented to the City of Annapolis by	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1099	Plantou	Triumph of America, or the Treaty of Ghent	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1100	Truman	Portrait -- Thos. Hutchinson	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1101	Sargent	Portrait -- General B. Lincoln	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1102	(Unknown)	Portrait -- Alexander Hamilton	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1103	Tenney	Portrait -- General Stark	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1163	Peale	Portrait -- Mrs. General Cropper	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1164	West	Portrait -- Stephen Carmick, Signer of the Non-Importation Act	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1165	Vanderlyn	Portrait - General Armstrong	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1166	Dunlap	Portrait -- Thomas Eddy	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1167	Morse	Portrait -- General Lafayette	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
1168	Sully	Portrait -- Commodore Decatur	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1169	Jarvis	Portrait -- Commodore Macdonough	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1170	Trumbull	Portrait -- General Washington	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1171	Waldo	Portrait -- General Jackson	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1171a	Jarvis	Portrait -- Commodore Perry	Painting	Annex, Gallery 44
1172	Broome	Base-Ball Players (Parian)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1173	Park	Birdie (bust)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1174	Park	Summer	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1175	Park	Purity	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1176	Park	First Boots	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1177	Park	Gardener's Daughter	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1178	Park	First Sorrow	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1179	Park	Sunshine	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1180	Park	Sappho (statuette)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1181	Park	Good-Morning	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1182	Park	Sappho (bust)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1183	Park	Rosebud	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1183a	Rush	Bust of Washington (clay model from life)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1183b	McDonald	Bust of Washington	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1183c	Este	Iolanthe, King Rene's blind daughter	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1183d	Henning	Happy Days in the Valley of Nysa	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1183e	Jacquier	Bust of Shakspeare [sic]	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1184	Story	Medea	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 44
1185	Foley	Jeremiah	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1186	Turner	Fisherman's Daughter	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
1187	Connelly	Horse's head	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1188	Haseltine	Fortune	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1189	Connelly	Queen Phillipa	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1190	Connelly	Thetis thinking how she may regain the birthright of her son Achilles	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1191	Connelly	Lady Clare	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1192	Powers	Bust of Charles Sumner	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1193	Connelly	Helen of Troy	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1194	Connelly	Diana Transforming Actaeon	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1195	Connelly	The Thread of Life	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1196	Connelly	Viola	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1197	Lawlor	The Emigrant	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1198	Haseltine	Spring Flowers	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1199	Haseltine	Lucretia	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1200	Haseltine	Captivity	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1201	Foley	Cleopatra	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1202	Turner	Transition	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1203	Haseltine	Cleopatra	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1204	Handley	America Honoring her Fallen Brave	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1205	Stone	Bronze vase	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1206	Story	Beethoven	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1207	Handley	Spring Crowning herself with Flowers	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1208	Handley	Giotto	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1209	Handley	Autumn Flowers	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1210	Haseltine	Duke of Leuchtenberg (equestrian statuette)	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1211	Haseltine	Lucia di Lammermoor	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
1212	Park	R.H.	The Mechanic -- bronze portrait statue	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1213	Palmer	E.D.	Bronze statue of Robert Livingston	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1214	Stone	Horatio, Dr.	Two bronze vases	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1215	Bailly	J.A.	Equestrian statue of Antonio Guzman Blanco, President of Venezuela	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1216	St. Gaudens	Aug.	Bust of Hon. William Evarts	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1217	Rogers	Randolph	Ruth	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1218	Ream	Vinnie	Spirit of the Carnival	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1219	Mills	Theodore A.	Eve	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1220	Ream	Vinnie	The West	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1221	Smith	R.C.	Bust of President J.M Sturtevant, of Illinois College	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1222	Ream	Vinnie	Miriam	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1223	Rogers	Randolph	Nydia, the Blind Girl of Pompeii	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1224	Ream	Vinnie	Bust of Senator Morrell	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1225	Warren	O.L.	Medallion of Edwin Forrest	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1226	Harnisch	A.E.	Bust of William J. Mullen	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1227	Connelly	P.F.	St. Martin Dividing his Cloak	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1227a	Fetweis	C.L., Jr.	Cast Away	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1228	Van Reuth	E.	Homage of America to the Spirit of her Institutions	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1228a	Stuart	Gilbert	The original portrait, from life, of Washington, painted in 1796. The	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1228b	Travers	W.T.K.	Abraham Lincoln	Mem Hall, Grand Central Hall, Gallery B
1230	Calverley		Bas-relief likeness of Peter Cooper	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1231	Lewis	Edmonia	Death of Cleopatra	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1232	Harnisch	A.E.	Statue of Wm. J. Mullen	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1233	Fillans	Miss W.	Medallion portrait	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1234	Foley	Miss M.	Two medallions of Mary and William Howitt	Mem Hall, Gallery K

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
1235	Turner	Night	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1236	Turner	Morning	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1237	Meynen	Statuette of the Madonna	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1238	Tassera	Singing Angels (alto-rilievo)	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1239	Graef	Model of a monument to Dr. Wales	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1240	Graef	Saint Mary	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1241	Graef	The First Step	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1242	Harnisch	Sketch for a monument to the Prisoner's Friend	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1243	Graef	Infant Bacchus	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1244	Foley	Medallion -- Mrs. T.B. Read	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1244a	Ream	Bust of a child	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1245	Ghetti	Monument to a child	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1246	Gerardin	Bouquet	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1247	Meyer	Portrait of a boy	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1248	Meyer	Portrait of a girl	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1248a	Waugh	Saint Agnes	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1248b	Gordon	Inspiration (bas-relief)	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1248c	Gordon	Rosebud (bas-relief)	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1248d	Kappler	Medallion -- Professor Agassiz	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1249	Hartley	The Young Samaritan	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1250	Benton	Metal model of Independence Hall	Sculpture	Mem Hall, Gallery K
1251	Eyre	Leda	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1252	Eyre	Rebecca	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1253	Eyre	Hercules and Antaeus	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1254	Eyre	Ruth	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
1255	Eyre	M. Dickerson Juno	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1256	Eyre	M. Dickerson Genius of the Vatican	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1256a	Seelig	M.J. & Co. Aesculapius (spelter)	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1256b	Seelig	M.J. & Co. Cupid (spelter)	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1256c	Seelig	M.J. & Co. A vase (spelter)	Sculpture	West Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1257	Eyre	M. Dickerson Psyche	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1258	Eyre	M. Dickerson Bust of Michael Angelo	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1259	Eyre	M. Dickerson Vulcan	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1260	Eyre	M. Dickerson Bust of Dante	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1261	Eyre	M. Dickerson Autumn	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1262	Eyre	M. Dickerson Spring	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1263	Eyre	M. Dickerson Hebe	Sculpture	East Arcade, Facade of Mem Hall
1288	Schworer	A. A Surprise	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1289	Wagner	A. Chariot-Race	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1290	Mayer	A.L. Marguerite	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1291	Kayser	E. The Convalescent	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1292	Epp	R. The Young Mother	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1293	Kockert	F. Autumn	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1294	Moreau	A. Field Flowers	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1295	Fichel	E. The Naturalist	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1296	Merle	H. Charity	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1297	Meyer von	men The Rabbit-Seller	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1298	Cortazzo	O. Difficult to Rhyme	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1299	Beard	J.H. "There's many a slip," etc.	Painting	Mem Hall, Gallery Y
1409	Lewis	Edmonia Old Arrow Maker	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
1409	Lewis	Hiawatha's Marriage	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1409	Lewis	Henry Wadsworth Longfellow	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1409	Lewis	Asleep (group in marble)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1409	Lewis	John Brown	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1409	Lewis	Charles Sumner	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	29 groups of plaster statuary for house and lawn (incl. the following)	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	Camp Fire or Making Friends with the Cook	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	Challenging the Union Vote	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	The Council of War	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	Country Post Office	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	The Home Guard--Midnight on the Border	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	The Picket Guard	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	The Returned Volunteer--How the Fort was Taken	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	Taking the Oath and Drawing Rations	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	The Town Pump	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	Union Refugees	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	Wound to the Rear--One More Shot	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
1410	Rogers	The Wounded Scout--A Friend in the Swamp	Sculpture	Annex, Gallery 22
n/a		Dr. Spaulding	Painting	Phila. Evening Bulletin, 8 July 1876, 2.
n/a		Elias Howe	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613
n/a		Walter Scott	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613
n/a		General R.E. Lee	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613
n/a		Gottschalk	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613
n/a	Anderson	Animal painting	Painting	Phila. Evening Bulletin, 27 June 1876, 2.
n/a	Bruerke	Columbus Discovering America	Painting	USCC, Reports and Awards, 693

Cat. No.	Artist	Title	Medium	Location
n/a	Degolia	Flowers	Painting	New York Herald, 10 April 1876, 5
n/a	Fenn	Old Fireplace	Painting	McCabe, Illustrated History, 587
n/a	Fenn	Old Covenant Gate	Painting	McCabe, Illustrated History, 587
n/a	Lewis	1876	Painting	Strahan, Masterpieces of the Centennial,
n/a	McKnight	Child	Painting	Phila. Evening Bulletin, 24 June 1876, 1
n/a	Mulvaney	Trial of a Horse Thief	Painting	Steele, Popular History of Our Country,
n/a	Page	Farragut Entering Mobile Bay	Painting	McCabe, Illustrated History, 587
n/a	Rogers	Hide	Sculpture	Sandhurst, Great Centennial Exh., 58, 60
n/a	Rogers	Seek	Sculpture	Sandhurst, Great Centennial Exh., 58, 60
n/a	Thorpe	Westward the Course of Empire Takes Its Way	Painting	McCabe, Illustrated History, 589
n/a	Tiffany	Snake Charmer	Painting	Steele, Popular History of Our Country,
n/a	Tiffany	A Guard at the Prison Gate, Tangier	Painting	McCabe, Illustrated History, 587
n/a	Volk	Bust of Douglas	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613
n/a	Volk	Bust of Lincoln	Sculpture	Daily Graphic, 13 May 1876, 613

Bibliography

Archival Materials

Henry Kirke Brown Papers, Yale University Library.

James Lawrence Claghorn Papers, Philadelphia Maritime Museum (reel and frame numbers refer to microfilm copies in the Archives of American Art).

Director-General Correspondence Received, 1876 (2), United States Centennial Commission Correspondence and Papers, Philadelphia City Archives.

Minutes of Meeting of the Commissioners of Fairmount Park, Fairmount Park Commission Archives, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

William J. Hoppin Papers, Houghton Library, Harvard University.

Pennsylvania Museum of Art, Accession Records, Philadelphia Museum of Art, Registrar's Office.

Sartain Family Papers, Historical Society of Pennsylvania (Phi 1650) (reel and frame numbers refer to microfilm copies in the Archives of American Art).

James D. Smillie Diary, Smillie Family Papers, Archives of American Art.

Primary Sources (articles grouped together by publication when more than one is cited)

The Aldine articles:

Sears, John. "Art in Philadelphia." 8 (June 1876): 196.

Marble, Earl. "Art in Boston: More Centennial Pictures." 8 (August 1876): 240.

"The Loan Exhibition." 8 (August 1876): 241.

"An Opinion." 8 (September 1876): 293-4.

American Architect and Building News articles:

Untitled ("The exhibition of paintings is as yet..."). 1 (27 May 1876): 169.

"The Fine Arts at the Centennial – I." 1 (1 July 1876): 213-4.

"The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VII." 1 (12 August 1876): 261-2.

"The Fine Arts at the Centennial – VIII." 1 (19 August 1876): 269-70.

"American Art and the Centennial." *New York Commercial Advertiser*. 28 July 1875, 2.

Angell, Henry C. *Records of William M. Hunt*. Boston: James R. Osgood and Company, 1881.

Appleton, Nathan. *The Centennial Movement*. Boston: Lockwood, Brooks, and Company, 1877.

Appleton's Journal articles:

- "Historical Art in the United States." 1 (10 April 1869): 45-6.
 "Editor's Table." 15 (12 February 1876): 213-5.
 "Editor's Table." 15 (15 April 1876): 503-4.
 S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter]. "Art at the Exhibition." 15 (3 June 1876): 724-6.
 Untitled article ("We have referred to the enlarged constituency..."). 2 (March 1877): 284-5.

Archer, T.C. "On the Probable Influence Which the Centennial Exhibition Will Have on the Progress of Art in America." *Art Journal* (London). 16 (January 1877): 7-8.

"Art Apathy." *New York Evening Telegram*. 1 September 1875, 2.

The Art Amateur articles:

- [Montezuma]. "My Notebook." 20 (April 1889): 98-9.
 Montezuma. "My Notebook." 20 (August 1889): 46-7.

The Art Journal (New York) articles:

- "In the Studios: The Centennial Exhibition." 1 (1875): 383.
 "Centennial Fine-Arts Gallery." 1 (1876): 86.
 "Notes: From Rome." 2 (1876): 127-8.
 "The National Academy of Design." 2 (1876): 157-9.
 "The Centennial Exhibition." 2 (1876): 161-8.
 "Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition: The English Pictures." 2 (1876): 218-20.
 "Notes: The Centennial Loan Exhibition, New York." 2 (1876): 256.
 S.N.C. [Susan Nichols Carter]. "Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition." 2 (1876): 283-5.
 "Notes: The New York Centennial Loan Exhibition." 3 (1877): 32.

Atlantic Monthly articles:

- "Characteristics of the International Fair." 38 (July 1876): 85-91.
 Howells, William Dean. "A Sennight of the Centennial." 38 (July 1876): 92-107.
 "Characteristics of the International Fair: II." 38 (August 1876): 233-9.
 "Characteristics of the International Fair: IV." 38 (October 1876): 492-501.
 "Characteristics of the International Fair: V." 38 (December 1876): 732-40.
 "Characteristics of the International Fair: Closing Days." 39 (January 1877): 94-100.
 "The Contributor's Club." 39 (May 1877): 617-8.

Bailey, David. "*Eastward Ho!*" *Or Leaves from the Diary of a Centennial Pilgrim*. Highland, Ohio: David Bailey, 1877.

Baur, John I.H., ed. *The Autobiography of Worthington Whittredge, 1820-1910*. Brooklyn Museum Journal, 1942.

Benjamin, S.G.W. "American Art Since the Centennial." *The Princeton Review* 4 (July 1887): 14-30.

_____. *Art in America: A Critical and Historical Sketch*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1880.

_____. "Tendencies of Art in America." *The American Art Review* 1 (January 1880): 105-10.

Bricktop. *Going to the Centennial and A Guy to the Great Exhibition*. New York: Collin & Small, 1876.

Bruce, Edward C. *The Century: Its Fruits and Its Festival: Being a History and Description of the Centennial Exhibition, with a Preliminary Outline of Modern Progress*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1877.

Burley, Sylvester W. *American Enterprise. Burley's United States Centennial Gazetteer and Guide, 1876*. Philadelphia: S.W. Burley, 1876.

E.A.C. "Fine Arts at the Centennial." *New York Evening Mail* 10 August 1876, 1-2.

Caffin, Charles H. *American Masters of Sculpture*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1903. Reprint, New York: Gordon Press, 1980.

_____. *American Masters of Painting*. New York: Doubleday, Page & Company, 1902.

_____. *The Story of American Painting*. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Company, 1907.

Catalogue of the Forty-Seventh Annual Exhibition of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, 1876. Philadelphia: Collins, 1876.

Cauldwell, John B. "Report of the Department of Fine Arts, Group II." In *Report of the Commissioner-General for the United States to the International Universal Exposition, Paris, 1900*, vol. II, 487-568. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1901.

"Centennial Art: Glimpses at the Philadelphia Art Collections." *The Boston Globe*. 16 May 1876, 5.

"Centennial Notes." *Public Ledger* (Philadelphia) 20 May 1876, 1.

Champney, James Wells. *Massachusetts Artists' Centennial Album*. Boston: J.R. Osgood & Co., 1876.

Clark, William J. Jr. *Great American Sculptures*. Philadelphia: Gebbie & Barrie, 1878.

Clarke, Ellis T. "Alien Element in American Art." *Brush and Pencil* 7 (October 1900): 35-47.

Cohen, David Solis. *One Hundred Years a Republic: Our Show*. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen & Haffelfinger, 1876.

Conant, S.S. "Progress of the Fine Arts." In *The First Century of the Republic: A Review of American Progress*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1876.

Cook, Clarence. "Art in America in 1883." *The Princeton Review* 59 (May 1883): 311-20.

_____. *Art and Artists of our Time*. New York: S. Hess, 1888.

The Crystal Palace Exhibition; Illustrated Catalogue, London 1851. An Unabridged Republication of the Art-Journal Special Issue. London: Dover Publications, 1970.

E.B.D. "The Great Centennial Exhibition: The Art Exhibition." *Arthur's Illustrated Home Magazine* 44 (September 1876): 563-66.

Daily Evening Transcript (Boston) articles:

"Art and Artists." 31 August 1875, 6.

"Art and Artists." 5 October 1875, 6.

"Art and Artists." 14 December 1875, 6.

"Paris Echoes." 2 March 1876, 6.

Alex. "Massachusetts Artists and the Centennial." 13 March 1876, 6.

"Art and Artists." 31 March 1876, 6.

"Art and Artists." 4 April 1876, 6.

A.P. "Centennial Echoes." 29 September 1876, 6.

"Art at the Centennial Exhibition." 14 October 1876, 8.

"Art and Artists." 11 March 1878, 6.

"American Art at Paris." 18 March 1878, 6.

"The Paris Exposition." 2 May 1878, 5.

"Art and Artists." 16 May 1878, 6.

"Art and Artists." 25 November 1878, 6.

"Art Notes." 28 February 1889, 4.

"New York Notes." 4 March 1889, 6.

Gordon. "The War of the Artists." 23 February 1893, 3.

H.T.P. "The Artists and the Fair." 25 February 1893, 9.

Bumpus, M.L. "The Fine Arts: American vs. French Art at Chicago." 16 August 1893, 6.

Dale, John Thomas. *What Ben Beverly Saw at the Great Exposition*. Chicago: Centennial Publishing Co., 1876.

Dodge, Pickering. *Sculpture: and the Plastic Art*. Boston: John P. Jewett, 1850.

Dorr, Dalton. "Art Museums and Their Uses." *The Penn Monthly* 12 (August 1881): 561-73.

Dunlap, William. *History of the Rise and Progress of The Arts of Design in the United States*. New York: George P. Scott and Company, 1834. Reprint, New York: Dover Publications, 1969.

Eliot, Samuel. *Memoir of Charles Callahan Perkins*. Cambridge: J. Wilson and Son, 1887.

The Evening Post (New York) articles:

"American Paintings at the Centennial Exhibition." 26 August 1875, 24.

"Art at the Centennial." 30 August 1875, 2.

"American Art at the Centennial Exhibition." 16 September 1875, 2.

"American Art at the Centennial Exhibition." 24 September 1875, 2.

"Fine Arts." 18 October 1875, 2.

"Fine Arts," 17 January 1876, 1

"Fine Arts." 15 March 1876, 1.

"Miss Hosmer's Work for the Centennial Exhibition." 20 March 1876, 2.

"The National Academy of Design: The New York Centennial Loan Exhibition." 19 June 1876, 4.

"Metropolitan Museum of Art: The New York Centennial Loan Exhibition." 20 June 1876, 4.

"The Belmont Gallery." 21 June 1876, 4.

"A New Centennial Art Catalogue." 3 August 1876, 4.

"Another English View of American Art." 30 August 1876, 2.

"American Artist." "The Centennial Exhibition: An American Artist on the Art Awards." 20 October 1876, 1.

"American Art at the Exhibition." 4 November 1876, 2.

"The Centennial Art Exhibition." 4 November 1876, 3.

"The Mistake of the Academicians." 23 April 1877, 2.

"American Artists." 30 November 1877, 3.

Evening Telegraph (Philadelphia) articles:

"The Art Department. Forty-sixth Notice--American Sculpture." 12 October 1876, 8.

"Centennial Awards. The Art Department List." 20 October 1876, 1.

Exposition des Beaux-arts de 1855: Liste par Ordre Alfabétique des Artistes Étrangers et Français dont les Ouvrages sont Exposés au Palais des Beaux-Arts. Paris: Vinchon, 1855.

First and Second Reports of the Board of Trustees of the Pennsylvania Museum and School of Industrial Art, 1876-77. Philadelphia: Review Printing House, 1878.

Fletcher, Robert Schenck. *The Centennial Exhibition of 1876: What We Saw and How We Saw It. Part I. Art Glances*. Philadelphia: S.T. Souder & Co., 1876.

Forney, John W. *A Centennial Commissioner in Europe*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1876.

Galaxy articles:

Quilibet, Philip. "Drift-Wood: The Centenary." 20 (July 1875): 118-21.

_____. "Drift-Wood: Come Over and Help Us." 21 (February 1876): 269-72.

_____. "Drift-Wood." 21 (May 1876): 696-9.

Anderson, Thomas M. "Have We a National Character?" 21 (June 1876): 733-7.

Coan, Titus Munson. "People and Pictures at the Fair." 22 (December 1876): 761-9.

Greeley, Horace, ed. *Art and Industry as Represented in the Exhibition at the Crystal Palace, New York, 1853-4*. New York: New York Daily Tribune, 1853.

Hand-Book to the Centennial Grounds and Fairmount Park: Where to Go and What to See. Philadelphia: John E. Potter & Company, 1876.

Harper's New Monthly Magazine articles:

"Present Tendencies of American Art." 43 (March 1879): 481-96.

Child, Theodore. "American Artists at the Paris Exposition." 79 (September 1889): 489-521.

Hartmann, Sadakichi. *A History of American Art*. New York: Tudor Publishing Company, 1934, first released in 1901.

Hawkins, Rush C. "Report on the Fine Arts." In *Reports of the United States Commissioners to the Universal Exposition of 1889 at Paris*, 3-105. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1891.

Holley, Marietta. *Josiah Allen's Wife as a P.A. and a P.I. Samantha at the Centennial*. Hartford, CT: American Publishing Company, 1877.

The Independent articles:

"Fine Arts." 18 May 1876, 5.

Round, Wm. M.F. "Art at the Exposition." 8 June 1876, 12.

Miller, Joaquin. "The Great Centennial Fair and Its Future." 13 July 1876, 1.

Briggs, Charles F. "Centennial Paintings: The American Department." 13 July 1876, 4-5.

_____. "The Centennial Art Exhibition: The American Department." 20 July 1876, 3-4.

Ingram, J.S. *The Centennial Exposition*. Philadelphia: Hubbard Bros., 1876.

The International Exhibition Guide for the Southern States. Raleigh, N.C.: R.T. Fulghum, 1876.

The International Review articles:

“Vienna and the Centennial.” 2 (January 1875): 1-24.

Walker, Francis A. “The Late World’s Fair. Part II – The Display.” 4 (July 1877): 497-513.

Isham, Samuel. *The History of American Painting*. New York: Macmillan, 1905.

Journal of the Franklin Institute articles:

K. “Centennial Exhibition.” 70 (July 1875): 16-9.

“The United States International Exhibition of 1876.” 102 (December 1876): 361-4.

“Motive Power of the International Exhibition.” 103 (January 1877): 1-7.

Koehler. S.R. *American Art*. New York: Cassell and Company, 1886.

_____. “The Future of Art.” *The American Art Review* 1 (December 1879): 72-4.

Lossing, Benson John. *The American Centenary*. Philadelphia: Porter, 1876.

Massachusetts Commission to the Vienna Exposition. *Reports of the Massachusetts Commissioners to the Exposition at Vienna, 1873*. Boston: Wright & Potter, 1875.

McCabe, James D. *The Illustrated History of the Centennial Exhibition*. Philadelphia: The National Publishing Company, 1876.

The Nation articles:

“The Progress of the Exhibition.” 22 (16 March 1876): 174-5.

E.S. [Earl Shinn]. “The International Exhibition – II: British Paintings.” 22 (1 June 1876): 347-8.

_____. “The International Exhibition – IV: American Art.” 23 (6 July 1876): 6-7.

_____. “The International Exhibition – XI: American Art – II.” 23 (3 August 1876): 71-3.

_____. “The International Exhibition – XIII: Italian Sculpture.” 23 (17 August 1876): 104-5.

_____. “The International Exhibition – No. XVI: French Art.” 23 (28 September 1876): 193-4.

_____. “The International Exhibition – No. XVII: French Art – II.” 23 (12 October 1876): 224-6.

G.W.N [George Ward Nichols]. “Correspondence: The Centennial Painting Awards.” 23 (12 October 1876): 227-8.

“The Awards at the Centennial Exhibition.” 23 (23 November 1876): 310.

Smith, Frank Hill. “Correspondence. The Centennial Art Awards.” 23 (7 December 1876): 340.

“‘Correspondence: The Fine Arts Group at the Centennial Exhibition,’ letter from Geo. Ward Nichols, Cincinnati, 17 December 1877 and Francis A. Walker, New Haven, 24 December 1877.” 25 (27 December 1877): 393-4.

Coffin, William A. "The Columbian Exposition -- II. Fine Arts: The United States Section." 57 (10 August 1893): 96-8.

_____. "The Columbian Exposition – III. Fine Arts: Pictures by American Artists – Sculptural and Pictorial Decoration." 57 (17 August 1893): 114-6.

National Republican articles:

"Ruhamah." "An Hour's Sojourn in the Gallery of Art." 13 June 1876, 1.

"Ruhamah." "Art at the Centennial." 15 June 1876, 1.

New York Centennial Loan Exhibition. Exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1876.

New-York Daily Tribune articles:

[Clarence Cook]. "The Exhibition of Pictures at the Metropolitan Fair." 9 April 1864, 12.

"Our Artists at the Paris Exposition." 23 January 1867, 2.

Cook, Clarence. "Art Notes: Art in Philadelphia." 22 May 1867, 2.

"American Art at Vienna." 4 March 1873, 4.

B.T. [Bayard Taylor]. "The Universal Exhibition." 28 May 1873, 1.

"The Universal Exhibition." 10 June 1873, 1.

Stillman, W.J. "The Irregularities in the American Department." 14 June 1873, 1.

Cook, Clarence. "Fine Arts: The National Academy of Design." 29 April 1875, 7.

"Centennial Monuments." 30 April 1875, 2.

"The Centennial Exhibition." 26 August 1875, 2.

"American Art at the Centennial." 6 September 1875, 4.

"An American Artist." "Art at the Centennial." 16 September 1875, 5.

"The Franco-American Union." 3 November 1875, 2.

"The Great Exhibition: Department of Art." 22 November 1875, 3.

"The Proposed Centennial Statue." 11 December 1875, 2.

"A Suggestion for the Centennial Summer." 2 March 1876, 4.

"Boston Artists at the Centennial." 20 March 1876, 8.

Cook, Clarence. "A Centennial Blunder." 4 May 1876, 2.

"Department of Fine Arts." 10 May 1876, 2.

"International Exhibitions." 10 May 1876, 6.

"The Centennial Fair: Novelties Added Daily." 17 May 1876, 1.

"The American System of Award." 26 May 1876, 1.

[Clarence Cook]. "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: First Notice." 1 June 1876, 8.

C.C. [Clarence Cook]. "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: Second Notice." 3 June 1876, 2.

_____. "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: Third Notice." 7 June 1876, 1.

_____. "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: Fourth Notice." 9 June 1876, 1.

_____. "The Fine Art Department. American Pictures: Fifth Notice." 17 June 1876, 2.

"Art Treasures at Home." 17 June 1876, 3.

"Art Notes." 19 August 1876, 2.

"Art Notes." 2 September 1876, 2.

- “Centennial Exhibition: Its Value to America.” 30 September 1876, 1.
 E.V.S. “Botching the Awards.” 27 October 1876, 1.
 “The American Department Debased.” 4 November 1876, 4.
 “The Great Fair Closed.” 11 November 1876, 1-2.
 “The Past Exhibition.” 16 November 1876, 4.
 “A Ramble Among the Studios.” 25 November 1876, 2.
 “Art at the World’s Fair.” 19 June 1893, 5.
 “American Art in Paris.” 22 July 1900, II, 1.

New-York Tribune Guide to the Exhibition. New York: New-York Daily Tribune, 1876.

New York Herald articles:

- “The Vienna Exhibition.” 4 August 1873, 3.
 “American Art at the Centennial.” 17 August 1875, 6.
 “Art at the Centennial.” 23 October 1875, 5.
 “Fine Arts.” 21 February 1876, 10.
 “American Artists in London.” 10 April 1876, 5.
 “The World’s Display of Art.” 11 May 1876, 6-7.
 “Vandalism at the Exhibition.” 20 May 1876, 7.
 “The Exhibition.” 29 May 1876, 11.
 “Condition of the Art Department at the Centennial.” 5 June 1876, 8.
 “The Changes Made in the Art Department of the Exhibition During the Past Week.” 19 June 1876, 9.
 “The Centennial Show.” 4 September 1876, 6.
 “After the Centennial.” 20 February 1877, 7.

New-York Times articles:

- “New-York’s Centennial Appeal.” 25 December 1874, 3.
 “A Book for the Centennial.” 26 December 1874, 4.
 “Revising History.” 4 May 1875, 6.
 “American Art.” 12 December 1875, 6.
 “The Fine Arts: Some New and Striking Pictures,” 2 January 1876, 10.
 “Art and the Centennial.” 5 February 1876, 5.
 “The New-York Centennial Board.” 16 March 1876, 8.
 Gar. “Something About Memorial Hall.” 7 May 1876, 2.
 “The Centennial Problem.” 26 May 1876, 4.
 Gar. “The German Paintings.” 26 May 1876, 4.
 _____. “The Art of America.” 9 June 1876, 1.
 _____. “The Art of America.” 11 June 1876, 1-2.
 _____. “The Art of America.” 13 June 1876, 1-2.
 “Art.” “An Exhibition Swindle.” 25 June 1876, 8.
 “The Medal Muddle.” 30 September 1876, 6.
 “Painters and Buyers.” 30 September 1876, 6.
 “Mechanic Arts at the Exposition.” 26 October 1876, 4.
 Frederic, Harold. “American Art in Paris.” 16 June 1889, 11.
 E.S.C. “Art at Chicago.” 23 June 1893, 9.

New York World articles:

- “American Art at the Centennial.” 21 June 1876, 6.
 “American Art at the Centennial.” 24 July 1876, 2.
 Untitled (“The review of the Centennial Art Exhibition...”). 24 July 1876, 4.
 “Art at the Paris Exposition.” 16 March 1878, 2.

Newark Daily Advertiser articles:

- “The Art Exhibition.” 13 July 1876, 1.
 Swinnerton, Henry U. “Centennial Letters.” 13 November 1876, 1.
 “The Centennial Loan Collection.” 25 November 1876, 2.

North American Review articles:

- “The Editor.” “The Progress of Painting in America.” 124 (May 1877): 451-64.
 McCormick, Richard C. “Our Success at Paris in 1878.” 129 (July 1879): 1-22.

Norton, Frank H., ed. *Frank Leslie's Illustrated Historical Register of the Centennial Exposition 1876: A Facsimile of Frank Leslie's Illustrated Historical Register of the Centennial Exposition, 1876*. New York: Paddington Press, 1974.

Parkman, Francis. *France and England in North America*, vol. 1. Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1865. Reprint, New York: Viking Press, 1983.

Catalogue of the Forty-Seventh Annual Exhibition of the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, 1876. Philadelphia: Collins, 1876.

Philadelphia Evening Bulletin articles:

- “Art Notes: Centennial Work by Philadelphia Artists.” 20 March 1876, 1.
 “Memorial Hall and the Fine Art Exhibits.” 11 May 1876, 8.
 “Art Arrivals.” 13 May 1876, 2.
 “Our Great Show.” 17 May 1876, 1-8.
 “The Fine Arts: Department of Sculpture.” 20 May 1876, 1-2.
 “The Centennial Pawnees.” 20 May 1876, 4.
 “Medical Department U.S.A.” 30 May 1876, 5.
 “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil.” 17 June 1876, 1.
 “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil.” 19 June 1876, 1.
 “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil.” 21 June 1876, 2.
 “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil.” 22 June 1876, 1.
 “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil.” 24 June 1876, 1.
 “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil.” 26 June 1876, 1-2.
 “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil.” 27 June 1876, 1-2.
 “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil.” 29 June 1876, 1-2.
 “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil.” 10 July 1876, 1-2.
 “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil.” 12 July 1876, 2.
 “The Fine Arts: United States Section – Paintings in Oil.” 13 July 1876, 1-2.
 “The Centennial Art Show.” 14 November 1876, 2.

Philadelphia Inquirer articles:

- “American Art at the Centennial.” 31 August 1875, 4.
 “The Great World’s Fair: Art and Industry.” 17 May 1876, 2.

The Press (Philadelphia) articles:

- E.D.M. “Arts and Artists Abroad.” 18 February 1876, 2.
 Untitled (“Mr. Clarence Cook...”). 5 May 1876, 1.
 “Visitors Inside and Their Comments.” 11 May 1876, 1.
 Memorial Hall Notes: A Walk in the Art Gallery.” 3 November 1876, 1-2.

Robinson, Frank T. *Living New England Artists*. Boston: S.E. Cassino, 1888.

Sandhurst, Phillip T. *The Great Centennial Exhibition*. Philadelphia: P.W. Ziegler & Co., 1876.

Sartain, John, ed. *The American Gallery of Art*. Philadelphia: Lindsay and Blakiston, 1848.

Sartain, John. *The Reminiscences of a Very Old Man*. New York: D. Appleton and Company, 1899.

_____. “Report of the Chief of the Bureau of Art.” In *International Exhibition, 1876. Report of the Director-General, Including the Reports of Bureaus of Administration*, vol. 1, United States Centennial Commission, 134-60. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880.

Scribner’s Monthly articles:

- “In and About the Fair: Dinners, Plants and Pictures.” 13 (November 1876): 115-24.
 “The Younger Painters of America.” 20 (May 1880): 1-15.

Sheldon, George William. *Recent Ideals of American Art*. New York: Garland Publishing, 1888.

Simonin, L. *A French View of the Grand International Exposition of 1876*. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen and Haffelfinger, 1877.

Something for the Children or Uncle John’s Story of His First Visit to the Centennial. Philadelphia: Campbell Press, 1876.

Statement Made by the Association for the Exhibition of the Industry of All Nations, In Regard to the Organization and Progress of the Enterprise. New York: Carr & Hicks, 1852.

- Story, William W. "Fine Arts." In *Reports of the United States Commissioners to the Paris Universal Exposition, 1878*, vol. II, 3-170. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880.
- Strahan, Edward [Earl Shinn]. *The Art Gallery of the Exhibition: A Selection from the Paintings and Sculpture Exhibition by Alma-Tadema, Bierstadt, Huntington, Moran, with Introduction and Descriptive Text by Edward Strahan*. Philadelphia: Gebbie, 1877.
- _____. *A Century After: Picturesque Glimpses of Philadelphia and Pennsylvania*. Philadelphia: Allen, Lane & Scott, 1875.
- "Suspension of Vienna Commissioners." *The Evening Star* (Washington, D.C.) 26 April 1873, 1.
- Taft, Lorado. *The History of American Sculpture*. New York: Macmillan Co., 1903. Reprint, New York: Arno Press, 1969.
- Trumble, Alfred. *Representative Works of Contemporary American Artists*. New York: Scribner, 1887. Reprint, New York: Garland Pub., 1978.
- Tuckerman, Henry T. *Book of the Artists*. New York: G.P. Putnam & Son, 1867.
- Tyng, S.H. *Address on the Occasion of the Funeral of William T. Blodgett*. n.p., 1875.
- United States Centennial Commission. *Appendix to the Reports of the United States Centennial Commission and Centennial Board of Finance*. Philadelphia: J.B. Lippincott & Co., 1879.
- _____. *International Exhibition, 1876. Official Catalogue, Art Gallery and Annexes. Department IV. Art. Fourteenth and Revised Edition*. Philadelphia, PA: John R. Nagle & Co., 1876.
- _____. *International Exhibition, Fairmount Park, 1876: Acts of Congress, Rules and Regulations, Description of the Buildings*. Philadelphia: U.S. Centennial Commission, 1875.
- _____. *International Exhibition, 1876. Reports and Awards*, vol. 7, Groups XXI-XXVII. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880.
- _____. *International Exhibition, 1876. Report of the Director-General, Including the Reports of Bureaus of Administration*, vol. 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880.

- _____. *International Exhibition, 1876. Reports of the President, Secretary, and Executive Committee, Together With the Journal of the Final Session of the Commission*, vol. 2. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880.
- _____. *Journal of the Proceedings of the United States Centennial Commission at Philadelphia*, 1st session, 1872. Philadelphia: E.C. Markley & Son, 1872.
- United States Commission to the Vienna Exposition, 1873. *Reports of the Commissioners of the United States to the International Exhibition Held at Vienna, 1873*, vol. 1. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1876.
- Wager, Mary A.K. "Paintings and Statuary: The Annex to Memorial Hall." *The Daily Graphic: New York*, 18 May 1876, 650.
- Walker, Francis Amasa. "The Exhibition in Memorial Hall," and "The Late World's Fair." In *A Popular History of Our Country: One Hundred Years of American Independence*, Joel Dorman Steele. Springfield, MA: Gay Brothers & Company, 1878.
- _____. *World's Fair. Philadelphia, 1876. A Critical Account*. New York: A.S. Barnes & Co., 1877.
- Weir, John F. "Group XXVII. Plastic and Graphic Art." In *International Exhibition, 1876. Reports and Awards*, vol. 7, Groups XXI-XXVII, United States Centennial Commission, 2-41. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1880.
- What is the Centennial? And How to See It*. Philadelphia, [T.S.] Dando, 1876.
- Whitman, Walt. "Song of the Exposition." In *Leaves of Grass*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1992.
- Woolsey, Rev. Theodore D. "Introduction." In *The First Century of the Republic: A Review of American Progress*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1876.
- World's Fairs from London 1851 to Chicago 1893*. Chicago: Midway Publishing Co., 1892.

Secondary Sources

- Anderson, Nancy K. and Linda S. Ferber. *Albert Bierstadt: Art and Enterprise*. Exh. cat., Brooklyn Museum, 1990.
- Avery, Kevin. "A Historiography of the Hudson River School." In *American Paradise: The World of the Hudson River School*, ed. John K. Howat, 3-20. Exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1987.

- Bennett, Tony. "The Exhibitionary Complex." *New Formations* 4 (Spring 1988): 73-102.
- Berkowitz, Julie S. "*Adorn the Halls*": *History of the Art Collection at Thomas Jefferson University*. Philadelphia: Thomas Jefferson University, 1999.
- Bienenstock, Jennifer A. "The Formation and Early Years of the Society of American Artists: 1877-1884." Ph.D. diss., City University of New York, 1983.
- Blaugrund, Annette. "Behind the Scenes: The Organization of the American Paintings." In *Paris 1889: American Artists at the Universal Exposition*. Exh. cat., Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, 1989.
- Braddock, Guilbert C. *Notable Deaf Persons*. Washington, D.C.: Gallaudet College Alumni Association, 1975.
- Broun, Elizabeth and Alan Fern. "Introduction." In *Revisiting the White City: American Art at the 1893 World's Fair*, eds. Carolyn Kinder Carr and George Gurney, 10-6. Exh. cat., National Museum of American Art and National Portrait Gallery, 1993.
- Brown, Dee. *The Year of the Century: 1876*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1966.
- Burke, Doreen Bolger and Catherine Hoover Voorsanger. "The Hudson River School in Eclipse." In *American Paradise: The World of the Hudson River School*, ed. John K. Howat, 71-90. Exh. cat., The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, 1987.
- Burns, Sarah. "In Whose Shadow? Eastman Johnson and Winslow Homer in the Postwar Decades." In *Eastman Johnson: Painting America*, eds. Teresa A. Carbone and Patricia Hills, 185-213. Exh. cat., Brooklyn Museum of Art, 1999.
- Carr, Carolyn Kinder. "Prejudice and Pride: Presenting American Art at the 1893 World's Columbian Exposition." In *Revisiting the White City: American Art at the 1893 World's Fair*, 62-123. Exh. cat., National Museum of American Art and National Portrait Gallery, 1993.
- Cawelti, John G. "America on Display: The World's Fairs of 1876, 1893, 1933." In *The Age of Industrialism in America*, ed. Frederic Cople Jaher, 317-63. New York: The Free Press, 1968.
- "The Centennial Exposition: 1876, A Summary." *Art and Archaeology* 21 (April 1926): 162.
- Conn, Steven. "Narrative Trauma and Civil War History Painting, or Why Are These Pictures So Terrible?" *History and Theory* 41 (December 2002): 17-42.
- Connor, Steven. *Postmodernist Culture: An Introduction to Theories of the Contemporary*. Oxford, New York: Basil Blackwell, 1989.

- Conrads, Margaret C. "‘In the Midst of an Era of Revolution’: The New York Art Press and the Annual Exhibitions of the National Academy of Design in the 1870s." In *Rave Reviews: American Art and Its Critics, 1826-1925*, ed. David B. Dearing, 93-105. Exh. cat., National Academy of Design, New York, 2000.
- Conrads, Margaret C. *Winslow Homer and the Critics: Forging a National Art in the 1870s*. Exh. cat., The Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, 2001.
- Cooper, Suzanne Fagene. "The British School at the Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857." *Apollo* 153 (June 2001): 30-8.
- Corn, Wanda. "Coming of Age: Historical Scholarship in American Art." *Art Bulletin* 70 (June 1988): 188-207.
- Crary, Jonathan. *Techniques of the Observer*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.
- Cummings, Thomas Seir. *Historic Annals of the National Academy of Design*. Philadelphia: G.W. Childs, 1865. Reprint, New York: Kennedy Galleries, 1969.
- Davis, John. "The End of the American Century: Current Scholarship on the Art of the United States." *Art Bulletin* 85 (September 2003): 544-80.
- Dearing, David B. "An Introduction to the History of American Art Criticism to 1925." In *Rave Reviews: American Art and Its Critics, 1826-1925*, ed. David B. Dearing, 17-29. Exh. cat., National Academy of Design, New York, 2000.
- _____. "Annual Exhibitions and the Birth of American Art Criticism to 1865." In *Rave Reviews: American Art and Its Critics, 1826-1925*, ed. David B. Dearing, 53-91. Exh. cat., National Academy of Design, New York, 2000.
- _____. "Appendix A: The Critics." In *Rave Reviews: American Art and Its Critics, 1826-1925*, ed. David B. Dearing, 273-5. Exh. cat., National Academy of Design, New York, 2000.
- Ditter, Dorothy E. C. "The Cultural Climate of the Centennial City: Philadelphia, 1875-1876." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1947.
- Docherty, Linda Jones. "A Search for Identity: American Art Criticism and the Concept of the ‘Native School.’" Ph.D. diss., University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1985.
- Donaldson, Christine Hunter. "The Centennial of 1876: The Exposition, and Culture for America." Ph.D. diss., Yale University, 1948.
- Eco, Umberto. "A Theory of Expositions." In *Travels in Hyper Reality*. San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1983.

- Fairmount Park Art Association: An Account of its Origin and Activities*. Philadelphia: Fairmount Park Art Association, 1922.
- Falk, Peter Hastings, ed. *Who Was Who in American Art, 1564-1975*. Madison, CT: Soundview Press, 1999.
- Ferber, Linda S. "Albert Bierstadt: The History of a Reputation." In *Albert Bierstadt: Art and Enterprise*, Nancy K. Anderson and Linda S. Ferber, 21-68. Exh. cat., Brooklyn Museum, 1990.
- Fielding, Mantle. *Mantle Fielding's Dictionary of Painters, Sculptors, and Engravers*. Poughkeepsie, NY: Apollo, 1986.
- Fink, Lois Marie. *American Art at the Nineteenth-Century Paris Salons*. Washington, D.C., National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, 1990.
- Fischer, Diane P. "Constructing the 'American School' of 1900." In *Paris 1900: The "American School" at the Universal Exposition*. Exh. cat., The Montclair Art Museum, 2000.
- Foner, Philip S. "Black Participation in the Centennial of 1876." *Negro History Bulletin* 39 (1976): 533-5.
- Frankenstein, Alfred. "American Art and the Urban Fair." In *The Shaping of Art and Architecture in Nineteenth-Century America*, 94-9. Exh. cat., Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1972.
- Garraty, John A. and Mark C. Carnes. *American National Biography*, vol. 12. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- Giberti, Bruno. "The Classified Landscape: Consumption, Commodity Order, and the 1876 Centennial Exhibition at Philadelphia." Ph.D. diss., University of California, Berkeley, 1994.
- _____. *Designing the Centennial: A History of the 1876 International Exhibition in Philadelphia*. Lexington: The University Press of Kentucky, 2002.
- Giese, Lucretia Hoover. "'Harvesting' the Civil War: Art in Wartime New York." In *Redefining American History Painting*, eds. Lucretia Hoover Giese and Patricia M. Burnham, 62-81. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Gold, Susanna W. "Imaging Memory: Re-Presentations of the Civil War at the 1876 Centennial Exhibition." Ph.D. diss., University of Pennsylvania, 2004.
- Gombrich, E.H. *Ideals and Idols: Essays in Values in History and in Art*. Oxford: Phaidon, 1979.

- Goodheart, Adam Kaufman. "Last Summer of the Republic: The Centennial Exhibition as Experiment and Experience." A.B. Honors Thesis, Harvard University, 1992.
- Green, Caroline V. "Fabricating the Dream: American World's Fair Sculpture, 1876-1915." Ph.D. diss., Boston University, 1992.
- Greenhalgh, Paul. *Ephemeral Vistas: The Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851-1939*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1988.
- Groce, George C. and David H. Wallace. *Dictionary of Artists in America, 1564-1860*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1966.
- Hajdel, Eugene A. *Harry H. Moore, American 19th Century*. Jersey City, NJ: [no publisher], 1950.
- Harding, Jonathan P. *The Boston Athenaeum Collection: Pre-Twentieth Century American and European Painting and Sculpture*. The Boston Athenaeum, 1984.
- Hartigan, Lynda Roscoe. *Sharing Traditions: Five Black Artists in Nineteenth Century America*. Exh. cat., National Museum of American Art, Washington, D.C., 1985.
- Hicks, John Henry. "The United States Centennial Exhibition of 1876." Ph.D. diss., University of Georgia, 1972.
- Higham, John. "The Construction of American History." In *Writing American History: Essays on Modern Scholarship*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1970.
- Higham, John. *History: Professional Scholarship in America*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1965.
- Hobbs, Susan. *1876: American Art of the Centennial*. Exh. cat., National Museum of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington D.C., 1976.
- Janson, Anthony F. *Worthington Whittredge*. Cambridge University Press, 1989.
- "Jervis McEntee's Diary, 1874-1876." *Archives of American Art Journal* 31 (January 1991): 2-19.
- Johns, Elizabeth. *American Genre Painting: The Politics of Everyday Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1991.
- Johns, Elizabeth. "Histories of American Art: The Changing Quest." *Art Journal* 44 (Winter 1984): 338-44.
- Kermode, Frank. *Forms of Attention*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1985.

- Kolbas, E. Dean. *Critical Theory and the Literary Canon*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press, 2001.
- LaFollette, Suzanne. *Art in America*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1929.
- Lancaster, Clay. "Taste at the Philadelphia Centennial." *Magazine of Art* 43 (December 1950): 293-7, 308.
- Lynes, Russell. *The Tastemakers*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1949.
- Maass, John. *The Glorious Enterprise: The Centennial Exhibition of 1876 and H.J. Schwartzmann, Architect-in-Chief*. Watkins Glen, NY: American Life Foundation, 1973.
- Mainardi, Patricia. *Art and Politics of the Second Empire: The Universal Expositions of 1855 and 1867*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1987.
- Martinez, Ann Katharine. "The Life and Career of John Sartain (1808-1897): A Nineteenth-Century Philadelphia Printmaker." Ph. D. diss., George Washington University, 1986.
- Martinez, Katharine. "A Portrait of the Sartain Family and Their Home." In *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*, Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott eds., 1-24. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.
- Matthews, Mildred Byars. "The Painters of the Hudson River School in the Philadelphia Centennial of 1876." *Art in America* 34 (July 1946): 143-60.
- May, Stephen. "Succeeding Against the Odds: Recognition at Last for Edmonia Lewis." *Sculpture Review* 44 (Fall 1995): 6-11.
- Mayer, Stephanie. "Reconsidering the 1853 Crystal Palace." Unpublished paper, Boston University, 2002.
- Meech, Julia and Gabriel P. Weisberg. *Japonisme Comes to America*. Exh. cat., The Jane Voorhees Zimmerli Art Museum, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 1990.
- Miller, Lillian B. "Engines, Marbles, and Canvases: The Centennial Exposition of 1876." In *1876: The Centennial Year*, Lillian B. Miller, Walter T.K. Nugent, and H. Wayne Morgan, 2-28. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1973.
- Mott, Frank Luther. *A History of American Magazines*, vol. 3. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1957-68.

- Nearpass, Kate. "The First Chronological Exhibition of American Art, 1872." *Archives of American Art Journal* 23 (1983): 21-30.
- Nicolai, Richard R. *Centennial Philadelphia*. Bryn Mawr, Penn.: Bryn Mawr Press, 1976.
- Nugent, Walter T.K. "Seed Time of Modern Conflict: American Society at the Centennial." In *1876: The Centennial Year*, Lillian B. Miller, Walter T.K. Nugent, and H. Wayne Morgan, 30-45. Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Society, 1973.
- Nutty, Sue Himelick. "John Sartain and Joseph Harrison, Jr." In *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*, eds. Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott, 51-61. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.
- Pergam, Elizabeth A. "'Waking the Soul': The Manchester Art Treasures Exhibition of 1857 and the State of the Arts in Mid-Victorian Britain." Ph.D. diss., New York University, 2001.
- Pizop, Faith K. "Preparations for The Centennial Exhibition of 1876." *The Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* 94 (April 1970): 213-32.
- Randel, William Peirce. *Centennial: American Life in 1876*. Philadelphia: Chilton Book Company, 1927.
- Robey, Ethan. "John Sartain and the Contest of Taste at the Centennial." In *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*, eds. Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott, 87-99. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.
- Robey, Ethan. "The Utility of Art: Mechanics' Institute Fairs in New York City, 1828-1876." Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 2000.
- Rydell, Robert W., John E. Findling, and Kimberly D. Pelle. *Fair America: World's Fairs in the United States*. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2000.
- Sacco, Ellen. "Art for the Millions: The Rise of Barnum's American Museum and the New York Crystal Palace." M.A. thesis, Hunter College, City University of New York, 1991.
- Savage, Kirk. *Standing Soldiers, Kneeling Slaves: Race, War, and Monument in Nineteenth-Century America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1997.
- Sellin, David. "The Centennial." In *Sculpture of a City: Philadelphia's Treasures in Bronze and Stone*, 78-93. New York: Walker Publishing Co., Inc., 1974.
- Sellin, David. *The First Pose. 1876: Turning Point in American Art*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 1975.

- Sewell, Darrel. "Thomas Eakins and American Art." In *Thomas Eakins*, ed. Darrell Sewell, xi-xxii. Exh. cat., Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2001.
- Simoni, John P. "Art Critics and Criticism in Nineteenth Century America." Ph.D. diss., Ohio State University, 1952.
- Simpson, Marc. "The 1870s." In *Thomas Eakins*, ed. Darrel Sewell, 27-40. Exh. cat., Philadelphia Museum of Art, 2001.
- Skalet, Linda Henefield. "The Market for American Painting in New York, 1870-1915." Ph.D. diss., The Johns Hopkins University, 1980.
- Spassky, Natalie. *American Paintings in the Metropolitan Museum of Art*, vol. II. Princeton University Press, 1985.
- Steen, Ivan D. "America's First World's Fair: The Exhibition of The Industry of All Nations at New York's Crystal Palace, 1853-1854." *The New-York Historical Society Quarterly* 47 (July 1963): 257-87.
- Savidou-Terrono, Evdokia. "For the 'Boys in Blue': The Art Galleries of the Sanitary Fairs," Ph.D. diss., The City University of New York, 2002.
- Thistlethwaite, Mark. "John Sartain and Peter F. Rothermel." In *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*, eds. Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott, 39-50. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.
- Thistlethwaite, Mark Edward. *Painting in the Grand Manner: The Art of Peter Frederick Rothermel (1812-1895)*. Exh. cat., Brandywine River Museum, Chadds Ford, PA, 1995.
- Trachtenberg, Alan, ed. *Democratic Vistas, 1860-1880*. New York: George Braziller, 1970.
- Trout, S. Edgar. *The Story of the Centennial of 1876: Golden Anniversary*. Lancaster, PA, 1929.
- Troyen, Carol. *The Boston Tradition: American Paintings from the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston*. Exh. cat., Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, 1980.
- _____. "Innocents Abroad: American Painters at the 1867 Exposition Universelle, Paris." *The American Art Journal* 16 (Autumn 1984): 2-29.
- Trumbull, Rebecca. *Memorial Hall: A History*. Philadelphia, PA: Fairmount Park Council for Historic Sites, 1986.
- Wallach, Alan. *Exhibiting Contradiction: Essays on the Art Museum in the United States*. Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 1998.

- Webster, Sally. *William Morris Hunt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.
- Weinberg, H. Barbara. "Introduction." In *American Art and American Art Collections*, ed. Walter Montgomery. Boston: E.W. Walker & Co., 1889. Reprint, New York: Garland Publishing, 1978.
- Whitehill, Walter Muir. *Museum of Fine Arts, Boston: A Centennial History*. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1970.
- Who Was Who in America*, Historical Volume, 1607-1896. New Providence, NJ: Marquis Who's Who, 1998.
- Wiebe, Robert H. *The Search for Order, 1877-1920*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.
- Wierich, Jochen. "The Domestication of History in American Art." Ph.D. diss., College of William and Mary, 1998.
- Wilson, James Grant and John Fiske, eds. *Appleton's Cyclopedia of American Biography*. New York: Appleton, 1888.
- Wilson, Richard Guy. *The American Renaissance, 1876-1917*. Exh. cat., The Brooklyn Museum, 1979.
- Winer, Donald A. "Rothermel's Battle of Gettysburg: A Victorian's Heroic View of The Civil War." *Nineteenth Century* 1 (Winter 1975): 6-10.
- Wright, Helena E. "Prints in the Sartains' Circle." In *Philadelphia's Cultural Landscape: The Sartain Family Legacy*, eds. Katharine Martinez and Page Talbott, 25-38. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2000.