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I. Introduction

"Changes: Art in America 1881/1981," the President's Exhibition, 1981, coincides with Marquette University's Centennial Celebration. The exhibition includes paintings one might have seen during an exhibition when the University opened in 1881, and also a selection of works illustrating recent development in American art of the kind one finds in 1981. The theme of "changes in American art" focuses on the uses of the human figure as seen through the eyes of forty-eight American artists working primarily in a realist tradition.1

Artists and philosophers alike have long regarded the human body as expressing spiritual significance — Hegel in fact considered it the highest manifestation of the spirit. The dimensions of the human spirit are interpreted broadly in this exhibition to include ideas and feelings of beauty and ugliness, devotion and the pursuit of pleasure, modesty and vanity, sobriety and levity — in short, the full continuum of the tragic-comic-outrageous. The content is, therefore, an especially appropriate topic to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of Marquette University, an institution committed to the investigation of values in all aspects of life.

Numerous recent exhibitions such as "Real, Really Real, Super Real," at the San Antonio Museum of Art, have undertaken the examination of contemporary forms of realism in painting. A distinctive feature of the present exhibition is that it encompasses two widely separated eras of American realism. This broad spectrum provides a base for assessing the changes that have taken place in the portrayal of the human figure by American realist painters. The assessment can best be accomplished by direct comparison of representative works from 1881 with those of 1981. Viewers who attend the present exhibition will form their own observations and judgments as to the significance of the comparison.

In addition to this contrast of styles in dealing with the human figure, the exhibition has the further objective of illustrating the influence of the camera on American painting during the past century. Within the framework of this double objective the major issues to be considered are these: What are the significant developments in figure painting over the past 100 years? What are the reasons for reemergence of the human figure to prominence in contemporary painting? How has the rapid emergence of the camera-photograph-film-video in contemporary life affected how and what artists paint? Undoubtedly the issues relating to changes in figure painting are related to those in the photographic arts. Despite predictions that the rise of photography would end the necessity for realist figure painting, artists have continued to paint. Nevertheless, painting has been influenced, for better or worse, by the powerful visual vocabularies of artists using the technique of the black and white snap shot, color slide, motion
pictures, and television, all of whom have elected to make people their primary subject matter.

It is conceivable that the reentry of the human figure into contemporary art is simply a coincidental result of cyclical changes in the fashions and tastes of artists and the public. But I find it useful to consider other factors: the intrinsic significance of the human figure as a visual symbol, and the influence of the camera.

II. The Human Figure as a Visual Symbol

The human figure has been a major factor in the training of artists from classical times to the present. Drawing and painting of this subject, nude or partially clothed, has been an essential element in the development of the artist's eye and mind. Mastery of the figure is considered by critics and art historians as a primary measure of artistic success. Its importance is affirmed by artists and historians, as in Winslow Homer's advice to a young student: "Paint figures, my boy, leave the rocks for your old age — they're easy," and in Lloyd Goodrich's remark about Thomas Eakins, "The human figure was the basis of his whole study."

Figures serve different purposes in paintings. Nineteenth-century landscape painters, Sanford Gifford, Asher Durand, George Inness, William Sonntag and others present figures in a diminutive scale compared to vast and spacious nature. The figures, however small, are nevertheless central to the composition and meaning of the paintings. Sonntag, for instance (figure 25), places two tiny figures at the end of a point of land where they are dominated by water and sky. The particular placement of the figures establishes dynamic interplay between the human figures and the natural setting, resulting in a contrast of the small figures with the expansive space allocated to water and sky. The experience evokes both spiritual and physical serenity as man contemplates his own destiny in relation to the vastness of nature.

The size of the figure in comparison to its surroundings began to change toward the end of the nineteenth century. One sees in the paintings of Winslow Homer, for instance, (figures 11 & 12), a significant increase in the scale of the figures as compared to the landscape. The change is even more pronounced in the paintings of twentieth-century artists such as Sidney Goodman, (figure 39), D. J. Hall (figure 41) or Richard McLean (figure 46). The tendency of artists to allocate greater portions of the picture space to figures is carried further in the works of contemporary American figure painters such as Philip Pearlstein, Alfred Leslie, and Jack Beal.

George Inness, another nineteenth-century artist, uses his figures in conjunction with other parts of the painting to inspire an emotion or sentiment.

The purpose of the painter is simply to reproduce in other minds the impression which a scene has made upon him. A work of art does not appeal to the intellect. It does not appeal to the moral sense. Its aim is not to edify, but to awaken an emotion... It must be a single emotion if the work has unity, as every such work should have, and the true beauty of the work consists in the beauty of the sentiment or emotion which it inspires.

Similarly, the desire to express feelings...
through human figures is intensified in the works of artists like D. J. Hall, who admittedly uses human figures, often middle-western visitors to resorts, to express feelings about aging and vanity (figure 41). Hall's figures are rich in humor and irony; these qualities are frequently the means of expressing ridicule, but in her case an underlying feeling for the people cancels out any suggestion that she is ridiculing her subjects. No less expressive of human sentiment is the "larger than life-sized" image in the painted photo mural screen by Keith Smith and Philip Lange (figure 50).

Thomas Eakins introduces yet another role for the human figure when he uses it for probing the underlying aspects of individual personalities and minds, as illustrated in his sensitive Portrait of Professor Marx (figure 8). Eakins grounded his interpretive figures in thorough observations of his subjects' features. Alfred Leslie's painting, Fig Newtons and Milk (figure 45) exhibits a similar tendency to penetrate into the underlying aspects of his subject's personality.

Although the present exhibition encompasses a broad range of visual approaches, it does not cover all of the ways in which the figure has been represented in twentieth-century art. An exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in 1962, "Recent Painting USA: The Figure," for instance, presented a very different view of the figure, one barely touched upon in the present exhibition. The dominant influence in the earlier exhibition consisted of abstract expressionist works of the mid-twentieth century. Of the artists who appear in the Marquette exhibition, only Sidney Goodman and Larry Rivers were represented in the earlier show. The figures in the 1960's exhibition are also "recognizable," if only barely so, but they lack the basic commitment to the humanizing powers of realism that has led Audrey Flack and other mid-twentieth-century artists to abandon abstraction in support of their conviction that "for the purposes of communication, art requires a form of realism with recognizable subject matter and lucid statement."6

Viewers and artists alike recognize the human figure as a powerful force in art. Faces and full-scale figures, whether presented nude or clothed, are universally appealing. The human figure in art is also associated with taboo. Not all cultures permit direct representations of the human image, and still others, while allowing some artistic representations, consider depictions of the nude figure a moral issue.

For our purposes it is useful to turn to a philosopher for some rationale for appreciation of the human figure. Hegel tells us that the human body, after which the figure in art is modelled, is the most perfect of all forms in nature. Its superiority is attested by the fact that it is chosen to house mind and soul, the sources of reason and feeling. With all of its natural perfection, however, the body yields to the creations of mind, among them painting, music, and poetry, for its most perfect expressions. The human figure in a painting is thus among the symbols chosen for expressing the highest forms of truth.

III. Influence of the Camera on Painting

During the initial stages of conception for this exhibition, it seemed clear that the camera had been a seminal force influencing both the late nineteenth-
centuries before photography, has in fact continued to show a separate rhythm of progress, . . . independent of the camera. This means . . . that a nineteenth-century painting may share many characteristics without being in the least influenced by photography.

Despite these important arguments to the contrary, the initial impressions underlying this exhibition remain intact. There is substantial evidence to support the influences of photography in both periods of the exhibition. Offsetting the skeptical options of Baudelaire and others are positive ones of equal force. An English author of the 1870's wrote the following defense of the use of photography in painting: "... let the photograph be accurately copied with the brush and there is no reason why it should not be received in any gallery." Theodore Robinson advises that the use of the camera helps to overcome the difficulties of painting directly from a changing nature by helping to keep the picture in the artist's mind. And Beaumont Newhall, the eminent historian of photography, offers his support for the influence of photography in these words: "It is surprising," he says, "that today's art historians with their delight in probing into the prototype of every artist's work, should so generally fail to recognize that photography has been ever since 1839 both a source and an influence to hosts of painters."

Barbara Novak is one historian who makes reference to the subject of painting and photography, and there are others. She notes, for instance, that a host of American painters in the mid-to late nineteenth-century, including Eakins and Homer, all seem to have made use of photographs, as studies and models for their paintings.
John Wilmerding, another historian of nineteenth-century American art, has begun to implement the type of investigation necessary to document the influences of photography in nineteenth-century painting in his recent studies of Winslow Homer and photography. Louis Meisel's examination of Photo-Realism provides visual materials and texts necessary to the study of photographic influences on contemporary realist painters.

Such efforts as these establish that the photograph, or an extension of it, in printed photo-images, provides the subject matter and a model for structuring the visual image on the canvas. For example, the use of camera images as a source for the subject matter, and the use of mechanical transfer of the image structure from a photographic source to the canvas, are easily documentable in the works of any number of contemporary artists: Audrey Flack, Hilo Chen, Robert Bechtle, and D.J. Hall to mention a few. There is also evidence to support the influence of the camera on the production processes used by contemporary painters. Speaking of the processes used in developing Hawaiian Gothic (figure 41), for example, Hall stated: "I shoot hundreds of slides of people at resort areas for eventual execution as paintings or drawings."

My fellow essayist Dennis Adrian properly calls for a more precise delineation of the involvement of photography with painting. Whether such involvement is primarily related to subject matter and the processes for producing the paintings, or to aesthetic matters concerning the influences of the camera on experiences provided by the paintings, are matters for further consideration. Any such investigations will necessarily extend to the full range of influences capable of being exercised by the camera, including choices of images available for artists today that extend far beyond the primitive levels of photography available to their nineteenth-century counterparts. The film, video, instant printing, and color photography, with their attending technologies for processing "photographic" images, together offer an infinite range of possible ways for the camera to influence the development of figurative painting. Motion picture frames and "frozen" video images, for instance, have each been incorporated into the works of one or another contemporary painter. One should not, moreover, overlook the advances in the art of photography such as photomontage as a source of photographic influences in painting.

No less important for the understanding of the camera's influence is the question of how paintings appear to the viewer. Here I return to my original "naive" claim, admittedly a subjective one, that the influence of the camera seems obvious from the looks of the paintings: the appearances of many paintings in both periods are strongly suggestive of this influence. It is not necessary for our purposes here to support this claim with a detailed point by point comparison of paintings and photographs. It may even be the case that a careful examination of the surfaces of the paintings will not support any detailed comparisons with photographic surfaces. Such activities, however, are not the basis on which people form general impressions of paintings. However much the critic and the art historian indulge their curiosities in such enterprises, possibly drawing conclusions contrary to popular opinion, the fact remains that viewers such as
myself are reminded frequently of photographs, film frames, and TV screen images when they encounter the products of figurative painters — Homer's Playing Old Soldier (figure 11) and J. G. Brown's painting of John Jacob Astor In His Hunting Outfit (figure 2). All suggest photographic influences. Bechtle's Sacramento Montego (figure 29.), D. J. Hall's Hawaiian Gothic (figure 41.), and Jerry Ott's Self-portrait (figure 47.), also strongly remind one of their photographic sources of one variety or another. This factor can hardly be ignored in any assessment of the camera's role in American painting. Viewers of this exhibit who choose to make a comparison may compare the Keith Smith/Philip Lange photo-mural (figure 50.) with any number of paintings and draw their own conclusions.

Having argued for the influence of the camera, it is necessary also to acknowledge that not all painters in the two eras made any direct use of the camera. Some painters undoubtedly chose to ignore the camera and paint directly from models or from nature. There are, moreover, other non-photographic factors that must be taken into account. A long-established tradition of European painting with its own approaches to subject matter and technique is tacitly assumed for the painting of both periods. In addition, the figurative paintings of today reflect the impact of artistic and aesthetic developments of the intervening years. It would be foolish, for instance, to ignore such factors as abstract art, Pop Art, Minimalist and conceptual art, and the subtle impact of those painters who did not abandon realism at any time. The latter day realists were available to teach the basic skills when the time was right for the contemporary painters to develop their own approaches to realism: New-Realism, Super-Realism, Photo-Realism, etc.

In conclusion, it seems apparent that the representation of the human figure in painting has undergone important changes in the past one hundred years. Some of these changes are nothing more than further developments of ideas already begun by the painters of the nineteenth century, for example, the alterations in scale and the use of figures to express feeling. The latter is more direct and personalized in the paintings of today. Other changes in the appearances of paintings are the direct result of the influences of the camera on the visual approaches of the painters.

Curtis L. Carter
Footnotes


Realism as it is understood in the present exhibition encompasses both the works of the nineteenth-century American artists and works that are being produced today. Recognizable subject matter, frequently human figures at their ordinary tasks of work, leisure activities, and contemplation, is the dominant characteristic of realism.

Realism is a way of painting, hence a form of human symbolism, abstracted from life. The broad scope of realist painters exhibits a range of particular visual approaches which vary according to the artists' intellect and sensibility.


5D. J. Hall, Letter to Curtis L. Carter, August 1, 1981.


10Kirk Varnedoe, "The Artifice of Candor: Photography," Art in America, January, 1980, 66-78. Both of these developments are indebted to Heinrich Schwartz's earlier discussion which traces the historic relations of painting and photography. The argument is directed primarily to nineteenth-century Impressionism and ignores a great amount of evidence to support the direct use of the camera by artists.

11Quoted in Schwartz, 252.


16Louis K. Meisel, Photo-Realism.
THE HUMAN FIGURE IN AMERICAN PAINTING:
Yesterday and Today

The purpose of the present exhibition is to determine and illustrate by means of two groups of paintings the differing uses of the human figure in American art of the third quarter of the 19th century and then one hundred years later. The exhibition does not really pose a distinct and rigid thesis so much as it offers the viewer a wide range of possibilities to explore visually the differences between works a century apart: in this way it is hoped that a variety of interpretive ideas about the human figure, the central theme of Western Art throughout its history, will be suggested. Doubtless a number of theoretical positions, even conflicting ones, may arise from such a juxtaposition. To stimulate various critical and historical formulations is surely a more productive function for an exhibition than merely to choose works in order to illustrate a predetermined theory.

By and large, American artists of the 19th century did not participate in, or even substantially reflect, the advanced developments of European art (especially French painting) during the period 1860-1880 until several decades later. The significant exceptions are figures such as Whistler and Mary Cassatt. Even these two artists are special cases because their important work was done abroad and so much within the context of European and English developments, that they are more integral parts of those contexts than they are artists within an American setting responding to these transatlantic artistic situations. Why is this so? There was certainly no difficulty about travel abroad throughout the later 19th century, except perhaps during the brief period of the American Civil War. The novels of Trollope, Henry James and, later, Edith Wharton prove that well-to-do Americans (likely to have some real or assumed interest and involvement with culture and the arts) and fair numbers of American artists were commonplaces, almost stock figures, of the European and English scene in just the period covered by the present exhibition. It seems that the first class of these travelers had no wish to seek out the advanced or outre to satisfy their cultural appetites; instead, they responded to the established forms of European art, the comfortable bourgeois or impressive academic formulations which still in this time appeared as the dominant unshakeable expressions of international civilization.

What Americans interested in art brought home from Europe were the accepted products of successful Salon artists, or works by the distinguished German professors of art who dominated the numerous academies established in all the major cities of the former principalities comprising the new German Empire. The few exceptions to this situation, such as the remarkable wealthy gentleman from Baltimore, George Lucas, who formed an immense collection of Barbizon and Impressionist prints (particularly Manet and Cassatt) — were isolated phenomena. Mr. Lucas, like Mary Cassatt, spent most of his time in France; and his collection, left to the City of Baltimore upon his death, was not really accessible until years later. (The collection is now on deposit...
at the Baltimore Museum of Art, founded in 1914.) The early American collectors of Impressionist and other advanced European (but mostly French) art, such as Mrs. Havermeyer of New York and Mesdames Potter Palmer and Ryerson of Chicago, did not start to collect actively until the very end of the 19th century. Therefore, the impact of their collecting belongs essentially to the history of the early twentieth century.

Germany more than France exerted a magnetic pull for those American painters wishing to study abroad during the decades 1860-1880. In both genre and portrait painting, the traditions of romantic landscape and detailed moralizing bourgeois realism were what American artists tended to imbibe from their studies in Leipzig, Munich, Düsseldorf and Dresden; similar tendencies were important in the big influential art schools of Brussels and Antwerp. Earlier in the 19th century these northern influences were important factors in the formation of American landscape painting styles from 1840 to 1860 but did not contribute materially to the development of figure painting. The only painter whose work reveals the direct experience of some of the newer tendencies in French painting during our period is Thomas Eakins, who began four years of European study when he entered the studio of the Academician Léon Gérôme in Paris in 1866.

The only relatively contemporary movement in French painting with which many American artists felt some sort of natural temperamental affinity were the Barbizon painters — especially Corot, Théodore Rousseau, the elder Daubigny and Millet. Except for Millet, all were essentially landscape painters. (Corot’s important figure paintings were neither very numerous nor, for reasons not yet sufficiently understood, very influential among the American artists who might have seen them.) Millet’s influence in America was considerably more widespread because of the moral reflections with which his work was imbued. His elevation of the peasant and working people, without condescension or cloying sentimentality, appealed to the land-based democracy of nineteenth-century American political and moral idealism. Nonetheless, Millet’s influence was not so often felt singly and without dilution; more often than not, his style, as reflected in American art, is mixed with that of other European genre traditions, the nobility of the “ordinary working stiff” being celebrated to a greater degree late in the nineteenth century in the heroicizing work of American sculptors. While offering to the sympathetic American artist its independent spirit and deep attachment to natural creation, Barbizon painting remained largely landscape. In any event, the Barbizon point of view was increasingly eclipsed after 1870 by more dramatic developments in French painting, particularly Impressionism; and, Impressionism itself (except in the work of Degas) had a powerful landscape component.

What we find, then, in American figure painting during the third quarter of the 19th century are the traditional utilizations of the human image as codified in Academic practice in European art since the end of the seventeenth century. There is the nude (idealized, except for the special category of the academy, or study piece); the portrait; the genre subject revealing actual or idealized aspects of daily life; the history subject; the allegory; and
landscapes including staffage, or incidental figures, of various types. There is, of course, some degree of admixture among these categories from time to time, but all (except the large scale figural allegory) are represented in the present exhibition.

The selected works reveal that, in conception or thematic structure, the established categories of pictorial types are maintained across a very wide spectrum of formal and stylistic concerns. It may be objected that choice of pictorial type is itself a stylistic element and this is undoubtedly so; however, this aspect of style is more revealing when considering a tightly chosen group of works from a single location, studio or artist than it is in treating of an otherwise stylistically diffuse group of works whose common point is the inclusion of a specific single image such as the figure. For our purposes then, the pictorial type (nude, portrait, etc.) is to be considered apart from the individual stylistic characteristics of the different works.

Something decidedly changed in our perception of the traditional pictorial types during the past hundred years is the relative importance given to these categories. For example, John Singer Sargent’s powerful academy of a standing nude male model has an interest for us now which is totally different from what the nineteenth-century view of it was. In that time, every artist who had passed through the conventional artist’s training of the period would have been expected to be able to produce such pictures either as part of his school training (both such painting and drawings are called “academies”) to demonstrate his proficiency in anatomy, drawing, chiaroscuro and command of form, or as teaching models for his own students and atelier assistants, as a guide to their understanding of these same elements. Such a painting would not ordinarily have been considered, or shown, as a finished independent work of art: certainly the grandes dames, society and fashion leaders and other celebrities who were Sargent’s portrait clientele would only have been shocked and revolted by such a picture. It would have been considered lacking in decorum because there is no emphasis on finish, no scene or action of significance and no attempt at the presentation of idealized beauty in the human form. This picture would have been seen and appreciated as a tool or part of the working apparatus of the artist, just as improvisational exercises of an actor might not, even now, be considered drama. Such works were however appreciated by the important but specialized public of other artists, critics, connoisseurs and officials of the art Establishment who would view them with an eye to assessing the painter’s grasp of universally accepted fundamentals of art. Only late in the nineteenth century do we find, even in French art, a treatment of the male nude offered as “high art” without anatomical idealizations, heroic settings, attributes and the like. Cézanne’s Standing Male Bather in the Museum of Modern Art, New York, must be among the first; it dates from the late 1880’s at the earliest.

For the late nineteenth-century American artist, the nude meant almost invariably, the female nude and heavily idealized at that. Rothermel’s Bather in the exhibition is a typical example. Completely artificial, the figure is the descendant of a long line of idealizing types, reaching back through the nymphs of Boucher and Fragonard in the eighteenth century, the goddesses
and naiads of Rubens in the seventeenth, the Dianas and Venuses of Titian in the sixteenth century, and Raphael's innumerable and influential nude studies widely disseminated through prints in his lifetime and for ages after. Even Raphael's figure types frequently have pedigrees reaching back to the inventions of antique art long before. The Rothermel kind of nude then is a type, a format, a recognized type of composition transcending reality through the idealization of its forms and their arrangement, and having nothing to do with the direct confrontation of the living body. In Sargent's nude, the bored stolidity of the model's stance and expression and the broad painterly building of muscular masses present the large specifics of the human form before the artist.

In certain works we do seem to find the artist addressing the unvarnished truth of the figural reality before him. Andriessen's *Torso of a Man* shows a careworn elderly figure, nude to the waist, bowed down not only in the apathetic ennui of models throughout the nineteenth century but also by the cares of work, age and poverty. In actuality, this figure is a "type" too. The artist has selected the figure just because of its expressive possibilities, possibilities which had long been established within the canon of accepted pictorial types. With little more than a change of title we can see this figure as a penitent St. Jerome, a St. Paul meditating, St. Peter in prison, an old philosopher and many other things as well. The *style*, showing the figure strongly sidelit against a dark background, recalls directly the countless and eternally popular images of geriatric religious worthies, established in the seventeenth century by Ribera and other artists in the wake of Caravaggio. Therefore, what seems here to be the direct confrontation of a living reality is not primarily that: it is a conscious recollection of, and reference to, established types and styles in the canon of the accepted Old Masters.

The portrait, despite the immediate and widespread popularity of different photographic processes after their invention in the 1840's, maintained an important role in nineteenth-century American painting. By and large, the portrait continued to perform its traditional functions: personal, social and political aggrandizement; commemorative purposes; and images of personal record. The subtlety of means employed for these purposes during the nineteenth century is sometimes lost to the present day viewer. For example, in John George Brown's portrait of *John Jacob Astor in His Hunting Outfit* we see what, in the absence of the title, might be any middle class gentleman of substantial figure and benign mien about to set off early in the morning for a pleasurable day of killing things. It is an international image: it might be any German bourgeois, or perhaps even one of the gun bearers and loaders who was an essential adjunct to the great *battues* and country shoots of Edwardian England. There is nothing, it would seem (other than the existence of the painting itself as a luxury object), to connect it with the sitter's identity as one of the titans of American commercial wealth and power. This becomes clear only when one recalls that the Astor fortune derives from the *hunting* and trading of fur animals early in the nineteenth century. The message of the picture is that, despite the possession and enjoyment of wealth
beyond the dreams of avarice, the holder of these boons retains nonetheless a becoming modesty (the painting itself is only 16" x 12") and frank acknowledgement of the rough and simple foundation of his social and economic eminence.

A more direct and penetrating analysis of the sitter comes in Eakins' unfinished Portrait of Professor Marks, where the artist's sober and deliberate method of building up a stable and strongly focused image is the analogue of the concentration and strength of the sitter's mind and personality. Eakins absorbed this directness and clarity from the teaching of his French master, Gérôme, and from his experience of Velázquez during a trip to Spain in 1869. These qualities are more sympathetic to the "honesty" valued by contemporary twentieth-century taste than they were to the broadest public in Eakins' lifetime. This, along with his very strong emphasis on carefully considered structural arrangement, is the secret of his "modernity". Eastman Johnson has managed something of the same pleasing forthrightness (though with less emphasis on constructional interest) in his Girl With Skates.

There are times when it seems the artist cannot find in the possibilities of his sitter enough to spark his best efforts, even within a thoroughly conventional approach. In his portrait of General Lucius Fairchild, Sargent appears to have been unable to quell his repugnance for the reptilian hauteur and suspicious arrogance of his subject: his statement of the General's official identity is confined to the large and gaudy medals so prominently flaunted on his bosom. One feels that the artist hoped his ineluctable reaction to the sitter would be understood by the viewer as showing the sitter's shrewdness and determination.

Paintings of the human figure set in the vastness of the natural landscape such as those of Sanford Gifford's Mount Rainier, Washington Territory and Asher Durand's A Break in the Clouds continue a tradition of the Sublime in nature, overwhelming by cosmic vastness the insignificant existence of man. This was a staple of German Romanticism, but the styles of Gifford and Durand as well as other American artists of their time owe a good deal to the combined influences of Claude Lorrain, Poussin, Constable and Turner, and much of the seventeenth-century Dutch landscape and marine painting. They bring to the American landscape a finely tuned apparatus of established artistic precedent as well as some feeling that the spectacular vastness of the then untouched American landscape is somehow "more pristine", as it were, than its European counterparts. Only when the subject is unmistakably American (Niagara Falls, Yosemite Valley, the Grand Canyon) do we sense the awareness of some sensibility not originating in Europe: without these topographical clues, it would not often matter if the title were Tyrolean Alps rather than Grand Tetons or A View of the Campagna rather than Appalachian Valley.

Few American artists managed to elevate the genre piece, or subject of daily life, to a level of monumental presence and formal strength; among these Winslow Homer is one of the most eminent. In his Watermelon Boys the clarity, stability and grandeur of the composition itself elevate a subject (two boys, one black, one white, democratically enjoying the fruit) which otherwise runs immense risks of maudlin sentimentality and racial
stereotyping. That Homer was able to do this in pictures of usually moderate dimensions (and sometimes quite small ones) brings him, through his own means, near the profound strength of Manet and the finest Courbets.

The more typical nineteenth-century American genre piece would be Junius Sloan’s *The Knitting Lesson* in which the cozy Biedermeier morality of the widowed grandmother passing on her age-old domestic skills through her tutelage of a young granddaughter is given with a fulsomeness of tricky effects of light, texture and detailed inventory of the depressing room. All these fancy touches blunt whatever sincere feeling might have originally animated the artist. With a theme so trite, a technique so labored, no action and a repellent sentimentality of facial expression, the final result is extremely tedious. George Henry Hall’s *The Turner’s Shop* has similar problems; the stiff composition, in which two young ladies of fashion respectively exalt a specimen of the turner’s craft and flirt with his assistant, derives from seventeenth-century pictures of Dutch cottage industry. This lineage, with its emphasis on careful perspective construction of interior spaces, provides Hall’s picture with almost its only element of enduring interest, and so we end by caring more for the racks and joists of the shop roof than for the people in the scene.

The history subject is represented in the older section of the exhibition by Eastman Johnson’s *Milton Dictating ‘Paradise Lost’ to His Daughter*. This subject enjoyed great popularity from the late eighteenth century, owing to its possibilities for pathos in the blind poet disclosing his epochal visions, for illustration of the philosophical point that art is a matter of the mind more than the eye, and for responding to the eternal fascination of all “creation” subjects. Johnson succeeds by underplaying the scene and by presenting it with no frills as though it were a genre subject; this is a case of one pictorial type adopting the features of another.

It is puzzling that more late nineteenth-century American artists did not reflect, or in some way make use of, the photographic techniques so popular from their beginnings in the 1840’s. French artists such as Courbet, Degas, Manet, perhaps Delacroix, and even Cézanne (in the *Standing Male Bather* mentioned earlier) readily utilized the new picture processes without significant qualms, especially studies of the nude and portrait photographs (an obvious convenience). Furthermore, the cropped forms at the edges which photography provided gratuitously to the casual practitioner had affinities with similar, but deliberate, effects of this kind in Japanese prints, which interested many French and other European artists during the 1860’s and later. It may very well be that such connections between photography and painting have been insufficiently studied: it is likely that something of the sort will be found if for no other reason than it is known to have been employed by prominent German painters such as Franz von Lembach at least as early as 1880.

In the American painting of the later twentieth century, the influence of the camera and its products assumes an importance and prominence as never before: in fact, only during the past two or three years have the various styles lumped together as “Photo-Realism” begun to wane as it was inevitable they should. In the present exhibition, the
paintings of Robert Bechtle, John Clem Clarke, Hilo Chen, Chuck Close, Audrey Flack, Ralph Goings, Sidney Goodman, Robert Grilley, D. J. Hall, Douglas Hofmann, Richard McLean and Jerry Ott can all be seen to have some intimate connection with photography. But just what is this connection? Though we recognize the kindred involvement with photography in all these artists, we do not have much trouble telling them apart. Therefore, it can be said that at the very least these (and other) artists do not have a connection with the same kind of photography, or that, alternatively, their involvement with photography is not of the same kind. The actual state of affairs in regard to these artists and photography is complex. When we look at their works it is immediately obvious that what they are not trying to make is something that looks like a photograph. No one looking at their pictures ever thinks he is seeing a photograph: the sizes usually exceed those of all but the most exceptional kind of photographs, the surface is different, there is not the sheen, glossy or matte, of the emulsions on the paper, the brush (or airbrush) reveals its characteristic facture no matter how skillfully employed and there are a host of other factors as well. Why then do we say when looking at such works “It’s just like a photograph!”? More often than not it is the subject that we recognize from photography — the scenes of people, places and activities that are either candid, like anyone’s summer Polaroids, or arranged with the exacting formality of the studio portrait or “art shot” are what we recognize as connected with photography. Certainly none of the works by the painters mentioned even looks like what one (and therefore the camera) sees through the viewfinder — size is wrong, things keep moving, the vision is usually monocular, and so on. Furthermore, it is not too much to say that the connection of this kind of painting is often not directly with photography at all, but rather with kinds of printed pictures derived from photography. It is a commonplace to observe that there are not, nor have there ever been, any photographs in Time or Life Magazine, but very often we refer to the photolithographic printed pictures they do contain as “photographs”. Even newspaper illustrations are commonly so called, though it is much more obvious that they are nothing of the sort. The visual reference of much Photo-Realist painting is, in fact, much closer to different kinds of printed pictures derived from photography than it is to photography itself. After all, in the experience of the ordinary person, it is these reproductions which are seen in a proportion of many thousands to one over the true photograph. These printed reproductions are closer in other ways to painting, too: they can easily be any size including the very large, can have almost any variety of surface and texture — they can even be printed on canvas, and very largely deal with images of the present or, strictly speaking, the recent past. This last quality makes Photo-Realist painting rapidly appear dated: clothing and automobile styles change, fashions of hairstyles and urban topology alter, and events and personalities retreat into the past as the continuing reality of the present develops. As this process of dating continues, the Photo-Realist painting will look less and less “like a photograph”, and more and more of its actual visual properties as a painting will be revealed. But this evolution is
dependent in large degree on the kinds of subjects chosen by Photo-Realist painters. Especially ephemeral aspects of the current photo-reproductive visual scene are selected as subjects. Where this is not so to such a degree, as in the large portrait heads of Chuck Close, the illusion of a photographic connection persists a bit longer than when the picture is replete with very transient topical images. Even with Close, it is clear that his real involvement is, to a great extent, bound up with the processes of reproductive printing: the grids and sequential applications of color in his paintings and drawings are analogous to half-tone screens and sequential printings of color in photolithography more than to the processes of effecting the image in the Polaroid photographs he has recently favored as the source of his imagery. He uses processes like those of color printing to realize an image that itself is selected from some kind of photograph.

The apparent effect on unedited reality so often remarked in Photo-Realist painting is another illusion: very few such artists fail to avail themselves of the privilege of editing, altering and in general recomposing the painted shapes to their artistic satisfaction regardless of the photographic (or photograph-derived) source of the image or subject. Some artists show more than the camera can see, and others less; still others pursue a constructional schema in the picture that has to do only with the kind of picture that they are making, that is, a painting. In this connection it is perhaps helpful to recall that the Roy Lichtenstein paintings of the early 1960's which looked “just like a comic strip image” invariably have undergone formal modifications which depart from the artist’s sources in printed pictures. Lichtenstein’s laborious and anonymous painting technique can be seen as an approach very similar to that of the Photo-Realists; indeed, it is their immediate antecedent. What is different is that Lichtenstein made paintings derived from printed pictures of certain kinds of drawings, rather than of printed pictures of certain kinds of photographs. In this aspect and in others like the banality of the subject matter, Photo-Realist painting can be seen as the moth stage of the organism whose larva was Pop Art.

A different modern figural tradition with its own connections to the art of the past but without Photo-Realism’s relationship to both the photograph and the technology of printed images is represented by four artists in the exhibition: Jack Beal, Philip Pearlstein, Alfred Leslie and Larry Rivers. Each of these artists has revitalized in his own manner the concerns of monumental figure painting, an idea at the heart of the Old Master and Academic traditions. It is important to note that only the conviction that large scale painting of the human figure is a prime artistic subject is shared with the older academic point of view. Each of these artists departs from the tenets of academicism in many important ways, but perhaps the most obvious and important is an interest in working to a great degree from the motif itself (the figure) and retaining a portrait-like individuality. All of these artists are major portraitists, but their interest in this kind of picture seems to come more out of their overall artistic concerns than from any adherence to the traditional functions of the portrait as outlined earlier. These four artists are, paradoxically, formalists to a high degree. The compositions of
Pearlstein's paintings, for example, are selected from a large repertoire of compositions he develops in pencil, watercolor or wash drawings done from the figure, and which are themselves created as independent works of art. Pearlstein selects from these autonomous works those which seem to have potential for his approach in paintings. Then he recalls the model(s) in order to work directly from the figure(s). Comparing the drawings with the paintings, one invariably finds that for the painting Pearlstein has made many adjustments for formal placement, arrangement and so on related to the different demands of the larger scale and more complex medium. His drawings are not, in the older sense, "studies" for paintings, but instead a repertoire of possibilities in existing works of art that suggest another formulation in painting or even graphics. Above all else Pearlstein's painting is about art and the processes of perception involved in its creation and experience — in fact, a highly abstract, formal aim. Except in his portraits, Pearlstein routinely "depersonalizes" the subjects. The figures are cropped in such a way that the head, or parts of it which would be expressive of personality and emotion are left out; or the model's eyes are closed, their faces turned away, or their gaze directed abstractedly away from the viewer. These devices help keep our attention focused on the nude figure as an object with certain formal properties. The infinitely varied swellings and returns of the volumes of the figure in the space the artist has created. Except for his portraits, Pearlstein's figures are obviously models in studio settings firmly established by the props of chairs and rugs, mirrors and wainscoting. He is not presenting us with harem ladies, resting nymphs, or fallen giantesses but with an intricately variegated architecture of the volumes, colors, values and arrangements of forms of flesh in space.

These same concerns are strongly present in Jack Beal's works; but, in addition, he seeks to reintroduce an expressive concern and symbolic import missing in a convincing way from monumental figure painting since the seventeenth century. Beal avoids the bathetic dangers of "modern allegory" by his splendid grasp of compositional structures related to Baroque and Mannerist art. The Hope, Faith and Charity in the exhibition takes up the idea of allegorical presentation of these virtues within the context of ordinary experience, an idea implicit in Caravaggio's religious and allegorical paintings, and developed further by certain northern artists influenced by Rubens such as Jacob Jordaens. The actual meets the metaphysically significant in a world of extremely careful spatial structure, volume and finely tuned awareness of each part of the image as a painted shape upon the canvas. Beal's lighting and rich vibrant colors give his works a weight and density unmatched in modern figure painting.

Alfred Leslie's approach is related to Beal's in its connection with those aspects of Baroque art originated by Caravaggio. The very large scale of Leslie's figures recalls the impressive monumentality of Pearlstein's nudes;
but Leslie, instead of depersonalizing his figures, enlarges upon their identity with the specifics of clothes, hair, jewelry and setting so that they often gain the somewhat intimidating individual presence of Chuck Close’s immense portrait heads. Besides the strongly lit contrasts of figures and backgrounds derived from Caravaggio, Leslie occasionally employs a loose and feathery scumbling in the backgrounds recalling certain paintings of Jacques-Louis David. The frozen formality of Leslie’s poses reminds us as well of the chilly stasis of David’s Neo-classicism. In Leslie’s rare subjects requiring action, such as one of the versions of The Death of Frank O’Hara, he seems to overlap the Baroque and return to Mannerist compositions, such as those of Pellegrini Tibaldi and Giulio Romano, in which gigantic figures are flung about through space in drastically foreshortened and energetically contorted poses.

Where Beal, Pearlstein and Leslie have developed modern approaches to the ideals, aims and effects of the height of the seventeenth-century Italian Baroque tradition (along with others: Pearlstein, for example has a strong relationship to Poussin, Tiepolo and Cézanne that is especially visible in his drawings), Larry Rivers’ approach to the monumental figure question in modern painting seems connected with aspects of “maverick” Impressionist figure painters like Degas and Manet, who are at great pains to reveal the kinetic aspects of their processes and technique. Degas’ scumbled forms and Manet’s loose “shot from the hip” strokes in his late work present a highly energized record of the artist’s handling of the material. Rivers’ interest in this is doubtless related to his having reached maturity during the heyday of Abstract Expressionism. If it is possible to single out a continuing and overriding aim in Rivers’ work, it is the courageous attempt to blend the aims of traditional monumental figure painting with the expressive freedom of psychic spontaneity he experiences in the act of painting. Ultimately he is connected with Beal, Pearlstein and Leslie in his practice of working from the model at critical stages in the painting process.

Besides the direct observational tendencies of these four artists and the Photo-Realist viewpoint described earlier, another important current in modern figure painting is a continuation of the Expressionist tradition formulated in the early twentieth century and having its ultimate roots in Northern art. Kiki Kogelnik’s Real Life Stinks I and II show the typical Expressionist devices of forceful handling with much impasto, relatively high color and value contrasts, and an emotionally affecting reorganizing of the figural image which takes liberties with our understanding of the body as it exists. This kind of approach would seem to preclude the possibility of portraiture of the recording of things seen. In fact it need not, because the Expressionist artist makes tellingly selective emphases, emendations and exaggerations of what is seen in order to set forth an emotional truth on the level of feeling.

To summarize: it would seem that the most significant directions in contemporary figure painting have broken in some way with the academic traditions relatively still intact and still unquestioned in the later nineteenth century. The contemporary figure painter does not or perhaps cannot completely jettison this tradition, but has tended either to push back for inspiration to the classical formulations of the seventeenth century in the case of
the "direct observation" painters or, in the case of the Photo-Realists, to develop an infinitely sophisticated academic technique put in service of an imagery related to a specific section of the visual present.
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1. TORSO OF A MALE, 1881
Richard Andriessen (1856-1940)
Oil on canvas, 36 1/4 x 30 1/2" 
Lent by Dr. Alfred Bader

Born in Ritibor, Prussia, in 1856, Richard Andriessen studied at the Munich Academy and later migrated to the United States where he became an American citizen in 1878. Andriessen returned to Europe in 1883 to be married. After his marriage, Andriessen returned to America, working as a lithographer in Allegheny, Pennsylvania. He died in 1940 at the age of 84.
Born in Durham, England, in 1831, John George Brown was originally trained as a glass cutter, but later studied art at Newcastle-on-Tyne and the Edinburgh Academy, Scotland. After settling in Brooklyn, New York, in about 1855, he studied at the school of the National Academy of Design and under Thomas S. Cummings. Brown's subjects included rural scenes of American life, children, and elderly people, all of which he treated with simplicity and naturalness. He was elected an associate to the National Academy in 1862/63, was an original member and vice-president of the New York Watercolor Society in 1866, and was an active member and vice-president of the Artists' Fund Society. Brown continued to paint his favorite subject matter through the 1880's, exhibiting at the National Academy, the Boston Athenaeum, and the Pennsylvania Academy. He died in New York City in 1913.
3. SMALL YACHT RACING, 1881
S.S. Carr (1837-1908)
Oil on canvas, 14 x 24"
Lent by the Terra Museum of American Art, Daniel J. Terra Collection

S. Carr was a genre painter of the late nineteenth century in America. Little is known about his artistic career, except that he exhibited his work at both the Brooklyn Art Club and the National Academy of Design in New York.
Born in Ireland in 1827, Dennis Malone Carter came to America in 1839. With no formal education in art, Carter began his career as an itinerant portrait painter, visiting many parts of the country. He settled finally in New York and was one of the founding members of the Artists' Fund Society in 1859. He is noted for his portraiture and painting of historical events. Carter exhibited his work at the National Academy, the Pennsylvania Academy, the American Art Union, the Boston Athenaeum, and the Washington Art Association. He died in the year 1881.
Born in Staten Island, New York, in 1823, Jasper Cropsey apprenticed for five years to the architectural firm headed by Joseph French of New York. He studied watercolor painting under Edward Maury and experimented in oils with scenes from the Catskills, Hudson River, and White Mountains. His first work was exhibited in 1843 at the American Art Union and the National Academy of Design. During 1847-49 Cropsey traveled throughout Europe; he returned to America in 1849 and taught at New York City Studio from 1849 to 1855. In 1856 he returned to Europe, and lived in England until 1863. By this time he had developed his own style of painting and was acquiring a favorable reputation in both America and England. During the years 1863-64 Cropsey returned to America and devoted himself to painting Civil War scenes. He worked in pencil and watercolor as well as oil, but it was his oil landscape paintings which gained him his popularity. Cropsey continued painting his famous autumnal landscapes until his death in 1900.
Born in Jefferson Village, New Jersey, in 1796, Asher Brown Durand left home at the age of sixteen after studying engraving in his father's shop. From 1812-17 he apprenticed under the engraver Peter Maverick in Newark, New Jersey. During this time Durand gained prominence through the engraving of banknotes and illustrations. Because of a commission to engrave John Trumbell's well-known piece, *The Declaration of Independence*, Durand terminated his partnership with Maverick. Influenced by Thomas Cole and through the patronage of Luman Reed, Durand turned to painting landscapes and portraits in 1835. He served as the second president of the National Academy of Design (1845-1861), and became the acknowledged head of the Hudson River School after the death of Thomas Cole in 1848. Until his death in 1886, Durand produced allegorical landscape compositions typical of the Hudson River School style, but also went beyond this format to explore the problems of light and atmosphere in a spontaneous proto-Impressionistic manner.
Born in Covington, Kentucky, in 1849, Frank Duveneck began his studies at the age of fourteen with a church decorator under whom he learned the fresco technique and the skill of paint mixing. His formal studies began in 1870 at the Munich Academy under Wilhelm von Diez and Wilhelm Leibl, whose teaching of objective realism encompassed the work of Frans Hals and Gustave Courbet. After becoming a success in Munich, Duveneck returned to Cincinnati in 1873; however, his work was not an immediate success in America, and did not receive popular acclaim until two years later. Duveneck returned to Munich where in 1878 he opened his own school of painting. He returned to America in 1888 and died in Cincinnati in 1919. With its tonal emphasis, free brush work and heavy application of pigment, Duveneck’s work was a forerunner of Impressionist painting in America. Whitney Duveneck describes the painting, J. Frank Currier: “Evidently the subject was congenial, for it is a strong portrait, carried through with a rare sympathy and sureness of effect... The eyes have a luminous quality, so full of anguish, intensity and yearning that one almost feels, looking at the portrait, that one has not the right to see so deeply into the storm and stress of another person’s soul. A portrait like this is more than a biography; something of a flash of life itself has been preserved.”
Born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1844, Thomas Eakins was a leader in American naturalistic painting in the nineteenth century. He was not only a painter but a teacher, sculptor and photographer. He entered drawing classes at The Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts in 1861 and studied anatomy at the Jefferson Medical College in Philadelphia. In 1866 he traveled to Paris, where he attended the Ecole des Beaux-Arts under the tutelage of Jean Léon Gérôme. In 1869 Eakins became influenced in Spain by the work of Velázquez and Ribera. He returned to Philadelphia in 1870 where he remained until his death in 1916. In 1880 Eakins began his experiments with photography, and in 1884/85 he collaborated with Eadweard Muybridge, of the University of Pennsylvania, in the well-known experiments with the figure in motion. Joined by his former students, he formed the Art Students League of Philadelphia in 1886. In the 1880's Eakins' work centered on portraiture. Often, as in Professor Marks, Eakins abandoned a painting, leaving it unfinished either for completion later or as the start of a second version. To Eakins, the human figure was the central element of art. On Eakins' work Lloyd Goodrich states, "They (the paintings) were not merely the recreation of things in the real world, but the creation of ordered design."

Although unpopular during his lifetime, Eakins' painting exhibited a vitality which made him one of the most influential American figure painters of the nineteenth century.
Born in Greenfield, New York, in 1823, Sanford Robinson Gifford attended Brown University and studied under John Rubens Smith in New York. In the year 1847 he began exhibiting his work at The National Academy of Design. Gifford traveled abroad in 1855-57, visiting England, France, Holland, Germany, Austria, Switzerland, and Italy. After returning to New York in 1857, Gifford made his second trip abroad during the years 1868-69, spending two years in the Mediterranean; later he toured the American West with Worthington Whittredge and John F. Kensett. He died in New York City in 1880. Gifford was influenced in his work by the landscapes of Thomas Cole. His sensitivity to light and color made him one of the founders of luminist painting in nineteenth-century American painting.
Born in Boston, Massachusetts, in 1825, George Henry Hall was largely self-taught as an artist; he seems to have begun to paint in the year 1842. In 1849 he went with Eastman Johnson to Düsseldorf, where he remained for one year. After living for a time in Paris, Hall established himself in a New York studio in 1852. He exhibited throughout his career at the National Academy in New York, which elected him a full member in 1868. His work was also exhibited at the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, the Brooklyn Museum, and in Philadelphia. Hall died in 1913 at the age of 88.
Born in Boston, Massachusetts in 1836, Winslow Homer began his career in 1854 as an apprentice to the Boston lithographer, J. H. Bufford, but soon went on to work in freelance illustration for Ballou's and Harper's magazines. Though without formal artistic training, Homer moved to New York in 1859 and began to paint in oil, submitting paintings to the National Academy of Design. At the outbreak of the Civil War he was sent by Harper's Weekly to record and illustrate the action at the front. It was at this point in Homer's career that the subject matter of Playing Old Soldier was formulated. Homer first began to work with watercolor in 1873, a medium which he would use extensively for the balance of his career. Much of the inspiration for his work during this period came from his travels in Massachusetts, the Adirondacks, and the Bahamas. In 1881 Homer moved to Tynemouth, England, a location which provided the basis for his paintings that deal with man's struggle against nature. He later settled in Prout's Neck, Maine, where he died in 1910. Homer was recognized as a major artist during his lifetime, exhibiting at the National Academy of Design throughout the 1880's. He is considered one of the leading American artists of the nineteenth century. His handling of the human figure and expertise in the medium of watercolor remain unsurpassed even today.
12. WATERMELON BOYS, 1876
Winslow Homer (1836-1910)
Oil on canvas, 24¼ x 38¾"
Born in Walpole, Massachusetts, in 1838, Alfred Cornelius Howland began his studies in Boston in 1857 under Max Eppendorff and Paul Schulze. Early in 1858, Howland moved to New York, where he was employed by Charles Parsons, a lithographer working for Endicott and Company and Currier and Ives. Howland attended the Düsseldorf Academy in 1860, studying under Andreas Muller and later privately under Albert Flamm. In 1862 he settled in Paris as a pupil of Emile Charles Lambinet, and associated with the Barbizon painters Corot, Rousseau and Millet. Howland returned to New York in 1864, where he taught at the Cooper Union while exhibiting his work at the National Academy of Design, Boston Athenæum, the Brooklyn Art Association, and the Philadelphia Academy. Howland continued his career as a genre painter until his death in 1909. "In 1882, a critic for *Harper's Weekly* described *Bargaining for a Calf* (now called *Driving a Bargain*) in The National Academy exhibition as 'a capital bit of landscape work...specially noteworthy for the admirable humor and effectiveness of the figures.'"
14. PINEWOODS MAGNOLIA, 1877
William Morris Hunt (1824-1879)
Oil on canvas, 34 x 44"
Lent by the Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, Gift of the Pupils and Friends of Mr. Hunt, 1910

Born in Brattleboro, Vermont, in 1824, William Morris Hunt studied under Henry Kirke Brown at Harvard College in the mid 1840’s. He traveled to Europe in 1846, where he attended the Düsseldorf Academy and studied in Paris under the painter Thomas Couture. While abroad, Hunt became a close friend of the Barbizon School painter Jean Francois Millet, who significantly influenced his work. After returning to the United States in 1855, Hunt worked in Newport, Rhode Island, Brattleboro, and the Azores. In 1875 he received a large commission to paint murals for the State Capitol in Albany, New York. Hunt drowned in 1879, an apparent suicide.
Born near Newburgh, New York, in 1824, George Inness was reared in Newark, New Jersey, where he first studied art under the itinerant artist, Jesse Barker. He was apprenticed in 1841 at Sherman and Smith, a New York engraving firm. After a brief period of study in New York under the French landscape painter Regis F. Gignoux, Inness traveled abroad in 1847. He returned to Europe in 1850 under the patronage of Ogden Haggerty and studied there for over a year before returning to New York in 1852. While in Paris in 1854, he studied the work of the Barbizon painters Rousseau, Daubigny and Corot. Inness returned to the United States in 1855 and established himself in a studio in New York City. In the early 1860’s he moved to Medfield, Massachusetts, the site which inspired the painting, Evening at Medfield, Massachusetts. In the 1870’s, under the patronage of Thomas B. Clark, Inness gained increasing public recognition, and it is during this decade that the influence of the Barbizon School is especially evident in his work. Inness made his home in Montclair, New Jersey, in 1878, and remained there until shortly before his death, which occurred in 1894 at Bridge-of-Allan, Scotland. Inness is considered a prominent landscape painter of the nineteenth century. His naturalistic approach and free handling of the pigment allowed him to instill personal expression into his work.
Born in Lovell, Maine, in 1824, Eastman Johnson was reared in Fryeburg and later Augusta, Maine. His crayon sketches of his family and friends gave an early indication of his talent. After brief employment in Boston by the lithographer John H. Bufford (who later employed Winslow Homer), Johnson continued producing crayon portraits in Washington, D.C., where he began his portfolio of prominent Americans. Encouraged by the American Art Union and accompanied by his friend George Hall, Johnson traveled to Düsseldorf in 1849 to study under Emmanuel Leutze. In 1851, inspired by the work of the Dutch Masters, Johnson studied at The Hague, Holland, and later under the French artist Thomas Couture in Paris. After returning to America, Johnson exhibited at the National Academy of Design in 1856. During this same year, Johnson visited Superior, Wisconsin, painting several portraits including Sarah Fairchild Dean Conover. During the late 1850's and early 1860’s Johnson portrayed American genre scenes, Indian portraits, and scenes drawn from his experiences while following the Union troops during the Civil War. Scenes of women and children in decorative garden settings, interior scenes with women, and Nantucket cranberry picking were among Johnson’s favorite subject matter in the 1870’s. Johnson returned to portraiture in the 1880’s, when he painted many of the great public figures of his time.
17. MILTON DICTATING “PARADISE LOST” TO HIS DAUGHTER, 1876
Eastman Johnson (1824-1906)
Oil on canvas, 25½ x 30½"
Lent by the Blanden Memorial Art Gallery, Fort Dodge, Iowa
18. SARAH FAIRCHILD DEAN CONOVER, 1856
Eastman Johnson (1824-1906)
Oil on canvas, 23½ x 19½"
Lent by the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, Madison
Born in Bolton, Lancashire, England, in 1837, Thomas Moran settled in Philadelphia after emigrating to America in 1844. His productive career as a painter, engraver and watercolorist began in 1853-56 when he was apprenticed to a wood engraver. By 1860 he had already begun working in the oil, watercolor, etching and lithography media, and was greatly influenced by the work of Joseph M. W. Turner, whose work he studied at the National Gallery in London in 1866. In 1871 he joined F. V. Hayden and the United States Geological Expedition to the Yellowstone region. Paintings that incorporate the subject matter gathered during this and subsequent trips to the American West brought him great acclaim. Moran moved to Newark, New Jersey, in 1872 and later took a studio in New York City. He spent his summers in East Hampton, Long Island, and traveled extensively throughout his life both to southern and western America and to Mexico and Italy. Moran died in 1926 in Santa Barbara, California.
20. THE BATHER, 1865
Peter Rothermel (1817-1895)
Oil on canvas, 16¾ x 10½”
Lent by The Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, Bequest of Henry C. Gibson

Born in Luzerne County, Pennsylvania, in 1817, Peter Rothermel was trained as a surveyor and did not start his artistic career until his early twenties. He studied art in Philadelphia under John Rubens Smith and Bass Otis in 1840 and thereafter toured the major art centers of Europe until 1859, when he returned to America. Rothermel was an active member of the Artists’ Fund Society of Philadelphia, and was director of the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts from 1847-55. He was an eminent American historical painter, portraitist, idealist, and noteworthy colorist.
Born of American parents in Florence, Italy, in 1856, John Singer Sargent received formal artistic training as early as 1868 in Rome under the German-American artist, Carl Welsh. In 1870 he attended the Academia delle Belle Arti in Florence, and later studied with the French portrait painter Carolus-Duran in Paris. Under Duran, Sargent learned accuracy of vision, control of tonal relationships, and direct painting technique. It was in Duran's atelier that Sargent first became interested in the work of Velázquez, which was later to be an influence on his own style. In 1887-88 Sargent moved to America, settling in the New England area. He received much acclaim and enjoyed his success as a portrait painter in the 1890's. He gave up work in portraiture in 1909 and devoted his efforts to painting landscapes and genre scenes. He spent the last years of his life in Boston and London, where he died in 1925. Sargent's keen aptitude for observation and his ability to capture the chic life style of the time made him a success during his lifetime. After his death his work was condemned for its superficiality, but today he is the subject of a substantial revival of interest.
22. MALE MODEL, (no date)
John Singer Sargent (1856-1925)
Oil on canvas, 28 x 22"
Lent by The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, Gift of Marquis de Amodio, 1972
Born in Kingsville, Ohio, in 1827, Junius R. Sloan became an itinerant portrait painter in 1848. In Erie, Pennsylvania, he stayed with, and possibly studied under, the portrait painter Moses Billings. After traveling throughout Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Illinois, Sloan moved to New York City in 1857 and later to Erie, Pennsylvania, where he remained until 1864. While working in Chicago from 1864-67 Sloan turned from figure painting to the landscape. After living in Yonkers, New York, from 1867-81, Sloan returned to Chicago in 1891, where he remained until 1900. He died in 1900 while touring Redlands, California. Sloan never received a formal education in art; however, his clarity of color and atmosphere, and his sensitivity to detail in both the landscape and the figure, make him a noteworthy artist of the nineteenth century.
Born near Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 1822, William Sonntag was self-taught as an artist, working for most of his life in Cincinnati and New York. In 1853 he traveled to Italy with fellow artist Robert S. Duncanson. He was a member of the Artists’ Fund Society, and in 1861 was elected a full member of the National Academy of Design, New York, where he exhibited annually. His landscape painting is in the luminist tradition, characterized by the use of bright sunlight, vast, open space and crisp detail.
25. PORTRAIT OF A WOMAN, circa 1880
   Artist Unknown
   Oil on paper board, 25 3/4 x 19"
   Lent by Dr. Alfred Bader
26. CAMPING AT LAKE SUPERIOR, 1880
C. Phillipp Weber (1849-1909/10)
Oil on canvas, 22 x 35 1/2"
Lent by Mr. Gary Bishop

C. Phillipp Weber was born in 1849. Little is known about his life history and career as a landscape artist in nineteenth-century America. Weber died in 1909/10.
27. LANDSCAPE WITH A WOMAN CARRYING WASHING TOWARDS THE RIVER, circa 1880
Thomas Worthington Whittredge (1820-1910)
Oil on canvas, 20 7/8 x 16"
Lent by Hirschl and Adler Galleries, Inc., New York

Born in Springfield, Ohio, in 1820, Thomas Worthington Whittredge lived in Cincinnati from 1837-49, where he worked as a house and sign painter, daguerreotypist and portraitist. In 1843 he turned his efforts toward landscape painting, a subject which remained a favorite with him for the remainder of his life. Whittredge traveled abroad in 1849, and, after touring London and Paris, he attended the Düsseldorf Academy, where he associated with Emmanuel Leutze. His work was subsequently influenced by members of the Academy. The years 1856-59 were spent in Italy. Shortly thereafter Whittredge returned to America to open his studio in New York City. On his return to America, he was elected a member of the National Academy of Design, of which he served as president during the years 1874-77. He traveled with Sanford Gifford and John Kensett to the American West and to Mexico. Whittredge was a primary member of the Hudson River School. Whittredge continued to paint during his final years in Summit, New Jersey, where he died in 1910.
28. HOPE, FAITH, CHARITY, 1977-78
Jack Beal (1931- )
Oil on canvas, 72 x 72”
Lent by Joel and Carole Bernstein and Family, courtesy of Allan Frumkin
Gallery, New York

Born in Richmond, Virginia, in 1931, Jack Beal studied at the Norfolk Division of the College of William and Mary and the Virginia Polytech Institute. From 1953-56 Beal studied at the Art Institute of Chicago under Briggs Dyer, Isobel Mackinnon and Kathleen Blackshear, and at the University of Chicago. His work is represented in such collections as the Museum of Modern Art, the Minneapolis Institute of Arts, the University of Notre Dame, the Whitney Museum of American Art, and the Art Institute of Chicago. Reflecting on his work, Beal has stated, “The guidepost I have learned to seek may best be expressed, ‘Make art like life: make life like art.’ The rich, full complexity of life provides more impetus and inspiration than any artist can manage, and those same qualities in art have helped me live a more rewarding life.”
Born in San Francisco, California, in 1932, Robert Bechtle received his education at the California College of Arts and Crafts, Oakland. Collections which include his work are the University of California, Berkeley; the Museum of Modern Art; the San Francisco Museum of Art; Valparaiso University, Indiana; the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York and many other institutions. Bechtle, together with Ralph Goings and Richard McLean, is closely associated with the Pop-related form of Photo-Realism.

Commenting on his work Bechtle states, "I try for a kind of neutrality or transparency of style that minimizes the artfulness that might prevent the viewer from responding directly to the subject matter. I would like someone looking at the picture to have to deal with the subject without any clues as to just what his reaction should be. I want him to relate to it as he would to the real thing, perhaps to wonder why anyone should bother to paint it in the first place."
Born in Taipei, Taiwan, in 1942, Hilo Chen received his education in architectural engineering at Chung Yien College, Taiwan. Chen exhibited as early as 1962 in the Ton Fan Painting Exhibitions, Taipei, Taiwan. After spending a year in fine arts studies in Paris in 1968, Chen moved to New York. Institutions which have exhibited Chen's work include the Indianapolis Museum of Art, the Baltimore Museum of Art, the Butler Institute of American Art, and the Paris Art Fair. Chen is represented in the collection of the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York, and other collections.
John Clem Clarke (1937-)
Oil on canvas, 62 x 55" 
Lent by O.K. Harris Works of Art, New York

Born in Bend, Oregon, in 1937, John Clem Clarke studied at Oregon State University, Mexico City College and the University of Oregon. His work has been shown at the Whitney Museum of American Art, the Milwaukee Art Museum, the Museum of Contemporary Art in Chicago, and other institutions. Clarke's work is included in the collections of the University of California, Berkeley; the Dallas Museum of Fine Arts; the Milwaukee Art Museum; and the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York.
Born in Monroe, Washington, in 1940, Chuck Close attended the University of Washington and Yale University. He received a Fulbright Grant in 1964-65 which allowed him to travel to Vienna, Austria, where he studied at the Akademie der Bildenden Künste. Close has had one-person exhibitions at the Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago; the Museum of Modern Art, New York; the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art; and other institutions. His work is represented in the collections of Harvard University, the Museum of Modern Art, and the Milwaukee Art Museum. Close is an accomplished artist in various media, but is best known for his large Photo-Realist portraits made with a grid and airbrush technique.
Born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 1946, Fred Danziger received his education at Indiana University in Pennsylvania, the University of Pennsylvania, and the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. His work has been exhibited at the Philadelphia Museum of Art, the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts, and the Minnesota Museum of Art. He is represented in the permanent collections of the Philadelphia Museum of Art and the Pennsylvania Academy of the Fine Arts. On his work, Danziger comments, “Usually I work very systematically. I get ideas simply by living. There is usually a visual stimulus, after simple things such as matchbooks or a broken toothpick. They kick off ideas which relate to personal experiences.”
Born in New York City in 1931, Audrey Flack studied at Cooper Union, New York, Yale University, and the New York Institute of Fine Arts. Flack is one of the senior members of the original Photo-Realists group, as well as its only woman member. She was the first Photo-Realist to have her work purchased by the New York Museum of Modern Art, and is prominently represented in the permanent collections of the major art museums in New York: The Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Whitney Museum of American Art, and the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum.

Before 1971, Ms. Flack's work was predominantly concerned with the human figure; thereafter, she made a crucial transition from the figure to still-life subjects. She is today considered one of the most accomplished still-life painters among contemporary artists.
37. PORTRAIT OF PEG, 1979-80
Gregory Gillespie (1936-
Oil on panel, 25 × 20"
Lent by the Forum Gallery, New York

Born in Roselle Park, New Jersey, in 1936, Gregory Gillespie attended Cooper Union in New York from 1954-60, and the San Francisco Art Institute in 1962. He has had numerous one-person exhibitions at such institutions as the American Academy in Rome and the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Washington, D.C. His work has also been exhibited at the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York; the Butler Institute of American Art, Youngstown; the National Academy of Design, New York; the McNay Art Institute, San Antonio; and the Pratt Institute, New York. Gillespie's work is represented in the public collections of the Forum Gallery, New York; Pennsylvania State University; the Whitney Museum of American Art; and numerous private collections.
Born in Corning, California, in 1928, Ralph Goings was educated at the California College of Arts and Crafts and Sacramento State University. He later taught at the University of California, Davis. His works have been exhibited at the San Francisco Museum of Art, the Milwaukee Art Museum, the San Antonio Museum of Art, and other institutions. Goings' work is represented in such collections as the Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago, and the University of Pennsylvania. Goings is the senior member of the original group of Photo-Realist painters, having begun to work with realist images in 1962. In regard to his work, Goings has stated, "I try to present a clear-eyed, unsentimental, non-critical view. The subjects are part of our common experience — familiar places, objects and people that are not extraordinary, quaint, or picturesque. I have a fondness for the subjects, but I try to distance and neutralize myself by the techniques I use."
39. THE ARTIST'S PARENTS IN THE STORE, 1973-75
Sidney Goodman (1936-)
Oil on canvas, 58 1/4 x 76 3/4"
Lent by Terry Dintenfass Gallery, New York

Born in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, in 1936, Sidney Goodman studied at the Philadelphia Museum School in 1958 and taught at the Philadelphia College of Art. He has had one-person shows at George Washington University, the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, and the University of Rhode Island. Institutions which have exhibited his work include the Museum of Modern Art, the National Academy of Design, New York; the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York; and the Corcoran Gallery, Washington, D.C. Goodman's work is represented in the collections of the Art Institute of Chicago, the Museum of Modern Art, the Minnesota Museum of Art, and the Whitney Museum of American Art.
EI AND JUNeko SLEEPING, circa 1978
Robert Grilley (1920-)
Oil on canvas, 40 x 50"
Lent by the artist

Born in Beloit, Wisconsin, in 1920, Robert Grilley attended the University of Wisconsin where he has been a faculty member since 1945 and chairman of the art department from 1962 to 65. His work is included in more than three hundred collections, both public and private. Institutions which have exhibited his work include The Butler Institute of American Art, Youngstown; the McNay Museum, San Antonio; the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis; and the Milwaukee Art Museum. Grilley has had one-person exhibitions in Chicago, New York, Los Angeles, and Milwaukee.
Born in Los Angeles, California, in 1951, D. J. Hall was educated at the University of California at Los Angeles; she received the Yvonne Kramer Scholarship at the University of Southern California and was awarded a fellowship for painting from the National Endowment for the Arts. Institutions which have exhibited her work include the Los Angeles County Museum of Art, the Los Angeles Institute of Contemporary Art, and the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia. Commenting on her work Hall stated, "I have strong formal interest in color and light, have always been committed to doing figurative work, and need my work to go beyond in expressing some kind of commentary (political, social or personal) on aging and vanity. Hawaiian Gothic...like much (most) of my work...portrays a middle-western couple visiting Hawaii."
Douglas Hofmann (1945-)
Oil on masonite, 48 x 45"
Lent by an anonymous private collector, courtesy of Jack Gallery, New York

Born in Baltimore, Maryland, in 1945, Douglas Hofmann attended the Maryland Institute of Art where he studied under Joseph Sheppard. Institutions which have exhibited Hofmann's work are the National Academy of Design, New York; the Butler Institute of American Art, Youngstown; and the Delaware Art Museum, Wilmington. Hofmann's work is included in the collection of the Joslyn Museum, Omaha, as well as the Marquette University Fine Art Collection.
43. PEOPLE II, 1980
Yan Hsia (1937-)
Oil on canvas, 40 x 54"
Lent by Edward F. Gray, courtesy of O.K. Harris Works of Art, New York
Born in Bleiburg, Austria, in 1935, Kiki Kogelnik studied art at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna and had her first one-person exhibition at the Galerie St. Stephan in that city. In 1961, she moved to New York. Kogelnik's work has been exhibited throughout America and Europe at such museums as the Corcoran Gallery of Art, Washington, D.C.; the Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, Washington, D.C.; the Kunsthau, Hamburg, Germany; and the Künstlerhaus, Klagenfurt, Austria. Her work deals with the concept of figure and ground. She uses vivid color and flat, planar space in her handling of form.
44. REAL LIFE STINKS II, 1979
Kiki Kogelnik (1935-)
Oil on canvas, 77 x 39 1/2"
Lent by Jürgen Kreuzhage, Munich, Germany, courtesy of Jack Gallery, New York
Born in New York City in 1927, Alfred Leslie attended New York University and the Pratt Institute in New York and studied under Tony Smith, William Baziotes, Hale Woodruff and John McPherson. He taught at the San Francisco Art Institute in 1964 and won the J. S. Guggenheim Fellowship in 1969. Institutions which have exhibited his work include the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York and the Museum of Modern Art. His work is included in the permanent collections of the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo; the Milwaukee Art Museum; the Museum of Modern Art; the Whitney Museum of American Art; and the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis. Leslie's work is characterized by hard-edged, heroic-sized figures executed in a free, painterly style.
Born in Hoquiam, Washington, in 1934, Richard McLean studied at the California College of Arts and Crafts and Mills College, Oakland, California. His work has been exhibited at such institutions as the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art; the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York; the Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago; Neue Galerie der Stadt, Aachen, West Germany; the Tokyo Metropolitan Museum of Art, Japan; and the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. On his work, McLean comments, “In spite of its obviousness, the ‘crafting’ of the image provides for me the consummate satisfaction of the whole enterprise . . . The very prospect of engaging it in each successive painting is essential to why I paint.”
Born in Albert Lea, Minnesota, in 1947, Jerry Ott attended Mankato State College, Minnesota, and the University of Minnesota, Minneapolis. His work has been exhibited at such institutions as the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis; the Dallas Museum of Fine Arts; the Butler Institute of American Art, Youngstown; and in Japan, West Germany, Sweden, Switzerland, Canada and Denmark. He is represented in the permanent collections of the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis; the Museum of Contemporary Art, Tokyo, Japan; and the Minneapolis Institute of Arts. Ott is concerned with the re-introduction of the human figure in realistic painting contrasted against the simulation of texture. The images which result are achieved through his use of the airbrush technique.
Born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, in 1924, Philip Pearlstein attended New York University and the Carnegie Institute of Technology, studying under Sam Rosenberg, Robert Lepper and Balcomb Greene. His work has been exhibited at the Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Philadelphia; the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York; and in Japan and Finland. He is represented in the permanent collections of the Whitney Museum of American Art, the Museum of Modern Art, the Corcoran Gallery, the Art Institute of Chicago and numerous private collections. Characteristic of Pearlstein’s work is the use of flat, even paint, blanched color tones and systems of thin shadows. He presents an objective study of the human model, often cropping the figure to underscore its abstract elements. Pearlstein was an important figure in the move from Abstract Expressionism to New Realism.
Born in the Bronx, New York, in 1923, Larry Rivers began his career as a jazz saxophonist, and attended the Juilliard School of Music. In 1947 he attended Hans Hofmann’s school of painting and began his studies shortly thereafter at New York University under William Baziotes. After traveling to Europe in 1950, Rivers returned to New York and shared a household in Southampton, Long Island, with his mother-in-law, Berdie, the subject of the painting exhibited here. In 1970, Rivers began his work in video, airbrush and acrylics. His work has been exhibited at such institutions as the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York; the Museum of Modern Art; the Tate Gallery, London; the Art Institute of Chicago; and in Japan, India, West Germany, England and Australia. He is represented in the collections of the Brooklyn Museum; the Corcoran Gallery, Washington, D.C.; the Metropolitan Museum of Art, and many other private collections. Larry Rivers introduced the human figure into the Abstract Expressionist movement, making the figure the basis of his free, painterly style.
50. UNTITLED, 1980
Keith A. Smith/Philip A. Lange (1938-; 1956-)
Photograph with applied color, 67 x 90 1/2"  
Lent by the artists

Born in Tipton, Indiana, in 1938, Keith Smith attended the School of the Art Institute of Chicago and the Institute of Design, Illinois Institute of Technology. He has had one-person shows at the Art Institute of Chicago; the George Eastman House, Rochester; and the Light Gallery, New York. His work has been exhibited at the Museum of Modern Art, New York; the San Francisco Art Institute; the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis; the Detroit Institute of Arts; and in Norway, England, Poland, Australia, Japan and West Germany. He is represented in the permanent collections of the Museum of Modern Art; the International Museum of Photography at the George Eastman House, Rochester; and the Fogg Museum, Harvard University.

Born in 1956, Philip Lange attended Carleton College, Northfield, Minnesota, and is presently at the Visual Studies Workshop, Rochester, New York. His work has been exhibited at the Museum of Contemporary Art, Chicago; the Rochester Institute of Technology; and the Philadelphia Art Alliance.
51. WALLACE STEVENS, THE HARTFORD MUTUAL, 1981
Paul Staiger (1941- )
Oil on photograph mounted on canvas, 58 x 80" 
Lent by Joel and Carole Bernstein and Family, courtesy of Allan Frumkin Gallery, New York

Born in Portland, Oregon, in 1941, Paul Staiger attended Northwestern University, University of Chicago, and the California College of Arts and Crafts, Oakland. Staiger taught at the San Jose State University, California. He has had one-person exhibitions at the Michael Walls Gallery in San Francisco and New York.
52. SELF PORTRAIT WITH DAUGHTER, 1980
Paul Wiesenfeld (1942- )
Oil on canvas, 47 3/4 x 65''
Lent by Robert Schoelkopf Gallery, Ltd., New York

Born in Los Angeles, California, in 1942, Paul Wiesenfeld attended the Chouinard Art Institute, Los Angeles; the University of California at Los Angeles; Yale University; the Kunstakademie, Munich; and Indiana University. His work has been exhibited at the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York; Yale University Art Gallery; the Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo; and in various locations in Germany. Wiesenfeld is represented in the collections of Morton Z. Newmann, Chicago; the Whitney Museum of American Art, New York; the Virginia Museum of Fine Arts; and the Städtische Galerie, Lenbachhaus, Munich.
Additional pieces included in the exhibition

34. PERIPHERY EXCAVATION
   Randy Dudley (1950- )
   Oil on canvas, 15 x 20"
   Lent by O.K. Harris Works of Art, New York

35. ON THE NIGHT TRAIN, 1980
   Leonard Dufresne (1941- )
   Acrylic on canvas, 12 x 14"
   Lent by Samuel Karp, courtesy of O.K. Harris Works of Art, New York
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