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INTRODUCTION

The development of art and museums in the United States was a long journey that began in colonial America. The formation of American patronage and the interest in collecting, although slow in its evolution, was central to the development and appreciation of art in this country. It was with the aid of such patronage and collecting that helped with the expansion of art museums in the United States. There have been many art patrons throughout American history, and in this discussion there will be a focus on four major families each of whom have had a vital role in helping to bring important European works of art to the United States as well as leaving substantial treasured contributions to various art museums. The art patronages of the Havemeyer, Stein, Cone, and Phillips families are unparalleled. Their passion for some of the finest artists of Europe and of the United States, especially those of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries shaped the direction of some of the great American museum collections including the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Baltimore Museum of Art, and the Phillips Memorial Collection.

Art patronage has deep roots in history and it seems related to a number of factors. Many patrons commissioned or sought works of art to establish their stature or vision whether motivated by religious, emotional, political, financial, or other reasons. Certainly cultivated taste shaped by wealth has often led to investment in fine art. Ancient rulers of the Greeks such as Perikles and Alexander the Great and Roman emperors such as Augustus, Nero, Trajan, and Caracalla, often commissioned great works of art, sculptural and architectural programs, to help fulfill their often grandiose
ideas of majesty and empire. Private patronage of works of art can be seen in the beautiful villas of Pompeii in which the extant works attest to the interests of the wealthy inhabitants. During the Medieval period the Church became a key patron of artists who created stained glass, metal reliquaries, or icons to those who painted triptychs; this is evident in the many remaining religious works of art. From the early to the late Renaissance, the Church continued to be a major supporter of works of art though more and more wealthy families became prominent art patrons as well. European nobles and monarchs have commissioned portraits and purchased great masterpieces. One only needs to think of the works of European artists such as Jan van Eyck, Jean Fouquet, Andrea Mantegna, Titian, Peter Paul Rubens, Diego Velázquez, and Francisco Goya and their close relationships with their royal and wealthy patrons to cite a few examples.

In Europe, there was not an immediate need for museums because many upper class citizens lived in them. The walls and rooms of their homes, mansions, and villas were full of paintings and sculptures of great masters. There was no need to establish public museums because they enjoyed art in the private sector for so many centuries. In contrast to this established tradition of art patronage, our nation in its early years, was struggling as a young republic. The country lacked the cultural background that had often inspired so many European works from tapestries, to mosaics, to statuary, and delicate illuminated manuscripts that were found in such cabinets of curiosities,¹ visible only to a few. In Europe the museum was merely making public something that had already

---

¹ Cabinets of Curiosities, also known as “Wunderkammer,” preceded museums and were collections of marvels and unusual objects that started during the Renaissance in Europe. These collections included objects belonging to natural history, geology, ethnography, archaeology, religious or historical relics, antiquities, and works of art.
existed, the private collection. The mission of a museum in the United States was that it represented something that was not truly found elsewhere in the country, a place to house artwork as the grand palaces and chateaux had done in Europe. The American museum was first and foremost an ideal, one that could provide a place for education of the public.

The first public American art and science museum was created by Charles Wilson Peale. It was motivated by a strong national pride and a hope for the future glory of American art rather than the importation of higher standards from abroad. In 1782 he had begun displaying his own works of art in a gallery in his home but eventually the collections expanded as he added natural history specimens, minerals, stuffed animals, a skeleton of an American mastodon, along with more of his portrait art. Peale ultimately housed his curiosity cabinet, all of these various specimens and works of art, in the old Philadelphia statehouse, now known as Independence Hall, until its closure in the 1840s.

Peale’s museum demonstrated the nativist ideals that many Americans supported. Though the museum did not endure it is important to note that many of the founding ideas of Peale and his museum are the same as those used by American museums today. For instance, he was the first to create marketing campaigns and solicitations for gifts to his museum. He strove to educate the public about science and the arts and believed that it was a community museum for all. The first root of American museums had been planted and the idea of establishing such education centers for the public only continued to develop through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in America.

---

Luman Reed (1787-1836) was another important early nativist collector of art in the United States. He was a successful American grocery wholesaler who was one of the first of a new breed of merchant-patrons who provided much needed support for American painters as they began to form an American school independent of Europe. Reed incorporated into his New York townhouse a gallery that he opened weekly so that those interested including the city’s growing community of artists might derive educational benefit from it. He began by buying only pictures by living American artists, especially Asher B. Durand, William Sidney Mount, and Thomas Cole. An example of the real need for a museum followed the void after Luman Reed’s sudden death in 1836 in that at the time of his demise there was no place to leave his art collection. The issue of the collection’s future was left to his heirs, who raised funds to buy the collection and housed it in New York’s old city-owned Rotunda, which they named New York Gallery of Fine Arts. It was to be the price of admission that was to support the endeavor, but the public’s unwillingness to see the same pictures over and over each year and the lack of funds for the board to buy new works led to the donation of the collection to the New York Historical Society in 1858. It is one of the most important early nineteenth century collections that have survived intact.

An issue of great importance is the constant predicament from the late seventeenth century until the mid-nineteenth century existing between the two opposing ideals of what kinds of art to collect. The nativists, like Peale and Reed and their

---

5 It is interesting to note that Reed purchased quasi-Old Master paintings, but later rid his collection of these questionable European Old Masters he had bought and focused only on American art collecting.
6 Nathaniel Burt, 51.
followers, supported the collection of art created in this country, while the cosmopolitans and their supporters sought the best of Western art available. The cosmopolitans believed that having the best European art available to the United States is more important than supporting American artists and art of this country. The creation of museums also saw a struggle between these two ideals and some early patrons of European art with substantial collections were rejected by their native cities when they offered their donations. One such collector was Thomas Jefferson Bryan who in 1852 tried to give his Parisian collection to Philadelphia, but the city rejected his request. The collection ended up in the New York Historical Society in 1864. It was not until after the Civil War that interest in European works of art became more prominent. This was partly due to the shift of art interests from the nativist ideals to the cosmopolitan ideals. Many began to enjoy the art of Europe more than that of America although painters like those of the Hudson River School had been very popular.

The United States had a small number of art collectors in its early years and it was impossible to view European works of great importance. “Before the Civil War (1861-65), the commercial art market barely existed. There were few art dealers with large inventories of paintings or sculptures….with only a handful of such establishments existing before the 1880s.” In order to be able to see the truly great masterworks of influential artists such as Michelangelo or Raphael Americans were forced to make the long voyage abroad to Europe. At this time travel abroad became more available due to the increase of the production of larger passenger ships and the competitive market

---

7 Ibid., 55.
between the leading shipping companies which helped lower the cost of fares across the Atlantic. As seen in the examples of Peale and Reed the period between the Revolutionary and Civil Wars brought the foundations of the idea of the museum and the strength of existence of private collections and art benefactors were fully established.

New York City became a vital art capital amidst a highly industrialized metropolis and is a wonderful example of how academies and organizations eventually led the country into the formation of established art museums. The large well visited city had seven well respected art institutions by the end of the nineteenth century. They included The American Academy of Fine Arts (1802), New York Historical Society (1804), National Academy of Design (1825), The Apollo Association which was later known as The American Art Union (c.1838), New York Gallery of Fine Arts (c.1844) which was started by Luman Reed, Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art (1859), and the renowned, Metropolitan Museum of Art (1870).

The year of 1870 was truly when the art museum in America began. It was in this year that not only the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York was established but also the Boston Museum of Fine Arts was founded. These two were followed by William Wilson Corcoran’s the Corcoran Gallery of Art in 1874 and then the establishment of the Philadelphia Museum of Art as a result of Philadelphia’s Centennial Exhibition of 1876. The Metropolitan Museum of Art’s birth came not from a group of artists, but of laymen who decided it was time for the city to have a public art gallery. John Jay, a lawyer and president of the Union League Club in New York, was the one who proposed the idea

---

9 Rennella and Walton, 365-383.
10 Nathaniel Burt, 59.
while in Paris, and when he returned to the United States he rallied many to the cause. It is interesting to note that though it opened on April 13, 1870 the museum did not acquire its first object, a Roman sarcophagus, until November 20. The following year was much more active for the museum as it added 174 European paintings to the collection. The Metropolitan Museum of Art is a wonderful example of many American museums which sprung up as an ideal before it even had artwork to display.

American museums from this moment on began to form throughout the United States. The country went from having less than ten established art museums before 1860 to founding nearly 100 by 1910. The art museum had found a home within the United States and though they varied in reason of why they were established, some forming as ideals and others as necessities to house specific collections. They all strove to accomplish the same goals as every museum does; to collect, preserve, exhibit, interpret, and advance knowledge and awareness of art.

Just like museums, there are numerous reasons why collectors are driven to collect. Dr. Alma Wittlin lists six different kinds of collections based on different motivations of those who assembled them: economic hoard collections, social prestige collections, magic collections, collections as expressions of group loyalty, collections as means of emotional experience, collections as means of stimulating curiosity and inquiry. Though not all of these apply to the collectors discussed in the following pages, they do categorize the vast number of collectors and collections throughout much of art

---

history. It seems that the collections discussed here can be grouped into a few of the six categories listed by Wittlin. They include economic hoard, social prestige, means of emotional experience, and means of stimulating curiosity and inquiry.

In my study, I present a look at different American family collectors beginning in this period of great change around the turn of the century to show their development and explain the importance of their individual contributions to American museums. For the scope of this project it would be impossible to cite and describe a large portion of all of the major collectors who have contributed through their gifts to American museums or created their own museums such as Solomon R. Guggenheim, Norton Simon, Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney, John and Mable Ringling, John and Dominique de Menil, and Isabelle Stewart Gardner to mention a few collections whose holdings have become museums. I felt it was important to address four different family collectors who had various collecting styles and influences on the art world and examine them in depth to indicate the importance and individual characteristics of their collections and donations that may not be as well known as other collections.

In my opening chapter, I examine the start of collecting as embodied in the life of Louisine and Henry Havemeyer. The family biography is integral to their developing a splendid collection. Throughout their years they were able to amass a collection spanning various periods and important movements, especially Impressionism, as well as obtaining works of various origins including from Japan. The Havemeyer collection provides a good example of the types of works being collected by connoisseurs during the latter half of the nineteenth-century. Louisine and Henry differed from most collectors of their era.
Their love of Impressionism and other modern artists led them to purchase their work before they were considered significant. The Havemeyers’ most important contribution was their bequest at their death of their collection to The Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City which helped to improve greatly numerous areas of the museum’s holdings.

In the second chapter I address the Stein family as collectors. The family biography and the dynamics of sibling relationships are presented as these personal factors play an active role in their acquisition of avant-garde art in Paris. They are quite different from the other collectors within this study in that they had much more financial restraints than the others, and due to this they were pushed to begin focusing their collecting on less established art of Paris, which were the avant garde artists of the Post-Impressionist and Cubist groups. I will also argue that their understanding and acuity for newly recognized artistic talent made their purchases possible. Leo, Gertrude, Michael and Sarah were able to not only collect but also have very personal relationships with some of the most important avant-garde modernists of the time including Pablo Picasso and Henri Matisse. Their various personal collections, though mostly sold to other collectors and galleries before their deaths, became important acquisitions for numerous museums and collections throughout the United States.

In my third chapter I look at the Cone sisters from Baltimore, Claribel and Etta. Both sisters were strong willed in their defiance of the female roles that were followed during the early twentieth-century as neither ever married. During their journey into their respective fields they eventually met Gertrude Stein and became close friends. The two
sisters were greatly influenced by the four Stein siblings and their connection with the family led them to meet some of the most prominent modern artists in Paris. Eventually Etta and Claribel went on to assemble one of the most comprehensive collections of Henri Matisse’s work in the world. The sisters remained true to their roots and donated their massive collection to the Baltimore Museum of Art. Their gift completely transformed the museum and city into a major center for study in modern art.

My fourth and final collector to be discussed is Duncan Phillips. His gallery was born from his great family loss and serves as a memorial to his father and brother. He lived his life eagerly searching for new art which inspired him. He also sought to both inform the public about art and the connections between the various movements throughout its history. Through his passion and need to educate he formed the first museum in the United States for living modern artists. The Phillips Collection has endured over the years and has grown to become one of the leading art institutions in the country. Art collecting in the United States by Americans not only helped to bring wonderful examples of masterly European works of art here but also, most importantly, ignited the desire for America to create its own styles and institutions and museums of art. This study provides an intimate view of four prominent American collecting families and their collecting habits and accomplishments while establishing their importance to American art and its museums.
CHAPTER I: HENRY AND LOUISINE HAVEMEYER

In the history of art collecting the Havemeyer name has become synonymous with one of the greatest collections created by an American family. The development of this prestigious collection took numerous years and many difficult decisions by Mr. Henry and Mrs. Louisine Havemeyer. Although most of the Havemeyer collection was assembled during the marriage of Henry and Louisine, the love of art that they both had began very early in their lives, before they were married. The bequest of their collection to the Metropolitan Museum of Art helped to transform the museum into a more significant site to study European art. It is important to understand where the Havemeyer’s passion for art came from in order to recognize how it developed into such an incredible collection.

Louisine Waldron Elder was born on July 28, 1855 to a wealthy merchant father, George William Elder and Mathilda Adelaide Waldron in New York City. Because of the affluence of her family Louisine was able when she was nineteen years old to travel to Europe for the first time with her two sisters, Annie and Adaline, and her mother. During their trip she stayed at the illustrious Del Sarte house in Paris. The Del Sarte family rented rooms to young Americans who were interested in perfecting their French. While on her trip Louisine began to meet many new people. Emily Sartain was an artist who was studying in Paris and staying at the Del Sarte house when the Elders arrived. Sartain would often go with the Elders to sightsee, watch theatre or attend other social events. Emily had made an Italian trip to Parma in the winter of 1871-72 and worked with Mary Cassatt, a woman artist from Philadelphia who had been educated at the Pennsylvania
Academy of Fine Arts. Cassatt moved to Paris to broaden her studies and it is in 1874 that she was introduced to Louisine by Sartain.

The two had an instant connection. Louisine was impressed by Cassatt and her individualism and courage. Their relationship would become one of the most significant collecting alliances between a patron and an artist in the nineteenth century. She described her feelings claiming, “I wondered how she had the courage to go to Spain in the days of the Carlista wars, or to Italy before the bandits were controlled, but she was resourceful, self-reliant, true, and brave and no one had a better or a more truly generous heart.”

It was Cassatt’s great understanding for real quality and her passion for art that inspired Louisine in her art collecting for the rest of her life.

Louisine described her opinions of Mary Cassatt during their first meetings together claiming that Cassatt had, “showed me the splendid things in the great city, making them still more splendid by opening my eyes to their beauty through her own knowledge and appreciation.” It is not surprising then that Louisine’s first purchase of art was guided by Cassatt. Louisine returned to Paris the following summer of 1875 and she was able to reconnect with her new friend during this trip.

Cassatt took Louisine to see a pastel work by the artist Edgar Degas. Mary had become infatuated with Degas’s art in 1875 and she wanted to share her reactions to his work with Louisine. Cassatt discussed her first encounter with the work of Degas in a window of a dealer on the Boulevard Haussmann stating, “I used to go and flatten my nose against that window and absorb all I could of his art. It changed my life. I saw art
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then as I wanted to see it.” Degas was from an aristocratic family and a number of his early works indicate his travel in Italy. Though Salon juries accepted his early history paintings, his works were often met with indifference in exhibitions. By 1870s his art shifted to more modern themes of Parisian life such as cabaret singers, musicians in opera orchestra, and ballet scenes which would become his most well known subject. He became a prominent member in almost all of the eight Impressionist exhibitions held in Paris between 1874 and 1886.

It seems Cassatt’s “commitment to Degas was the most important and enduring element of her artistic career.” She greatly urged Louisine to buy one of the artist’s canvases and was successful. Louisine ended up purchasing the work entitled, *Ballet Rehearsal* (1875) (Figure 1) for five hundred francs, which was about one hundred dollars at the time. This work is one that exemplifies the manner of the artist, showing his favorite subject matter, ballet dancers. Louisine described her feelings during this first purchase in her autobiography. She claimed, “It was so new and strange to me! I scarcely knew how to appreciate it, or whether I liked it or not, for I believe it takes special brain cells to understand Degas.” This comment shows Louisine was still quite naïve about art collecting and lacked the understanding of the aesthetics of modern French painting at the time. Louisine was, at first, unsure of how to truly appreciate modern works. Without the influence of Cassatt, Louisine surely would not have discovered and observed
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Degas’s work at such an influential period during the artist’s career. It did not last long before Mary Cassatt’s knowledge and influence led Louisine to full-blown collecting.

Even though Louisine was unsure of her ability to understand and appreciate the art she initially purchased, she continued her pursuit. She had, with the purchase of Degas’s work become the artist’s first American patron. Louisine showed great fearlessness in her collecting by spending her entire allowance on her first art purchase. She has been quoted as saying that collecting took one attribute, nerve.\(^1^8\) She continued to exhibit this boldness throughout her many years as a collector. Soon after her purchase of the Degas she also acquired many other works by the young Impressionist group. She added Claude Monet’s *The Drawbridge* (1874) (Figure 2) as well as a work by Camille Pissarro entitled, *The Cabbage Gatherers* (1878-79) (Figure 3) to her collection.

It is important to note that Louisine’s purchase of so many Impressionist paintings beginning in the 1870s was very bold at the time for an American, especially for a woman. Historically, the United States remained behind in the acceptance of many styles and movements as they developed in Europe. Impressionism was not developed by American artists in the States until fifteen or twenty years after the French Impressionists formed their movement and then it took on its own distinctive qualities. The American public was often hesitant to accept the works presented to them in few European exhibitions, such as Durand-Ruel’s Impressionist show in Boston in 1883. In 1880 Americans showed their reluctance for the new style with critics stating their mistrust of Impressionism and what art critic Benjamin considered an “effort to paint the soul without the body.” Charles H. Moore also agreed and described, in the *Atlantic Monthly*,

\(^{18}\) Havemeyer, *Sixteen to Sixty*, 78.
it as a movement that was “a mistake destined to be short-lived.” \(^{19}\) Louisine, therefore, was a forerunner in understanding the work of these bold artists who created this movement.

In 1881 during another trip to Europe Louisine was able to experience her first Gustave Courbet exhibit with Cassatt. It was held in the foyer of the Théâtre de la Gaîté. The exhibition of Courbet’s work was undoubtedly an exciting experience for Louisine to finally see this artist’s work. She had a desire to since her first meeting with Cassatt, when Louisine heard her new friend discuss his work and praise the artist so much that it evoked curiosity. Courbet, staunch leader of the Realist movement in France, had a great influence on the Impressionist period by breaking free from past artistic notions of embellishment or idealism. Louisine described her experience at the exhibition in her memoirs, “She took me there, explained Courbet to me, spoke of the great painter in her flowing generous way, called my attention to his marvelous execution, to his color, above all to his realism, to that poignant, palpitating medium of truth through which he sought expression…I never forgot it.” \(^{20}\) Appreciation and understanding of Courbet with his Realist viewpoint took time for Louisine to develop and she did not begin buying works by Courbet until after she was married.

In the early 1880s Louisine began to trust her own artistic judgments and to acquire a more assured taste in her purchases. During a visit to London with her mother she made the bold move to call on James Abbott McNeill Whistler, the American expatriate artist who is best noted for his nocturnal paintings, etchings, and often bold
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full-length portraits. He is also one of the major figures to introduce modern French painting into England. Louisine was aware of his scandalous painting in the Salon de Refusés as well as his taste for Japonisme as seen in Old Battersea Bridge (1872-75). His distinct style of painting with his laborious techniques appealed to Louisine, and she purchased some of his works.

The artist obliged Louisine’s request to meet with him to see his work and she and her mother visited him in his studio on Tite Street. She had a great desire to finally meet the artist who had created Portrait of Miss Alexander (1872-74), which Louisine had previously seen and greatly enjoyed. Arriving at Whistler’s studio, Louisine told the artist that she only had thirty pounds to spend and that she did not want to leave without one of his works. Her bold move paid off and she left that day with five pastels on brown paper, which the artist completed during his trip to Venice after his well publicized libel suit against writer and critic, John Ruskin. Whistler even put a title on the back of each pastel and also decorated it with his trademark butterfly signature which he had begun to use in the 1860s.

The joys of collecting, meeting artists, and listening to their ideas and stories related to their works became among one of Louisine’s favorite activities. It seems that Miss Elder also had a great desire to share her art collection from the beginning of her career. In February 1878 Louisine’s first art purchase, Ballet Rehearsal by Degas, was lent to the Eleventh Annual Exhibition of the American Water-color Society. The exhibition was held at the National Academy of Design in New York and the Degas pastel was listed in the exhibit as being lent by G.W. Elder. The initials were those of
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Louisine’s deceased father as well as her younger brother George. It is interesting that she did not use her own name as the lender in the exhibit. This helps to show the hesitation and acceptance of women at the time within the realm of collecting. From early on she knew the importance of sharing the work she was fortunate to own with the public. Her generosity in the early years of her career only foreshadows the vast gift of works she would leave to the Metropolitan Museum of Art at the time of her death.

It is interesting that Ballet Rehearsal, being the first French Impressionist work to be shown in America did not receive more attention by critics or the press.\textsuperscript{22} The reviewer for the New York Tribune, Clarence Cook, did not mention the Degas at all in the several writings about the exhibit. It seems only a reviewer from Scribner’s Monthly took notice of the importance of the work in the exhibition. He stated, “Among the pictures from abroad, A Ballet, by Degas, gave us an opportunity of seeing the work of one of the strongest members of the French ‘Impressionist’ school, so called; though light, and in parts vague, in touch this is the assured work of a man who can, if he wishes, draw with the sharpness and firmness of Holbein.”\textsuperscript{23}

It is no surprise that Degas’s work was treated so summarily when shown to the American public as it was still before the time when the Impressionist style would receive general acceptance here in the United States. Impressionism became more widely seen and accepted by the end of the century as it had been exhibited in almost every major city in the United States.\textsuperscript{24} It was in the late 1880s that Impressionism began to gain popularity among American artists. Even without great praise Louisine still did not seem
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fazed or disappointed in her purchase of Degas’s painting. She even went to great pains to restore the frame, the artist’s own selection, after the hanging committee for the National Academy had painted it gold, due to their rules of exhibiting. She discussed the horror she experienced when she went to see the work and realized what they had done to the frame. She protested the action, of course, but the committee stood by their rule. Louisine seemed to have been quite sure of herself and Degas’s vision, for in discussing the event she plainly stated, “Of course we were then only in the nineteenth century…”

It was as if she knew that her ideas and opinions of art were ahead of their time just like the artists she had come to admire in her collecting. She astutely realized that one day the practice of collecting would develop into her standards.

Henry Osborne Havemeyer was born on October 18, 1847 and had been quite close to the Elder family for his whole life. Henry, always referred to as Harry, was first raised by his sister, Mary, since his mother had died when he was only four years old. His sister was married to Lawrence Elder, Louisine’s uncle and Louisine’s parents took care of Harry after the age of fifteen. The two grew up in the same household for several years when Harry was not in boarding school.

Being the son of Frederick Christian Havemeyer, owner of a successful sugar refining business, Harry had to prove his abilities in the business before becoming a partner. His father felt that one should work their way up, experiencing every aspect of a company. That is exactly what Harry did in the family business, starting at more minor positions. He eventually took charge of the buying and selling department of his father’s business. When he was twenty-two he became a partner in the family sugar refining firm.
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Over the years the firm became one of the largest sugar refineries in the world. Harry himself came to be known as the “Sugar King.” He helped form the Sugar Trust in 1887 which was a huge financial gain for the company and the family. It was with this business that he became quite wealthy and was able to fund all of the travel and collecting that he and his future wife would continue throughout their marriage.

Because of his wealthy family, Harry was able to be well educated and was, early in his life, exposed to the arts. He became a wonderful violinist and early on he was exposed to the visual art of Samuel Colman, an American painter who was influenced by the Hudson River school. The artist was well-traveled and painted romantic landscapes that were often inspired by regions in Europe, North Africa and the American West. Harry eventually met Colman and they became friends. He later acquired many works by Colman including paintings, watercolors and prints. It was with the artist that Harry began his art collecting at the 1876 Centennial Exhibition in Philadelphia. While at the exhibition he bought a large group of Japanese decorative arts, including examples such as, textiles, brocades, and lacquer boxes. Works from the East had just recently become available in America and Mr. Havemeyer’s taste for art from the East, especially from Japan, continued throughout his life. His vast collection of Asian art is one which deserves its own pages and it is only necessary to state that it was Mr. Havemeyer who purchased such wonderful and well known woodblock prints by nineteenth-century artists such as Utagawa Hiroshige and Katsushika Hokusai. Hiroshige’s *Rapids at Naruto*
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(1857) (Figure 4) and Hokusai’s *Under the Wave off Kanagawa* (c. 1830-32) (Figure 5), two of the most well known images of Japanese woodblock prints, are in the collection of the Metropolitan Museum of Art due to Harry’s love of Asian art. Harry also continued his collecting by purchasing works by French artists as well.

Unlike his future wife’s more modern taste he originally bought works by established Salon artists such as Marie-François Firmin-Girard. He purchased Girard’s *Ladies Caught in the Rain* in 1879. He also made purchases of old masters such as Rembrandt van Rijn. He acquired two Rembrandt paintings, *Portrait of Christian Paul van Beresteijn, Burgomaster of Delft* (1632) and a portrait of his wife, *Volkera* (1632) for sixty thousand dollars (Figures 6-7). In 1881 he turned to mid-nineteenth century French landscape painting and started to purchase works by Barbizon artists including, Diaz, Rousseau, Corot, and Millet. The Barbizon school was a group of landscape artists that worked in the town of Barbizon south of Paris and rejected the Academic tradition in an attempt to achieve a truer display of life in the countryside. It is this movement that would be the first French movement to have a definite impact on the art world in the United States. The taste of Barbizon painting predictably developed later in the U.S. than in France and it is notable that Harry made such financial speculations in collecting many great examples of this school’s style nearly a decade before it was fully accepted in the U.S.

In 1882 he is known to have bought Eugène Delacroix’s *Arab Rider* for the large amount of seven thousand dollars. Delacroix’s work as a French Romantic painter who was one of the most significant figures in nineteenth-century French art, he is best known
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for displaying historical events and literary scenes in his painting and prints. The artist had a great fascination with the more tragic aspects of life including violence and destruction and his expression of energy and movement in his works made him one of the most important artistic figures of the time.

Harry’s proposal to Louisine was accepted only after he swore to his future wife that he would never touch alcohol again. It was his alcoholism which ended his first marriage and he kept his promise to Louisine for the rest of his life, never having another drink.  

30 Louisine married Henry Osborne Havemeyer on August 22, 1883. Both of them were established in their collecting abilities, the tone was set for how they would collect throughout the rest of their lives as a married couple. Though Mr. Havemeyer did become more interested in European work over the years, he seemed to always have a great desire to collect art from the East as well, especially Japanese works, while Louisine, with the help of Cassatt seemed to push for more modern pieces. 

31 The couple had not only acquired different tastes in art but also different characteristics in how they went about their collecting. Mr. Havemeyer was very instinctive and made quick decisions not caring about the price of objects if he believed the quality of the object was good enough. “He was convinced that there would never be a sufficient supply of great works of art to fulfill the demand for them and that their value would thus increase over the years.”

32 Louisine, on the other hand, was not as impulsive when buying works of art. Since she began collecting more avant-garde work from the start she seemed to have a spirit for adventure and a desire to be a pioneer. Louisine, unlike her husband, possessed
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the quality of patience. Looking at some of her purchases through the years she is known
to have taken as long as a few years to secure a specific piece of art. “For her,
experiencing a work of art was of crucial importance; its possession was secondary.”33
Her slow thoughtful style of collecting and desire to fully experience and appreciate a
work before making the decision to purchase sometimes resulted in Louisine missing out
on various acquisitions to others. Although Harry and Louisine’s collecting habits were
completely different they did complement one another and they became an exceptional
collecting couple.

After marrying in 1883 the couple had three children; Adaline was born on July
11, 1884, Horace born March 19, 1886, and Electra on August 16, 1888. As the couple
began their lives together and created a family Louisine was determined to create a home
that would house their growing art collection. At the beginning of the Havemeyer’s
marriage it was Harry who did most of the collecting, while Louisine dealt with family
duties, designing, and decorating their home. Harry focused on Oriental pieces at this
time and it was in 1883 that he began to collect Japanese tea jars. He would eventually
collect around 475 of them over his lifetime.

It seems that Louisine did not attempt to expose Harry to the modern works of art
she highly enjoyed due to the fact that it was difficult to find pictures by artists such as
Monet, Pissarro, and Degas in America at the time and they were too busy to travel to
Europe.34 In turn, Louisine set her mind to creating a home that could properly display
the wonderful works of art they loved. She spent the late 1880s and early 1890s designing
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the interior of their home with the help of Louis Comfort Tiffany, the major Art Nouveau designer, and Samuel Colman. Tiffany helped Louisine create a beautiful home that epitomized late nineteenth century decorating principles. This also helps to illustrate the overwhelming amount of wealth the Havemeyers had obtained and were able to employ for their love of the arts. Furthermore the overriding design principle for their home was the display of their artworks in the best way possible.

With the newly designed home the Havemeyers began to collect more works than ever before. It seems that most of their extensive collection was formed between 1888 and 1907, the year of Mr. Havemeyer’s death. Louisine seemed to focus her collecting on modern French painting such as Gustave Courbet and Édouard Manet. In 1894 the Havemeyers became the most active collectors of Impressionist painting in the world. For the next ten years, they were often given first choice of virtually any painting, sculpture, or print on the market by the dealers Paul Durand-Ruel and Ambroise Vollard. They used this privilege to assemble exhaustively complete collections of works by Corot, Courbet, Manet, Degas, and Monet that numbered about thirty examples each.\textsuperscript{35} Durand-Ruel was an early supporter of the Barbizon artists and for many years was the only dealer to buy such works. He then ventured into selling Impressionist art after meeting Claude Monet and Camille Pissarro in the early 1870s. He courageously bought the work of the Impressionists even though they were mostly shunned by the buying public. His persistence for showcasing these artists, including taking their canvases to New York City and establishing a branch of his gallery there in 1887, led to the Impressionists’ great success in the United States.

Édouard Manet was one artist whose paintings captivated the Havemeyers and made a huge impact on their collection. They would collect about twenty-five works by this avant-garde artist. They were all purchased before Mr. Havemeyer’s death in 1907. Louisine did not purchase any others by the artist after her husband’s death. This may have been due to the fact that Harry seemed to have had a great love for Manet and she could not bear to collect any more without him. Louisine describes it in her memoirs claiming that the painter had become an “open book” to her husband. They started their collection buying small still-lifes like, *The Salmon* (1868) (Figure 8) in the late 1880s. In January of 1894 they purchased Manet’s *Ball at the Opera* (1873) for eight thousand dollars (Figure 9). It is this work that Louisine discusses in her memoirs as one she hung in her own apartment and that it had helped her understand the work of the artist. “I have studied and enjoyed it, hour after hour, year after year, until I have learned to consider it one of Manet’s best if not his greatest work.” The Havemeyers began collecting Manet’s works quite feverishly in spite of the less favorable opinion of the artist at the time.

In 1895 they obtained many of their well known paintings by the artist including, *Luncheon in the Studio* (1868), *The Grand Canal, Venice (Blue Venice)* (1875) (Figure 10), and *Boating* (1874) (Figure 11). It seems that three years later was another big year for their Manet collection for they obtained such works as *The Kearsarge at Boulogne* (1864) and *A Matador* (1866-67) (Figure 12). They also purchased *Mlle Victorine…In the Costume of an Espada* (1862) (Figure 13) for fifteen thousand dollars as well as the
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famous Manet work, *Gare Saint-Lazare* (1872-73) (Figure 14) for the same amount on December 31, 1898. The latter painting is one of Manet’s best works. Louisine describes her feelings about *Gare Saint-Lazare* claiming, “…it appeals to our inherent love of truth, and we look at the picture again and again because it might be our child, nay, it might even be ourselves when we were children, clinging to those rails and looking with the same interest on the busy scene below. It tells us of childhood…”\(^{38}\)

It seems that Louisine enjoyed how art affected her emotionally, the feeling that she would get from a work of art was probably the inspiration for her purchase. One of the last works of Manet that they bought was in February 1903 and was the work entitled, *The Dead Christ and the Angels* (1864) (Figure 15). They purchased the piece for seventeen thousand dollars, against Mr. Havemeyer’s better judgment, for he was not quite sure where his wife would put it and Louisine soon after the purchase found it to be too cumbersome to live with, as her husband suspected. It remained in storage until after Harry’s death when Louisine put it on loan to the Metropolitan Museum.

Gustave Courbet, as noted, had made an early impression on Louisine at the Théâtre de la Gaîté in 1881. Louisine had to persuade Harry later on before being able to collect any of the works by Courbet. There were not many great examples of his work in the United States available at the time besides those that were too large or too provocative for American tastes. It was in 1896 when Louisine used all of her persuasiveness to convince Harry to purchase a very provocative painting by the artist. *Woman with a Parrot* (1866) (Figure 16) was being shown at Durand-Ruel’s gallery in New York and was about to be returned to France since the dealer could not find a buyer.

\(^{38}\) Ibid., 239.
Louisine begged her husband to purchase the painting, “not to hang it in our gallery lest the anti-nudists should declare a revolution and revise our Constitution, but just to keep it in America, just that such a work should not be lost to future generations.”

They did buy the painting, saving it from leaving the country and it was, in 1909, placed on long-term loan to the Metropolitan Museum where it remains still today. This is yet another example of Louisine’s desire to share the art which she believed to be of great importance in the development and appreciation of modern art in the United States. She had strong convictions that such a piece would be needed to be seen by future generations in the United States. It is interesting to know how much effort it took to convince the couple to purchase nudes by Courbet, for they would come to own the largest collection of Courbet’s nudes in the world. A few other examples from their collection include *The Woman in the Waves* (1868) (Figure 17) and *The Source* (1862) (Figure 18).

Their collection of Courbet does not only contain the artist’s nudes but also represents every genre in which the artist worked. There are portraits of men and women, still-lifes, scenes of daily life, and landscapes. Many of the works they collected were often ones which reminded them of other works that they had seen or missed out on purchasing before. They acquired such works as, *Portrait of Jo (La belle Irlandaise)* (1865-66) (Figure 19), *Torso of a Woman* (1863), *The Knife Grinders* (1848-50), and *Alphonse Promayet* (1851) (Figure 20). In their search to find works similar to ones they had seen before, yet were not available, the Havemeyers seemed to have formed a well-rounded collection that shows their appreciation for the artist. They collected over thirty of Courbet’s works and Louisine credits this to Miss Cassatt, “the godmother who took
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me to see that exhibition in the foyer of the Gaîté in Paris, and said to me: ‘Some day you must have a Courbet.’\textsuperscript{40}

The work of Claude Monet had an impact on the Havemeyer collection as well. The couple would acquire about thirty works by the artist, but most of them have remained out of public view. Many of the Monet works in the collection were of an appropriate size for displaying in a household and therefore the Havemeyer children seemed to have kept the majority of the artist’s works for their own enjoyment after their parents’ passing. Their subject matter was also appropriate for daily viewing in a modest home. The Monet collection includes paintings that range from his early career, through his proto-Impressionist styles and into the Impressionist peak of the 1870s. Works like \textit{In the Garden} and \textit{The Drawbridge}, as mentioned above, are such examples. It was the latter which was the second purchase of Louisine while in Paris in the late 1870s. Not until 1894 did she acquire another work by the artist. In this year and the following year the Havemeyers bought seven of Monet’s works. \textit{Haystacks} (1891) (Figure 21), \textit{Morning on the Seine} (1893), \textit{View of Rouen} (1872) and \textit{Floating Ice} (1880) (Figure 22) were a few of the works they purchased at that time. It was with the help of art dealer Durand-Ruel, the main Impressionist dealer of the time, that many of these and numerous other works entered into the Havemeyer collection.

Seemingly, many of the works of Monet that were obtained by the Havemeyers were purchased from other American collectors. This shows that the artist had earned a following in the United States and was beginning to become more widely accepted. At the turn of the century it was Monet as well as the artist Rodin that were two of the most
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famous artists alive.\textsuperscript{41} With this acclaim it was much easier to view Monet’s work and see his various stages throughout his career clearly. This allowed the Havemeyers to form a very high quality collection of the artist’s work. Monet was one artist who Louisine continued to collect after her husband’s death. She purchased four more paintings by the artist between 1911 and 1917. The works were, \textit{In the Garden, Garden of the Princess, Louvre} (1867), \textit{Germaine Hoschedé in the Garden at Giverny}, and \textit{Morning Haze} (1894). There were also eight main Monet paintings Louisine chose to give to the Metropolitan Museum. \textit{The Green Wave} (after 1865) (Figure 23), \textit{La Grenouillère} (1869) (Figure 24), \textit{Bouquet of Sunflowers} (1881) (Figure 25), \textit{Chrysanthemums} (1882), \textit{Haystacks (Effect of Snow and Sun)} (1891), \textit{Poplars} (1891), \textit{Ice Floes} (1893), and \textit{Bridge over a Pool of Water Lilies} (1899) (Figure 26). These eight alone make a remarkable collection for the museum and they come from a part of a more immense private collection.

The work of Edgar Degas always had a great influence on Louisine. It was his work that she acquired first as a collector and it would also become the last she would purchase. Her last acquisition was the artist’s, \textit{A Woman Seated Beside a Vase of Flowers} in 1921 (1865) (Figure 27). She had a great understanding of Degas and this helped her acquire the most extensive collection of the artist’s works in the world. She felt that his earliest works were the best of his career. It is also not a coincidence that Mrs. Havemeyer paid the highest price ever attained by a living artist in 1912 when she purchased Degas’s \textit{Dancers Practicing at the Bar} (1877) (Figure 28) for nearly one hundred thousand dollars.\textsuperscript{42} This high price shows her immense desire to obtain his works
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at any cost. It seems that many of the pieces by the artist were bought by the Havemeyers at the time Degas painted them. The Havemeyer’s connection with Durand-Ruel and Miss Cassatt helped to insure their immediate knowledge of a new work by the artist and the ability to acquire it for their collection.

It is also important to know that Louisine was the person who encouraged the artist to repair his original wax figure *Little Fourteen-Year-Old Dancer* (modeled 1880, cast 1922), which had been damaged and was sitting in his studio (Figure 29). The sculpture was first shown in 1881 at the sixth Impressionist exhibition and was the object of much negative criticism. She had not seen the sculpture until a visit to his studio in 1903 and it was then that she encouraged him to repair it. Though he never followed through with casting the sculpture, it was after his death that many of his modeled sculptures were cast in bronze. Louisine reserved the first bronze sculpture made of the wax original for sixty thousand francs. In the end the Havemeyers collected around seventy works by Degas with samples of his paintings, pastels, etchings, bronzes, lithographs, monotypes, and drawings.

Paul Cézanne is yet another artist whose work can be seen in the Havemeyer collection. The couple surely became acquainted with his works while visiting other artists’ studios and through their beloved friend Cassatt. It was around the turn of the century that they met Cézanne’s dealer, Ambroise Vollard. He was one of the premier art dealers in Paris at the time and gave Cézanne his first one-man exhibition in 1895. The dealer also helped to form the careers of avant-garde artists such as Pablo Picasso and Henri Matisse. Vollard sold a few of the artist’s still lifes to the Havemeyers in 1901.
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They are said to be awkwardly composed, but the couple was just beginning to understand the artist and enjoyed the pieces without regret. Cézanne was mostly misunderstood and discredited during his career by the public. In 1903 they acquired a sexually-charged work by the artist, *The Abduction* (1867) (Figure 30) which displays the artist’s violent and dark subject matter that uses extreme light and shadow, his style during that time. They later purchased an early self-portrait of Cézanne as well as two works from the 1880s, *The Banks of the Marne* (1888) (Figure 31) and *Still Life: Flowers in a Vase* (1888) (Figure 32). In 1901 they purchased from Vollard the artist’s landscape entitled, *Winter Landscape of Auvers* (c. 1890) as well as a still life, *Flowers*. Vollard also sold them one of Cézanne’s series of Mont Sainte-Victoire, *Mont Sainte-Victoire and the Viaduct of the Arc River Valley* (1882-85) (Figure 33). These many landscapes are from the artist’s more mature period from 1870s onward. They show the artist’s ability to represent deep space as well as flat design. After the artist’s death in 1906 the prices for his paintings greatly increased. It was due to this drastic rise that the Havemeyers refused to buy any more. The couple owned thirteen works by Cézanne and achieved a fine sample of his career.

The Havemeyer collection is distinguished by the fact that it contains numerous comprehensive groups of specific artists: Manet, Monet, Courbet, Degas, and Cézanne are a few of the many artists whose careers are clearly represented by this massive collection. Though primarily major nineteenth-century artists were discussed here, their collection included works by artists spanning numerous movements from Dutch Baroque to Post-Impressionism. Throughout their years of collecting they purchased what they
wanted and rarely regretted their decisions. Louisine’s favorite artist, Degas has been quoted in saying, “Art is not spontaneous but the result of constant effort.” It seems that not only art, but the process of collecting art as well can be seen in the same light. Collecting took tremendous insight and sophistication to acquire works which had not always been well received. The collecting efforts of the Havemeyers took insight and a level of fearlessness that few could match.

It is difficult to portray the great impact the Havemeyers had on fine art in America. By leaving their massive collection to the Metropolitan Museum of Art it allowed the American public to view numerous works by the same artist, often ones that spanned the various stages in their career. This gave the public a chance to understand many artist’s styles and developments as well as being able to examine the revolutions that had occurred in European art. Such examples were not often seen within the United States or by most Americans due to the great expenses of travel and shipping of pieces of artwork overseas. The Metropolitan did have some works by the many artists the Havemeyers collected but not such a range of pieces from each artist. The museum collection did already contain many works by Manet and Corot. It also did have a few Courbets and at least one Renoir as well. The fact that Courbet, Manet, Monet, and Degas are represented at full length in the Havemeyer bequest has made it one of the preeminent collections outside of Paris to this day.

There were eleven Manet works, eight oil paintings and three pastels which found great company with works already owned by the museum such as the artist’s, Boy with a Sword (1861), The Funeral (c.1867), and Woman with a Parrot (1866), which as noted,
the Havemeyers had purchased. The bequest also contained nine Corot figure studies which emphasize the artist’s true strengths. Cézanne is also represented with a fine group of five of the artist’s works. The eight Monet paintings included in the bequest show each phase of the painter’s development. The bequest also included a sizable group of Cassatt paintings and colour-prints, and at least one painting each by Delacroix, Daumier, Renoir, and Pissarro. The museum also gained acquisition of Barye watercolors, Degas pastels, as well as a number of drawings by other nineteenth and twentieth century artists such as Guys, Whistler, Gavarni, and Millett. The Havemeyers also had a wonderful collection of Spanish painting by such artists as Goya and El Greco, many of which were lent by Louisine to the Knoedler galleries on Fifth Avenue earlier in life. Other Goya paintings in the collection include, *La Bella Librera (Young Lady Wearing a Mantilla and a Basquina)* (1800-05), *Maria Luisa of Parma: Portrait of the Queen of Spain* (after 1800), and *Portrait of Manuel Cantin Lucientes* (private collection) which was the only child portrait by the artist that the Havemeyers owned.

The Havemeyer’s brashness pertaining to their collecting seemed unparallelled by other American patrons of the arts at that time. Those who were wealthy enough to travel abroad and collect often chose a few artists and remained loyal to them as well as often not selecting those artists who were controversial. Both Louisine and Harry knew exactly what they liked artistically and they collected it without remorse. With this brazenness

\[44\] Havemeyer, *Sixteen to Sixty*, 177.

\[45\] This specific work has since been established as a copy of Goya.
Louisine was one of the first if not the first American(s) to own works by Degas, Monet and Pissarro.\textsuperscript{46}

The immense collection from this family was generously bequeathed to the Metropolitan Museum in 1929 at the death of Louisine Havemeyer. In one swift movement the gift transformed the museum and its collections forever. Louisine left 142 works in memoriam to her husband Harry. Their three children, Horace, Electra, and Adaline then decided to donate another 111 paintings, pastels, and drawings, 213 prints, including thirty-four by Rembrandt, and immense quantities of Oriental ceramics, Japanese armor, textiles, and bronzes. It is known that the Havemeyer children consulted the curators in each department to make sure that the museum received only what it wanted. The sole conditions of the collection were that each object be labeled as belonging to “The H.O. Havemeyer Collection,” and that they be for “permanent exhibition.”\textsuperscript{47} Overall, the entire Havemeyer family would give over four thousand works of art to the museum. The collection made the Metropolitan Museum, “the premier Museum for nineteenth-century French art in America, and one of the two or three most distinguished in this branch in the world.”\textsuperscript{48} As well as placing it at the front rank of American Museums for French nineteenth-century painting studies. It seemed to have fit the pressing needs of half a dozen different departments and made it able to hold its own in comparison to the great galleries of Europe. The donation of the Havemeyer collection not only improved the status of the museum and its collections but it also led to other

\textsuperscript{46} Havemeyer, \textit{Sixteen to Sixty}, XIII.
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donations by collectors of French nineteenth- and twentieth-century art such as Stephen C. Clark and Walter H. Annenberg.
CHAPTER II: LEO, GERTRUDE, MICHAEL, AND SARAH STEIN

The Stein family has become famous for their contributions to the arts in writings and their collections of some of the most famous avant-garde artists of the twentieth century. The Steins were unique in many ways. Although surely not poor they did not have the enormous wealth of the majority of other major art collectors in the early twentieth-century yet they were able to acquire an unbelievable amount of art between them. Their history as collectors gives a wonderful example of a family who, with their connections with artists, dealers, and patrons helped to bring some of the most avant-garde works to the United States. Their collection was dispersed over the years to various private collectors and, in turn, to many museums.

The now famous siblings, Michael, his wife Sarah, Leo and Gertrude (Figure 34) were not always avid patrons and art lovers. The family was originally based in Baltimore and Pittsburgh, but moved often over the years. Michael was the oldest son of Daniel Stein, a businessman, and Amelia Keyser. Leo and Gertrude were the two youngest of the seven children. All of the children were educated. They were exposed to European culture early in life, for they spent the first five years of Gertrude’s life in Vienna and Passy, France. They returned to the United States in 1880 and settled in Oakland, California. The family moved often in Gertrude’s early years due to their father’s numerous partnerships that all seemed to eventually dissolve. It was in Oakland that he got into the business of street cars, real estate and the stock exchange. 49 Growing up the children did not have much parental or adult influence and this led to the two

youngest, Leo and Gertrude, becoming very close to one another and developing quite a dependent relationship, one that would eventually erupt into a spiteful feud.

Michael only became more involved with his younger siblings’ lives when their father, Daniel, died only three years after their mother had passed away from cancer in 1888, when Gertrude was only fourteen.\textsuperscript{50} The loss of their parents at such a young age may have been one of the reasons for such a dependent relationship between Gertrude and Leo. At the death of their father in 1891 Michael became guardian of the two youngest siblings and moved them to San Francisco. He spent his life as the father figure to his siblings, always keeping track of their finances and making sure they knew how much they had to spend even after he was not legally obligated to do so. He remained a support system for his family, including his wife, Sarah, who was often called Sally. She is known to have called him heroic because of all the thoughtful deeds and caring acts that he did for her and his family throughout his life. Although he was always the paternal figure in the family, he never criticized his youngest siblings’ decisions. Gertrude and Leo developed various interests over the courses of their lives, both changing their careers and studies multiple times. Though they altered their plans again and again they always seemed to connect with one another and follow each other to new experiences.

Leo, Gertrude, and their sister Bertha moved to Baltimore, not long after their father’s passing to live with an aunt. After getting settled into a new city, Leo and Gertrude both enrolled at Harvard. Gertrude went to the Harvard Annex, which was a precursor to Radcliffe College. In 1897 she entered the Johns Hopkins University

Medical School. It was there where she would meet Claribel Cone and, in turn, her sister, Etta. The Cone sisters would become quick friends and their importance will be discussed later. It did not take long in medical school for Gertrude to become bored and realize that she did not have the enthusiasm or desire to pursue a medical career.

In the summer of 1900 Gertrude joined Leo for a trip to Europe. After some time there Leo made the decision to become an artist and moved to London in 1902 and then to Paris in 1903. It was in this year that Gertrude returned again to Europe and joined her brother, Leo, who had been traveling. They settled down into what was to become their famous flat, 27 Rue de Fleurs in Paris. His appreciation for works of art marked his link to this milieu in his years in Europe.

Out of the Stein siblings in Paris, it was Leo who established the first true connection with the art world. He was originally in Europe with the intent to study Italian quattrocento art. As he travelled and studied Italian art he began to realize it was not his forte. In the fall of 1902, while in London, Leo bought his first modern painting, an oil painting by Philip Wilson Steer. Steer was a leading British Impressionist artist and a founder of the New English Art Club, which strove in 1886 to bring Impressionism from France to England. Gertrude and Leo had, for many years in Paris, bought prints, specifically Japanese prints, and various other objects classified among the minor arts, but never ventured into the major art forms. With the purchase of the Steer painting the Steins began to realize that “one could actually own paintings even if one were not a millionaire.”51 The collecting of oil painting in the United States was looked at as a

51 Janet Hobhouse, Everybody Who was Anybody: a Biography of Gertrude Stein (New York: G.P. Putnam’s Sons, 1975), 36.
practice that only the very rich could afford, for the Steins it was a joyful rush to be able to pursue this passion.

With this purchase Leo began his passion for collecting modern art and his desire to be an artist surfaced soon after. While in Paris he made the decision to stay in Europe and live in the French capital, and Leo invited his sister to join. Gertrude moved to Paris, not only because her desire to have a medical career dissolved, but also because she wished to be liberated from the social structures that were felt by women in the United States in the early twentieth century. She was a strong-willed woman who did not see herself settling down and marrying, therefore she often felt isolated in America. Paris was a place that had more liberal social structures for women and allowed her to be free.

As Gertrude and Leo settled into their 27 Rue de Fleurs flat, Leo began to explore the art market of Paris, and it was his friendship with Bernard Berenson, which truly opened his eyes and ignited his interest in modern art. This began during his time in Florence at the beginning of the new century. An influential art historian, Berenson was an advisor to many American museums and collectors in the early twentieth-century. It was in the spring of 1904 when Berenson visited Paris and advised Leo to look at the work of Paul Cézanne at Ambroise Vollard’s gallery on the Rue Lafitte. Cézanne is best known for being the bridge between the nineteenth-century Impressionists and the twentieth-century Cubists. Going to Vollard’s became a routine visit for Leo and he is known to have gone there often and within a few months he bought his first Cézanne, *The Spring House* (1879) (Figure 35).  

---

Leo’s love for Cézanne’s works deepened when he spent the majority of his summer in Florence at the home of the wealthy American, Charles Loeser who owned a number of Cézannes himself. It was this summer it is believed that Gertrude saw her first Cézannes for she had joined her brother in Italy and surely accompanied him to Loeser’s home. Over the next few years Leo and Gertrude became more familiar with the works of other artists as well, including, Toulouse-Lautrec, Vincent van Gogh, Paul Gauguin, and Henri Matisse.

One of the first known times that the Stein siblings saw the work of Matisse was at the Salon d’Automne of 1904. Leo is known to have said that “Matisse made perhaps the strongest impression on him, ‘though not the most agreeable.’” Gertrude and Leo did not buy any works from any artists represented in that show but waited until the following year when they surprisingly had an unexpected eight thousand francs to spend. They heard the news from their brother, Michael, who was both their financier as well as the one who gave them a monthly allowance. Hearing this grand news from their brother the two went straight to Vollard’s gallery. Gertrude states, “I selected two Gauguins, two Cézanne figure compositions, two Renoirs, and Vollard threw in a Maurice Denis, *Virgin and Child* (c.1890), for good measure.” She claims she picked out the works that they bought that day, but it was surely a joint decision between the siblings. Gertrude often took sole credit for many events and decisions in her personal writing and letters, as she seemed to have often thought very highly of herself. This windfall was spent quickly, yet
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it became the foundation for which Leo and Gertrude began to build a collection that would later become well known.

It was during the first half of 1905 that Leo and Gertrude also obtained Cézanne’s *Portrait of Mme Cézanne* (1881) (Figure 36) and Eugène Delacroix’s *Perseus and Andromeda* (1853) (Figure 37). Leo is known to have considered Delacroix as being “by all odds the greatest French painter of his century.”55 His observation and discussion of artists of the time helps to show that he was truly the Stein family member who led his siblings into the world of art. It was at the infamous Salon d’Automne in October of 1905 where Leo and Gertrude saw Henri Matisse’s portrait of his wife, *Woman with a Hat* (1905) (Figure 38). This work caused uproar at the salon that year and many did not know whether to feel anger or to laugh at the intense combination of colors and unusually free application of paint. Claribel Cone, prominent modern collector, who will be discussed later, described the salon that year, “We asked ourselves are these things to be taken seriously. As we looked across the room we found our friends (believed to be Michael and his wife Sarah Stein) earnestly contemplating a canvas – The canvas of a woman with a hat tilted jauntily at an angle on the top of her head – the drawing crude, the colour bizarre.”56 It was Michael’s wife, Sarah, who seemed to really understand Matisse and his vision as an artist. They would create a friendship that lasted the rest of their lives.

Though Michael and Sarah were the prominent Matisse patrons in the family for the longest period of time, it was their siblings who purchased this controversial piece a
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few weeks after the 1905 Salon d’Automne. The actual purchasing of the famous work is vague due to the fact that Gertrude and Leo provided differing stories on how it all occurred. Gertrude claims that she did not understand why it infuriated everyone and that it “seemed perfectly natural” to her. She declared to have told Leo she wanted to buy it and noted that he was not as attracted to the piece as she was but conceded and agreed to the purchase.  

Later in life Leo looked back at the event and asserted that it was he who was impressed by the work and it was his idea to purchase it. There is also an account by Sarah Stein claiming that she discussed the importance of buying the work with the family. Whether it was Gertrude or Leo’s idea or whether Sarah had discussed it with Leo, the Steins bought Woman in a Hat for five hundred francs. This seems to be the first major purchase of such an unappreciated artist for the family and the start of a long patron relationship with the artist. “It was the boldest acquisition yet made by these collectors, new to modern art, and set them and their brother Michael on their path of buying many of Matisse’s most important paintings over the next few years.”

Around this same time period, within a few weeks of purchasing of the Matisse, Leo was introduced to the work of a little known Spanish artist, Pablo Picasso. It was Leo’s friend, Clovis Sagot, who had a shop on the Rue Lafitte, who had for sale a few of Picasso’s works at the time. Sagot told Leo about the artist and it was Leo who was the first Stein to see Picasso’s work. The image he saw was Picasso’s The Acrobat’s Family with a Monkey (1905) (Figure 39). Leo is known to have said, after viewing the work of

---

Picasso that he was in fact “the real thing.” He enjoyed it so much that he bought the painting and later returned with his sister, Gertrude, to show her the work of the artist.

The main work that they viewed during this visit was *Young Girl with a Basket of Flowers* (1905) (Figure 40). Gertrude actually noted that she thought the image was “rather appalling” and did not want it in the house. The image shows a nude girl with an awkward body holding a basket of flowers and with her head turned facing the viewer. It seems that the head is the most detailed part of the image, while the body and basket are more impressionistic. Not wanting to lose a sale Sagot actually offered to cut the painting and allow the Steins to buy just the head of the girl. Neither Gertrude nor Leo accepted the idea, and the painting was luckily preserved. Leo did eventually buy the painting and was allowed to bring it into their shared apartment. Once Leo had purchased the work of Picasso he was on a mission to meet the artist himself. H.P. Roché, a publisher who later worked with such modern artists as Marcel Duchamp, was the man who introduced the two. The publisher was a man who knew everyone in Paris and was known for introducing people. Although Gertrude did not immediately fall in love with Picasso’s painting it does seem that she highly enjoyed the painter himself. From the very beginning it appears that Picasso and Gertrude understood one another.

It is important to know that around the period of the Stein family commencing their important collecting practices they began to hold weekly open houses on Saturday evenings. Beginning as a way to visit with friends and artists and discuss the arts, these gatherings soon turned into a well known salon that many wanted to be a part of and even

---

59 Hobhouse, 49.
60 Mellow, 85.
many scholars, writers, and collectors visiting the city tried to attend. Saturday evenings at 27 Rue de Fleurs were filled with artistic minds like, Georges Braque, André Derain, Max Jacob, Guillaume Apollinaire, Jean Cocteau and Marie Laurencin, as well as important Americans writers such as Ernest Hemingway and F. Scott Fitzgerald and American art historian and adviser, Walter Pach. Michael and Sarah Stein also began to join in on the festivities and held a similar soirée at their home at 58 Rue Madame. These gatherings hosted by the Steins, which brought so many prominent members of the arts together, became legendary. Ambroise Vollard has stated that the Steins were, “the most hospitable people in the world.” The two Stein salons were fashionable places to visit with their great displays of avant-garde art. The walls of 27 Rue de Fleurs were covered with rows of paintings by the most prominent artists of the last quarter of the nineteenth and early twentieth century (Figure 41). There were often great discussions of philosophy as well as topics of current events and the arts of Paris.

Matisse was, of course, a usual guest at the Michael Steins’ home but often went to 27 Rue de Fleurs as well. Picasso immediately after meeting the Steins became a regular on Saturday evenings too; and it seems that these weekly events surely helped to establish the strong relationships between these two artists and the various members of the Stein family. It was at 27 Rue de Fleurs that Matisse and Picasso became acquainted with one another. They both began to come to visit and it was the Steins who brought the two artists together. Other important future collectors who often joined these men were Etta and Claribel Cone. The two sisters would greatly profit from these soirées and the discussion of their collection to follow in these pages shows that they even surpassed the
Stein family in their collecting practices. Ambroise Vollard, Guillaume Apollinaire, and Bernard Berenson as well as other collectors, sellers, and many other prominent society members travelling through Paris were also visitors. The Stein’s ability to host such events in their respective homes initiated friendships and relationships between artists and artists, artists and dealers, and artists and collectors that were some of the most important in the twentieth century. These relationships led to purchases and patronage which aided some of the most famous modern artists during the beginning of their careers.

Leo Stein highly enjoyed these evenings for it was a time for him to make his beliefs and ideas known about the works of art he had seen and bought. A description of Leo on such evenings is found from a friend and collector of the arts, Mabel Dodge Luhan:

Leo was always standing up before the canvases, his eyeglasses shining and with an obstinate look on his face that so strongly resembled an old ram…with a fire no one would have suspected in the thoughtful, ramish scholar, he sought in every way to interpret the intention in them…patiently night after night wrestling with the inertia of his guests, expounding, teaching, interpreting…

He would often talk most of the evening about his views on various artists and political issues, while Gertrude is said to have sat back in a chair and regularly would just look at everything in front of her. This was surely due to the fact that it was around this time that she was working on her now famous work, *The Making of Americans*, which she seemed to have received some inspiration from watching the people and events at these Saturday evenings.
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evening soirées. Leo often claimed that these evenings were propagandistic. Writing in his book *Appreciation*..., Leo claimed, “One man who came to my place in Paris told me that the only Cézannes he cared for were those he saw there. Certainly they were not the best Cézannes but the place was charged with the atmosphere of propaganda and he succumbed.”

It is true that the evenings at the Steins surely helped to shape peoples’ opinions about the art which was being collected and displayed in their home. Leo is known to have had a great energy during these evenings and unquestionably facilitated in setting the tone as well as the Steins’ reputation throughout those days in Paris. It was a challenging time in the early years of the twentieth century when perceptions about modern art changed drastically; it seems that a certain few helped to shape and formulate what was considered to be masterpieces of those years.

The Steins differ greatly from the other collectors discussed in these pages due to their great lack of assets in comparison. They were known to live quite frugally in order to be able to spend their money on the art that they so dearly enjoyed. According to Leo in the early days when they were in Paris he and his sister lived on about one hundred and fifty dollars a month. Their limited resources made some of the famous, more popular painters of the time inaccessible to them due to the higher costs of their works. It also allowed or, to look at it plainly, forced them to consider the new, up- and-coming, artists of the time whose paintings were much cheaper in price. This surely is one major reason the Steins even looked at some of the unknown artists for whom they would soon become their patrons. Leo, once discussing their financial situation at the time stated, “life was then cheap in Paris, rents were low, food was not dear, we had no doctor’s bills...we
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despised luxury except when someone else paid for it, and got what we most wanted. That made a satisfactory living."\(^{63}\) It seems as if the Steins found a way to pay for the art that they wanted most and did not seem to regret a single purchase or how they came to afford them.

It is well known, as mentioned, that the Michael Steins had an enduring relationship with Henri Matisse as his patrons and his friends. Sarah Stein, specifically, had a deep relationship with Matisse that lasted many years. Their friendship began when Sarah first met Matisse in 1905, after the famed debut of *Woman in a Hat* at the Salon d’Automne. Sarah is known to have certain eloquence about her and her friend Harriet Lane Levy claimed she, “mesmerized” others into accepting him as *the* painter of his generation."\(^{64}\) It was at these Saturday evenings at their own open houses she is said to have spent the majority of the time discussing Matisse’s greatness. It was a friendship between the Matisses and the Michael Steins that grew over the years. The artist found not only a friend in Sarah but someone whom he trusted in the judgment of his work. She became a major critic of his work, but one who seemed to help him work through the issues he was having at the time. It is as if she helped to contribute to his paintings with her thoughts and ideas. A friend, Annette Rosenshine discusses the patron and artist’s relationship claiming;

> I recall seeing Matisse in the Stein’s apartment when he was in the throes of struggling with a new creative expression. There he found solace in unburdening his latest problems and uncertainties to Sarah Stein, knowing that he would

\(^{63}\) Ibid., 46.
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receive sensitive, sympathetic understanding. The talk and friendship were of value to him…and over the years his loyalty to her never flagged.65

Their friendship also led to Sarah getting informal painting lessons from the artist and it was she who helped him establish his short-lived art academy called the Académie Matisse which lasted from 1907 until 1911.

It seems that the Michael Stein’s greatest activity in collecting Matisse’s works was during 1905 and 1908. Though many were sold after the First World War, they were able to amass a collection of his work which displayed every phase of his early development. It was Leo who bought the artist’s famous Joy of Life (1905-06) (Figure 42), but the Michael Steins acquired many studies for the painting which helped to show the artist’s progression through the thought process of the piece. Michael also was able to finally get Matisse’s Woman in a Hat in 1915, buying the painting from Gertrude and eventually taking it with them back to California. This was not the first time that they had taken Matisse’s works home to the United States. In April of 1906 Michael and Sarah received news of a fire that had followed the San Francisco earthquake on the eighteenth of that month and decided to return to the States to see what the condition of their properties in the city were after the disaster.

When they returned to the United States they took with them some of their Matisse paintings they had at the time and it was the first time that anyone in the country had seen the work of the artist. One of the works that accompanied them to the States was Madame Matisse (The Green Line) (1905) (Figure 43). The unveiling of the works by Matisse to friends in California caused quite an enormous impact. In a letter to Gertrude,
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while in America, Sally Stein discussed Albert Bender, a leading patron of the arts in San Francisco, who had always been a good friend to her and defended her when many said that she and the rest of the Steins were crazy. After seeing the Matisse painting he looked at her and asked, “But don’t you think you’re crazy?” It seems that Americans were not quite ready for the new styles of Matisse and the other avant-garde artists. The relationship between the Michael Steins and Matisse was longer-lasting than the relationship between Leo and the works and artists that interested him.

It is quite interesting to look at the connection between Leo Stein and his passion for various masters of modernism. He, as shown above, was the family member who introduced the Steins to avant-garde art, yet he was the first of them to abandon it. He highly enjoyed the work of Matisse and Picasso quickly and many other artists as well, but it was the rise of the new style of Cubism that propelled Leo away from modern art. Leo had fallen for Picasso’s work while the artist was in his Rose period, for those were the first images by the artist he viewed. Picasso’s break from this style into his radical work, Les Demoiselles d’Avignon, made in spring 1907 left Leo staggered (Figure 44). This painting stirred much discussion among those who were able to view it. It was not publically shown for many years and those who did see it often had intense reactions to the piece. Leo thought the work was a “horrible mess” and had only agreed to acquire some of the early sketches of the painting hoping for a better end result, but was sadly disappointed at what he saw.
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It was this canvas that marked the “beginning of the end of Leo’s support for Picasso.” He was unable to understand what Picasso was doing with his new style and therefore could not bring himself to invest his time and interest in the artist. The first director of the Museum of Modern Art, Alfred Barr, claims that, “For two brief years, between 1905 and 1907,” Leo, “was possibly the most discerning connoisseur and collector of twentieth-century painting in the world.” Leo’s passionate relationship and understanding for the works of modern art seems to have overcome him at this time. For a man who was so sure of the works of these artists he was just unable to accept where the new developments were going.

It was not only Leo who could not seem to understand Picasso’s new style. Many did not know what Picasso was doing, including such artists as Georges Braque, André Derain, and Maurice de Vlaminck. Apollinaire, a true defender of Picasso, was anxious about the artist’s new work and kept a nervous silence. The Russian patron who was important to Picasso, Sergei Shchukin, could also not accept Les Demoiselles and after viewing it claimed, “What a loss for French art.” The fact that Leo and many others did not approve of Picasso’s new style did not seem to bother Gertrude.

She did not hate the style at all and her acceptance of the piece may have been due to the fact that she did not care as much about Picasso’s radical vision as her brother did. She had her own reasons for liking the work and for embracing Cubism. Some believe that Gertrude partially accepted Cubism so easily due to the fact that her brother had such difficulty with it. This difference of opinion was one of the many issues at the
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time that eventually led to the dissolution of their very dependent relationship. Gertrude listened to her brother speak about art and its various aspects and seemed to have tired of his leadership role. She later wrote that, “He continued to believe in what he was saying when he was arguing and I began not to find it interesting.”\textsuperscript{70} Leo and Gertrude slowly severed ties with one another and after a certain point they did not speak at all. They also often were ruthless and cruel when discussing one another with friends and artists.

Gertrude’s understanding of Picasso seemed to have come from her belief that they were very similar in many ways. She understood what Picasso was doing in his Cubist works and claimed that it was “a composition that had neither a beginning not an end, a composition of which one corner was as important as another corner, in fact the composition of cubism.”\textsuperscript{71} This discussion of composition was one that she became obsessed with and she linked it to her own work in writing. She felt that the two of them shared a deep aesthetic link; Picasso being a genius in painting and she being a genius in writing. She began creating pieces that she claimed were cubistic, using words and phrases repetitively in order to create a story which had no beginning, middle, or end, just as Picasso had done in art. Neither artist nor writer was understood at that time and it may be this fact that caused Gertrude to embrace Picasso as the artist to follow. Gertrude with her strong ego saw her own radical form of writing as developing along the same lines as Picasso’s work in painting. She was in the midst of some of the greatest artists and writers, such as Ernest Hemingway, F. Scott Fitzgerald, and Jean Cocteau, of the time and was their equal.

\textsuperscript{70} Ibid., 78.
\textsuperscript{71} Mellow, 112.
As their friendship grew Picasso asked his patron and friend if he could paint her portrait. It was in 1905 that he began working on the painting of Gertrude which was unusual for him since he had not been in the routine of using a model at that time. It seems though that it caused a renewed interest in portraiture for Picasso and after beginning his work on Gertrude’s image he sketched Leo as well as Michael and Sarah’s son, Allan. The portrait of Allan (1906) was actually a birthday gift to Sarah from her husband that year (Figure 45). The portrait of Gertrude was not easily completed. She is said to have sat for the artist eighty to ninety times during the winter and spring of 1905 and 1906. It was during one of these many sittings Gertrude brought her friend Etta Cone to meet Picasso in his studio. This visit turned into many and Etta and Claribel sister began to become regular patrons of Picasso as well. It was a few months later that Michael and Sarah Stein introduced the sisters to Matisse as well, and they bought regularly from him throughout the years.

The portrait of Gertrude was one that frustrated Picasso to the point that one day in the spring of 1906 he painted out her head and claimed that he could no longer see her when he looked at her. The painting was left unfinished through the summer when Picasso and Fernande, his partner at the time, went to Gósol, Spain. The time away must have given him the break that he needed from the image and it was only when he returned that Picasso finished the portrait without seeing Gertrude since he had returned to Paris and surprised her with it when they saw each other again (Figure 46). Gertrude enjoyed the image of herself, though the majority of her friends and family did not believe it resembled her. Picasso is known to have said in response to the accusation that
Gertrude did not look like the image he painted with the comment, “she will.” It was as if he was claiming to know what her image would be to those around her over the years, maybe stating that he created the portrait of her as he believed she would look someday.

Portraits of the Stein family were made often during their careers in art patronage. Beside Picasso’s portrait of Gertrude and his works of Leo and Allan in 1905 and 1906, mentioned above, many other artists completed portraits of their fond patrons. Christian Bérard finished an ink drawing of Gertrude in 1928. Gertrude also discusses a sculpture of her being done by artist Jo Davidson in the early 1920s. She supposedly liked Davidson and found him witty and amusing. She was also lucky enough to have a bust done of her by Jacques Lipchitz in 1920 (Figure 47). Louis Marcoussis also was inspired by Gertrude and did an engraving of the patron (1898) that is now in the collection of the Museum of Modern Art, New York (Figure 48).

Matisse is known to have completed many studies of Allan Stein in 1907. The artist also did a portrait of Allan’s mother, Sarah around 1908 and 1916. He continued to work on pieces of the family and completed a portrait of Michael Stein in that same year. Francis Picabia was also interested in the Stein family and completed a portrait of Gertrude in the early 1930s. Other artists who did portraits of Gertrude include, Francis Rose, Pavel Tchelitchew, and Félix Edouard Vallotton. Mahonri Young completed a terracotta sculpture of Leo Stein in 1926. The number of popular artists of the time who chose the Stein family as models is lengthy at best, but it indicates how much the family
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was adored by the artists to whom they were patrons as well as with whom they became
dear friends.

Gertrude and Picasso’s relationship is one of the most studied and written about
patron- and-artist relationships. This may have been due to the many events that the two
survived, such as war, as well as the fact that though they had many arguments and
disagreements, in the end their friendship endured. The two continued their bond and
often just met and discussed daily conversational subjects as well as art and literature.
They both survived the war unscathed and their friendship continued, though Paris as a
city had changed forever. Gertrude wrote that after the war things began to break apart.
She discussed the great loss in the death of Apollinaire in 1918 and claimed, “Guillaume
would have been a bond of union, he always had a quality of keeping people together,
and now that he was gone everybody ceased to be friends.” Many artists left Paris to
enjoy lives in various provinces while others stayed and tried to make sense of the war
time losses that occurred and the post-war world that they all lived in. Dada started to
appear in 1916 independently in Zürich and lasted until about 1919, but spread quickly to
Paris, Berlin, and Cologne. The movement reached New York in 1915 and endured until
1920. By 1924 a more positive movement, Surrealism, dominated most artistic centers.
Through all of this the Stein family continued to collect, although some did so more than
others.

Though it was four members of the Stein family who influenced the development
of modern European art at the beginning of the twentieth century, Gertrude is often the
one who is best known and discussed when it comes to patronage of modern art. With the

74 Hobhouse, 113.
knowledge of the great influence of these Stein family members why do they get less attention by historians? Surely one could argue that Leo may not be considered a patron on the same level due to the fact that he abandoned many artists just as they began creating some of their most influential works of the century. Though this is true he was still the Stein who entered into the art world of Paris first. He was the first to find Paul Cézanne and Pablo Picasso. It was he who introduced Gertrude to these artists and without his influence in the beginning Gertrude may not have ever had the life that she eventually led in Paris. Michael and Sarah Stein have also often been discussed less than their sister even though they were more influential in the growth of Matisse’s career than Leo or Gertrude had ever been. This may be because Picasso is often held on a higher level than Matisse by some due to his importance in the creation of Cubism. Gertrude who had the closest and longest relationship with Picasso, therefore she is discussed more often. It seems though that Gertrude’s grand celebrity is at least if not mostly due to her own writing.

It was in the early 1930s that Gertrude began to write her book entitled, *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas*. Alice was Gertrude’s longtime partner and she used her name to write her own form of her life story. In this biography she wrote of the time in Paris and her life with Alice, from the eyes of Alice. The book was begun by the writer because many of her friends and acquaintances often pressed her to make an account of her life and times. Biography was not her favorite form of writing and she tried to push Alice to write the story of her life, but when Alice refused she decided to write it herself but from the perspective of her partner. This twist seemed to add enough of a challenge
for Gertrude in writing her own story, for she had to use the same style and tone of Alice which needed extra effort by the writer, who highly enjoyed the challenge. As soon as the manuscript was in the hands of publishers, it was a hit and many in the industry were praising it before it even went to print. It gave a glimpse into the world of “the old crowd” in Paris and of the “heroic age of cubism” and of the “lost generation” of the twenties.\(^75\)

The book was and still is a wonderful view into the world in which Gertrude lived during the early twentieth century, but it is also the outlet the writer used to create a beloved celebrity persona of herself. Her modesty is hard to see as she described how she was a child prodigy in writing. Gertrude claims to have written a Shakespearean play at the young age of eight and she was one of the favorite students of William James. She also alleges to be the first to step out of the nineteenth century and into twentieth-century literature with her writing of *Melanctha*. It was in *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* that Gertrude asserts that she almost single-handedly discovered modern art and advised Picasso and even created Ernest Hemingway as a writer.\(^76\)

These claims lay somewhere in the truth of Gertrude’s life but many are indeed exaggerations to say the least. Clearly, she had not single-handedly discovered modern art, for it was a number of important figures during the period who reached out to the unknown artists of the time and brought them and their new styles to the forefront. She could surely not have accomplished what she had in the art world without the help and guidance of her brother Leo at the very beginning. It would be hard to even press the
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claim that the Stein family certainly was important in the early years for the avant-garde, because so many more critics, patrons and buyers of the time aided in the growth and reputations of many modern artists who are now famous.

When the book arrived in the U.S. the American public fell in love with Gertrude Stein. *The Autobiography of Alice B. Toklas* became an instant best seller and with it came the glory that Gertrude had always wanted in her life. A comment in a letter by Carl Van Vechten helps to show how people viewed the book as a way to get to know the true Gertrude Stein; he wrote, “...it is a joy to know you and to shake your hand across the sea...”77 Her celebrity fame was to continue when the French translation of the book came out soon after, and she began to be invited to numerous salons and high-society dinner parties. Gertrude was even convinced to return to the States to do a multi-city lecture tour discussing the book and her thoughts. With this rush of love and acceptance from so many in America and France there also came a charge of resentment from some.

It was those whom Gertrude had slighted in the story who were displeased with how they or their parts in events were described. The disgruntled readers and critics included, but are not limited to, Matisse and Gertrude’s former editor, Eugene Jolas. Matisse strongly refuted Gertrude’s claim of being one major figure in purchasing his *Woman with a Hat* in 1905 and stated that it was Sarah Stein who made the purchase happen. He also denied Gertrude’s claim that it was Picasso alone who invented Cubism; Matisse stated that Braque had a pivotal influence on its beginning as well. The artist had to also defend the image of his own wife whom Gertrude had compared to a horse. He
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even went on to state that she “understood nothing.”

It may not have been that Gertrude understood nothing; it may have been the fact that she did not believe in full historical truth. She seems to have believed that “History was not fact, it was merely ‘something you remember’, and she felt no obligation to strain to ‘remember right’.”

Though many disputed the events discussed in the book Gertrude’s persona was set for many in France and America and it was this form of celebrity that has caused her to be the most talked about Stein family member.

As discussed above it was truly the four members of the Stein family who were involved in the modern art world at the beginning of the twentieth century. Whether they continued to collect certain artists over their careers as patrons they, as a whole amassed an enormous collection that contained works by the most well known artists of the time. Cézanne was one of the first artists to interest the Stein family. Some samples of the many that they collected include *Apples* (1873-77) and his *Bathers* (1895). Édouard Manet, Honoré Daumier, Juan Gris, Jacques Lipchitz, André Masson, were some of the artists who were also included among their interests.

For the Steins, Matisse was a major artist in their collections. Not only did the family buy his *Woman in a Hat* and famous *Joy of Life*, they also collected many of his lesser known works as well. *The Serf* was a sculpture made of bronze (1900-03) (Figure 49). Leo discusses this work in *Appreciation: Painting, Poetry, and Prose* stating, “…I had seen this figure in plaster several times and admired it, but it was only when I saw it
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in bronze that my enthusiasm flamed, and I bought it.” Matisse completed his, *The Blue Nude* (1907) (Figure 50), in early 1907 and both Gertrude and Leo later discuss seeing the work; Gertrude claimed, “We knew a Matisse when we saw it, knew at once and enjoyed it and knew that it was great art and beautiful.” The Steins enjoyed the work so much and did recognize its greatness, later lending it to the Armory show in 1913. The Steins would acquire numerous other works by Matisse that displayed his many styles.

Picasso, of course, was the family’s other favorite artist over the years, though most of the acquisitions of his works were done by Gertrude, he was still a prominent member in their full collections. Some of the works included in the collection of the family from Picasso’s earlier periods such as the Blue and Rose periods are, *Two Women at a Bar* (1902) (Figure 51), *Circus Family with Violinist* (1905), which was acquired by Michael and Sarah, and *Boy Leading a Horse* (1905-06) (Figure 52). As the artist ventured into his Cubist years the family collected many of his studies for paintings as well as main works themselves including, *Study for Nude with Drapery* (summer 1907), *Still Life with Fruit and Glass* (1908), *Three Women* (1908) (Figure 53), *The Architect’s Table* (1912) (Figure 54) and *Woman with a Mandolin* (1913-14), to name a few.

As one can easily see the Stein family’s collection was massive and included numerous artists, some famous, while others a little less known. The Steins not only became patrons to the up-and-coming artists of the twentieth century but they also spread the word about their art by introducing them to friends and showing their works to whomever would view them. They entered Paris at the beginning of the twentieth century
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not knowing that they would someday be one of the most prominent and influential families of collectors in the history of modern art. It was their ability to see the potential and greatness of the artists and their works at a time when many turned away which gave them such success. They not only helped to shape artists’ careers but each Stein family member created friendships with these artists which lasted for decades, if not for the rest of their lives. Unlike the other collections discussed in these pages the substantial collection of the four Steins, like so many other collections, was dispersed and sold over the years to other connoisseurs. It is important to note that this may partially have been due to their financial strains over the years and it is known that they constantly sold works of art in their collection in order to buy new ones. Sarah Stein is known to have begun selling her collection a few years before her death in 1953 and most of Gertrude’s collection was sold by her death in 1946. There is known to have been one specified donation in Gertrude’s will stating that Picasso’s portrait of Gertrude be given to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, “because she thought that it was there where it would have a measure of immortality.”

The Steins are an illustration of many collectors at the turn of the century that traveled to Europe regularly, as Michael and Sarah had done, and those who decided to stay in the stimulating city of Paris once visiting there, like Leo and Gertrude had done. The Steins greatly differed from other major art collectors due to their great lack of finances that others were lucky to have. They lived frugally in order to purchase artwork that they loved and this also led to them considering many of the modern artists that they became great patrons to. Similar to other connoisseurs they felt it important to share their
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art and findings with others. But instead of ensuring their collections endured after their deaths in one cohesive collection in a museum like the other collectors, they focused on what they could do during their lives. The Saturday evenings in both of the Stein homes in Paris aided in building important relationships with artists, such as Picasso and Matisse. It also forged connections with dealers, writers, and collectors that helped to push modernism into the forefront of the art world in the early twentieth century. If these figures did not have a central place to come and communicate and discuss the arts and their ideas the impact that revolutionary artists such as the Cubists and Post-Impressionists had could have been greatly altered. Their impact moved to the United States through American travelers visiting Paris and the Stein’s apartment, who brought back with them new ideas and art inspired by those seen in their home. They were also exposed to the American public by writers like, Carl Van Vechten and Henry McBride, both having newspaper series where they frequently discussed members of the Stein family. The Steins are one of the most written about families of art collectors due to the immense impacts they have caused in the history of modern art and on many modern art collections and will forever be seen as some of the first who appreciated and promoted the new avant garde artists and hosted a meeting place for followers to convene and develop more ideas.
CHAPTER III: CLARIBEL AND ETTA CONE

It was the passion and persistent taste of two sisters from Baltimore that led to the creation of one of the most well known modern art collections in the United States. Dr. Claribel Cone and her younger sister Etta Cone were born into an affluent family. Claribel was born November 14, 1864 and Etta on November 30, 1870. Their father started his successful grocery business after the family moved to Baltimore from Tennessee in 1871. As the business flourished the Cone family moved into 1607 Eutaw Place, a building in a quite fashionable German-Jewish community. During the 1880s two of the Cone sons, Moses and Caesar, had built an extremely successful textile industry in the South and it was for this reason that the family grocery business dissolved in 1890. It was such family success that would provide the two Cone sisters with the funds they needed to support their ever growing art collection. At the death of their father each of the surviving eleven children gained an inheritance. Claribel and Etta also were fortunate in gaining shares which originally belonged to their two brothers, Moses and Caesar, who gladly signed them over to their unmarried sisters. This allowed the two Cone sisters a yearly income of about two thousand four hundred dollars, which enabled them to live comfortably. It also allowed the sisters to be free from financial concerns, a problem unmarried women often faced.

Etta and Claribel did not begin collecting art early in life as did some other known patrons, such as Louisine Havemeyer; they each had specific goals and obligations which became a higher priority before their desire to own art emerged and the two sisters waited until their late-twenties, early-thirties to begin focusing on art. Claribel is known for
being very strong willed and self-absorbed. “Perhaps her most characteristic trait was a seamless confidence in her own judgment, which gave her the courage to follow her own mind without regard for convention.” It may be this trait which aided her in collecting some of the most avant-garde artists of the time regardless of the opinions of others. In 1883, as she graduated from Western Female High School in Baltimore she announced that she had a great desire to become a doctor. It was a plan that was not supported by her father, who tried repeatedly to dissuade her for the belief at the time was that a woman who was developed intellectually would destroy her feminine nature, but one which Claribel eventually carried out. She entered the Woman’s Medical College of Baltimore four years later.

She always seemed to get what she wanted and this goal was one she was determined to accomplish. She graduated with her medical degree in 1890 and was at the top of her class. She continued her studies for a few years in graduate school at the Woman’s Medical College of Pennsylvania in Philadelphia. Returning to Baltimore in 1893 she became professor of pathology and pathological histology and was a researcher under William Welch at John Hopkins Medical School. Claribel also served as president for the board of trustees at the Woman’s Medical College of Baltimore from 1899 to 1900. Her passion for medicine early in life helped to educate her and it was a key component in the development of Claribel as a woman. It was the medical field which led her to Germany for the first time in 1903, settling in Frankfurt to do research in pathology. She fell in love with the country and spoke German fluently. Writing in a
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letter to Etta in 1910 she claimed to have felt more at home in Germany than in America.\textsuperscript{84} For the rest of her life she always seemed to enjoy being anywhere but in Baltimore.

Etta was quite unlike her sister in many ways, timid, self-reflective and caring. She did not follow her sister into college life, instead completed her formal education at the Western Female High School. She spent much of her life providing care for family members including her parents until their deaths and her later widowed sister-in-law. Music was a great passion of hers and she was proficient at the piano. She also differed from Claribel in the fact that she had a strong interest in France and its culture as opposed to Germany. She studied the French language with persistence. Etta always put herself second, which must have been done not only because of her more passive nature but also due to the fact that she was the last remaining girl of the family. This meant that she was to take up the role as manager of her parents’ household. Subsequently Etta was subordinate to Claribel throughout their lives as well. Etta often reveals this in letters and writings always discussing being amenable to following her sister’s wishes. At age twenty-five it is known that she was proposed to by Mahonri Young, the sculptor, but she turned his marriage proposal down. Some believe that it was due to the fact that her brothers did not want her to marry a non-Jew, for Mahonri was a Mormon.\textsuperscript{85} It also may have been due to Etta having a desire to someday be free of expected female responsibilities.
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Gertrude Stein was a major influence in the collecting careers of the two sisters. Gertrude moved to Baltimore with her sister Bertha after her parents’ death, as previously discussed. It was in the city that the three women met. Gertrude first became friends with Claribel at Johns Hopkins Medical School and the three of them quickly became friends. Etta is known to have joined her sister and Gertrude after classes. The friendship with Gertrude would be of great importance to the sisters’ lives in various ways. It was through the Stein family that Etta and Claribel were introduced to a more cultured life, for the Cone family was very business oriented. Through Leo and Gertrude, Etta began to study history and art. It seems that she had an instinctive feeling toward art that began early in her career as a patron.

After their father’s death in 1897, Etta had created a plan to cheer up her mother by redecorating the front parlor of their family home. It was in this process that she purchased her first works of art. Her older brother Moses gave her three hundred dollars and with the help of an agent, Mr. Randolph, she purchased five small oil paintings by Theodore Robinson, an American Impressionist who had studied with Monet in Giverny. It is quite interesting that Etta’s first purchase of art was by an Impressionist, it was a bold purchase. Leo Stein, who had been to Paris and had a better chance of seeing and accepting the works of the Impressionists, did not fully discover the Impressionists until around 1904. Due to her family’s lack of exposure to fine art, Etta surely felt daring at the time.

At the age of thirty Etta, joined by her cousin Hortense Guggenheimer and friend Harriet Clark set out for Europe, on May 10, 1901. Leo Stein is known to have met them
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on their arrival in Naples. It was Leo who guided the group around, for he had been living abroad for many years, and was eager to teach Etta all he knew about the art world. In June the group visited the Galleria dell’Accademia to see modern paintings and after viewing the collections she wrote that the works did not appeal to her. 87 This is surprising since she would later become one of the most well known American patrons of modern art. Etta was quite eager to discover all she could about art and she carefully looked at works numerous times in order to learn about each painter and what they offered as an artist. Her friend and travel companion, Harriet Clark later wrote thanking Etta for such a great trip stating that she was “overwhelmed at the way you learned pictures and names.” 88

In Paris in September of 1901 Etta made her second purchase of a work of art. Accompanied by Gertrude Stein she bought a small bronze relief by Antoine Louis Barye entitled, Walking Panther (1831) (Figure 55). Throughout the rest of the year, even after returning to the United States in October, Etta and Gertrude became close; together they went to galleries and museums. Etta became so close to Gertrude that she also began typewriting Gertrude’s book, Three Lives. Although Etta had glimpses of freedom from responsibilities during her European trip that summer it was not until the death of their mother in 1902 that Etta was truly free from her household tasks and could travel without guilt. Therefore she and Claribel left for Europe early in the summer of 1903 for a few month’s stay. In the following summer she returned and soon began to rent an apartment on the Rue Madame, close to Leo and Gertrude on Rue de Fleurs.
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Claribel joined her sister in Paris and they attended the infamous Salon d’Automne on October 18, 1905. Claribel described the scene of the exhibition, seeing the Stein siblings there and experiencing Henri Matisse’s work, *Woman with a Hat*. She claimed the work to be crude. Her reaction to the exhibition of the avant-garde and to Matisse’s work was similar to most who visited it at the time. Louis Vauxcelles, art critic, reviewed the exhibition and declared that the artists in the ‘central cage’, a room comprised of paintings by Matisse, Marquet, Manguin, Jean Puy and Rouault were *Les Fauves* or wild beasts.\(^{89}\) It was Leo Stein who bought the bizarre work by the artist and, as discussed in the previous chapter, Leo was first in the group to discover Pablo Picasso, being introduced to his work by art dealer Clovis Sagot. He bought Picasso’s *Acrobat Family with an Ape* that same day.

A few days later Etta joined him and Gertrude visiting Picasso’s studio. Etta soon purchased a study drawing of a baboon by the artist and all three were frequent visitors to the artist’s studio thereafter. Etta’s love for the artist grew for in March 1906 she is known to have purchased eleven drawings and seven etchings by Picasso for one hundred seven five francs.\(^{90}\) She would continue to enjoy the work of the Spanish artist and appreciate him, but her true dedication in art was the work of Henri Matisse. It is interesting to note that though the Cone sisters did become patrons of Picasso the majority of their purchases were from his Blue and Rose periods and not from his Cubist years.\(^{91}\)
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Since the Salon d’Automne Matisse was a well known artist who was mocked in the press. A quote found in an art review magazine, L’Occident, in November 1907 discusses how many felt about Matisse’s work. Louis Rouart states:

The most clear-sighted view of M. Matisse as nothing but a mediocre, ordinary figure tortured by the desire to be original. He is taken seriously only by two or three Jews from San Francisco and by a few dealers who think that works of art…need have no more real value than stocks do.\textsuperscript{92}

Still there were people who were open to his ground-breaking art and because of this he became a staple at Sally Stein’s salons. It was these types of salons put on by the Steins; Michael, Sally, Gertrude, and Leo, that brought together the avant-garde and their supporters. Since Matisse’s work was not widely accepted it was difficult to become familiar with his art because it was not displayed. “But from 1905 to 1907 virtually the only place to see Matisse’s work was at the apartments of Leo and Gertrude and Michael and Sally.”\textsuperscript{93} It was there where figures like Etta and Claribel Cone could view, discuss and learn about artists such as Matisse. Etta went to the artist’s studio and bought two of his drawings on January 15, 1906 and soon after purchased the oil painting \textit{Yellow Pottery from Provence} or \textit{The Yellow Jug} (1905) (Figure 56). The work is composed of quick brushstrokes and juxtaposed colors. Parts are left sketched and unpainted. In 1906 it was surely seen as a revolutionary piece and shows that even from the beginning of Etta’s love for the artist she was willing to accept his bold vision. Within six months in
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1905 and 1906 she purchased twenty-eight works of art by six artists including Matisse, Cézanne and Picasso.\textsuperscript{94}

Soon after her busy year of venturing into the world of art collecting she left Paris with her sister and their brother Moses and his wife Bertha for a grand tour around the world. They spent a full year traveling and visiting numerous places such as India, Athens, Jerusalem, Shanghai, and Constantinople (Figure 57). While on her trip Etta particularly missed the city and her life and friends in Paris. Her friends also missed her and she is known to have received a letter from Gertrude containing a hand drawing by Picasso (Figure 58). They all returned safely home to Baltimore but the siblings’ trip around the world was to be their last. It was the following year, December of 1908, which would bring great sorrow to the family when Moses passed away. Etta was especially affected by his death due to their extreme closeness over the years. They were known to have a close bond and she spent many months at her brother’s family home in Blowing Rock, North Carolina. Over the next few years also Etta stayed there during the summers to help her widowed sister-in-law. It was during this time that Claribel returned to Germany. At the time of World War I the sisters wrote to one another but they did not collect art.

Claribel around 1910 began to feel a disconnection with her passion for medicine and within five years she had given up any serious research in the United States and in Germany.\textsuperscript{95} It was at this point that she began to focus more of her attention on the arts. It is known that Claribel would often try to obtain works of art from Gertrude Stein.
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Gertrude on numerous occasions would invite Claribel over to show her works of art that she was thinking about selling in order to acquire new pieces. The Cone sisters did obtain a number of works of art from the Stein siblings over the years of their friendship. Claribel showed her strength when she decided to courageously stay in Munich during World War I. She somehow managed to live openly as an American without being branded an enemy. It seems that she continued enjoying life during the war going to concerts and visiting art museums and dealers. During the war there was no easy way for her to receive letters or news from her family in America. She was isolated from them for six years and therefore she sadly did not find out about the death of her brother, Caesar, on March 1, 1917 until the following year.

Claribel did not return to Baltimore until May 1920 and it was then that she took residence with Etta and their brother Fred at the Marlborough Apartments. The building was in a fashionable area of the city and their adjoining apartments were on the eighth floor with seventeen rooms all together. Fred in his younger years worked in the family’s cotton mills and later joined his sisters in buying art of his own. Etta’s apartment seemed to have been the center of activity for the siblings and was where the three often ate together and discussed art and other interests.

Two years after Claribel’s return to America she and Etta left for Europe on a search for new works for their collection. This was Etta’s first trip to Europe in fifteen years and both sisters’ interest in art had been reawakened. It was in 1922 that their love of art became a full passion in collecting. The war increased their income because the greater need for military uniforms helped the family textile business boom when many
other businesses were faltering. In the summer of that year the sisters purchased many works by Picasso and Matisse directly from the artists themselves. They also acquired six paintings from the Paris art dealer Bernheim-Jeune and one painting from Durand-Ruel. One work by Matisse that they purchased from Bernheim-Jeune was *La Malade* also known as, *The Convalescent Woman* (1899) (Figure 59) for four thousand francs. This piece is known to have previously been in the collection of Leo Stein. The painting shows the artist’s characteristic use of brilliant color and it departs from other Impressionistic works by Matisse at the time and becomes somewhat abstract. It was around the same time that Claribel purchased another work by the artist, *The Pewter Jug* (1916-17) (Figure 60) for about twenty two thousand francs. It was also in that same year that they acquired Matisse’s quite aggressive painting, *Woman with a Turban* (1917) (Figure 61). In 1923 they continued expanding their collection by purchasing ten works by Matisse.

The Cone sisters were unique in the fact that neither excitedly discussed the purchase or acquisitions of works, big or small, in their diaries or letters. Claribel did not even mention the great highlight of Picasso drawing a portrait of her in the summer of 1922 (Figure 62).\(^{96}\) It was through Matisse’s son, Pierre, that Etta acquired the artist’s drawing of 1919, *The Plumed Hat* (Figure 63). Of the many works the sisters collected in 1923 many were newer pieces by the artist as opposed to the older works they had collected from him the previous year. It was also in that year that the two gave a lecture at an art forum in Baltimore about the work of Henri Matisse and Paul Cézanne.\(^{97}\)

\(^{96}\) Ellen B. Hirschland and Nancy Hirschland Ramage, 97.

\(^{97}\) Ibid., 99.
Etta and Claribel showed great aptitude in deciphering Matisse’s works and purchased many of the artist’s lesser praised paintings of the 1920s and 30s. Works of this period in the artist’s career created in his Nice period were viewed by many as “decorative” and lacking. It would not be until 1986 that such works by the artist were praised when the National Gallery of Art in Washington, D.C. hosted an exhibition, *Henri Matisse: The Early Years in Nice.* The sister’s determination in their collecting practices is shown here as they went against what other collectors were acquiring at the time from the artist; they knew that what they obtained was great art. A work which the two purchased during this period was the artist’s 1922 painting, *Anemones and Chinese Vase* (Figure 64). It shows one of the brilliant aspects of Matisse with his ability to combine many patterns and vibrant colors with complex points of view into a scene while at the same time creating a work that is also pleasing to the viewer. They also obtained Matisse’s, *Odalisque Reflected in a Mirror* (1923) (Figure 65), *Large Cliff, Fish* (1920) (Figure 66), and *Interior, Flowers and Parakeets* (1924) (Figure 67).

Etta and Claribel, as mentioned before, were close friends with the Stein siblings. They were unaware that they were often thought of as easy marks by the Stein family when it came to being able to sell them works of art. Claribel seemed to have trusted Michael Stein completely and both sisters admired the families’ opinions of art and did indeed collect many works from the Stein family collection. In the 1920s many art dealers fought one another for modern works of art. It is known that being associated with the Stein collection often helped a work sell, and the Cone sisters seemed to have been lucky in the fact that they obtained many works directly from the Steins at the
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dismay of many dealers at the time. In 1925 Claribel purchased Marie Laurencin’s 1908 painting, *Group of Artists* (Figure 68) from Michael for ten thousand francs. The painting is a portrait of the artist with her lover, Guillaume Apollinaire, and Picasso and his mistress, Fernande Olivier. Etta, like her sister, purchased works from the Steins including one from Gertrude entitled *Bathers* by Paul Cézanne (1890s) (Figure 69). “Etta particularly loved the Cézanne, which she kept in prominent view in her dining room, hanging alone on a narrow wall.”

It was the work of Cézanne that brought the biggest price tag that either sister would pay in their entire careers. Claribel in June of 1925 bought his painting, *Mont Sainte-Victoire Seen from the Bibémus Quarry* (1897) (Figure 70) from Bernheim-Jeune in Paris, paying 410,000 francs, about nineteen thousand dollars. The amount paid for this one painting was ten times the annual salary for an average American worker that year. The artist had completed numerous studies of the mountain and both sisters loved this painting. Claribel also showed her audacity and sophisticated taste in collecting when she purchased Matisse’s *Blue Nude* (1907) (Figure 50). She spent around five thousand dollars for the work, which was not a large sum for a piece by the artist at that time. This price indicates that many collectors were not interested in buying the boldly crude piece. The work is known to have previously been in the Stein collection and many who visited their apartment during their well known parties were often appalled by it. The painting also caused uproar when it was displayed in the Armory Show of 1913 in America and
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was burned in effigy in Chicago. The sisters also purchased the artist’s clay model study of the work, *Reclining Nude I (Aurora)* (1907) (Figure 71).

The year 1928 was a huge one for the Cone collection. The sisters bought about thirty-eight works from eighteen artists. It was a period that they broke free from their love of Matisse and began collecting artists such as Renoir, Edgar Degas, Félix Vallotton, Vincent Van Gogh, and Odilon Redon. Etta spent about six thousand dollars on Renoir’s, *The Washerwomen* (1888) (Figure 72). The painting shows women in the country doing laundry in a stream in a soft, painterly style. She continued her collecting by purchasing *The Lie* (1897) (Figure 73) by Félix Vallotton from the artist’s brother Paul. This seductive painting shows a couple embracing each other on a sofa. The bright and muted reds seem to verge and entwine with one another like the couple in their embrace. It is quite a bold piece and surely was thought of as such at the time of its purchase by Etta.

This year’s success in collecting was surely due to the sister’s numerous friends and contacts with artists, collectors, and dealers. The two often paid close attention to the various characters that they befriended as well as following their reliability. It seems that their close attention to such attributes helped to ensure many wonderful acquisitions for their collection.

Claribel purchased a wonderful still life by Vincent van Gogh from 1887 entitled, *A Pair of Boots* (Figure 74). She also purchased at the same time Odilon Redon’s *Peonies* (1900-05) from Paul Vallotton. Claribel encouraged her sister later to buy a Van Gogh painting which she had been hesitant about. She told her to buy what she liked, “Why
care a darn what anybody else says of it.” Etta listened to her sister but later discovered that the work she had purchased was a forgery. It was quite common for collectors to have at least a few works be proclaimed counterfeit in their collection. Especially if one was interested in popular well known artists, for their work was easily copied and portrayed as the artists’ original. Louise Havemeyer is known to have found out about a number of pieces in her collection being imitations.

Clariibel’s final purchase before her death was Gustave Courbet’s *The Shaded Stream at Le Puits Noir* (1860-65), on September 10, 1929 (Figure 75). This work is quite different from others that she had acquired over the years but was peaceful and beautiful. Courbet accomplishes a wonderful portrayal of the contrast between the sunshine and the deep darkness he shows with perspective. It was only ten days following this purchase that Claribel at age sixty-four passed away from a heart attack. Etta was devastated by the news of her sister’s death, for they had shared a lifetime of passion in letters and trips. It is interesting to note that although it is known that Claribel was the more dominant of the Cone sisters she had a great debt to her sister. In a letter written to Etta a few years before Claribel passed away she wrote, “to thank her sister for having taught her so well, saying how much she had learned from her.” Etta decided to honor her sister by creating and distributing a catalogue of the sisters’ joint collections of works of art. It was in this catalogue that appears a posthumous portrait of the elder sister by their favorite artist, Henri Matisse (Figure 76). It was also decided in the midst of the
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artist working on Claribel’s portrait that he finished one of Etta as well. He finished a charcoal drawing of Etta in 1934 (Figure 77).

The two portraits were included in the catalogue which was entitled, *The Cone Collection at Baltimore-Maryland: Catalogue of Paints-Drawings-Sculpture of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*. When the catalogue was printed Etta felt that only those who appreciated the sisters should receive one. It is known that the director of the Baltimore Museum of Art, Roland J. McKinney, provided her with a list of appreciative museums. It was an extremely sought after catalogue in the art world and many who did not originally receive one wrote to hopefully get a copy. It became a very personal item to Etta and she guarded every copy. Receiving one was a mark of high esteem and proof of a special relationship with Etta. Alfred H. Barr Jr., the director of the Museum of Modern Art in New York, claimed the catalogue to be, “by far the finest catalog of a collection of modern paintings that has ever been published.”\(^{103}\) It received many other wonderful compliments including those by Lionello Venturi, author and art historian. Venturi wrote to Etta stating that the catalogue was, “a testimony of the high level and of the courageous trend of your taste, and this is as rare as admirable.”\(^{104}\) Claribel naturally had left her portion of the collection to her sister; she surely knew that Etta would continue to add to it with pride and vigor.

Etta did just that and although she was deeply saddened by her sister’s death she saw it as a duty in honor of her to continue to expand the Cone Collection. It seems that after Claribel’s death Etta took on her sister’s dominant characteristics and began

\(^{103}\) Ibid., 143.
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collecting fiercely. From 1929 to 1938 Etta purchased one major work each year by Henri Matisse. Some include *Large Seated Nude* (1923-25) (Figure 78), *The Yellow Dress* (1929-31), *The Pink Nude* (1935) (Figure 79), and *Purple Robe and Anemones* (1937). *The Pink Nude* was purchased for nine thousand francs and Etta hung the painting across from the artist’s *Blue Nude* which was on the wall of Claribel’s apartment even after her death. She also increased the number of bronzes by the artist in 1931 purchasing, *Tiari with Necklace* (1930) (Figure 80), completed the previous year. Etta felt that she should not only collect works similar to ones that were already in the collection but also fill in the gaps of artists that they had admired but not yet owned. She did purchase Picasso’s *Woman with Bangs* (1902) (Figure 81) from Gertrude around 1930. By 1933 Etta’s relationship with Gertrude had considerably soured. She no longer needed the Stein’s influence in collecting art.

It is interesting that she purchased a drastically different portrait of a woman by Édouard Manet in the same year as *Woman with Bangs*. The work is a pastel entitled, *Lady with a Bonnet* (1881) (Figure 82). It is a sketchy portrait but quite pretty as opposed to Picasso’s oil work which is ominous and melancholic. She also obtained a portrait of Leo Stein by Picasso in the early 1930s. It was one which she had enjoyed for quite some time and was a great addition to the collection, especially due to the sisters’ closeness to the Steins, particularly Leo early in their career. She continued branching away from her usual styles in the collection and acquired a Cubist work by Picasso entitled, *Nude with Raised Arm* from 1907. It was a daring acquisition for her not only due to the fact that she normally did not purchase works from the artist’s Cubist years but also because the
painting itself was still shocking to many. She also bought Georges Braque’s work, *Still Life with Lemons* (1928).

One gap that Etta felt she needed to fill was a missing piece by Camille Corot. She acquired *The Artist’s Studio* (1868) which is a rather formal composition. She also felt she needed to collect more American artists’ works and obtained works by artists such as John Marin’s, *Rocks and Sea, Maine* (1931) which she purchased in 1944. She also acquired Paul Gauguin’s, *Woman with Mango* (1892) (Figure 83). The painting was completed during the artist’s time in Tahiti. Like his other works from that period he uses bold colors and also includes fertility symbols such as the mango. In August of 1939 Etta decided to purchase Picasso’s *Mother and Child* (1922) (Figure 84) from Siegfried Rosengart. The painting was sent to her in the last days before all transatlantic shipments became impossible with the onset of World War II.\(^{105}\) This painting is rather different from the others in the Cone collection by the artist. Its strong outlined figures are reminiscent of ancient Greek vases. The light washing of colors are also quite unlike the boldness of the other Picasso works in the collection. In turn, it was a wonderful addition to the set, in that it provided a range of the artist’s styles.

In July 1949 Etta made plans to go to her sister-in-law’s home in Blowing Rock, North Carolina. She received news that her health was not good and she had a bad heart. It was while in North Carolina that Etta received a phone call from Allan Stein from Paris. He wanted to sell her his portrait by Picasso. He knew that she had always enjoyed the portrait and extended the offer to purchase it. The two agreed that Etta would pay fifteen thousand dollars for the painting and the transaction was completed. Little did

\(^{105}\) Ibid., 173.
anyone know that this purchase would be Etta’s last; she would never have the chance to
admire the work again for the painting arrived in Baltimore on September 1, 1949 the day
after Etta passed away.

It became Etta’s responsibility to decide where their collection would end up.
Claribel had mentioned that she would like it to stay in Baltimore but only if the city had
gained appreciation for modern art. In the end it was Etta’s task and for many years
numerous museums strove to convince the remaining sister that it was their museum
which would be the best for their massive collection. In the end the Baltimore Museum of
Art became the recipient of the desired collection at the death of Etta. It was important to
both sisters that their collection, which took so many years to acquire, would remain
intact. Included with the collection itself the sisters donated four hundred thousand
dollars to build a wing to house the collection. Eight years after Etta’s death, on February
23, 1957 the three-story Cone wing opened to the city of Baltimore. The stipulations of
the will also gave the Baltimore museum the right to give any unwanted works to the
Women’s College of the University of North Carolina. The museum and the city of
Baltimore now fully recognize the importance of the Cone collection that they were so
fortunate to be given. The collection of the Cone sisters was an expression of themselves.
George Boas agrees claiming, “‘The Cones were satisfied to embody themselves in their
collection, as if it were sufficient expression of their personalities.”106 The final collection
consisted of about three thousand works of art about five hundred of which were by
Matisse. The collection alone consisted of more than 149 paintings, 97 drawings, 54
sculptures, 114 prints, and three illustrated books by Henri Matisse, including his
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Mallarmé set. The collection today is surely worth more than one billion dollars and is one of the greatest art collections in American history.
CHAPTER IV: DUNCAN PHILLIPS

Unlike the other collectors discussed in previous chapters Duncan Phillips sought to bring a connection between the art of Europe and that of the United States within his collection. He had a great desire to educate the art-viewing public and to create a balance in his gallery between the two continents. It seems fitting that this exploration of art collectors ends with the Phillips Collection since it is a wonderful example of a mixture of European and American art. It represents how the American public and so many collectors began to accept and enjoy the art of American artists as they developed and defined their own styles. The collection began being displayed on the walls of the family home and transformed into the now renowned Phillips Memorial Collection in the nation’s capital that has always remained a personal vision of an impassioned man.

The Phillips family, like other collectors of the time, was affluent. Duncan’s father, Duncan Clinch Phillips, a well educated man, was a business executive manufacturer of window glass and he was also a cavalry officer in the Army of the Potomac. His mother, Eliza Laughlin Phillips also came from a prominent family. Her father was a banker and cofounder of the Jones and Laughlin Steel Company. Duncan and Eliza lived in Pittsburgh with Eliza’s mother and enjoyed their two sons, Duncan and his brother, James. James was born in May of 1884 and Duncan was born two years later in June. Although Duncan was born in Pittsburgh his family moved to Washington D.C. in 1896 when he was ten. They sought a milder climate, and there was no significant reason to live in Pittsburgh once Duncan’s grandmother passed away. Throughout his childhood Duncan attended private schools, starting at the Washington School for Boys
and eventually received a Bachelor of Arts in English literature from Yale University in 1908.

During his time at Yale he delved into literature, writing, and the arts. Duncan was an active writer for the *Yale Literary Magazine* during his years at the university. He became an editor of the well known magazine in 1907. One of the key articles he wrote from this time was his discussion of Yale’s lack of art history or art appreciation courses on campus. Duncan argued the great importance and need for the arts in our lives. He proclaimed, “In order to enjoy aright this wonderful, beautiful, plentiful world of ours, we should, during our period of preparation, submit ourselves to the influence of the arts, and develop, if we can, that critical sagacity which will be the power and those glowing entusiasms which will be the joy of our advancing years.” Duncan believed that one must first be introduced to art in order to learn one’s own taste and opinions. He further advocated that without ever being or allowing to be exposed to the world of art one could not truly see the beautiful things in life.

Duncan stressed his philosophy, in his writing, stating that it does not matter a person’s cultural standing in life that defines if he is cultured or not. One could be well read and educated but without his own ability to have an opinion he is uncivilized. “A man may succeed in memorizing a wide amount of book knowledge – yet if he is without the ability to understand, appreciate and possess opinions of his own, he is not cultured.” With the great need to be exposed to art Duncan discussed the difficulty to study art due to the lack of the majority of original European art within the United States
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and even less seen in New Haven. Duncan noted that photographs and slides make it difficult to truly understand and appreciate the originals that have become beloved and labeled masterpieces. He also provided insight into the debate that appreciation of art is determined by personality and mood of the beholder, which unlike other subject matter makes it difficult to be represented by one lecturer. Although there are these various obstructions in teaching and learning the history of art Duncan believed it should not prevent holding courses on what one should know within the subject. He pushed that the course could be supplemented by visits to the Metropolitan Museum in New York as well as other available galleries and shows.  

His passion for writing continued throughout the rest of his career and life. He continued to have strong beliefs in art education and appreciation. After college Duncan would make frequent trips to New York for inspiration and he wrote for publications like the *Forum, Art and Progress* and *Scribner’s* discussing such topics as art appreciation and criticism. While in New York he was exposed to more art. Duncan and his family acquired Japanese prints by Hokusai, Hiroshige, and Harunobu while they traveled to Japan and China in 1910. His enthusiasm also led him to visit Europe to see such cities as London, Madrid, and Paris and to meet artists and see exhibitions. This was not his first European excursion; his parents took him there when he was four years old.

During his travels he often wrote in a journal and while visiting the Louvre in Paris on August 22, 1911 he commented, “The colour of Tiepolo and his followers certainly influenced such dissimilar masters as Chardin, Claude, Watteau and Goya and served as a connecting link between the great Venetians and the disciples of colour for its
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own sake in modern painting." Duncan enjoyed comparing works by different artists and he always believed in the importance of understanding where artists received their influence from in order to value their place within the timeline of art history. He felt that the progression of art through its numerous movements was not due to a lack of connection between them but was proof that each movement was inevitably linked to another through inspiration.

After moving to New York City with his brother, Jim, the two continued to collect contemporary American paintings, his passion for art continued to grow and it also led to inspiration for Duncan’s writing. His first book, The Enchantment of Art was published in 1914 by John Lane and consisted of a collection of essays on his favorite writers and artists. Within this collection of writings he strove to encourage the idea that appreciating art led to the enhancement of life as a whole. The two Phillips brothers collected numerous works between 1916 and 1917, while in New York, including paintings by, J. Alden Weir, Ernest Lawson, Arthur B. Davies, Augustus Vincent Tack, Childe Hassam, and Robert Spencer. Their appreciation for American artists was important early on, at a time when there was little awareness of these paintings, and eventually led to Duncan’s desire to link their inspirations and works to that of the famous European artists of the day.

The year of 1917 brought devastating events to the family. Jim was married to Alice Conyngham Gifford in June which was sadly the same day of their father, Major Phillip’s, death. This caused Duncan to move to Washington to live with his widowed, Marjorie Phillips, Duncan Phillips and His Collection (Boston: Little, Brown, 1970), 41.
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heart-broken mother and he left New York behind. Just as the family was beginning to adjust to their loss they were struck by Jim’s unexpected death from influenza only fifteen months later. Duncan was inconsolable but after a few months had passed he decided that he should honor his father and brother, who both loved art as he did, by creating a memorial gallery. The Phillips Memorial Gallery was incorporated in 1918. The gallery was housed in a few rooms of the family’s home on 21st Street and was finally opened to the public in the fall of 1921. Although the collection was smaller than the great museums of the country at the time it was influential as being the first museum of modern art in this country, with its main emphasis on living painters.

The most well known and praised work of the Phillips collection, Pierre-Auguste Renoir’s, *Luncheon of the Boating Party* (1880-81) (Figure 85), was acquired for the collection in 1923. Duncan knew that the work was one of the best by the artist and purchased it from Joseph Durand-Ruel, the son of Paul Durand-Ruel, the well known art dealer of the Impressionists. The artist had passed away four years earlier which surely made the work more indispensable. Renoir, the figure painter of the Impressionists, was well known for his feathery brushstroke style of painting as well as his use of vibrant light and rich colors. He often focused on genre scenes such as the one seen in *Luncheon of the Boating Party*. The painting shows a group of the artist’s friends enjoying food and spirits along the Seine at a popular restaurant in Chatou, a western suburb of Paris. It is also an important display of how class structure was changing toward the end of the nineteenth century. Many classes were welcomed to mix together at such restaurants at that time; Renoir shows this by displaying a diverse group within his painting including
business men, society women, artists, writers, etc. The painting portrays a very common scene for many Parisians of the time as traveling to the suburbs of the city to enjoy the countryside and relaxation became easy after railway transportation was established by the 1870s. Duncan is known to have paid one hundred twenty-five thousand dollars for the work which was well worth the price since to this day it still brings great prestige to the Phillips Collection.

Another wonderful artist who has a strong presence in the Phillips collection is American Arthur Davies. Davies received his education from the Chicago Academy of Design and the Art Institute of Chicago before moving to New York. He was a principle organizer of the Armory Show in 1913 and is known for his exquisite figure paintings. The first painting acquired by the Phillips family was *Visions of Glory* (1896) (Figure 86), bought by Duncan and his brother in 1916. Phillips did publish a book on the artist as a Phillips Publication in 1924. It consisted of essays about the artist by Phillips, Dwight Williams, Royal Cortissoz, Edward W. Root, Frank Jewett Mather Jr., and Gustavus Eisen. The collection has many wonderful examples by Davies including, *Tissue Parnassian* (1923), *Hesitation of Orestes* (1915-18) (Figure 87), *The Flood* (1903) (Figure 88), *Horses of Attica* (c.1910), and the *Erie Canal* (1890). His best known ethereal works display dream-like landscapes with allegorical nudes. Davies was unique in the fact that though he rejected the avant-garde styles of the time in his own work he continuously supported the avant-garde throughout his career similar to one of his main patrons, Duncan Phillips.
Duncan’s goal to share art with the public continued outside of his own gallery. He helped in the beginning stages of the creation of the National Gallery of Art in Washington D.C., which was possible due to Andrew W. Mellon’s vast gift to the country of his collection and charitable trust. The gallery opened in 1941 and due to Duncan’s support of the museum he became a charter trustee and a close friend to the National Gallery’s first director, David E. Finley.\textsuperscript{112} His contributions to the art world continued throughout his career and Duncan’s writings have helped to preserve his thoughts on art and hopes for his collection. His \textit{Collection in the Making} was a description of the progress of the collection over the five years since its opening and the plans for the future. Alfred Barr, friend and Museum of Modern Art’s first director, described the book asserting, “The brief estimates are sensitive, personal, and often possessed of extraordinary charm of language – a collection of charming and discerning critical vignettes.”\textsuperscript{113} In his discussions of the collection Barr states his policy of collecting work, “it is to choose the best representative as well as the best creative and abstract design and to do reverence to both.”\textsuperscript{114}

The most important contribution that the gallery gave to the art world in the nation’s capitol during the 1920s and 1930s was that it was the only museum in Washington to own and show the work of both contemporary Europeans and living American artists. A great example of this was a group exhibition held in 1927 displaying works from artists such as Matisse, Braque, Marsden Hartley, Man Ray, Walt Kuhn, Georgia O’Keeffe, and Karl Knaths. The American public was able to compare the works
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of these two continents and see how inspiration occurred between the two art worlds at that time. Duncan is also known to have loved hanging contemporary artists next to great past painters within the collection. This gave the gallery a unique characteristic and juxtaposition that many other galleries did not offer. The Museum of Modern Art, established in 1929, strove to display modern works of the time but did not incorporate older art works into their collection as Phillips had. Another influential museum, the Whitney, founded in 1930 by Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney, advocated living American artists, but differed from the Phillips Collection in that it only focused on American works and not European as well. Duncan hoped that such pairings of older and newer, European and American would begin conversations between the various time periods of each work so visitors could find unusual relationships among these contrasting paintings.

Duncan’s wife described his great fondness for his collection by describing him sharing his collection with visitors she claimed he showed people the gallery with, “an exhilarating, quiet and intelligent enthusiasm…he always cast light on unsuspected but important aspects of each work and enjoyed hearing others’ opinions.”

It was important to Duncan that the museum maintained a sense of intimacy and wanted the gallery spaces to allow visitors to slow down and enjoy the pieces without feeling like they were in a space that was intimidating. It is a great tribute to Duncan’s vision that even after renovations and his death the gallery has remained a place where visitors feel at home in an intimate setting.

After the death of Duncan’s mother in the fall of 1929 the family decided to move into a new house in the following year in order to give the rest of the family home to the
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collection. In the process of expanding the gallery Duncan also enrolled his old friend, C. Law Watkins to become an associate director for the gallery. He helped to develop the lecture program at the gallery as well as opening up an art school on its top floor. Each year they displayed the students’ work in an exhibition. Expanding the gallery also led to an increase of works within the collection. 1929 brought four wonderful paintings to the Phillips collection; Bonnard’s, *The Midi* (c.1924) and *The Palm* (1926) (Figure 89), Cézanne’s *Self-Portrait* (1878-80), and John Constable’s landscape *On the River Stour* (1834-37) (Figure 90).

Throughout his career Duncan differed from many collectors in the fact that he purely trusted his own taste and ideas instead of relying on others such as agents or advisors. The Phillips collection began as a family collection that had personal meaning and throughout his life he continued to maintain this delicate aspect that is often lost in art collections shared with the public. Duncan describes the great importance of making your own choices in his *The Artist Sees Differently* stating, “The capacity to decide for oneself is one’s only safeguard against the contagion of fashion in art which are so peculiarly prevalent today…my special function is to find the independent artist and to stand sponsor for him against the herd mind whether it tyrannizes inside or outside of his profession.”

By following his own taste he formed units of his favorite artists for his collection. These units are a large set of works by an individual artist that were featured in the galleries. Duncan had a desire to stay away from collecting specific schools of artists and strove to focus on individual artists who did not always necessarily fit into such movements.
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One of Duncan’s most well known relationships with an artist is the one with American artist, Arthur Dove. The museum holds one of the most significant collections of the artist in the United States. Dove was one of the earliest nonobjective artists in the country. He began his career being a magazine illustrator for such publications as, *Scribner’s*, *Collier’s*, and *The Saturday Evening Post*. Like many other artists of that time he traveled to Paris to study and learn from the Impressionists and Fauvists. After his return to the States he linked with artists such as Georgia O’Keeffe and John Marin and began to focus more on abstract art. He exhibited at the well known 291 gallery in 1910, owned by Alfred Stieglitz. Dove’s art was amorphous and he is known to have used muted coloring. Though abstract his works often had a sense of nature and landscape. He also played with collage and worked with pastels and graphic media throughout his career. Dove’s connection with Stieglitz led to his introduction to Duncan which developed into a full fledge patronage in 1922.

Duncan had a strong belief that Dove was an artist who could not truly be defined. “His art is as different from the spatially geometrical Cubists and from the precisely proportioned Purists as it is from the complicated literary painters of Surrealism. He was never theoretical, never literary, never anything but painterly and sincere.”¹¹⁷ Over the years Duncan would acquire more than twenty-five works by Dove. His first purchase of Dove’s works was in 1926 when he bought two of Dove’s works, *Waterfall* (1925) and *Golden Storm* (1925) (Figure 91). The latter was painted with metallic paint on wood panel. The painting shows the view Dove had on a boat off Long Island. It is a great representation of the artist’s mature style. He shows the choppy waves in the harbor with

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 96-98.
dark blues and gold tones forming an abstract water and sky seascape. Within the next four years he acquired three others as well including, *Coal Carrier* (1929-30) (Figure 92), *Huntington Harbor* (1926), and *Snow Thaw* (1930) (Figure 93). Duncan became Dove’s main patron and was given first choice of his works from his annual exhibitions. His acquisition of Dove’s works was an important step for the collector as he began to accept abstract form and expressive color in works of art.

Pierre Bonnard was a popular and well represented artist in the Phillips Collection and it would eventually acquire the largest American collection of works by Bonnard. The artist is known for being one of the best colorists of late nineteenth-century French art and was a leader for the Intimists and part of the Nabis group. The latter was a group who strove to create art that was symbolic and spiritual in nature and experimented with arbitrary color, expressive line, and flat, patterned surfaces. He shared a studio with Maurice Denis and Édouard Vuillard in the famous Montmartre area of Paris. He is known for his intimate domestic interiors and still life canvases that were painted with intense colors and small brushstrokes, which were characteristic of the groups he participated in. By 1910 Bonnard had moved toward focusing on landscapes and began to be influenced by the sixteenth-century Venetian school’s coloristic tradition. Duncan purchased his first Bonnard painting, *Girl and Dog* (1891) (Figure 94) in 1925 after seeing the work at the Carnegie International Exhibition in Pittsburgh the previous year. Over the next six years Duncan continued feverishly collecting Bonnard’s work adding at least nine other paintings from the artist to the collection. Some of these works include,
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Early Spring (1908) (Figure 95), The Palm, The Riviera (1923), The Open Window (1921) (Figure 96), Movement of the Street (1907) and Woods in Summer (1927). Duncan was quite inspired by Bonnard’s The Palm and wrote a description of the artist’s skill:

It goes beyond Monet into lyrical Expressionism. Such Enchantment of Vision as he possessed cannot be charted, can only be enjoyed if one has any part of his sensitivity and love of life. Not the violet figure standing in shadow against the full orchestra of light and color. He needed the cool violet as a foil to the orange and green and wanted the spectator to be in the picture and to pass around and look over the shoulder of this incidental attractively arresting person, to the red roofs, the over arching palm – the distant sea. Bonnard’s mastery of color has never been surpassed. His feeling for the time passing and for the abundance of nature carries us back to Giorgione.119

Duncan was ahead of his time with his appreciation for the Bonnard. Many Americans did not realize the importance of the artist as Duncan had during this period of his career, because many were drawn to the popularity of Picasso and Matisse and their followers. Eventually the Phillips Collection would obtain nineteen oil paintings, five drawings, and a collection of lithographs by Bonnard creating a superb sampling of the artist.

Maurice Prendergast was an American Post-Impressionist and a member of The Eight, a group of American artists who formed in 1907 to revolt against academic art and had a determination to bring painting back into contact with ordinary life.120 Like many other artists he studied in Paris at the end of the nineteenth-century and was inspired by

119 Phillips, Duncan Phillips and His Collection, 80.
120 The Eight included, Arthur B. Davies, Maurice Prendergast, Ernest Lawson, Robert Henri, George Luks, William J. Glackens, John Sloan, and Everett Shinn.
Post-Impressionists such as Pierre Bonnard. Later in his career he was greatly influenced by Cézanne and was one of the first American artists to adopt his style. Prendergast is known for his works displaying leisurely scenes in parks and on beaches and although early on in his career he mainly used watercolor and monotype, he eventually turned to oil painting around the early 1900s. Duncan began to collect Prendergast’s works as he began to create his collection in the 1920s. Within a few short years he acquired eleven paintings by the artist which formed a wonderful unit of the artist displaying different stylistic stages of his career in the collection.

Some of the more prominent works by Prendergast in the Phillips Collection are, *Pincian Hill, Rome* (1898) (Figure 97), *Picnic Party* (1913-1916), *Under the Trees* (1913-1915) (Figure 98), *Ponte della Paglia* (1922) (Figure 99), and *Blue Sea* (1903). *Ponte della Paglia* was one of the artist’s earliest oil paintings. He began the work while in Venice in 1899 over the years he painted over the work changing the style from his early detailed and tightly painted manner to a more loosely broad and colorful brushstrokes which looks influenced by the Pointillist technique. It is a wonderful example of the artist and gives a glimpse of his various styles which he worked in during his career. Duncan not only supported the work of Prendergast by his patronage but also contributed greatly to early literature on the artist. He discussed Prendergast’s importance in 1922 writing, “(Prendergast) painted with a brush full of colors far more beautiful and subtly related than was to be found on the palette of any painter in France.”

---

Duncan was also rare in the fact that he enjoyed the work of many English artists. Many American collectors kept their focus on artists from the main European countries of France, Germany, Spain, and Italy. He did enjoy the works of English Romantic masters like John Constable and Joseph Mallord William Turner but also acquired works by many lesser praised English artists including, Paul Nash, Henry Moore, Christopher Wood, and Ben Nicholson. Paul Nash was a major war artist in England during both the first and second World Wars. He was also a leader in the modernism movement in England promoting the avant-garde in abstraction and Surrealism, as he helped to found the modern Unit One movement in 1933. The Unit One movement was a group of British artists, including, Ben Nicholson, Barbara Hepworth, and Henry Moore, who wanted to promote avant-garde art, including both abstract and Surrealism, in England.

Henry Moore is an internationally known abstract sculptor and many of his abstract-figural bronze sculptures can be found around the world. His works were added to the collection in the late 1940s. There is a wonderful sketch drawing by Moore of a group of figures in an anonymous setting which is a great example of the artist’s ability to capture the soul of the human figure. This talent can also be seen in one of the other works in the collection, *Family Group* (1946) (Figure 100), is one of his bronze sculptures. It shows a family of four, mother, father and their two children seated together as one unit. His use of voids within his sculptures helps to give his figures more of a sense of abstraction. Ben Nicholson was another English artist influenced by abstraction as well as the works of the Cubists. Duncan collected his paintings in the 1950s including, *Talisman* (1955), *Trendrine (2) December 13-17* (1947), and *Zennor Quoit 2*
(1966). Each of his works seen in the collection is exemplary of his Cubist styling. *Zennor Quoit* 2 was a gift in 1967 to the collection from Duncan’s wife and son, Laughlin, in memory of his death the year before.

Although Duncan passed away in 1966 the Phillips Collection continues to be the wonderfully intimate assemblage that he strove to maintain throughout the formation of his collection. Since his first purchase of art Duncan acquired works that he felt a connection with and did not follow the path of most connoisseurs buying works of specific movements or genres. Duncan’s strong belief in supporting living artists helped to make the Phillips Collection a unique entity that houses various artists often not found together in collections. His mixture of masters and popular artists with new American artists and the often overlooked modern British artists gives the Phillips collection matchless distinction all its own. Today the museum's collection includes nearly 3,000 works by American and European artists—among them, Degas, Cézanne, Gauguin, van Gogh, Bonnard, Matisse, Picasso, Braque, Klee, Homer, Whistler, Hopper, Stieglitz, O'Keeffe, Calder, Rothko, and numerous others. Duncan Phillips’s most important attribute besides his love for art was his conviction that art gives us the ability to see all that is beautiful in this world. A friend once claimed, “To dine with Duncan Phillips is to learn what the arts are, and what they can do for us.”122

CONCLUSION

The Havemeyer, Stein, Cone, and Phillips families have helped to transform the history of American art and its museums with their patronage. This discussion of these families has provided an intimate overview of their patronage and influence on the American art scene as its museums developed into world-renowned institutions. In the formative decades of our nation the colonists worried little about art and its importance. As the country fought for its independence and established the foundation of a new government and societal structure many began to realize the need for art and organizations for artists. This led to the development of artistic leagues, an increase in patronage and venues for the display of fine art, which can be seen mostly after the Civil War. Charles Wilson Peale and Luman Reed are early models of American patronage and nativist ideals that helped to establish its importance early on in the country’s history. The establishment of the American art museum during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries is essential in understanding the importance of these collections to the country. Without the deeply passionate collectors within the United States at this time, who helped to support our country’s artists as well as bring great examples of European art to American artists and the public, our art opportunities and museums to see and learn about art would be sparse compared to the richness and vast numbers of museums this country has attained today.

Louise and Henry Havemeyer exemplify the peak of collecting in the late nineteenth century. Both husband and wife had individual interests in their patronage of the arts collecting everything from Asian art to paintings by the Impressionists. Louise
developed a close relationship with painter, Mary Cassatt who aided in the development of her appreciation of modern art. Louisine and Henry, as a couple, became the most active collectors of the Impressionists in the world by 1894 and were given first choice of works of art by dealers such as Ambroise Vollard and Paul Durand-Ruel. The final collection is distinguished by having numerous comprehensive groupings of artists such as Monet, Courbet, Degas, Manet, and Cézanne. With the collection being bequeathed to the Metropolitan Museum of Art, after Louisine’s death in 1929, it gave the public a chance to view many works by the same artist within the United States giving museum goers insight into the developments of styles throughout an artist’s career. The entire bequest consisted of hundreds of paintings and prints as well as immense quantities of Oriental ceramics, textiles, Japanese armor, and bronzes. It aided in making the Metropolitan Museum one of the premier museums for nineteenth-century French art in America.

The Steins acquired some of the most influential works of avant-garde art of the twentieth century. They greatly differ from the other three collectors in this study due to the fact that most of their collections were dispersed over the years to other collectors and galleries for financial reasons but it was their close relationships with such avant-garde artists, writers, critics, patrons, and dealers of the time that made them some of the most influential patrons of the early twentieth century and worthy of inclusion in these pages. Leo led the Steins into the appreciation of such modern artists as Cézanne, Picasso, and Matisse in Paris. Gertrude joined her brother and it was at their 27 Rue de Fleurs flat where their Saturday evening soirées became the most popular location for artistic minds.
such as André Derain, Max Jacob, Guillaume Apollinaire, Georges Braque, Henri Matisse, and Pablo Picasso. Michael and Sarah followed in its popularity having similar salons at their home at 58 Rue Madame. These salons aided in the building of relationships between dealers and patrons with new avant-garde artists of the time and led to great patronage of their work. This in turn, helped build the careers of some of the most influential artists in history. Sarah’s close relationship with Matisse is not as well known as Gertrude’s with Picasso, but led to Sarah bringing the first Matisse works to the United States in 1906. Gertrude's passion for Picasso led to a life-long friendship and aided in both artist and patron’s careers. Without the central place of the Stein homes for such avant-garde minds to meet and discuss ideas and the arts the impact of these revolutionary artists and their movements could have been greatly altered.

Etta and Claribel Cone persisted in their tastes for art and with the help of friends like the Steins created one of the most established modern art collections in the United States. The sisters’ collection included works by Paul Gauguin, Pablo Picasso, Gustave Courbet, Vincent van Gogh, and most importantly, Henri Matisse. Matisse was the sisters’ favorite artist and their final collection contained over four hundred works by the artist including paintings, drawings, prints, and sculptures. This massive set of works by Matisse joined with the numerous other works of art by various other artists transformed the Baltimore Museum of Art when it was bequeathed to the museum as the sisters desired. The collection of about three thousand works of art embodied the Cone sisters’ personalities and helped to make the city of Baltimore a center for the study of modern art.
The Phillips Collection, established in 1918, became the first museum of modern art in America, setting an emphasis on living painters of the time. Duncan Phillips strove to combine modern works of both European and American artists within its walls in order to educate the public regarding the development and differing characteristics between works of art. His passionate desire to start discussion on art and its inspirations and purpose may be one of his most influential attributes. His collection is a wonderful example of the fusion of the nativist and cosmopolitan ideals that often caused tension between art activists and within the creation of art museums in both the late nineteenth and into the early twentieth centuries in America. It preceded the three influential museums in New York, the Museum of Modern Art (1929), the Guggenheim Museum (1939), and the Whitney Museum of American Art (1930) by a decade. Each museum important in their own right in the establishment of the importance of modern art in the U.S. but all lacked the premise of displaying both European and American living artists together. Set in Washington D.C. the Phillips Memorial Collection was the archetype of what America’s museums would become.

This study of these four families helps to illustrate each one equally in the various types of patrons that have helped to transform the art and museums within the United States. The Havemeyer family dappled in numerous types of artwork from around the world and is an illustrious example of a worldly collector during the period of development of art museums in the United States. The Stein family is surely the most dissimilar example of patronage within this collection due to their lack of a donation of an intact life-long collection to an American museum. Though lacking in this aspect, it is
important to note that they may be the best example of patrons who were financially constrained throughout their collecting careers and not only lived frugally but often sold works in order to have money to purchase new ones for their collection. Their importance is still remarkable as they created close connections between patrons and artists that aided in bringing many avant-garde modernists to the forefront of popularity.

The Cone family gives a grand example of the influence one collector had on another. Their close ties to the Stein family aided them in getting started in their collecting practices. They strove to accumulate works that they loved and illustrate how many collectors remain faithful to their roots by donating their important collection to their hometown of Baltimore, when their collection could have easily been welcomed by a more established and well known institution. The Cone sisters are similar to the Havemeyer’s in that they wanted their collection to continually be displayed to the public and kept together and known to be a part of their donation. The Cones allotted a large financial sum to be used to build an entire new wing to house the extensive compilation of works of art. It seemed advantageous to end the discussion of patronage and their effect on American museums with the Phillips family. Duncan illustrates a combination between the desire to leave his collection to the public such as the Havemeyers and Cones had done and the want to be a part of and see the effect on the public that the Steins had accomplished during their Saturday evening salons in Paris by establishing his own museum. Phillips was able to fuse together the nativist ideals and the cosmopolitan principles in the creation of his museum. Each of these families of collectors and their compilations display the various styles and categories of collections that were commonly
seen in the United States during this booming advancement of museums at the turn of the century.

It is important to note that each of these families had a comparable desire to share their collections with others in order to educate the public and encourage artists in their careers. These four families give examples of how patrons at the turn of the century greatly contributed in the creation of the American appreciation of art of Europe as well as significantly supporting the country’s own artists. Collecting has numerous intentions including financial gain, social status, and passion. Each of these is true for the four families discussed here, but it was their immense passion that seems to be the driving force for the collections. Unlike patrons of modern times who often collect and donate parts of their collections to museums mostly for financial gain and in order to receive tax deductions,\textsuperscript{123} those of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries truly wanted to purchase works and give their collections due to their great fervor for art and in order to share their passion with the public, to help educate, and display their accomplishments as collectors. It is such ideals that led to the creation of the American art museum and is why the discussion of these families is of such great importance.

\textsuperscript{123} The Estate tax was first enacted in 1916 and the Gift tax created in 1924. Both are the only wealth tax levied by the federal government. Though they have seen many amendments over the years they are very important to collectors and patrons of the arts. The most important part of these two taxes to collectors is the charitable bequest deduction. This deduction states that all money donated to charitable organizations are deductible from the gross estate. This deduction allows patrons of the arts to donate works from their collection in order to receive a deduction from their taxes either at the time of gifting to a museum or at time of death.
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